OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

---

3 EDWARD VII., 1903

VOL. LIX

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTH DAY OF MAY TO THE NINETEENTH DAY OF JUNE, INCLUSIVE

NATIONAL DEFENCE
RECEIVED
MAY 25 1970
LIBRARY

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

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
APR 5 1994
CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E. ISLAND.

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 6, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 153) to incorporate the Montreal Savings Bank.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 154) to incorporate the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Railway Company.—Mr. German—by Mr. Logan.

EXCHEQUER COURT—RAILWAY DEBTS

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville)—(translation)—moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 155), respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway debts. He said: Mr. Speaker, the Act of 1899 already allows the Exchequer Court to order the sale of a railway, at the request of a mortgagor or of a holder of debentures. The Bill which I submit to the consideration of the House has for its object to allow the Court of Exchequer to order that a railway be sold, on a petition from the Minister of Railways or from a creditor not protected by mortgage, when the railway company has become insolvent or is no longer in a position to manage its own affairs.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

IMMIGRANTS REFUSED ADMISSION.

Mr. WILSON asked:

1. How many immigrants have been refused admission into the Dominion of Canada, and for what causes or reason, for the years 1901 and 1902; and up to 1st of April, 1903?
2. How many immigrants have been deported to the country from which they came, and at whose expense, and for what cause?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock):

1. In the year 1901-2, 193 immigrants were refused admission into Canada on the ground that they were paupers who might become a public charge if allowed to remain in Canada, or because of their being afflicted with loathsome, dangerous or infectious diseases; and for such reasons 193 were deported at the expense of the steamship company on whose ships they had been brought to Canada.

2. For the period from 1st July, 1902, to 1st April, 1903, 147 immigrants were for like reasons refused admission to Canada, and were deported at the like expense of the steamship company, and for like reasons.

INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT, KING'S, N.B

Mr. FOWLER asked:

Who is the medical attendant to the Indians in the county of King's N.B.? When was he appointed, and on whose recommendation? What salary does he receive, and upon what basis was the amount of salary computed? How many Indians are there in said county?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock):

1. Duncan H. McAllister is the medical attendant for the Indians of King's county, N.B.

2. He was appointed on the 31st May, 1900.

3. He receives a salary of $200 per annum, which covers the cost of medicines prescribed, and was computed on the average cost of attendance for the three years previous to his appointment.

4. The Indians of the county number 59.

SASKATCHEWAN LAND COMPANY.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Have any lands been sold by the government of Canada to the Saskatchewan Land Company? If any, what is the extent of the acreage of lands sold and where situated?
2. If any sold, what was the price per acre?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). The information asked in this question will appear in the return which was ordered by the House on Monday last.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When will that be down?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In a few days, I suppose.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We want to have it before the Interior estimates come up.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There will be no delay.

RAILWAY STATION AT ALBERTON, P.E.I.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to construct a new railway station at Alberton, in Prince County, P.E.I., this year ?
2. Will they construct it of brick, which are manufactured in plenty at that place and vicinity ?
3. Is it the intention to deflect the track so as to avoid the 'Y' nuisance that now exists ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The construction of a new station at Alberton is under consideration.
2. If constructed, it will probably be of wood as well as all the other stations of the railway are.
3. It is not the intention to deflect the track to avoid the 'Y.'

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—SALE OF TICKETS.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Are through tickets to all parts of Canada and the United States sold by agents at the different booking stations on the Prince Edward Island Railway ?
2. If not sold at all stations, at what particular stations may they be found on sale ?
3. Are such tickets for sale at Wellington station ? If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1 and 2. Through tickets to all points in Canada and the United States are on sale at the following stations on line of Prince Edward Island Railway, viz :—Alberton, Bradalbane, North Wiltshire, Souris, Summerside, Cape Traverse, Charlottetown, Kensington, Hunter River and Mount Stewart. And a limited issue covering New England states and all points on the Intercolonial Railway are on sale at all other booking stations, except at Wellington, Miscouche and Royalty Junction.

3. No. No requests have been made to the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway for such an issue of tickets at this station.

COAL IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Did members of the Geological Survey staff make an examination in the Province of Prince Edward Island, during the last year, with a view to the discovery of coal ?
2. Who were employed in the work ; and have they reported to the government ?
3. At what places were the examinations made ; and are the indications, as reported, favourable to finding coal in workable quantities ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) :

1. Yes.
2. Dr. R. W. Ells and one assistant—Yes.
3. Examinations made over the island generally. Examinations proved the presence of several anticlinal folds traversing the island, notably, near the west coast near Miminegash or Campbelltown, near Summerside, at Gallas Point, near Wood Islands, and other points.

There are no indications of coal on the surface, since all the rocks exposed belong to the upper carboniferous, which overlie the true coal measures of Nova Scotia, but it is probable these may underlie the island, in which case they can only be reached by borings.

The most favourable locations for boring are regarded as near Miminegash, on the west coast, near Summerside, and at Gallas Point or Wood Islands, preferably the former.

LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE IN MONTREAL.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask : Has any action been taken by the government in regard to the strike prevailing among the longshoremen at Montreal, and which has been creating so much disturbance in commercial operations there ? Has anything been done by the government, and if so what has been done ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is quite aware that the government has no authority to interfere in this matter. The law provides for the existing conditions, and the law is being followed. The local authorities have thought it advisable to call upon the military authorities to give them assistance, and all the assistance that it was in the power of the military authorities to give has been rendered.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Might I ask the right hon. gentleman, if there is any foundation for the statement that His Worship the Mayor of Montreal has appealed to the government, that the expenditure in connection with the calling out of the militia force shall be borne by the government and not by the municipality of Montreal ? If the Mayor of Montreal has made that request, has the government given any reply ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The request has been made. The law is to be followed, and I do not interpret the law to mean that the government is to bear that expense.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has an application been made to send the regular troops to Montreal ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Such an application has been made, and the telegram

of the Mayor of Montreal to that effect has been published in all the newspapers. But the whole thing has been done under a misapprehension. The law provides that when peace and order is threatened, the municipal authorities may call upon the military authorities to give assistance. The municipal authorities have made a request to the military authorities to supply them with troops. Colonel Gordon, commander of the district, has called upon certain volunteers to do patrol duty on the wharfs. I understand that it is contemplated by Colonel Gordon to replace some of these volunteers by the permanent force——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Within his district.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, within his district. All this is a matter for the consideration of the military authorities, and it is a peculiarly military question.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I may inform the hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) that I have just received two telegrams from the agents of the Franco-Canadian line stating that as one of their ships cannot be discharged it will have to leave the port of Montreal with its cargo. It is also stated in these telegrams that the crew of the ship were threatened that if they tried to discharge the steamer they would not be allowed to do so. That ship sails under the Russian flag, and the Russian Consul has telegraphed as follows :

Failing to get ship discharged will have to leave port with cargo.

Might I ask, if anything will be done by the Labour Department concerning this matter ?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is aware that the Labour Department has no power to interfere with the militia in maintaining order. The military authorities have provided men to protect that crew and it shall be protected.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. With the permission of the House I would suggest that my hon. friend the Minister of Labour make an offer of intervention. In some cases such an offer has been made unofficially, and with very good results. The hon. minister has at his disposal, I am glad to say, very able officers, especially the deputy minister, and I am inclined to believe that if an offer of intervention were made, it might have some good results.

Mr. T. C. CASGRAIN (Montmorency). Mr. Speaker, I am probably not in order, but I will conclude with a motion, if necessary. I think the present state of affairs in Montreal has lasted long enough, and some step should be taken by the government to put an end to it or to relieve the municipality of Montreal from a difficulty which is not local in its character, but the effects of which are being felt all over the country. It is well known that the trade not only of Montreal, but of the whole country is being paralyzed by this strike—the cattle trade and every other trade concerned. Every day more ships are coming to that port, and there are no ship labourers to take the cargoes off the ships. I understand from a very competent authority that merchants all over Canada will suffer to a very great degree should this strike be prolonged. I understand that a great many merchants throughout Canada, retail merchants as well as wholesale merchants, will probably be ruined if this state of things continues. It seems to me this is an occasion on which the Labour Bureau should exert its influence to relieve the tension. It is high time the Labour Bureau did something. I do not know whether they have done anything at all; it is not reported that they have made any effort to intervene between the longshoremen and the ship owners to put an end to the strike. The House and the country should be informed on this point. If nothing has been done by the Labour Bureau, I trust that the hon. Minister of Labour will put as many of his employees as necessary, especially the head of the department, at the disposal of the people who are interested, so as to bring this strike to as prompt a conclusion as possible. As I said before, it is a matter which interests not only the city of Montreal, but the whole trade of this country. The city of Montreal is paying out large sums of money every day for the maintenance of troops to keep order. We have in different parts of the country, not only in the military district of Montreal, but at Quebec, Toronto and other points, soldiers who, though doing their duty to the best of their ability, have very little to do, and it seems to me that they might be brought to Montreal to perform the duty which the citizens of Montreal are now attending to. It is a great hardship to many of these people to be obliged to be under arms. Many of them are losing their positions. Members of the Sixty-fifth regiment, the Royal Scots and others have to obey the command of duty, but the employers of many of them are telling them that if their services are required much longer, they will lose their positions. Under the law of this country the militia are liable to be called under arms at any time ; but at the same time, when we have troops stationed at Toronto, at St. John, at Quebec and other points, who are paid their allowances every day, it seems to me that the authorities might bring them to Montreal and relieve the local militia. I hope in the first place that the Labour Bureau will do everything that lies in its power to bring this strike to an end as soon as possible, and in the next place that the military authorities will come to the aid of the civic authorities in keeping the peace on the wharfs. I move, seconded by Mr. Kemp, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. R. BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence). Mr. Speaker, we all realize the truth of what the hon. member who has just taken his seat has said. Every one is anxious to have this strike settled, and everything possible has been done to settle it. We are all offering suggestions, but none of them can be put into effect. We have had meetings between representatives of the longshoremen and representatives of the ship owners in Montreal during the last two or three days, at which I have been chairman; we have sat three nights trying to bring about a reconciliation. The ship owners have agreed to the demands of the men in every instance, they are willing to give them the wages they want, but they refuse absolutely to recognize the union. On that point there is a deadlock. The longshoremen refuse to go back to work unless union men and union men alone are employed. The ship owners, on the other hand, say that they will engage the men who suit them best whether they are union men or not. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has spoken of the St. John troops. They are there now; they came yesterday. There is no trouble on the wharfs; order is being kept; any man who wishes to go to work is protected, and everything that could be done has been done. I have just received a telephone message from the President of the Steamship Association, in which he says they have about 1,100 men at work now on the wharfs, and that a great many of the teamsters who struck have gone back to work. Matters are in a little better shape than they were yesterday, though they are not by any means satisfactory. Nothing more that I know of can be done at the present time. I would be very much pleased if the Labour Bureau could bring about a settlement. The steamship men will not recognize the union, and the longshoremen will not go to work unless the union is recognized, and hence the deadlock.

Mr. C. MARCIL (Bonaventure). May I ask if this union is a Canadian or an American union?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The union is simply an association of longshoremen which is not incorporated. The head of the union is an American, who is over here now, and is agitating.

Mr. CLARKE. The organization is purely voluntary, is it not?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Purely voluntary.

Mr. GALLERY. I would like to ask the hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal, (Mr. Bickerdike) if the majority of these longshoremen are citizens of Montreal?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. No, they are not. A great many are, but most of them are from the country districts around Montreal. A great many are shantymen who, after working in the shanties in the winter, work on the wharfs at Montreal in the spring. Ninety per cent of them are Canadians, but they are from different parts of the district of Montreal.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Nothing which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has said goes to show that the citizens of Montreal who are mulcted in an expenditure of about $8,000 a day in connection with this strike, and who are contributing their share to the support of the Labour Bureau, receive from that bureau the help they are entitled to receive at the present moment. The question I asked was intended to elicit from the hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) an answer showing that since this strike has been in existence, the Department of Labour has taken some steps to bring it to an end. It is incumbent on the hon. gentleman to show that his department has been of some use in this very serious affair. It is certainly the duty of this government to interfere, it is certainly the duty of the Minister of Labour to see what can be done, and the Department of Labour should have had a representative at these meetings which were held, and to which the hon. member for St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike) has just referred. This strike has now been on over twelve days. It is the duty of the government, which is interested in the maintenance of the reputation and the good fame of the port of Montreal, to use all the means at its disposal to have that strike brought to a close.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). The question was aked whether the party who had been influencing the longshoremen to strike is a Canadian and a native of Montreal, and we are told that he comes from the United States. Sir, the emissaries of the labour unions of the Uuited States are traversing this country from end to end, fomenting difficulties, instigating strikes, and acting in a manner detrimental to public interest. Their business is to create difficulties in order that they may give some showing for the salaries they receive, and unless they can foment strikes, their labours are apparently fruitless.

Mr. MONK. Is the hon. gentleman aware that this strike at Montreal has been fomented by Americans?

Mr. CHARLTON. I merely take the reply given to a question with reference to that matter by one of the hon. members from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike). I am also aware that American emissaries are engaged in the business of fomenting strikes—strikes based on the demand that the labour union shall alone be recognized, based on the monstrous assumption that no labourer can be employed unless he becomes a member of the union. That was the crucial trouble in the great anthracite coal strike, which disorganized business in the United States. This strike was based on the demand that

the union should be recognized, and acts of violence were committed in order to prevent men from exercising their rights as citizens to make contracts with their employers, unless they belonged to the union. That strike was referred to a board of arbitration. That board sat a long time, it examined into all the circumstances, it delivered its findings, and decided that labour must be recognized as such, that the individual must be recognized as well as the labour union, and that while the labour union might be and should be dealt with, it was not entitled to take the position of preventing the individual from selling his labour to an employer and giving that labour unmolested by the union. The whole country is pervaded by rumours of strikes, fomented by these agitators who are not, as a rule, Canadians. They come here from the labour unions of the United States to create a state of things which must inevitably lead to great trouble, and even to violence on the part of those who desire that no one should work except under the auspices of the labour union and at its dictation. It is high time that this matter was taken into serious consideration. I believe that the government would be justified in excluding these agitators from the country, in considering them as disturbers of the public peace, and requiring them to go forthwith about their business.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). There has been nothing brought up this afternoon which entitles the hon. member for North Norfolk to draw the inference that the strike at Montreal has been caused by union emissaries from the United States. As a matter of fact I believe—and I think that hon. members from Montreal will bear me out—that the strike was on before these men were sent for, and that as a matter of fact the strikers sent for them to come and try to effect a settlement. If men who come here at the instance of the labour element to settle a strike, are to be called agitators, I do not think such language calculated to have any good effect. It was well known throughout Montreal that this strike was bound to take place this year. The shipping federation declared last year that they would not again be put in the same position in which they were last year, when labour was scarce, and said they were about to import men to do their unloading, irrespective of the trade organizations. There is a Bill before the House asking for the incorporation of the Shippers' Federation with that very purpose in view. At present it is said that there are a thousand men on their way from the port of Liverpool to come and unload vessels at Montreal. The shippers may be perfectly within rights, but they are making an attack on the longshoremen, residents of Montreal. I rise specially to protest against the unwarrantable inference being drawn that this strike has been brought about by foreign agitators or that the condition of affairs has been aggravated by foreign emissaries. As regards what was said about the regular troops being more generally employed to take the place of the militia or the civil authorities, let me say that we should be very careful how we endorse the calling out and keeping out of regular troops. The civic authorities of Montreal have ample means at their disposal for the keeping of the peace, and I believe that that work should be done by special constables.

Mr. MONK. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUTTEE. It seems to me that it is wrong to resort to the military in these matters, and I do not think that such a proceeding will commend itself to the people of this country.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Toronto Centre). Coming from Toronto, I think it but right that I should give my views on the matter before the House. The strike is not only a very serious grievance to the merchants and the manufacturers of Canada, but also to those who have agricultural produce to ship at various points. I have seen a notice this morning that the railway companies are refusing to take possession of freight to be brought to Toronto, and at present there are some 1,200 or 1,300 of our young men in the militia guarding the wharfs at Montreal. I can speak feelingly of this myself because nearly a dozen are out of my establishment in that city, and these young men are kept out these very cold nights without proper provision being made to protect them from the cold. I think that the city of Montreal should add to its police force on occasions of this kind, so that the regular police could attend to the difficulty on the wharfs and additional police do patrol duty in other parts of the city.

This whole matter of trades unions in this country and the way they are governed and worked is a serious menace to business. It is one of the most serious matters we have to deal with at the present time. Any man wishing to enter upon any kind of enterprise must face the fact that directly he has done so, on the one hand he is assailed by labour agitators and on the other by politicians—and, in fact the whole question is too much mixed up with politics, so seriously that I can understand the difficulty the government have in attempting to deal with such matters, fearing that what they do may be used against them with this numerous body, and that they may be made unpopular with one class. Notwithstanding what I understood the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) to say, I here assert, without fear of contradiction, that the agitation is brought largely from the United States. It is all very well to get up and say that nothing has been brought forward in this House to establish this, but I tell you the papers are full of it; and I say that in any of the difficulties we have had in

labour unions in this country, we find that the mainspring is on the other side of the line. I am strongly in favour of an organization of labour in this country, but I say that it should be under the control of our own people and our own government. We should not have before us continually the danger of being obliged to follow any particular organization to the other side of the line and beyond the control of our own people. The time may come when we shall be rushing to arms to protect this country from that kind of thing. This is the time for the government to take hold of the question. I do not say how that should be done, but they will be able to say. They should take hold of this and deal with it, apart from politics, framing measures solely with the view to meet the difficulty that faces us. At the present time it is a very difficult matter for us to say when the military power should step out and the civil power should step in. I certainly think in this case the civil authorities in Montreal should have had power to deal with the difficulty and deal with it firmly. I believe with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the individual in this country has rights. I am willing to concede to a labour organization also that it has rights. But when the organization undertakes to interfere with the individual and with his personal rights, the whole power of the country and the government should be brought forward to put a stop to that interference at once. The difficulty in the United States, as we know, is want of power in the central authority to deal with these matters. In these troubles the people who suffer most are not the workmen, not the manufacturers, not the capitalists—the whole accumulated evil falls upon the consumer, upon the masses of the people who have to pay the bill every time. If you prevent miners from getting out coal, they will get back at you, because they will merely charge a dollar or two more for every ton and, so far as the capitalist is concerned, he will be as well off as ever. The men who are posing as representatives of labouring men forget that in every one of these contests the workingmen come out at the small end of the horn. They always do. Not a single case can be named where the workmen have not got the worst of it. So I say the proper course is for a good strong government to take hold of this matter and prevent these people from the United States coming in here and agitating in this country, for it can be seen that their only object is agitation. They do not care that these poor longshoremen are out of work, they are idle and spending money sometimes very injudiciously. All they want is to pose before the people of this country and the United States as being anxious for the welfare of the people for whom they are agitating, although they are causing them to lose not only their time, but their money. I do trust the government will see their way to do a little more——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). What would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) suggest that a good government should do ?

Mr. BROCK. If I were Minister of Labour I should be in a position not only to make suggestions, but, I hope, to do something. Why, this is almost childish. When an hon. gentleman on this side presents the view that the government are not doing all that they ought to do we are asked : What is your policy, what suggestions have you to make ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly, because you do not make out a case until you do.

Mr. BROCK. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House any longer. But I can assure you that, to myself personally as well as the city I represent, this is a very serious matter. Before sitting down, I may mention one thing. At this season of the year the importers of this country are bringing in a very large quantity of what we call spring and summer goods. We know that shipments of these goods are in the vessels in the port of Montreal ; but the goods cannot be delivered, they cannot be distributed throughout the country, under the present circumstances. The result is that a serious loss is going to fall upon these importers. For, the goods now coming in are usually of light material—what I may call fashionable goods—and suitable for the season. If the goods are not sold now, there will be a serious loss in carrying them over, because, next year they will be unfashionable and worth almost nothing. Therefore—there may be some selfishness in it— I am associated with those who are anxious that this difficulty be put a stop to as quickly as possible.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, I deplore the existence of industrial struggles, such as those going on in Montreal and in other parts of the country, just as much as any hon. gentleman in this House. But I want to say that, so long as hon. members of this House are not prepared to assume that some fault may be found on both sides in this struggle, so long will affairs remain in the present condition. Now, Sir, these people have reason for the position that they take. It is true, their reasons may not always be good reasons. But, when large bodies of men who depend not upon a bank account, but upon each dollar as it is earned as a daily wage, without any prospect of maintaining a living whilst on strike, take the course that these men have taken, we may depend upon it they have some reason for entering upon such a struggle. Now a great deal has been said including what has been said by the hon.

member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), with regard to outside agitation. I do not think the position taken on that matter by these hon. gentlemen is a fair position at all. How would the hon. member for North Norfolk like it if I were to demonstrate to him that alien capitalists in this country had provoked strikes by their tyranny and oppression? So long as the hon. member objects to the doctrine that the individual labourer is not entitled to come to this country and have a voice in the sociological questions without being considered an agitator, what is he to say when the capitalist employer, who is an alien, seeks to oppress and tyrannize over our people by his method of carrying on business? Now, there are two sides to this question. I do not believe in strikes. I want to say that I have been associated for many years as a leader of a labour movement, and I have never yet been in a single strike, I have always used my influence against strikes. But I want to remind hon. gentlemen in this House that there are national strikes, that there is the strike of war, that there is the position taken by one nation against the other—and even the modern method of settling these questions ultimately is for the parties to take up arms against each other and demand their rights. That being so, it must be easy for hon. gentlemen to concede that labour and capital—and labour especially, which lives in dependence upon the exercise of its force for a daily wage, is entitled to adopt that method, so long as, in doing so, it does not interfere with the constitution and with the laws of this country.

I do not think I would under any circumstances be inclined to permit an alien agitator to come to this country and dictate to me as to what were the proper conditions under which I should work. Sir, there is not as much in the contention supported by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as he asserts. This institution at Montreal, contrary to what has been said on the floor of the House to-day, is a voluntary institution, and does not receive dictation from over the line. I am speaking subject to correction, but if I understood the hon. gentleman aright, he said that it was not a voluntary institution but that it was subject to dictation from the other side. I wish to say that no alien agitator has anything to do with the conduct of the business of this institution. I agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the most legitimate kind of influence is that which emanates from the authority of the government. But we must remember that the government have no power to insist that these people should settle their grievances: and I would like the hon. gentlemen who represent the interests of organized capital in this House to be able to assure the government that if provision was made empowering the government to compel a settlement of these troubles, they would support a proposition of that kind. If I had time and opportunity, I could demonstrate to this House that in nine cases out of ten of labour struggles, labour has volunteered to stand by the results of compulsory arbitration enforced by government, and that in only one case out of ten do we find the capitalists prepared to do so. Now, it is right that these facts should be presented to this House. Both sides have a right to be represented in this matter. There are two sides to this question. What does the ordinary member of this House know about the actual grievances of these poor men in Montreal? What proof can any member of this House give to show that there may not be the greatest possible reason for this strike at Montreal? Where is the remedy? The remedy I believe is in increased legislation along these lines. I do not believe that the people of this country would support the principle of compulsory arbitration, but I believe they would agree to accept some further amendment of governmental dictation along the line of compulsory investigation and conciliation; I believe in that principle. The Minister of Labour has a Bill before the House for that purpose.

Now, Sir, as to the request made upon this government to assist in paying the expenses of protection of the public in this strike at Montreal. I do not think that would be a proper thing to do, for the outside authority to have such power. I consider that the power to call out military protection by the municipality is a wise provision. But, I want to say this, that if any financial assistance is given by this government in consequence of a strike of that kind, I can easily conceive how much more ready the municipalities would be to call out the militia without necessary provocation when they know that the expense would have to be borne by another authority. There are two sides to this question also. I want to say, and it ought to be said to the credit of the strikers in Montreal, that the newspapers, who are as a rule anxious to record the misdeeds of the strikers, have not been able to chronicle a single unlawful act on their part. What reason can be given by the authorities in Montreal for calling out the militia in this instance? If the expenses of this protection are to be paid by this government, how much more easily it will be for these municipalities to call out this protection because somebody else has to pay the bill. The greatest safeguard for prudence in such matters, is the fact that the people who are concerned must pay for the protection they require.

Now, Sir, I will support any proposition in this House that will bring to an end these industrial struggles. I will subscribe with my vote to any measure that will increase the powers of the government to make compulsory investigation into these

matters with a view to avoiding trouble. But, so long as hon. members in this House are prepared to look only on one side of this question, so long as they are prepared to assume that there is only one party in the struggle, and only one that is absolutely right, while the other is absolutely wrong, then I want to say that those hon. members utterly fail to grasp the facts of the situation. I want to tell the hon. member for North Norfolk that any individual, or any member of this House, who does not recognize the rights of labouring men to enter into voluntary association, is as big a demagogue as the man who would adopt unconstitutional methods to accomplish his purpose. There are unreasonable men in the labour movement; yes, there are unreasonable men in the capitalist movement; and what is wanted is proper government authority to deal with these extreme people, and to provide that the business of the country shall be conducted for the benefit of the whole community.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The question introduced has assumed a somewhat wide range. I do not propose to discuss the labour question in the abstract, the fringe of which has just been touched by some hon. members; I would rather confine my few observations to the question that led to this discussion. The trouble in Montreal to-day is not new. It has been growing for some time. The two parties evidently have been organizing, and have entered upon a contest of strength. Before the outbreak of hostilities the government endeavoured to prevent them. I am sure that hon. gentlemen are all most desirous that the interests of the country should be paramount in a matter of this importance. I am sure that no hon. gentleman would desire to make any political capital out of a question such as this. I say this with all frankness and in all sincerity. Whatever views may exist, I will say this, though a party man, that I hope the day will never come in a Canadian parliament when the members will make a football of the labour problem. It has challenged the efforts of the best governments and the brightest minds the world has ever known, and it is not yet solved. We have a task before us, and we will be better able to solve it if we keep the one object in view of the common interest of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before this trouble began the government sent for representatives of the two parties. You will understand the delicacy of the negotiations, in view of the strained relations that exist and have existed for some time. You cannot with success plunge into the midst of a struggle between two parties who are excited and determined. But so far as our private interviews, influence, advice, and pressure could go, they were exercised to induce, if possible, a settlement and to remove all causes of difference. Our advice was refused. It was deliberately given, it was deliberately taken into consideration, and it was deliberately refused.

Mr. MONK. May I ask the hon. gentleman who the representatives sent were?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I assume in advance that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is most anxious for a satisfactory solution of this difficulty, and he will quite understand that, to go into particulars and to give names, would jeopardize the negotiations that have continued up to this moment. At no time since the trouble began has there not been present in Montreal endeavouring to make overtures to and to establish relations with both sides a gentleman of high standing and in close touch with the government. We have not only had him in daily and constant communication with us, but we are in telegraphic communication with him, and even since this debate began the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has received telegraphic despatches reporting the state of affairs. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asks a natural question, but I am sure it would only strike him as equally natural for me to say that I doubt if anything would be gained by giving away, if we have the right to do it, the confidences of which we are the recipients on both sides.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. Postmaster General say whether the advice was deliberately refused by one or both sides?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) will, perhaps not press me too far upon that point. He has the same object that we have in view and it is extremely important that the government should be at all times able to enjoy the unqualified confidence of disputants in labour troubles, not only on this occasion but on all occasions, and if the government's influence is to be for good we must preserve the unqualified confidence of disputants no matter how wrong either of them may be. I say that not desiring to withhold anything, but for the reason which I am assigning here. The hon. member for Centre Toronto urges us to do something. There are only two things that can be done in regard to labour strikes. If you had a law by which you could by force compel men to go to work you could invoke such a law. This is a free country and there is no such law upon the statute-book. I do not think that any hon. gentleman would propose to put such a law upon the statute-book. There is one other method and that is by friendly conciliation and by bringing the pressure of public opinion to bear. In regard to either of these steps there is a right time and there is a wrong time. There is a time when intervention would be effective; there is a time when it would be a failure. It is difficult to strike the right time. It does

not appear yet to have arrived, for we cannot induce either of these parties at the present moment to receive any friendly overtures from the government. What more can be done at this stage is a question that I am unable to answer. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) mentioned that it was my duty to make a statement. I hope he did not think I was refusing to do my duty or shrinking from trying to do my duty. I rose several times, but in deference to the wishes of others that I saw rising I gave them the right of way, but, and it was not through any disinclination, as soon as I had the opportunity, to make these few observations. As to the suggestion that the government might bear the expense, the law is to-day what it has been since confederation. It is no new law. It was not passed by this government and not by the immediately preceding government, but it has been ratified by parliament and by public opinion for a generation and more, and that law is that the municipality must bear the expense of calling out the militia to maintain order within the municipality. I would say that at this very moment we have a gentleman of high position in this country in Montreal endeavouring to induce the parties to receive in a friendly way the overtures from this government with the view of arriving at a settlement. It took the President of the United States a good while to solve the problem in the anthracite coal regions. For some time the strikers refused to listen to his suggestions. They continued that strike for five months and national disaster was the outcome, the injury spreading beyond the confines of the United States. We suffered ourselves. He could not at first succeed but in time he did succeed. As the struggle continues these two disputants may become more receptive of friendly advice, and all I can say on behalf of the government is that we are in an attitude ready and waiting and anxious to be allowed to be the medium of peace whenever the two parties will permit us to act in that capacity.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, before this debate is concluded, I want to call the attention of the House to a statement of fact which was made a moment ago by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), and one which calls for some consideration on the part of every member of this House. The hon. member for Montmorency stated a moment ago that some of the volunteers who are now doing duty on the harbour at Montreal are threatened with dismissal by their employers if they continue to be removed from their daily occupations. I think that when the hon. member for Montmorency made that statement he was misinformed. I cannot believe that there is in the city of Montreal any man so mean, any man so unpatriotic as to threaten one of his employees who happens to be a volunteer and is performing his duty as such with dismissal. I cannot believe that there is any employer of labour, knowing that his employee is engaged in protecting property, who would threaten him with dismissal because he has to be absent from his occupation. There was some feeling upon this question in the state of New York last winter when it was reported in the press that a labour organization in Schnectady, New York, had expelled one of its members because he was a member of a military organization in the state. I hope we are not going to have anything of that kind in this country. I have seen the statement that during last winter some labour organizations in this country had discouraged their members from joining the militia force. I do not believe that statement, and in reference to the statement of the hon. member for Montmorency, I still refuse to believe that there is any man in Canada who would discourage any of his employees from becoming members of the volunteer force. It would be a sad day indeed for Canada if any citizen were to discourage any one at all from discharging his duty to the country, and if the hon. member for Montmorency is correctly informed, I think that the voice of parliament ought to be unanimous in declaring that if such a threat were to be carried into execution, if the volunteers now doing duty for their country were to be dismissed, the man who did that would be branded with infamy and he would be consigned to the indignation of every patriotic citizen of Canada.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike), in speaking upon this question a few moments ago, said that the difference, so far as remuneration is concerned, between the longshoremen and the employers had been practically settled, and that the only matter in dispute, the only question that kept the parties separate, was the question of the recognition of the union of the employees. If that is a fact, I am sure that we can appeal to the hon. Postmaster General to use his good offices to get this union recognized; because, I believe, it is one of the conditions imposed upon those who tender for work in his department that the work shall be done in a union office, and that the union scale of wages shall be paid. The demands of the men certainly could not have been so unreasonable as some hon. gentlemen have pointed out, because the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence, has told us that the parties have agreed as to the remuneration and that the only question is as to whether the men have the right to unite together for the purpose of protecting themselves, and whether it is a reasonable position for the employers to take to say that the men shall not have that right, and to say that those who organize themselves into a union of employees shall not be given

employment. This is a very serious position and one that ought to engage the attention of the Department of Labour, and engage it forthwith. We on this side of the House have no desire to make political capital out of these labour disputes. If any such capital has been made out of them, I am not going beyond the line of my duty when I say that the Postmaster General, in addressing the electors from one end of Canada to the other has pointed out that if the government is entitled to confidence for one thing more than another it is because it has established a Labour Bureau, which from time to time adjusts the labour difficulties which may arise.

I want to enter my protest against the statement made here: that foreign agitators are at the bottom of all this trouble. It is an insult to the Canadian workman to say that foreign agitators whom he never saw before can come to Montreal, Toronto or anywhere else, and can induce Canadian workmen to leave their employment and demand unreasonable terms. Such a statement is absurd. It needs only to be mentioned to be scouted at once. Canadian workmen have had organizations from one end of Canada to the other for the past half century, and the record of these unions is the best possible answer to the charge made against Canadian workmen as to their unreasonable demands. I myself have had the honour of belonging to one of these organizations for about thirty-five years. That organization has had an existence in Canada for nearly three-quarters of a century; and during that long period, on only two, or at most three occasions, were the most amicable relations which exist between the employers and the men, in any degree strained. The great bulk of the men who compose the labour unions in Canada are men whose interests are identified most closely with the interests of their employers and the interests of the country. They are most reasonable men; they are conservative in their methods. They do not desire to create a condition of things that will compel them to strike. Striking is the last resort in the case of the great majority of them, because as the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) has pointed out, no matter what may be the result of the strike, ultimately they are the sufferers. Those against whom they strike do not in the end suffer, because, as my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) has pointed out, the other parties to the difficulty eventually compel the public to bear the losses to which they have been subjected. Even if the workingmen be successful, it takes them a very long time out of the additional wages they receive, to recoup themselves for the losses they incurred during the time they were demanding their rights. I do not desire to prolong this discussion, but there is one phase of it, in relation to the efforts which the government is making to settle the matter, on which I desire to say a word or two. We are bound and we are ready to accept most fully the statement made by the Minister of Labour in respect to the action of the government during the past month or two to bring this difficulty to a satisfactory settlement. But is there not too much mystery about the methods which the government are employing? The Postmaster General made the statement that when the President of the United States interfered—and interfered wisely and patriotically—to bring that tremendous conflict between labour and capital to a satisfactory settlement, he appointed commissioners to represent him. But let me point out that the people of the United States were apprised at once as to the action of the President, as to who represented him, and as to what lines the attempts made to bring about the settlement, were based upon.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was many months after the strike.

Mr. CLARKE. I am speaking now of the time when the President intervened, and he at once apprised the people of what was being done hour by hour and day by day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My recollection is that the strike began in March, and that the President did not intervene until September.

Mr. CLARKE. But the moment the President did intervene the public were apprised of all that was going on, and the hands of the President were strengthened, because the public were at his back. I am satisfied that if the Minister of Labour would take the House and the country into his confidence, and tell us who are representing him in Montreal and what their instructions are, then if the instructions commend themselves, as I have no doubt they will, to the majority of the people of Canada, the hands of the minister would be upheld, public opinion would be focussed upon this trouble, and a settlement would probably be reached sooner than it otherwise would.

One word as to the affiliation of Canadian labour unions with the American unions. No Canadian union is obliged to affiliate with a union on the other side. The advantages of affiliation are mutual. Unfortunately, up to the present time, aye and at the present time, a greater number of men belonging to Canadian unions go to the United States to seek employment, than do American labour unionists come from the United States over here. The international card is a substantial advantage to the members of the Canadian unions, and that card has never been dishonoured by the unions on the other side. That card forms a bond of union between the workingmen on both sides of the line, and the reason the Canadian unionists identify themselves with

American unionists, is because they believe it to be to their advantage and because they do not believe it is derogatory to their position, or to the interests of Canada that they should so identify themselves. These are the facts, and if, as my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has stated the employers of labour in the port of Montreal have been arranging for the past six or nine months to have men in Montreal when navigation opened to take the place of the longshoremen; may I not without prejudicing the case say, that these employers placed themselves in a position to accentuate the hostility of the longshoremen; that they were doing what was likely to antagonize the longshoremen of Montreal, and to make a reasonable settlement more difficult? As the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) pointed out, there must be a recognition of the rights of both parties before a satisfactory settlement can be reached; there must be an observance of the golden rule. Except in a very extreme case, I have never known an instance where fair propositions for settlement were made by one or other of the parties, that these propositions did not eventuate in a satisfactory settlement. I hope that the efforts of the Minister of Labour will be crowned with success, but I repeat that a great deal of good would be done if he would take the House into his confidence and state who represents the government in Montreal, what has been done, how far he has succeeded in bringing the parties together, and what is the real reason why he has not been completely successful in his efforts. Before I take my seat, I again repudiate the statement that foreign agitators are the cause of this trouble in Montreal. I am sure the hon. gentleman made the statement in good faith, but I do not believe that statement is susceptible of being substantiated. It is an insult to the Canadian workmen to say that they cannot recognize their own interests, and that they have been led away by men whom they do not know, to commit acts which may bring disaster on themselves and their families.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) refers to me, I wish to say that I did not make that statement. What I said was that the head of that organization was an American.

Mr. CLARKE. Then I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I understood him to say that the present strike in Montreal was caused by the presence of foreign agitators in the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It was the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) who said that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I rise, as a newspaper man, to enter my protest against the statement of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith). He said that the newspapers are always anxious to record the misdeeds of the workmen. Let me tell him at once that the newspapers have worked more harmoniously with the labour unions than with any other class of the community. In the printing office with which my name is connected there are as a rule about 250 men employed, and all or nearly all of them belong to labour unions, and we never have any trouble with them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Nearly all the newspapers in Canada are employing union men. They are skilled tradesmen and I am proud to say that there is no class of men who give less trouble than the members of the Typographical Union. Suppose, for instance, that one of them gets on a spree and he is dismissed, there is no trouble over it and no objection made. I make this statement to correct the wrong impression which possibly may have been created in the minds of some hon. gentlemen here, that when union men are employed in an office or a shop, they are masters. That is not the case. One of my hon. friends near me, before I rose, asked me to state what I understood by the recognition of the union. It means undoubtedly that when you have admitted a labour union in your establishment, you must work with them; they work with you, and you must work with them.

Mr. CLARKE. The obligation is mutual.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The question has been asked whether we are not in a free country; in other words, whether free labour, labour which is not connected with labour organizations, could not be employed along with union labour. I read a day or two ago a report of a meeting that took place in the month of December last in New York under the auspices of the National Civic Federation, of which Senator Hanna was the president. At that gathering the whole question was discussed very thoroughly. The contention of the labour unions to-day is that the individual workingman has no right to sell his labour outside of the union. I read that argument in very able speeches delivered by Mr. Gompers and by Mr. Keefe, who is president of the Longshoremen's Union. Their contention is that in these days of progress and of vast organizations of capital, the right of the labourmen to organize is as large and as broad as the right of capital, and that the individual workingman, selling his labour outside of the labour organizations, causes damage and injury to organizations that should be recognized as being for the best advantage of the country in which they exist. As my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Smth) says, there are two sides to this important question, and the sooner we recognize that fact the better, both from the labour standpoint and the capital standpoint. There is no use of denying to the workingmen the

right of forming themselves into organizations. Capital is forming organizations, and we do not on that account denounce capital. Labour has the same right, and I verily believe, after having tested the labour organizations on a pretty large scale, that if the owners and managers of large establishments would grapple with the question without any prejudice; if they would realize that in a country like this where industries are growing bigger every day the masses employed must grow bigger every day; if they would make up their minds to the fact that labour men have families, and that they have duties to perform to those families, that they have rights to protect; if they would recognize that there are two sides to this important question; the labour problem would be solved without much difficulty. I have not been made acquainted with the cause of the difficulty in Montreal, I fully realize the delicacy of the situation in which the government are placed; but all the same I am not sure but my hon. friend from Toronto is to a large extent right in asking the hon. Minister of Labour, if not to-day, as soon as possible, to take the House into his full confidence. This is a question in which the whole country is interested; parliament is sitting, and we have some right to advise, for after all the government is only a committee of the House; I invite the hon. minister—perhaps it is not necessary for me to do so—to proceed as speedily as he can in the settlement of the difficulty, which is of national importance.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker it would seem to me, from the statement made by the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), that it is a very small matter of contention between the parties. We have in the west many labour unions of various kinds on a firm footing. The city of Winnipeg is a city of unions, and my experience has been that where unions have been formed, they have been beneficial both to the employers and the workingmen. I have never known unions to work an injury, and I think the longshoremen of Montreal are quite justified in forming a union to better their condition. The hon. member for St. Lawrence said that the only point of contention was that the ship owners refused to recognize the union.

Mr HEYD. What do you understand by the phrase, 'recognition of the union'?

Mr. McCREARY. That they will deal with the officers of the union in regard to wages and other matters.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does it not imply that they will employ none but those belonging to the union?

Mr. McCREARY. It does not necessarily imply that, unless the by-laws of the union so provide. The association which the hon. member for St. Lawrence belongs to is a union of the shippers of Montreal, which they have entered for their own benefit, for the purpose of charging proper rates of freight, getting proper rates of insurance, and so forth. Then the Manufacturers' Association—what is that but one of the greatest unions in Canada, and, so far as we are concerned in the west, one of the most tyrannical? And yet we are told these longshoremen are not to form a union to protect themselves. There is another phase of this question which has been presented by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that is, that these unions have no right to import from the United States men who have had experience in the same line. If the hon. member for North Norfolk were so particular about not making use of Americans, we would not hear such long speeches from him, for he goes over to the states to get a good deal of his inspiration for these speeches. The Americans are coming to our country in large numbers, to work our mines and develop our prairies, and I do not think there will be much harm done if one or two come across to help the suffering longshoremen of Montreal to protect their own interests.

With regard to employing the military to suppress the unions, I am against that all the time. The moment you do that you are going to do an injury not only to the cause of labour, but to the militia system of Canada. I was speaking the other day to a man in Winnipeg, a member of a union, who had been at one time chairman of the Trades and Labour Council. He intimated to me that there were likely to be strikes. I remonstrated, saying I thought they were going a little too far. He said they were not, as prices of everything were so high that they needed higher wages. Then we proceeded to discuss the militia and its relation to the unions. He said the time was coming when men would have to choose between belonging to a union and belonging to the militia. I asked him, 'What would you do in that case?' He said: 'I am an old soldier. I was in the expedition to Manitoba under Lord Wolseley, I also served at the time of the rebellion in 1885, and I am still in the militia, but if I have to resign one or the other, I will resign the militia and not the union.' If that spirit gets into the militia of Canada, if a man becomes convinced that he cannot be a consistent union man and belong to the militia as will be the case if you persist upon calling on the militia to suppress strikes, that will disrupt this whole Dominion. I do not think it comes with good grace from men who belong to unions themselves to object to those poor longshoremen belonging to a union. We have union in every calling from the clergy down. We have unions among manufacturers, lawyers, doctors, and I am glad to know that the farmers in eastern Canada are forming an association. We have the

Grain Growers' Association in the west, and I hope that the farmers in this country will form a union and assert their rights. With regard to the influence of these unions, let me say that the manager of a large industrial concern in the United States told me it was much more satisfactory dealing with unions than with disorganized labour; and some of the greatest corporations in that country want all their men to belong to a union. They find that there is less trouble dealing with the president of the union than with a mob of men. In my opinion it is the duty of the Minister of Labour to send his men down to deal with those shippers and endeavour to convince them that they should recognize the union or else this government will not protect them.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). I do not desire to enter into a discussion on this question, but I would like to have a better definition of that phrase, 'The recognition of the union.' What does it mean? Each speaker gives it his own interpretation, and I would like the hon. minister to give us an authoritative definition of what the employees mean by it and what the employers understand by this term.

Mr. A. S. KENDALL (Cape Breton). I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to say very much on this question, because I am not conversant with the details of the strike in Montreal, but shall content myself with a few general remarks. During a later period I shall probably bring before this House some measures dealing with that great question of the relations between capital and labour. I have the honour to represent a strong, labour, industrial county in this Dominion—a county that produces millions of tons of coal every year. Down there we have a labour union which we consider the very strongest in Canada. It is about 7,500 strong. And let me say that in the county of Cape Breton we have not had, for some eighteen or nineteen years, any serious disturbance between capital and labour. Why? Because the representatives of capital recognized that their best policy is to deal with organized men and not with a mob. I wish to point out—and I think that in saying this I have history on my side—that the capitalists of this country and all those who look ahead would do well to glance over the history of similar movements in Europe and Great Britain. We may make up our minds that we have to arrive at the point reached in Great Britain and Europe, and we had better take the easiest and not the hardest road to it. Let me raise my humble voice to ask the employers of labour to consider this matter, because a storm is rising in this country. No man who has an eye in his head can fail to perceive that great difficulties are about to confront us, and it will be a serious matter for us if we have to wade through the difficulties which agitated England and Scotland from 1840 to 1880. I sincerely hope that the recognition of the union of workingmen will be facilitated by capital in this country, instead of thwarted, and in this way, more than any other, will be avoided difficulties such as we are now considering.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I think that the question of discussion this afternoon is one of great importance. My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Kendall) has told us that a storm is no doubt brewing in this country. Every day we hear capitalists say that the labour question is the most dangerous one ahead of us in this country at present, and that it is rendering unsafe the investment of capital. At the same time we must recognize that the labouring man has the same right to unite with his brother labourers as the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) has to unite with his brother manufacturers in the Manufacturers' Association. The attempt to shut out labour unions in Canada would lead to civil war and could never succeed. Calling out the militia is, of course, the last resort, and should only be done to secure the peace of the community and not to suppress a strike. The question before the House was brought up by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier asking the government if they proposed to pay the city of Montreal a portion of the cost of calling out the militia.

Mr. MONK. I did not bring that question up at all. I asked the government what they were doing or intended doing in Montreal.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am responsible for that question.

Mr. LOGAN. Then it was my hon. friend from Montmorency who put that question. I think that to do what my hon. friend asked would be to set a dangerous precedent. I would ask the government if there is a precedent of that kind? We had a great labour struggle in the city of London only a few years ago, and the militia were called out to preserve the peace, but I do not think that the government of Canada were asked by that ambitious city to pay for the militia.

Mr. MONK. There was the case of the town of Valleyfield. The government were asked to pay for the militia there, but I do not know what was done.

Mr. LOGAN. I think that the government refused to accede to its demand.

The PRIME MINISTER. It was against the law.

Mr. LOGAN. And, as my right hon. friend the Premier has said, it was against the law. We had a very serious strike in Toronto last year, and although that city is not slow in asking favours from this government, we never heard of it asking that this government should pay the militia.

Mr. CLARKE. The militia were doing their annual drill, but even then the city of Toronto had to pay them.

Mr. LOGAN. The city of Montreal is ambitious. It proclaims itself as the national port of Canada. Surely, it should not come begging this parliament to preserve the peace in that port. If we should do so, we would be establishing a most dangerous precedent. With reference to the storm brewing, serious thinking people realize that there is one certainly threatening over the labour question. I would humbly suggest that the government should be forewarned, and that it might be in the public interest—this may not be a very well considered suggestion, but I make it in all sincerity—for this government to appoint a commission of able men to meet the leading labouring men of Canada and the capitalists and consider whether some means could not be devised for preventing the outbreak of the threatened storm. We have labour organizations, we cannot prevent their existence, we have also organizations of capitalists, and it seems to me that commission might possibly be the means of some agrement being arrived at between capital and labour in this Dominion.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I rise to make a personal explanation. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the city of Montreal is coming to parliament to beg the governmen to pay part of the expenses that are incurred by keeping the militia on the docks to maintain peace and order in the city. What I said is that, if the militia are to be used to maintain peace and order, it seems to me that the regular troops who are at St. Johns, Toronto, and Quebec, and who are being paid their salaries now by the government, might properly be brought to Montreal to relieve those members of the volunteer force who are now engaged in the work of maintaining order. These regular troops get their pay from the government now, and they would get the same in Montreal as they do where they now are. That is all.

The PRIME MINISTER. In answer to the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain), let me say that the troops at St. Johns have been brought to the city of Montreal and all the troops available in the district of Montreal are at the command of the municipal authorities. But, to bring troops from other cities, from Toronto and other places, it is a question that involves very serious considerations.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I do not propose to go into the merits of this question, nor to discuss the general principle involved. I wish to refer to one point in connection with the bringing out of the militia. I feel very strongly that when an occasion arises that makes it necessary for the government to employ troops to keep order, the volunteers of the locality if called out might be forced to war against their fellow-citizens and countrymen and that this would be wrong. On an occasion of a strike in a city, such as we have in Montreal, no local militia should be called out. The men serving in the local regiments are, in many cases, the brothers and friends of the men on strike, and both sides believe that they are doing what is right. When occasions of this kind arise—and, unfortunately, I suppose we must beileve that they will arise, that we cannot help it—we should have permanent troops sent to each place of disturbance to maintain the peace. If it is accepted and understood that in the case of a street railway strike in Toronto or a longshoremen's in Montreal, the local volunteers will be called out, perhaps to fire on some of their brothers or friends, I think we are going to destroy absolutely in this country the spirit out of which our militia grows. No matter at what cost, in the case of a strike of this sort, the government should send the paid force of the country to keep order and not call upon the local militia. Though not an employer of labour, I have opinions as one who has perhaps, thought a good deal about this subject, although without saying very much. I believe that unionism is of great advantage to the men; I believe that it has come to stay and that it is going to accomplish in the end very great things for the labourer. At the same time, I have just as strong an opinion that unionism is absolutely wrong when it adopts the boycott. I believe I am right when I say that not more than one-third of the labourers in the cities—leaving out farm labourers, that is to say, not more than one-third of the mechanical labourers—belong to the unions. If I am right in that, I do not think that it is right that one-third of the labourers who are in the union should be able to say that the other two-thirds shall not work. I am not able to suggest a remedy for the difficulty, but I believe a remedy will be found; and I think that as time goes on there will be a better feeling between capital and labour—and that good feeling is growing, and must grow—these difficulties will be avoided. I believe that in the principle of a minimum wages and a share in the profits of all industries will eventually be found the solution which will make labour and capital work together in union. It is a slow process, perhaps, but we are tending to that end, and I know of industries in which that scheme has been attempted and has worked, and is working, to the satisfaction of both labour and capital. I believe it only requires patience, the avoidance of temper, and the recognition of the rights of both labour and capital. I must confess that I do not believe that a compulsory board of arbitration will do good. The results of compulsory arbitration will only be

accepted in good faith practically by the party in whose favour the award is made. I believe, that, eventually, arbitration will rule very much more than it does now. And I believe that with the keen interest taken by the Minister of Labour, who is now the man whom we look to as the head man in dealing with matters of this kind, if he puts politics aside and perhaps, nominate some outside man, as the President of the United States did—some strong man who would go upon the ground and see what could be done, some man who is not in politics, not a railway man and not an employer of labour——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Where would you find him ?

Mr. OSLER. Cannot a fair man be found in the whole country ? If the hon. minister (Hon. Sir William Mulock) has that idea of the country, I say God help the future—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) must not put words in my mouth that I did not use. He suggested that a man should be found, a strong man, one who is not in politics and not in railways and not an employer of labour. I only asked where I was to look for such a man. Of course, there may be such men.

Mr. OSLER. I can only say that I believe, there are men not in politics, and not in railways, strong men and honest men who could be found.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman send me a list of them.

Mr. OSLER. I wish I could quote correctly. I remember coming upon a sentence —very appropriate in describing the present government. It was to the effect—describing such a government as this—that where men who have taken power and assumed the duties that go with it and are not able to solve the questions that come before them, they are either incapable or otherwise wholly unworthy of the position they have assumed. It is not for the government benches to throw taunts at this side on every occasion, to cry : Give us a solution of the difficulty. We are not here to solve the questions that face the country. We are here to approve or disapprove of what the government do.

Mr. McCREARY. What did you do in the labour question during the eighteen years when you were in power ? You did not put in a line upon the statute-book.

Mr. OSLER. I do not hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary). Is he referring to eighteen years back ?

Mr. McCREARY. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. I am not here as a member of this House to approve of everything done eighteen years ago. I will agree with the hon. gentleman very often that those things were bad. This government have now a strong majority, they are backed by a majority of the constituencies of the Dominion of Canada, and it is their duty to face manfully every proposition that comes before them. If they are not able to face that, then they are not fit to be in their positions. They have no right to taunt the opposition by asking them on every occasion what they would do under certain circumstances. Whenever occasion arises in which the public interest is concerned, the government are bound to propound a scheme ; it is the duty of the opposition to object or to approve of that scheme, and of the government to carry it with their great majority.

But I rose principally to express my views on this point, on which I feel strongly, that I think it is very wrong and very injudicious to call out the militia of this country to suppress disturbances between our own people, in strikes and troubles of that kind. I believe that the government, no matter at what expense—charge it to the cities, if you like, I don't object to that—but I believe that the government should make the permanent force do duty on all occasions where military force is required, as in the present instance in this strike in Montreal.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I would like to explain to the House that there has been some misapprehension in this discussion. We have been for nearly two hours discussing a question which can be boiled right down to one word. I have here the offer drawn up and submitted to the steamship people, and also the one submitted by the longshoremen. It is clause 8, which reads :

> The stevedores and the parties of the first part, will not discriminate against union men, and willingly agree to employ them.

That clause was put in because the steamship men had made a contract with some 350 men. Now, having made that contract, they are bound to carry it out.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, having already spoken, is out of order.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). I was much interested in listening to the remarks made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary). I should suppose, judging from the tenor of his speech, that he is going to desert his old friends, the Doukhobors, and intends to secure, if he can, the representation of the city of Winnipeg in the next election. Therefore the present labour leader of that city (Mr. Puttee) must hand in his resignation, for he will no longer represent the magnificent city of Winnipeg in these halls. The member for Toronto was asked a little while ago what the Liberal Conservative party had done for the people during the eighteen years they were in power. If my memory serves me right, they gave bread and butter to the workingmen of Canada. If my memory serves me right, they closed up the soup kitchens that had been opened during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the soup kit-

chens have never been reopened since the national policy came into force. I cannot agree with one remark made by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler), who says that only the permanent corps should be employed to put down riots. I maintain that it is the duty of every citizen of Canada, whenever disorder or disturbance exists in his municipality, to turn out and do his duty in assisting to preserve law and order within the bounds of his own municipality. As a representative of a riding that is not troubled with strikes, I object on behalf of that community to paying any share of the cost of suppressing any disagreement that may happen to arise in the city of Montreal, and I should strenuously object to one dollar of the public money of Canada being paid towards a settlement of any strike in Montreal. Let Montreal settle her own troubles.

So far as unions are concerned, I have always upheld them when they tend to the betterment of the condition of the workingmen, or of any other men; when their association tends to make them more temperate, more law abiding, more intelligent, to shorten the hours of labour and develop their home life. But when it comes to a union saying to a man who has to earn his bread and butter: You shall not take employment under these men, then I maintain that it is the duty of the state to step in and tell the gentlemen of the union who are on strike that they may go a certain distance, but no further. We have seen suffering on the part of families of labouring men who are endeavouring honestly to earn their bread and butter, and who do not wish to join these labour unions under the dictation of a foreign leader or to be controlled by such. When these men and their families are hooted at on the streets and otherwise abused, I maintain the time has arrived in this country when the gentlemen of the unions must be taught that while they are at perfect liberty to work or to strike, they must not directly or indirectly interfere with any other man who does not belong to the union, and who wishes to earn his daily bread at whatever wage he can obtain. More than that, if the capitalists become tyrannical they must be controlled likewise by the government of the country. In England, when that great engineers' strike took place a few years ago, the nation lost millions of dollars. Already the Dominion of Canada, by reason of this strike in Montreal, has lost an enormous amount which it will take years for the parties who are engaged in that strike to make up by their operations.

Mr. KENDALL. The hon. gentleman says that the engineers' strike in England entailed a loss of millions of dollars on British industry. If that is so, would the hon. gentleman tell us how he would measure the loss to the country that was caused by the control of the cotton industry by the factory men of Lancashire for a century?

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I shall answer that question at a later period. But I want to point out that I object not only to the tyranny of the labour unions, but to the tyranny of the capitalists. The labour unions in the old land are very tyrannical, and I will give you one instance: A wholesale dealer in the city of Toronto visited Staffordshire a few years ago to purchase a certain brand of crockery, of which there was none in the market. It was a little out of the ordinary line of manufacture. The manufacturer said he could make the crockery for him, but said he must consult the head of the union before he could give him a final answer whether they would manufacture that line or not. Business was not any too good at that time in the old land. The gentleman was notified next morning that the labour union objected to manufacture this class of ware, and the gentleman took his order to Germany, and Britain lost hundreds of thousands of dollars on that transaction alone. So, we find, Sir, that these unions may be carried to an extreme just the same as the tyranny of capital may be carried to an extreme. The only point I rose to make is that while I recognize the right of any labouring man in any part of the Dominion of Canada to strike, I want the gentleman distinctly to understand also that he has to allow any other free man to go and take his place without being molested, and without being hounded from one end of the country to the other, as is being done to-day. The time is not far distant when this sort of thing must be put a stop to. If men seeking to go to their work on the docks are to be hounded to death and trampled in the dirt on the streets of Montreal, it is time the law interfered, and whether it be done by the regular troops or by the militia, it is time the strong hand of the law made it plain to these men that this country must be a law abiding country, and that we must have the law obeyed whether these men be in favour of it or not.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I have not received my union instructions with the brief which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) speaks of. I am not in a position to use the same kind of language as the hon. gentleman who seems to think that the longshoremen are alone to blame in this matter. The hon. gentleman, for the first time in this House, has alluded to violations of the law on the part of the longshoremen in Montreal. I have heard no charge made of that character this afternoon. So far as I am personally aware I do not know all the details of this difficulty between the longshoremen and the employers, but there is one thing I want to call attention to and it is

that one of the most important contentions of the workingmen is that a fair day's pay shall be given for a fair day's work, that we find that there is no difference between the two parties in regard to this question and that the longshoremen have been satisfied in that respect. But, I have learned also that the chief grievance that now exists between the two parties who are contending is in reference to the fact that 350 men were brought to Montreal and to the threat that something like 1,000 more men would be brought to Montreal in order to perform the work that the longshoremen usually perform which will only have the effect of depressing their wages. I recognize the rights of workingmen the same as I recognize the rights of any other class of the community. Surely, when a man has nothing else but his labour to sell he has a right to associate with other men for their mutual advantage and mutual protection and so long as they comply with the law and so long as they guard against violating the law I do not see that there is any particular harm done to the country by an association of that character. I may say that those men who claim the right for their own particular class and calling to be associated together and to be organized are not justified in finding fault with workingmen simply because they claim the same right. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke strongly to-day as a manufacturer—I think entirely too strongly. He has assumed that Mr. Gompers came from the other side for the purpose of fomenting trouble and difficulty in this country. If Mr. Gompers is doing so surely he will not lay the blame on the longshoremen of Montreal for bringing that gentleman here. They are not associated with Mr. Gompers in any way. He comes to this country as a citizen of the United States and he enjoys the privilege which the law of this country gives him, of speaking to the people of this country. He has now that privilege in the city of Monreal. I do not wish to approve of his remarks or to disapprove of them because I know nothing about them, but he has that right and I would say that the longshoremen are not to blame in any sense whatever. concerning him. I would say to the hon. member for North Norfolk that if a number of workingmen refused to work for a manufacturer simply because he belonged to the Manufacturers' Association, if the manufacturers brought that before this House as a reason for the condemnation of the workingmen, I would rise up in my place and offer a few remarks on an occasion of that kind in support of the Manufacturers' Association in condemning conduct of that character. So, I say what is good for one is certainly good for the other. Fair play to both is a proper thing. I will take some of the other close organizations in this country. Take the legal profession and the medical profession and no one will contend that they are not close corporations. I remember that a few years ago an effort was put forth to have it declared, for instance, that a medical gentleman moving from the city of Ottawa to the city of Hull, which is situated in another province, would not be allowed to practice his profession without being guilty of violating the provincial laws which would not give him that right. So the House will see that even the medical profession are protected and that they are a close organization. I quite approve of that, because, in their particular profession, it is necessary that they should be protected. It is a matter of life and death frequently and I am not in favour of quacks practising medicine. Then, take the legal profession. A member of that profession cannot pass from Ontario or Manitoba or British Columbia and practice his profession without violating the laws of Manitoba or British Columbia. Probably there may be some quacks among the lawyers who might attempt to practice in these provinces and in order to practice themselves and guard their interests the legal gentlemen have a close organization in the different provinces. So, I say it would not be becoming on the part of the legal profession, the medical profession, or of the Manufacturers' Association, or of the capitalists, to undertake to prevent the workingmen from becoming organized. I was very glad to hear from the director of one of the greatest enterprises in the Dominion of Canada speak as he has done. I refer to one of the hon. gentlemen from Toronto. Now, I know as a matter of fact that the railway companies in this country do recognize the trades unions. I know as a matter of fact that they have their grievance committees and that from time to time, year in and year out, the officials of the railway companies confer with the representatives of the unions and whatever grievances they have are adjusted and adjusted, I believe, to the satisfaction of both parties concerned. So I say that if the manufacturer is desirous of doing what is right, and if the employee is desirous of doing what is right no difficulty can occur between them. I was glad also to hear the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) say that this question should not be discussed in a party spirit. I quite approve of that but I am somewhat of a doubting Thomas at the time of a by, or general election, when I hear the hon. gentleman taking credit to himself and his department for the work he is doing on behalf of labour and appealing to the workingmen to support his candidate or party by reason of this claim. If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to refrain from resorting to that kind of party warfare I have no objection I am sure to his statement and I would rather approve of not making this a party question at all. The idea has been suggested that if the hon. member for North Norfolk thinks that the presence of Mr.

Gompers and his course in discussing matters in the way he has been doing is a detriment to the country what is the matter of calling the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour to the fact and have him place one of his officers in communication with Mr. Gompers with the view of notifying him that the course he is taking is not in the interests of labour in this country. I do not care to take up any more of the time of the House but I understand there is to be some legislation proposed, probably to-day, and if there is to be I trust that all those hon. gentlemen who are so sincere in their efforts in behalf of the workingmen of this country will lend their best efforts towards making this legislation as perfect as possible.

Motion to adjourn the House negatived.

SETTLEMENT OF RAILWAY LABOUR DISPUTES.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) moved second reading of Bill (No. 17) to aid in the settlement of railway labour disputes. He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has had the advantage of a discussion that has I trust prepared the mind of the House to give it a receptive consideration to the principles involved in the measure. Last session I had the honour of introducing a Bill of a similar nature, and on that occasion I stated that it was not the intention of the government then to press the Bill to a conclusion, but rather to leave it over to the present session in order that it might in the meantime receive the consideration not only of the employees and the employers, but also of the general public. Accordingly, I again bring the matter before the attention of the House, and I shall point out now wherein this Bill differs from the measure that was introduced last session. This Bill may be said to differ from the other in three respects. The Bill of last session provided for arbitration only—this Bill provides for an intermediate procedure, namely, an attempt at conciliation, and failing conciliation then arbitration. Under the Bill of last session the award of the arbitrators was enforcible by legal process to a certain extent as it provided penalties for those who disregarded the awards—the present measure departs from that, and instead of providing compulsion through the courts, it leaves the enforcement to such influences as may be brought about, in order to have it respected by public opinion and the good judgment of the parties concerned.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In other words, do I understand that the arbitration is compulsory but without any legal sanction to enforce it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. The award is given to the public and to the parties and there it rests. In the Bill of last session a permanent board of arbitrators was appointed by the parties and it was to remain in office for a certain term of years—under the present measure instead of there being a standing board, the scheme contemplates a special board to be chosen to deal with each case. These are, I think, the leading differences between the Bill of last session and the present Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As to the composition of the board; are the parties to have any voice in it under this Bill?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. Later on I will explain the reason for the changes. The Bill recites that strikes and lockouts, or whatever may lead to strikes or lockouts, are against the public interest. I presume it is understood that the measure does not deal with labour disputes except in respect to railways, and it applies to all railways in Canada whether under the legislative control of the Dominion or the provinces, whether operated by government (the Intercolonial for example) or operated by corporations. The Bill also applies to street railways and to all other institutions that may be known as railways. The Bill recites the reasons why parliament should proceed in this way, namely: that the public is interested in the proper transportation of passengers, mails and freight, and that whatever is likely to interfere with such transportation is against the public interest, and that therefore the public have a right to intervene to prevent such injury to their interests. In the event of it appearing that there is likely to be any interruption of the transportation of passengers, mails, or freight, or in the event of a strike or a lockout actually having occurred upon a railway, the Minister of Labour may invoke the machinery of this Bill. He may, on the application of either party, or on the application of the municipal council directly concerned, or he may of his own motion take steps to establish in the first place, a board of conciliation. He proceeds to do so by inviting the two parties to choose their conciliators, and if they comply with that request then it will be the duty of the two conciliators to choose a third. These three conciliators are the board of conciliation and mediation. In the event of either party making default, then the minister may appoint a conciliator for the parties so making default. There is also a provision for filling vacancies on the board; the party having the right to appoint also having the right to fill up a vacancy.

Assuming that the board of conciliation and mediation has failed to bring about harmony, then the Minister of Labour may refer the matter to arbitration and a board of arbitration is then appointed, which may be the board of conciliation if agreed to by the parties, and if not, then the board of arbitration is appointed in like manner as the board of conciliation. The board is clothed with the power to examine witnesses, to call

for the production of papers and to make the award. It will be the duty of that board to ascertain the causes of the dispute, to make suggestions for its termination and such other recommendations as it in its wisdom may deem proper. That award and the report will then be presented to the Department of Labour and become documents of record. Copies will be given to the parties directly concerned, and to the press and the public, and it will be laid upon the Table for the information of parliament. There the jurisdiction of the machinery proposed by the Bill ends. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition will therefore see that the enforcement of the award is left to such influences as may be brought to bear, backed up of course by the standing of the arbitrators, the manner in which they have conducted the arbitration, and the force of public opinion. As I stated on a former occasion, I know of no other machinery for compelling submission to such awards, except it be the compulsory machinery of the law. There is a wide distinction between the two methods. My own inclination is altogether in favour of the principle involved in this Bill.

Mr. CLARKE. When did the hon. gentleman change his mind ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will tell my hon. friend when I changed my mind. It is true that last session I presented a measure providing different machinery. I was not on that occasion very sanguine in favour of that procedure, but I submitted it to the House and the country in order to get the benefit of the advice of the parties interested and of the public. There are arguments in favour of the enforcement of awards by compulsion, and there are arguments against it. The only law of that kind which has been on trial for any considerable time is the New Zealand Act. That was passed in 1894, and went into operation on the first of January, 1895. It has given more or less of satisfaction, perhaps dissatisfaction. Opinion is as yet divided upon it. A year or two ago the state of New South Wales desired to study the labour law of the state of New Zealand, and sent a very distinguished jurist to New Zealand to inquire and report whether or not in his opinion the compulsory law of New Zealand was a desirable measure. That commissioner studied the question pretty thoroughly, and made a report which on its face might be considered an endorsement of that method for the settlement of labour disputes, that is, a method under which the award has the force of a judgment of a court, enforcible just as any legal judgment would be. But he observed that the Act had only been in force in New Zealand during the period of a rising market. During that time, as a rule, the workingmen had gained by the awards. The question arises, would they acquiesce in the awards of the arbitrators in a period of a falling market ? It cannot be said, I think, that that law has undergone a complete trial, until the parties have had an opportunity of coming to a conclusion as to its efficiency when there is a falling market. If, after there has been a falling market in New Zealand for a term of years, public opinion should stand by that view, we would be warranted in adopting that method; but up to the present time, I submit, it has not undergone that complete trial that would warrant us in adopting it. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) asks me when my views underwent a change. That is putting it rather strongly, because though I did frame the measure of last session, containing some very trifling penalties, they fell very far short of making it one that might be treated as a compulsory mode of settling disputes. The penalties were not very onerous and the methods of enforcement were rather mild. But I will tell my hon. friend with all frankness how this present measure came to be framed. When speaking on the subject last session, I gave what I considered to be a public invitation to all parties interested to assist the government in framing a measure. The invitation was responded to, to a certain extent. I am not at liberty to give the names of the representaives of the railway employees who consulted with me with regard to the framing of this measure, and I am sure no hon. gentleman will ask me to do so.

Mr. INGRAM. Did they approve of it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They did. But I will go so far as to say that I had the advantage of meeting on several occasions a large number of men representing different branches of railway employees, and amongst them their legislative representative, Mr. J. H. Hall. That gentleman, I understand, occupies a very prominent position in the labour world. He is, I understand, the legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, the Order of Railway Conductors, the Order of Railway Trainmen, and the Order of Railway Telegraphers. He took part in all the negotiations with me, at which the railway employees were present.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Where is his residence, may I ask ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. His residence is in the city of Toronto. He was good enough to convene a meeting of railway employees and introduced to me the deputation, a very numerous one, of men deeply interested in this question. In speaking of the men, I would say that I was prepared to receive advice from both sides—not only prepared, but most solicitous to receive it; and I have had the opinions of some leading railway men in Canada in regard to this measure. Perhaps I would be

giving an incorrect impression if I were to leave the House under the impression that it was a one-sided measure. At the same time, I would perhaps be conveying an equally erroneous impression if I were to say that it had the hearty approval of the railway companies. Yet I think I am correct in saying that some of the largest railways in Canada view it with hope. I think there may be in some quarters a prejudice against it. I am able to say, in regard to the Intercolonial Railway that the measure has the approval of the Minister of Railways. Well, I met a delegation of railway men with Mr. Hall, and we discussed this subject at very great length on many occasions, and it has not been my good fortune on any occasion to have met a set of men more zealously anxious to arrive at a proper solution of the labour question, than the men who assisted me with their advice in the preparation of this Bill. By common consent, we did not think it advisable to invite the reporters to be present during the preparation of the measure. There are delicate questions to be discussed between employer and employee, and there is always more or less an attitude of standing on guard assumed by the one towards the other. At the same time, I must testify to the unqualified loyalty of the representatives I met towards the companies under whom they served; and, having reached the conclusion that we could provide a law for the settlement of railway disputes by appealing to public opinion and the consciences of the men concerned, it was to me most gratifying to be assured by the men that, so far as they were concerned, the House and the country might depend on it that the railway operatives of Canada would loyally stand by the decisions of the board of conciliation and award.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand the hon. member for Vancouver to state that the trade unions of Canada approved of compulsory arbitration.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). What I did say was that in the majority of cases the labouring men had showed a disposition to agree in any decision arrived at by the government authorities.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The House and the country may rest assured that if this measure becomes law, the railway men will be found loyally supporting the government boards of conciliation and award. I am not in a position to speak of the other classes, but I may say that the committee which assisted me gave that as their opinion, and I have no reason to doubt that the railway companies will equally loyally abide by the decisions of the boards of conciliation and award. They are as amenable to public opinion as are the employees, and if we can get the employers and employees in Canada to respond to public opinion in their dealings with each other, we will have made some progress towards solving the labour problem. I am not one of those who hope to ever see an end to labour troubles. These troubles are incident to industrial life, and arise from natural self-interest. It is most natural that the employee should seek to better his position and that the employer should endeavour to make his enterprise as profitable as possible. The workingman wants a higher wage and the employer is anxious to make more money out of his investment. That is a condition of affairs which we will always have, and the more industrial progress Canada makes, the greater our industrial activity, the more frequent will be these frictions. It is idle to suppose that there ever will be an ideal state of affairs when every body will do everything desired by the other, and no man will have to stand up and battle for himself. But in connection with this question, it may be observed that the Bill does not travel beyond railway disputes, and while I might be asked the reason, I think that perhaps the bare statement of the question answers itself. The railway companies are creatures of parliament for the benefit of the public. They are not created for the benefit of any corporation or labour. They are created to serve the general community; and whilst both employer and employees have a deep interest in the working of the road, there is a still greater interest concerned, and that is the public interest. Therefore, on an occasion like this, I submit that the public have a locus standi, have a right to intervene and see that if the employer and employees fail to operate the road satisfactorily, then the public will do its best to see that the road is properly run and at the same time provide means for justice being done to employer and employee.

Mr. CLANCY. Through what channel?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Through the channel suggested in this measure. While, as my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has suggested, it might be desirable to extend this principle beyond railway companies, yet this Bill does not go beyond them. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) suggested last year that this Bill should be made to extend to telegraph companies. There are also coal companies and many other companies, monopolistic in their character, and which perhaps might properly be brought within the provisions of this Bill. I hope that this measure, if it becomes law, will prove so satisfactory in its operations as to lead to the extension of the principle into various other industrial channels. My hon. friend from Cumberland made a valuable suggestion, which I am glad to endorse. It does seem to me that the employers and employees of Canada would do well to recognize that the labour question is here to stay, that strikes and lockouts will always be resorted to

until we supply some other tribunal for the settlement of these differences. We have lockouts to deal with differences of another character, but there is no tribunal to-day apparently within the reach of employers and employees except the tribunal of force, such as strikes and lockouts, to solve these disputes. Perhaps, therefore, parliament is not altogether free from blame in not having long since endeavoured to devise some better means than these violent measures of strikes and lockouts for the settlement of labour troubles. But coming back for a moment to the Bill, I will take the liberty of reading to the House a letter which I received from Mr. Hall, as follows :—

Grand Union Hotel,
Ottawa, Ont., March 18, 1903.

Honourable Sir William Mulock,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Hon. Sir,—After the great amount of consideration that I have given to your Bill for the settlement of railway labour disputes and your desire to put a Bill such as it is on the statutes of the country, for the purpose for which it is aimed, I feel that considering those motives, it is one that should be endorsed by the members of parliament. The fact that the Bill has the power of appointing a conciliation committee, whose duty it will be to endeavour by all possible means to bring about settlements of disputes that may arise, I have no doubt will have good effect. Although in the train service we have had no serious difficulties between the train hands and the company for over ten years. and I don't see that there is a possibility in the near future of anything of the kind occurring, still, the fact of a measure such as this being under the statutes of Canada will place the Minister of Labour in a position to use his good offices to bring about a settlement of those differences, should they arise, possibly without going so far as arbitration. If, after the committee have failed to settle the difference, then the privilege of course, of referring the matter to arbitration, or of what is more a fact—investigation of the difference between the company and their men. They making their report to the Minister of Labour, who will according to the provisions of the Act, make report of the findings of that committee through the public press of the country ; this being for the purpose of influence by public opinion. Something, I believe, that will have that force behind it, that no matter which side of the controversy refuses to be fair, will compel them to accept reasonable conditions and to make a settlement. As I said before, the matter has had a great deal of consideration from myself, and also from other representative railway men of the country, and while admitting that there are a number of those interested who opposed the Bill, I think merely from the fact that they believe that the existing circumstances are all that are required, claiming that they have been able, up to the present, to settle their differences without interference from anybody, and believe that they can still continue to do so, and argue that there is no occasion for the Bill. But I am confident that a large majority of those interested are satisfied to accept your Bill, with the guarantee that it is intended to accomplish the one object—the bringing about of settlements of disputes that may arise.

As the legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, the Order of Railway Conductors, the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen and the Order of Railway Telegraphers, I have consented to the Bill as it is now introduced, and hope that all concerned will make the necessary use of the Bill, if the occasion ever arises, and also that it will be interpreted according to the ideas and intentions of the minister, and as I believe the Bill is intended to operate, and serve, my only wish is that it will be the dove of peace to bring about conditions where sometimes we have war and enmity to each other.

Respectfully yours,
(Sgd.) J. H. HALL.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of legislation on the subject of labour disputes. You can scarcely turn to the statutes of any country without finding more or less legislation of this kind. I shall not trouble the House with any review of the laws in other countries ; but, in case any hon. gentleman should desire a book of reference, I would suggest that he take up a book which he will find in the library, the Fifteenth Annual Report on Arbitrations, issued by the New York State Department of Labour. There will be found a collection of the statutes now in force throughout the United States, including an inter-state law and also the statutes of various other countries. On going through these different Acts, you find that with rare exception, the stumbling block in the way of their being useful is that the law is not set in motion except on the application of one or other or both of the parties. When the two parties, employer and employees, are at arms length neither is willing to manifest a sign of weakness by invoking outside help. The legislation of the United States is largely a dead letter, and I believe that it is largely attributable to this fact. There is a most interesting article published in the Bulletin of the Department of Labour of the United States, the May number, written by Charles Francis Adams—not the great lawyer and diplomatist, but a son of his, who has written a great deal on questions of this kind. I do not propose to read this article to the House, but the writer's suggestions are so much in line with this Bill, or rather the Bill may be said to be so much in line with his suggestions, that a reference to the article, I am sure, will be extremely interesting to the members of the House. There is a draft Bill at the end of the article. While I cannot quite trace all the provisions in the Bill now before the House, I have no doubt that the views presented by Mr. Charles Francis Adams in this article, assisted me in coming to the conclusion set forth in this measure. I refer to this article mainly for the purpose of pointing out that at page 670, will be found a description of the use made of the Massachusetts Act, a measure somewhat similar to this Bill, in the settlement of the great railway strike in

the state of Massachusetts in 1877. The writer describes with great satisfaction how the state board, intervening at the right moment held a public inquiry, summoning the parties before them, and reached an award and gave it to the public. Both parties immediately accepted the award, and peace was restored. The article proceeds to argue in favour of a setlement of disputes by the aid of public opinion, the principle upon which this Bill proceeds. After the general scheme of the Bill that is now before the House became known to the public, I received communications from persons outside of the railway world inquiring why we did not extend the provisions of the Bill to the industrial world generally. One of these communications was on behalf of a very large and influential section of the labour world. I think that, from the tenor of that letter, we have a right to assume that the very considerable section of workingmen represented by that order would rejoice if some peaceful measure such as this were within their reach, so that, in the event of their having trouble, they also might get the benefit of this measure. But I replied saying that the Bill was, at present, limited to the railway world; but that, if it proved satisfactory and public opinion, represented by employers and employees, demanded its extension to other classes, I was sure that parliament would accede to that demand. I think the time has come when both classes—indeed the whole community—might well address themselves to the question of endeavouring to devise means for the settlement of the labour question. I do not regard this country as on the brink of some great upheaval, as some hon. gentlemen seem to suggest. There is enough common sense among the people to demand what they conceive to be their rights, but yet not to go too far. They may go much farther at times than is wise, but they will not go to too great extremes. But seeing that, in my opinion, the time has arrived, I desire to give some practical form to that opinion; and I would suggest whether it would not be in the interest of all classes, employers and employees, if both sides should seek to bring together a representative committee of men of both classes, to thresh out this question and see if they could not find a solution, perhaps somewhat in the lines indicated. Such a discussion and the conclusions arrived at would, perhaps, bring to bear upon the question such a force of good will and impartial opinion as to make it effective practically in all cases of industrial war. At all events, I do not think we are warranted in assuming that parliament cannot make effective legislation in this direction. Therefore, I go so far as to express the hope that the public will seriously consider this proposition and assist in trying to solve the question. To-day, I received a letter from a large employer of labour in the city of Montreal. There is a passage in the letter, which, perhaps the House will allow me to read. The suggestion comes from him that there should be legislation. Speaking of labour organizations, he says:

> That these organizations have the power to negotiate and arrange any matters of interest affecting the particular trade or calling with which they are connected. Failing to accomplish this by amicable negotiation, the matter to be brought into court and regularly tried, in the same way as any other civil matter, and in the event of a failure to comply with the decision of the court, pains and penalties to follow, the same as in any other case in dispute. I know this is a large order, but we have to face the problem now in a most unsatisfactory manner.

This is from an employer of labour. My hon. friend from Vancouver this afternoon, alluding to some remarks made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), asked whether the employers would be willing to be bound by rules. Well, this is a letter from an employer who suggests the extreme procedure of having a board established by law, and the award of that board to be binding as in a civil court, and enforcible by all the fines, penalties, sheriffs, and powers that the law can supply. I only cite it to show that there is a feeling abroad in favour of some such solution of this question. Therefore, I suggest to those who take an interest in the matter that they should try and organize themselves into a free deliberative body in which both sides may meet and debate the question, and see if some good cannot come out of it. At least no harm can come. I submit it is our duty as good citizens to make every effort to bring about some agreement. You cannot suppress the question. It will be present on every occasion. Therefore, instead of deploring and wringing our hands when we are confronted with labour troubles let us rather as wise men set ourselves to work and try to solve the difficulty. However, I am travelling outside the record of the particular Bill before the House. My Bill is not limited to railways. I should say no more at present than to submit it for the consideration of parliament, feeling sure that if it becomes law it will meet all reasonable expectations.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 139) respecting the St. Mary's River Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 140) to incorporate the Cardiff Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 141) respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 142) respecting the Elgin and Havelock Railway Company.—Mr. Fowler.

Bill (No. 143) respecting the Canadian North-west Irrigation Company.—Mr. Oliver.

SETTLEMENT OF RAILWAY LABOUR DISPUTES.

House resumed debate on proposed motion of the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) for the second reading of Bill (No. 17) to aid in the settlement of railway labour disputes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). With respect to the Bill which has been introduced by the hon. the Minister of Labour, I may say in the first place that, even if the Bill is only an experiment, still I believe we ought to be willing to accept any experiment that offers any promise of useful results. I am bound to say, after hearing the explanation of the Minister of Labour, and after an examination of this Bill, that I cannot see that it does promise to produce any results that are likely to be of any advantage in allaying disputes between capital and labour in this country. It is a somewhat curious coincidence that since the establishment of the Department of Labour by this government a few years ago, we have really had a greater number of strikes, some of them very important ones, than I think we ever had before in the same period of time in the history of Canada. I concede at once that this condition of affairs in the country is such as to justify some action on the part of the government. It is suggested sometimes on the other side of the House that this is a growing time. I may say to the Minister of Labour that since this department has been instituted, it has been a growing time for strikes as well as for everything else. Now the first criticism which I would like to make on this Bill is that, if it is to be of any advantage at all, I see no reason for restricting it to steam railways and street railways. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour suggested that on account of the monopolistic character of the railways and street railways they should alone be included in this Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, not on that account.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, my hon. friend made the remark in that connection. I could understand the argument if there was any remedy to be given by the Bill by which the government, could, as he said, in one part of his speech, take over these railways and operate them, and relieve the country from a serious situation induced by a strike. If there was anything of that kind in the Bill, I could understand there would be some reason for restricting it. But, surely the Minister of Labour will agree with me that if there is to be any advantage derived from this Bill, it is an advantage which ought to be extended to any other trade or business when affected by a strike. For example, if the provisions of this Bill are to be of any use, why should they not be extended to the condition of affairs that now unhappily prevails in the city of Montreal, where a strike is going on which is paralyzing a very important branch of business in that port. There is nothing in the provisions of the Bill which would not make it as much applicable to that condition of affairs as to any strike upon a railway or street railway.

Then there is another suggestion which I would like to make. Does this Bill accomplish anything that cannot be accomplished under existing legislation? If it does, I would like to know what it is. I would like my hon. friend to consider that: What is there that you can do under this Bill that you cannot do as well at present? My hon. friend may say that you cannot appoint a board of arbitration. What is the use of appointing a board of arbitration unless the parties in the first instance will agree to accept its award, or are bound by law to accept the award after it is made

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting at the present time that we should pass a law providing for compulsory arbitration, but I am merely pointing out that a law of this character seems to me to be absolutely useless and may possibly be detrimental because it will result in nothing. The hon. Minister of Labour says that we may thereby have an inquiry. Is he not at the present time making an inquiry in British Columbia by means of a royal commission in regard to the labour situation there? Cannot he get every opportunity for making an inquiry from the legislation in existence that he could possibly get from this Bill? He may say that he cannot get a board of conciliation. He can get a board of conciliation under the Act passed two years ago, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour whether or not any action has ever been taken in the establishment of boards of conciliation under that Act, or whether any advantage in so far as establishing these boards of conciliation is concerned has ever resulted from the passing of that Act. Then, if he is not able to answer in the affirmative, it must be doubtful whether he can expect any advantage to result from the provisions which he is now proposing to this House? If he wants a board of conciliation, if he wants intervention between capital and labour, can he not have it under the Act passed two years ago, or can he not have it by the intervention of the Deputy Minister of Labour, who, I believe, from everything I have seen of his work, is a very capable and efficient officer? If he cannot accomplish that by the board of conciliation which he established two years ago what is he going to accomplish by this Bill? In the first place, under this Act, if a strike is threatened, or is in progres, he establishes a board of con-

ciliation and the board of conciliation proceeds to negotiate. This negotiation can be carried out under the boards of conciliation that we have already under the Act of two years ago or it can be carried on by the very capable officer who is acting as the Deputy Minister of Labour. Well, the hon. Minister of Labour might say in addition that after you have gone through all that red tape—because there is a great deal more machinery about this Bill than anything else—after you have gone through all that red tape of establishing, first, your board of conciliation it is, if I understand the provisions of the Bill, open to you to establish a board of arbitration which would take upon itself the duty of making an inquiry and making some award in respect to the difference. What would be the advantage of that ? The hon. Minister of Labour admits, as the fact is, under the provisions of this Bill, that when the award is made it may be absolutely disregarded by either one or both of the parties. What would you have accomplished ? The hon. minister will say that you would have accomplished something by your inquiry. You can make your inquiry now as he is doing in British Columbia, you can have your board of conciliation under his Act of two years ago and you can accomplish under this Bill nothing that you cannot accomplish as conditions stand at the present time. It would seem to me that it would be very much better for the hon. Minister of Labour to devote his energies to some practical purpose, not to the establishment of a tribunal whose award might be disregarded by both parties, a tribunal which may not be attended by either of the parties because there is nothing in his Bill to compel either of the parties to attend, there is no penalty placed on either of the parties for not attending this board of arbitration—a tribunal which if once appointed may be left alone in its glory to make an inquiry without either of the parties paying the slightest attention to it. Under these circumstances no possible good can result. If the hon. minister would devote his attention to some practical scheme by which both parties might be brought into agreement for the purpose of arranging to be bound by the award of some tribunal I think in that way he would accomplish some result in the end by reason of the fact that both parties had agreed to be bound by the award of the tribunal. In establishing this tribunal under the forms of law, but whose award is not sanctioned by law and which cannot have the sanction of law to enforce it, are you not really putting an obstacle in the way of an agreement between the parties to be bound by the tribunal ? If you can get capital and labour to come together and agree that they will be bound by the award of a certain tribunal you have accomplished something, because I believe that when capital and labour have entered into an agreement of that kind they will abide by the result. If instead of doing that you simply ask these people to attend before a tribunal that they may absolutely ignore and if you permit that tribunal in the absence of one or both of the parties possibly, to make an award, you are going through a mere form in the end, and how are you going to accomplish anything in that way for the settlement of disputes between capital and labour ? I do not regard this measure of the hon. Minister of Labour as one that is likely to produce satisfactory results, or, in fact, any results at all. I think it is a measure that will have about the same end, so far as practical results are concerned, as the measure which he introduced two years ago in regard to establishing boards of conciliation. In these questions at issue between capital and labour you must very largely have regard to public opinion, and I suppose the hon. minister is looking to the force of public opinion to enforce the award. But, I think in this he is starting at the wrong point. I think the time to invoke public opinion is when you are seeking to bring the parties into an agreement for the purpose of having an award made which both will submit to when it is once made ; but I think if you invoke the force of public opinion to enforce an award after it is once made, after the inquiry has been made (it may be ex parte), you are expecting too much if you anticipate therefrom any very great results. These, Mr. Speaker, are the very brief criticisms which I would make of the Bill in its present form and at the present time. We may be justified in making an experiment of this kind which has been proposed by the hon. minister who has evidently devoted some thought and considerable attention to the subject, but I say from my own brief consideration of this Bill, and looking at what has been accomplished by the somewhat similar provisions of the Bill introduced two years ago, that I for one would not anticipate any very great results from it, and I would think that possibly it might stand in the way of obtaining agreements between capital and labour to be bound by arbitration. I do not think that legislation can possibly do a great deal in matters of this kind, at all events, in the direction in which the hon. minister is moving. You cannot by force of legislation, compel any man to work for a wage which he is not willing to accept, and you cannot by force of legislation compel any man to give a higher wage than that which he is willing to pay. You have to deal with matters of this kind, I admit, very delicately, but you have to deal with them wisely with the view of arriving at an agreement as early as possible in the history of the problem which presents itself to the government for solution, and I would think that the

object of legislation would be to bring about as early as possible some agreement between capital and labour—perhaps you cannot go farther than that at present—some agreement between capital and labour whereby the differences which lead to strikes and riots and difficulties of that kind can be submitted to some tribunal the award of which both parties would agree to observe. If you accomplish that by legislation, or if you take a step towards the accomplishment of that, then you have accomplished a very great thing, but it does not seem to me, with all deference to the views of the hon. minister, that the legislation which he has now introduced into this House is legislation which is calculated to bring about any such useful results as those which he anticipates.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I look upon the Bill which is before the House as being practically an extension of the Conciliation Act, and looking at it in that light, I think we can make up our minds that it will not do any harm whatever. At all events, the Conciliation Act cannot be charged with having caused one strike in the country since it was put on the statute-book.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman think it much of a compliment to the Conciliation Act which was designed to prevent strikes, to say, that it had not caused any strikes.

Mr. PUTTEE. I do not. When the Conciliation Act was being passed in 1900 I expressed the opinion that it would not be very effective and that it would be far better for us to attempt something more radical. However, since the leader of the opposition has pointed out that during the last few years, in connection with the growing times strikes have also grown, it is perfectly fair for me to add that so far as the Conciliation Act is concerned it is not responsible for causing a solitary strike.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not suggest it did.

Mr. PUTTEE. The Conciliation Act has been useful in closing up a good many disputes ; not more than I expected it would and in comparison with the number of strikes in the country very few indeed. I believe that such a voluntary Conciliation Act is necessarily limited to disputes that have grown old, disputes which both sides are tired of, and disputes of trivial importance.

The Bill introduced last year was practically a compulsory arbitration Act. That Bill has been withdrawn and we may assume that the reasons given by the minister were sufficient cause for him withdrawing it. I agreed last year that the Bill instead of being passed into law should be submitted to the criticism of all parties in the country, and there is no doubt that it was condemned, and condemned almost unanimously. I regret that, because most of the people in condeming it also condemned the principle of compulsory arbitration. I belive that had that Bill of last year been more thoughtfully and carefully drawn, it would not have been so generally condemned. A number of organizations, however, made this distinction : they condemned the Bill but they did not condemn the principle of compulsory arbitration. For my part I am in favour of compulsory arbitration and I admit that in that respect I am not in entire touch with the majority of the labour men in this country. Since New Zealand put the Compulsory Arbitration Act into effect in 1896, I have carefully watched all the findings that have been made and all the operations of their various conciliation and arbitration boards, and up to the present time there has been no distinct set-back met with. It does look as if now they were coming to the first test. It is pointed out that these years have all been practically on a rising market, and the test of the Act has not yet come. But, Sir, I notice that the Australian commissioner who went to New Zealand, after thoroughly investigating, reported to his government in such a way, that they have not only adopted the principle of compulsory arbitration, but that they have stricken out the conciliation part of the Act and adopted only the arbitration boards. These are in operation now in Australia. I believe that compulsory arbitration is far better than any process that has yet been tried to do away with strikes. At the same time I must say that I do not think that public opinion in Canada is prepared for a compulsory arbitration measure. I am thoroughly convinced myself that it is the proper method and why I stay with it now is because my experience is that strikes are a loss to the labouring men themselves ; that the defeats are too disastrous and that the victories are too dearly bought. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that we have more strikes to-day than ever we had before. In the last few years the number of strikes has been increased and in the years to come the number will increase. We are not on the threshold of a period of peace in the matter of industrial disputes. Probably this is the outcome, first, of the combinations of capital that preceded the combinations of labour, but at all events we can rest assured that there will be more strikes in the future than there have been in the past. That is why I believe we should go to the full extent that public opinion will let us go, to try and provide for the proper arbitration or conciliation of those disputes that are bound to occur.

I am quite in sympathy with the leader of the opposition when he asked why this principle of compulsory investigation should only apply to the railways. Last year I introduced a Bill to amend the Conciliation Act, and for that matter I have introduced

it again in this session, although I fear it will suffer the same fate of not being called when the Minister of Labour is in his seat. My Bill to amend the Conciliation Act includes the principle of this Bill we are now discussing as regards railway labour disputes, but I believe that the principle should be made general. Probably it would not affect a number of the smaller disputes, but we have had as many mining strikes almost as railway strikes and they were just as disastrous I believe. It seems to me that this principle should be applied to strikes in large factories, because public opinion in these matters is just as effective as in connection with railway matters. Most of our mining strikes and most of our big factory strikes hinge between those representing the unions and the manager; one manager. I believe that if there was compulsory investigation and the whole facts were ascertained and the findings made and published, that probably in most cases the directors and the shareholders of the companies would get a better grasp of the matters in dispute between their own manager and the employees. I quite think that it would be just as effective in settling disputes of this kind as in settling railway disputes. Now, in my Bill there was one section which does not appear in this Bill, and I submit that it contains a very material provision. The absence of the idea of it from the Bill of last year, brought forward very general condemnation of that Bill. I may state, Mr. Speaker, that the compulsory arbitration principle as operated in New Zealand and Australia does not attempt to arbitrate between the individual and the employer. It arbitrates between two organizations, the organization of the workers and the organization of the employers. The weakness of the compulsory arbitration Bill of last year was that it only recognized the individuals. As this would lead to the disintegration of the labour organizations, very naturally and wisely they repudiated it. I urged that the Conciliation Act should recognize the principle of the labour organizations by having added to it another section, which would read as follows:—

> In no case shall a conciliator or arbitrator stipulate, nor shall it be stipulated in any agreement promoted or recommended by a conciliator or arbitrator, that any employee shall relinquish his membership in any local, national or international trades union or labour association; nor shall an agreement subject any employee to a penalty on account of such membership.

I believe the inclusion of such a section would in no way weaken the Act, but would to a tremendous extent create confidence in it, and in the good intention of this parliament in passing that Act. It is no use of this House or any employer any longer attempting to ignore the existence of trades unions. They are a fact and a factor in labour disputes, which must be recognized. The disputes that arise without them usually have very little merit in them. Men in this country as well as in other countries have been compelled by the very force of circumstances to organize, and rightly so; and to ignore the fact in any conciliation Act or arbitration proposal seems to me only to weaken the confidence of the people who are going to be affected by it. The Minister of Labour has explained to us that this Bill is acceptable to what are known as the big brotherhoods, the railway organizations—the engineers, the trainmen, the firemen, the conductors and the telegraphers. These organizations accept this Bill, because they believe it will not affect them at all; and in that belief they are right.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the good of the Bill, then, if it applies only to them and will not affect them?

Mr. PUTTEE. They state in their letter that they have not had a strike in the Dominion of Canada for ten years. That is very nearly correct. As a matter of fact, I believe the last strike was that of the railway telegraphers in 1895, eight years ago. The reason that these organizations have not had a strike for eight or ten years is that they are strong now. In the early days they were the very people who had the greatest number of strikes. They were then always in trouble. Every one of these organizations is an international organization. The reason that they have not had a strike for ten years is that they are strong, and the question of their recognition has been settled. They are recognized by the railway companies as a matter of course, and that means peace and harmony. The hon. member for West Toronto wants to know what will be the use of this Bill if it does not affect these organizations. Well, I believe, making a very generous estimate, that the five big brotherhoods comprise less than 20 per cent of the employees of the railways of this country. There are several other organizations with far greater membership than they have, which will be affected by this Act, which will have to put it to the test. For instance, there are the switchmen, the boiler-makers, the machinists, the firemen, the trackmen, the bridge-builders, the freight handlers, and a number of others. At least four-fifths of the employees of the railways will be affected by the Act, and most of their organizations are not yet recognized by the railway companies. If I might digress for a moment, I would like to explain what recognition means. Recognition in connection with trades organizations simply means the giving to the second party to a settlement or agreement the right to see that that settlement or agreement is carried out; that is all it means. After a strike there is a settlement, or agreement. If the union is not recognized, there is no one to see on behalf of the employee that the conditions of the agreement in his favour are carried out. There-

fore to settle a strike without recognition of the union is simply to lose the strike, so far as the employees are concerned; but to settle the strike, with recognition of the union, means that the officers of the union or its committee represent the other side to the bargain. That is all there is in recognition. The large majority of the men who are going to be affected by this Bill are not the brotherhoods who have endorsed it, but the other organizations, the majority of which have not yet been recognized by the companies; and I submit that that fact makes the inclusion of the clause which I have read all the more necessary. Without that clause, I believe the Bill will be weak, but with it, it will be strong. Now, instead of our having a new Bill, I believe the Conciliation Act should be amended. But because things are not done in just the way we wish, we must assume that there is some reason why they are done in another way. I regret that we have not been taken into the confidence of the hon. Minister of Labour and been told what the reason is. I think this principle should be included in the Conciliation Act, so that we may find out whether there is any value in it, or whether we should substitute anything else for it.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Yale and Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, as a representative of a district where there are a number of organizations of railway employees, I feel that I should say a few words on this Bill, more especially as I have been approached personally by members of those organizations, and have had forwarded to me resolutions relating to the Bill. Speaking personally, I believe a compulsory arbitration law would be in the interest of both employers and employees. However, I found an objection to such a measure on the part of the unions of railway employees. The chief difficulty seemed to be in the formation of the tribunal of arbitrators. They seemed also to think that the measure struck at the union to a certain extent. In this respect I am merely expressing what they said to me, not offering my own opinion. As this Bill was originally introduced by the hon. Minister of Labour last session, it provided for compulsory arbitration and copies were widely distributed for the consideration of those more particularly affected. In my district, the unions were opposed to the measure for the reasons I have stated. Then there was a second drafting of that Bill which was also objectionable, but in the present Bill these objections are removed by certain sections. I may say that I received resolutions asking me to oppose the Bill as introduced last session and as drafted the second time, but the gentlemen who represents in Ottawa the interest of the railway employees of Canada—at least he so assured me and I put faith in his assurance—went over the Bill with me very carefully, and he instructed me that the Bill as now drafted is satisfactory to railway employees. He also showed me letters which he had written to the unions, which had forwarded their protest against the measure, not as now submitted, but as drafted in the second place. At all events, he showed me the letters he had written, pointing out how the objections had been removed by certain clauses in the Bill now before the House, and assured me that it was satisfactory, and I have received no further instructions to oppose it. I do not agree in the opinion of the hon. leader of the opposition that this Bill is practically useless. Although there is no provision to enforce any award, there is a provision for compulsory investigation. In the case of a dispute, the employees should have no objection to the facts being made public and thoroughly investigated, so that the public may understand the points in dispute, nor should the employers have any objection to an investigation being had and being made public. Such being the case, this Bill, if it does nothing else, will have the effect of placing the matters in dispute before the public so that the public may judge who is in the right, and either party to the dispute will no doubt be very anxious to have the public opinion in their favour. There will at all events be the moral suasion of public opinion, and the ultimate success of either party will no doubt depend considerably on the verdict of the public. For those reasons I propose to vote in favour of this Bill.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Toronto Centre). I did expect, Mr. Speaker, that we were going to have a Bill presented to us on this important question which would have some backbone in it. But instead we have a Bill which really amounts to nothing. In a question of this kind, we should not forget that there are two parties to the dispute. There is organized capital on the one side and organized labour on the other. In this Bill, we have provisions dealing with a corporate capacity, which can be attacked in the law courts, and from which damages may be exacted. I refer to the railway companies. But the other party affected by this measure and which is described in the Bill as 'labour,' is a body which occupies an entirely different position. No doubt, what is meant by the word 'labour' is organized labour, organized up to a certain point, and the most cowardly kind of organization—one that can attack capital but cannot be attacked in return. It seems to me that the first thing organized labour should do, if they want to be respected, is to organize under the laws of the country and place themselves in the same position as other organizations which we have incorporated. But they refuse to come under the law and are in the cowardly position of having neither a body to be kicked nor a soul to be damned. We are placing capital in a most unfair position. I do not

stand here as the representative, in any shape, of organized capital, but as a Canadian anxious to see fair play and fair dealings, and I think that my hon. friends, like my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), are also anxious that there should be some fairness in the legislation we pass. This Bill is most unfair. The very fact of its being so flimsy, the very fact of their being so little in it, makes it all the more objectionable because when a Bill of this kind becomes law, that is the end of it. We are told this evening that international organized labour is an advantage to this country. The advantage to this country, under our existing laws, is that labouring men can go to the other side and get protection. We are very anxious on this side of the House that that matter should take a different turn and that we should be able to hold out inducements to these organized labour gentlemen to come to this country and be protected. We are anxious to give them the same protection here as they get on the other side, but I do not notice that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) are supporting the policy of the opposition in this House—a policy which would place us in a better position to deal with labour and industries as they are dealt with on the other side of the line. The government should legislate for protection, not only for labour but for capital and industry in this country, and not bring down a Bill of this kind that has nothing in it. The only inducement to pass a measure of this kind is to be found in clause four :

> It shall be the duty of the conciliation committee to endeavour by conciliation and mediation to assist in bringing about an amicable settlement of the difference to the satisfaction of both parties, and to report its proceedings to the minister.

That is the whole thing in connection with this Bill. Well, we have that already. I do not see that you are going to put any more strength into it, or that you are going to place this Dominion of Canada in any better position to deal with conditions on the other side of the line by passing this Bill. Indeed, I think we shall be in a worse position, for we shall have made a pretense or an appearance of doing something while really doing nothing. Now, Sir, these labour strikes do not take place in this country of their own accord. There must be some motive power, some spirit in them ; and that motive power and that spirit I assert again, notwithstanding what has been said on both sides of the House, comes from forces antagonistic to Canada on the other side of the line. Why should the port of Montreal be crippled at the present time ? Simply because an endeavour is being made on this side of the line to provide a system of transportation by which the produce of this country will reach Europe through Canadian channels. I can understand New York and Boston using all the means that are in their power to block the city of Montreal and the city of Quebec as much as they possibly can. How can they block them ? Simply by promoting a system of strikes such as that taking place at the present time in Montreal.

Mr. MORIN. Or by destroying the Welland canal.

Mr. BROCK. Exactly. We know, Mr. Speaker, that, a few years ago, thinking that one of our vulnerable points was the Welland canal, men came over here in the interest, not altogether of the United States, but in the interests of disorganized labour in the United States, to blow up the locks of the Welland canal and so interrupt the transportation system of this country. Those who are standing for the improvement of our transportation system are being recognized in the United States as a force. So, organized labour is joined with organized hatred of Canada and Great Britain. For, make no mistake about it, that is the case. We know what is going on in the United States ; we know that there is a party there antagonistic to Canada ; we know from watching the debates in Washington that one of the strongest arguments there against anything that looks like reciprocity is to tell them that this will result in benefiting Canada, and it is voted down by an overwhelming majority. We cannot shut our eyes to these facts, we must recognize them. Therefore, what we should have on this side is something strong, something well defined—not such an effeminate Bill as this now before us. We want something that will assert ourselves as a nation. We are told by one of the hon. gentlemen on the other side that he has made this country a nation. Sir, we shall never make a nation with Bills of this kind. No one will respect them. We have heard the representatives of labour in this House, and even they are not satisfied with this Bill. And I am sure the country will not be satisfied with it. That is why I ask the government to withdraw this Bill and endeavour, at another session, to give us something stronger, something more manly, something more national. In this Bill we are dealing with disputes between railway companies and railway employees. The railway companies have capital to be attacked. You can bring them into court, get judgments against them and collect damages from them. But, on the other side, you have an organization which is no organization when you come to attack them. They simply scatter into fragments. You cannot sue them, you cannot collect damages from them, you cannot bring pressure upon them to make them amenable to the laws of the country. In the city of Montreal to-day damages to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars have been done by organized labour. What relief can we get ? If organized labour is in the wrong,

can we attack them ? If we sue them and get verdicts, from whom are we to collect damages ? This is a matter which should be taken hold of in a statesmanlike way. I stand here regardless of what effect all this may have upon the voting power of this country. We should do what is right, regardless of that power. The very votes that we pander to are the votes that will turn against us if we show weakness. That has been so in the past, and will be found to be true in the future. I ask the government to bring down something stronger, something more manly, something more national than we have in this Bill.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It seems to me that there is very little difference between this Bill and chapter 24 of the Statutes of 1900, the last Conciliation Act. The only difference that I can see is in reference to the parties to whom it may apply. The Bill passed in 1900 applies where difficulty exists or is apprehended between an employer or any class of employer and the workmen, while the other Bill applies to disputes between railway employers and their employees. I do not know what interpretation a member of the legal profession would put upon it, but it seems to me that the first Bill might apply to railways as well as to any other department of industry. Is it not a fact that, under the provisions of the Bill of 1900, the minister has himself already appointed the commissioners that are now inquiring into some labour troubles in British Columbia ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is referring to the commission now sitting in British Columbia. That commission is appointed under chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that it could equally well have been appointed under this Act of 1900, which has reference to the appointment of conciliation boards. The Act provides that the minister may :

(c) On the application of employers or workmen interested, and after taking into consideration the existence and adequacy of means available for conciliation in the district or trade and the circumstances of the case, appoint a person or persons to act as conciliator or as a board of conciliation ;

(d) On the application of both parties to the difference, appoint an arbitrator or arbitrators.

The report is made to the minister, and a memorandum of it kept. It provides also :

It shall be the duty of the conciliator to promote conditions favourable to a settlement by endeavouring to allay distrust, to remove causes of friction, to promote good feeling, to restore confidence, and to encourage the parties to come together and themselves affect a settlement and also to promote agreements between employers and employees with a view to the submission of differnces to conciliation or arbitration before resorting to strikes or lockouts.

The conciliator or conciliation board may, when deemed advisable invite others to assist them in the work of conciliation.

If, before a settlement is effected, and while the difference is under the consideration of a conciliator or conciliation board, such conciliator or conciliation board is of opinion that some misunderstanding or disagreement appears to exist between the parties as to the causes or circumstances of the difference, and with a view to the removal of such minunderstanding or disagreement, desires an inquiry under oath into such causes and circumstances, and, in writing signed by such conciliator or the members of a conciliation board, as the case may be, communicates to the minister such desire for inquiry, and if the parties to the difference or their representatives in writing consent thereto——

—The government may appoint commissioners to make the inquiry.

I take it that all this would apply equally well to railway employees as it would to employees in any other line. So it seems to me, all the power that the minister would have under this proposed measure, he already has under the existing law. Perhaps my interpretation may not be exactly correct, but I notice that in his explanation of it, he himself tells us that the object is to aid the boards of conciliation in promoting the settlement of trade disputes and difficulties that arise from time to time between employers and employees, and that it is hoped that the affirmation of this principle may prevent strikes and lockouts. He goes on and explains it in that way. Then he refers to the English Bill of 1896. Long before 1896 the system was in force. Since then I think statistics show that six-sevenths of the disputes have been amicably settled by consent of the parties, either through a board of conciliation or by the parties themselves while the boards were in deliberation. The first Bill provides for conciliation boards and arbitration boards, the second Bill provides for the same thing. I see no difference except that the first Bill does not apply to railways, but it lays down provisions where the Act might be invoked, and which I think would enable the minister to take up railway disputes as well as any others. If that be so, then this Bill is unnecessary. Now the duty of the committee is set forth here. There is to be a conciliation board, mediation and investigation. That is conciliation and inquiry. Now what is the difference between investigation and inquiry ? Both have to report back to the minister ; neither have any authority to enforce their findings, and the dispute is left an open question.

It should be the duty of the conciliation committee to endeavour, by conciliation and mediation——

The very same words as are employed in the other one.

—to assist in bringing about an amicable settlement of the difference to the satisfaction of both parties, and to report the proceedings to the minister.

Almost exactly the same words are used. So it seems to me this Bill is entirely unnecessary. Then it provides for a board of arbitration. But the only difference I can see between the board in the Act of 1900 and the board as proposed by this Act, is simply this, that in the old Act the minister may pay the members of the board what he thinks fit; in this case the members of the board get $10 each a day, and expenses. It is left to the minister how much he shall pay the chairman. It seems to me the only result of this Bill will be to give the minister an opportunity of employing a few more of his friends to act at $10 a day and expenses, to make an inquiry, or become a mediation commission. In this Act there is no provision for an arbitration, if I understand arbitration correctly. I have always understood that arbitration was an attempt to ascertain the differences between disputants, to adjust those differences and reach some conclusion. In this case no conclusion is reached, they only make an inquiry and report. Therefore in my judgment this might more appropriately be called a provision to appoint a commission of inquiry, than to appoint an arbitration commission. They have power to inquire into differences, only to inquire and report back to the minister. Now I do not know whether the first Act would give powers to the commission of inquiry to deal in the same way with railway companies and their employees as it does with other companies and their employees, but I think it does. If it does, there is no need for this Act because it is practically the same as the other.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). It seems to me a very unwise thing to put on the statute-book an Act that is of no use, and can be of no use. Now when the minister introduced his Labour Bill last year he used these words:

> Although this is hardly the occasion for any lengthened observations, still, as the measure is somewhat novel, perhaps a few words now would not be out of place. I would say that the proposition is in effect one of compulsory arbitration between railway companies and their employees in regard to the various subjects of controversy that from time to time arise between these parties. The measure is confined entirely to the railway world, it does not deal with any other than railway industries.

Now since last year the minister has found that there is a strong objection to compulsory arbitration. I will not say now whether I agree with compulsory arbitration or not. A year ago when the minister brought in this Bill, there may have been a general feeling that compulsory arbitration had been successful in Australia, and especially in New Zealand. There can be no possible object in a Bill of this kind unless it has power to do something. This Bill has no power to do anything. It has power to get certain information in connection with certain railway strikes, but the only final power it has is to make a report, and that report shall be published at the country's expense in the 'Labour Gazette.' There is no power to compel either sides to agree to an arbitration. There is no reason, under such a Bill, why either party to a dispute should refer their case to such a tribunal. We have an instance of this in what was called the arbitration board of the board of trade, in Toronto, which was copied, I think, from a scheme of the board of trade in England. After a great deal of trouble had been experienced on the part of members of the board of trade in various cities, a board of arbitration was appointed which it was thought would result in doing away with the heavy legal expenses which arose when disputes occurred between members of the board of trade, principally in connection with grain operations. It was thought the disputes might be referred to this tribunal, and so save large legal expenses. I think I am right in saying that this board of conciliation, or this board of arbitration, has been an absolute failure. When a man wants to get a dispute settled, instead of going to his friends in the board of trade, he goes straight to law, where he can get a decision and pay the costs of it, which sometimes amount to more than the award he gets.

Another weakness in this Bill is that it is confined to railway disputes. Now how can we define railway disputes? We have to-day, perhaps, the most serious strike that has existed in Canada, in the case of the dock labourers in Montreal. I would ask the Minister of Labour whether, under this Bill, he can call upon these dock labourers to arbitrate their disputes, and publish the result of that arbitration in the 'Labour Gazette.' I do not think he can, if I read the Bill aright. This Bill takes power to arbitrate strikes of the most trivial character between street railway companies and its employees, in a town of five or six thousand inhabitants; but it ignores entirely the larger interests connected with railways. This Bill is brought in with the idea of adjusting railway disputes, but it does not provide for arbitrating disputes between teamsters and their employers in any of the large cities of Canada. It is narrowed to a small section of labour, it absolutely has no power and I contend that it can do nothing but bring about soreness and friction between the parties who are supposed to be parties to the arbitration which may be held under the Bill.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) stated that the railway organizations are perfectly satisfied with this Bill. If so, I feel that that entirely relieves me from making any suggestions to him towards perfecting the Bill. What I arose specially to say was this: Some very hard things have been said about the or-

ganizations that this legislation is supposed to specially affect, and I feel that I would not be doing my duty if I did not come to their defence, especially as I believe such remarks as have been made were not called for and should not have been applied to the organizations that this Bill affects. First, I will say, that the Order of Railway Conductors of this country, known as the O.R.C., have for a great many years had a special clause in their constitution that strictly forbids strikes to take place under the auspices of this organization. That proves conclusively that this organization are not in favour of strikes and that they would not allow any of their members to engage in strikes. The organization is composed of men of good common sense, who endeavour to reason out with the railway companies any question at issue and to obtain in that way the rights which they think they should have as servants of the railway companies. These men perform a very useful work in this country. They have an insurance fund in connection with their organization and they are doing their utmost to supply the railways with good, capable, efficient men, men who are not inclined to strike or to create difficulties with the railway companies. In other words, they have a very conservative organization, and they do not care to take part in any strike whatever. So far as the organization of locomotive engineers is concerned, it is conducted largely on the same lines. I cannot undertake to say that the locomotive engineers have nothing in their constitution preventing their members from engaging in strikes, but knowing the conservative head of their organization, Mr. Arthur, by reputation, who is not a Canadian, but who resides on the other side of the line, and who has been at the head of the locomotive engineers for a great many years. I know that he has always taken the stand that the locomotive engineers should not engage in strikes of any kind whatever if at all possible to prevent it. They are entirely opposed to them, though, I presume, at times they are compelled to join in them. The other organizations to which this Bill applies, I know, look upon the question of strikes in the same light. None of these men are connected with cowardly organizations as has been said. They are connected with what I believe to be good organizations and organizations that will not be a detriment to the people of the country in any way whatever. In so far as this legislation is concerned and the legislation introduced into this House last year, I will undertake to say—I may be mistaken—that the very organizations that this Bill specially affects and the Bill of last year specially affected were not the parties who asked for legislation of this kind in the sense in which it has been given to them. They did not ask to be specially legislated for; if there was legislation brought down to this House, they did not ask that any exclusive privilege should be accorded them over any other class of workingmen. They did not ask to be specially selected as the only workingmen to whom legislation of this kind should apply. I am not aware of the railway men ever making such a demand exclusively, but finding that legislation was introduced into this House last year that they as an organization took very strong objection to, the hon. minister will bear me out when I say that during the recess between last session and this session, a deputation of railway employees met the hon. minister with the view of presenting their objections to the legislation he introduced last year. As a result of that conference between the railway employees and the hon. minister the Bill of last year was entirely abandoned and this Bill is introduced now. I take it that the railway employees believe that the government were bound to bring down legislation of this kind, and that being the case, they made efforts to have a Bill introduced that would be less objectionable than the Bill of last year. Is there anything unreasonable, wrong or cowardly about that on the part of these men? I think not. We are here to legislate for all classes of the community in this country. We are not here to specially legislate for any particular class or to grant any particular class of legislation. We are here to endeavour to legislate in the interests of the whole people without doing any injury to any class of people. From my connection with railway men in this country, I may say that a large portion of them are as conservative as the remarks I have just made at this moment. They do not want anything of a special character, they do not want anything that will injure any other class of the community; all they want is reasonable and fair legislation granted to them as it is granted to other classes of the community. So far as this Bill is concerned it may be that there are some very objectionable features in it, but, at all events, let them be as objectionable as they may, they are extremely mild, as the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has said, and being extremely mild, I cannot see how they are going to injure any other class of the community. Now, it is held in some parts of Australia in particular that where organizations ask for legislation and where they step in to have an arbitration with their employers, they should be incorporated the same as railway companies and the same as manufacturing industries, and that being incorporated, if they fail to carry out any agreement which they have made they will be just as responsible as the employers of labour——

Mr. PUTTEE. They are only incorporated for the purposes of the Compulsory Arbitration Act.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not discussing that point, but what I am saying is that many people hold that they should be held quite as responsible as the employers of labour. I may also say that in Australia, as far as the matter of conciliation is concerned, there is a difficulty. Sums of money have been paid to persons who have acted on the boards of conciliation. It was discovered that these men derived by reason of their being selected as members of the boards of conciliation, a larger amount of pay than they could otherwise make, and that by reason of that they adopted means of creating and fomenting strikes and difficulties between capital and labour. For that reason the people objected to those boards of conciliation almost altogether. This is the objection they found to boards of conciliation in Australia, and I would be very sorry indeed if the conditions are the same in Canada as they are in Australia, because, if the conditions are similar the same difficulty would occur in this country. The hon. minister stated to-day that this Bill is based largely on the lines of a Bill introduced in the United States. If that be true, then the conditions will arise here perhaps that have arisen in the United States. For instance, when a difficulty occurs between the railway companies and their employees and both object to take part in a conciliation to settle the difference, I presume that under such circumstances the Bill would allow the Department of Labour to have a compulsory investigation irrespective of either or both of the parties. If the result of the deliberations of the department is published in the 'Labour Gazette' in order to create a public opinion against the party who dissents from the award, I cannot see anything particularly wrong about that. If a railway company does what is right to its employees they can have nothing to fear from fair and reasonable investigation. On the other hand if the employees are not willing to enter into conciliation, and if on investigation the government finds that the employees are to blame, then it would be in the interest of the country that such a public opinion would be created as would compel the employees to resume their occupation. Let me give an instance of what has occurred right here in the city of Ottawa. There is a difficulty between the trackmen and the Canada Atlantic Railway Company. I understand that two responsible gentlemen offered their services to the Canada Atlantic Railway officials to try and bring about a fair settlement and that the offer was refused. Now, what followed? I do not know of this personally, but I am told it, and if I am wrong I shall be willing to withdraw it; I am told that all the heavier engines of the Canada Atlantic Railway are in the shops to-day, that the company is afraid to trust them on the line because the track is not in the condition it would be if the trackmen were continuously at work. If that be true, then some interference should take place on the part of the Department of Labour, because it has gone beyond the question as between the Canada Atlantic Railway and the trackmen, and loss of life and accidents may occur at any time. If the company is not reasonable and will not have their affairs investigated, then they should be shown up in their proper light before the people of this country. I do not think that the Bill goes far enough to enable the board to get sufficient information to arrive at a proper conclusion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Turn to section twelve.

Mr. INGRAM. Section twelve reads :—

12. For the purpose of such inquiry the board shall have all the power of summoning before it any witnesses, and of requiring them to give evidence on oath, or on solemn affirmation, if they are persons entitled to affirm in civil matters, and produce such documents and things as the board deems requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which it is inquiring, and shall have the same power to enforce the attendance of witnesses, and to compel them to give evidence as is vested in any court of record in civil cases ; but no such witness shall be compelled to answer any question, by his answer to which he might render himself liable to a criminal prosecution.

It would appear from this that they might obtain the necessary information to arrive at a fair conclusion. I am not a lawyer, but from my reading of the Bill it would appear that there is no provision to enforce the findings of the board because there are no penalties provided. However, when the Bill comes up in Committee we will have greater scope to discuss its different provisions. I want to assure hon. gentlemen in this House that so far as the railway employees of this country are concerned, this is the first instance of any legislation being conceded to them without their specially asking for it and in which they are considered exclusively the only workmen that should be legislated for. I do not know whether or not this parliament has the right to legislate as regards matters affecting the manufacturing industries, or whether that is within the purview of the provinces. I know that in the province of Ontario we have what they call a Mutual Arbitration Act, but I am bound to say that so far as I know that Act is practically a dead letter. It can only be acted upon by mutual consent, and to my knowledge there never has been a case where, by mutual consent, it was put in operation. However, that may be, if the provinces have power over these matters, then if the legislatures are not doing their duty they must be held responsible to the people.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). We are bound to give to any legislation tending to improve the relations between employers and employees all the help we possibly can.

In that light, there are some features of this Bill to which I would call the attention of the Minister of Labour. In section 2 we have the provision that this law will apply to all railway companies, whether under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada or of the legislature of any province. I question very much whether we have the right in this parliament to legislate in case a difficulty should arise between the employees of a railway under provincial jurisdiction and the company operating that railway. At first sight, I do not think we have that right, and it seems to me to be a matter upon which we should have the opinion of the Department of Justice. In case any difficulties arose between railway companies under the control of the local legislature and their employees, upon what ground could we intervene or bring the machinery provided in this Bill to bear? This leads me to submit this further consideration to the hon. minister. We have had no legislation of this kind, so far as I am aware, previous to 1900, and it seems to me doubtful whether we have any jurisdiction at all to provide legislation for the settlement of railway disputes between employers and employees. These difficulties arise in connection with the contract for the lease and hire of work, and that contract falls under the subsection of section 92 of the Confederation Act, which leaves to the local legislatures everything which has reference to property and civil rights. The difficulty which exists to-day in the city of Montreal, is one arising out of the conditions connected with the lease and hire of work, and I question very much whether this parliament has any jurisdiction in regard to matters of that kind. I suppose it might be claimed that under the general terms of the Confederation Act, which says that the parliament of Canada has the right to legislate for the peace, order, and good government of Canada, we might possibly intervene; but outside of these words, I think all difficulties connected with labour disputes are under the jurisdiction of the local legislature, and that has evidently been thought to be the case, since the hon. member who has just taken his seat has referred to the measure on the statute-book of the province of Ontario relating to this very subject. I do not by any means claim to decide the point, but I think it is one well worthy of the consideration of the Department of Justice before we go any further in the consideration of this Bill. I wonder whether the hon. Minister of Labour has considered the wording of chapter 24 of 63-64 Victoria, the Conciliation Act of 1900. It seems to me that everything which is provided for in this Bill is equally provided for in that statute. The machinery may be a little different, the wording is different, but the same object is attained. Section 4 of that statute says:

Where a difference exists or is apprehended between an employer or any class of employers and workmen, or between different classes of workmen, the minister may, if he thinks fit, exercise all or any of the following powers.

This Bill makes the same provision, except that its machinery is restricted to railway companies. There is some difference in the organization of the conciliation commission and afterwards the arbitration board; but if experience has taught the Department of Labour that the particular machinery provided for in this Bill is better machinery, why not modify the statute of 1900, and make it serviceable for everybody? —because strikes and labour difficulties are likely to occur between all classes of employers and employees; and I do not see why one kind of machinery should be provided for in the statute of 1900, applicable to difficulties that may occur, for instance, between shippers and longshoremen, and another and better system of machinery, applicable only to railway companies and their employees. There is another feature of this Bill which I think we ought to consider very carefully before we pass it. The machinery it provides for will be expensive, there is no doubt about that. In the first place, the conciliation commission may be entirely organized by the minister himself. I do not know whether that is the interpretation of the hon. minister; but, as I read the Bill, if both parties to the dispute refuse to take part in the nomination of a member of the conciliation commission, the minister then has the jurisdiction to name them himself, as well as to name the third member of the commission; so that there will be a conciliation commission named entirely by the minister. I presume that of course he would endeavour to choose members who would represent all the interests affected; still the facts remain that the minister or the department of the government alone would name the commission, a commission that would act at the expense of the Dominion government. But what would that commission do? Its functions are merely of an investigating and conciliatory nature. It makes an investigation; it ascertains the facts. Have we not a department, costly enough, which at the present moment has power to ascertain the facts? Without naming three men or incurring extra expense, the Minister of Labour has the entire machinery of his department under his control, and can ascertain the facts just as well as they could be ascertained by this special process. And that work is done at the present moment, as my hon. friend from Toronto says, by the deputy minister. In fact, as soon as that official sees one of these difficulties dawning, it is his duty to investigate the facts. But apart from that, I think he has the power to ascertain the facts under oath, in such manner as he sees fit. Then, in case the recommendations of this commission

are not accepted by the parties, we have the action of the arbitration board. That board of arbitration would unquestionably be still more expensive. As I read this Bill, the functions of the arbitration board are very much the same as those of the conciliation committee, but their form of procedure is a little different. Instead of saying to the parties we have ascertained the facts and think you should agree on such terms, the arbitration board proceeds with a little more solemnity to ascertain the facts and then makes a report. It does not deliver a sentence of arbitration binding on the parties but reports to the ministers, and that report is published and communicated to the parties. These proceedings might have more weight than the proceedings of the conciliation committee but not much more, because the members of the conciliation committee are qualified and will probably be chosen to form the board of arbitration. We would therefore have two proceedings, held before two bodies, having different names but with very similar attributions, and I venture to say that these proceedings would lead to no binding result. There is the crucial point. The sentence of the arbitrator binds nobody at all, and we are simply making additional unnecessary expense, whereas at present the department has all the powers necessary to ascertain the facts, and the minister himself or those he employs have all the necessary authority and weight required to advise and suggest a remedy. It seems to me therefore that by this Bill we are simply introducing expensive machinery without much result. I listened attentively to what the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) said as to the necessity of these arbitration committees or boards rendering sentences which would be binding on the parties. I understand the hesitation of the hon. Minister of Labour to introduce such legislation. It is something very new and about which a great deal may be said on both sides. I believe with the hon. member for Winnipeg that, harsh as it may appear and as it might sometimes act in certain cases, it will be necessary for us, in view of the great labour troubles upon which we have just merely entered, to adopt some such principle in our legislation, in order to compel a settlement of these labour disputes. I say all this, subject to the doubts I have expressed regarding our jurisdiction, on which we should have the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice. As regards provincial railways I am afraid that we would come into conflict at once with the local jurisdiction. But on general principles, at the stage where conciliation and arbitration would be suggested as a remedy we have no jurisdiction over labour disputes. It is only where the peace, order and good government of Canada are concerned, as for instance in the existing conditions at Montreal, we might intervene.

Mr. MONK.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Except with the consent of the House, I have no right to make any further remarks, but as some hon. gentlemen have evidently, by their observations, invited me to reply, I shall try and dispose of their criticisms. In the first place, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) seem to think that, under the Conciliation Act of to-day we could proceed as this Bill proposes we should. I endeavoured to make it clear in my opening remarks that the American legislation and incidentally our Conciliation Act have the inherent weakness that they can not be put into force execept with the consent of the parties. Under the Conciliation Act, no committee, no board of arbitration could be appointed except with the consent of the parties. Therefore these hon. gentlemen will see that we have no statute enabling the government to refer a matter of this kind to arbitration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was fully aware of that, and pointed it out in the ccurse of my remarks. But the point I made is this, that in the present Bill, as in the Conciliation Act, you are appointing a tribunal which will not have the power of enforcing the awards it may make.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At all events, if my hon. friend did not refer to the Conciliation Act, his friends beside him did. As regards the contention of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, that because the two parties are unwilling to come together, therefore it is improbable that any good will come from his measure, I would refer him for his answer to the anthracite coal strike arbitration. You could scarcely find two parties more opposed to conciliation or arbitration, when President Roosevelt undertook to bring them together. If there had been statutory power, it is doubtful if these two could have been brought together, but by virtue of his high office, the President was able to bring pressure upon them and, practically against their consent, bring about arbitration.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not a fact that the operatives were always willing to submit their case to arbitration ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That may be, but I understand that long before the proceedings were given to the public, Carroll Wright, the editor of the 'Labour Gazette' and the 'Bulletin' of Washington, was acting as an emissary on behalf of the United States government, endeavouring by solicitation and argument to induce the parties to come together. What was given to the public was not the commencement of the difficulties by any means. But in the end an arbitration was brought about. There was no power to compel either party to submit to the award except the pressure of

public opinion, and under the influence of that pressure, the award has been practically acquiesced in. While on that point, just to encourage my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, to belive that there is something good in that measure, I will read what Mr. Francis Adams has said with reference to the Massachusetts railway strike :

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am afraid I did not make myself clear. I endeavoured to say as distinctly as I could that I think the object to be aimed at in efforts of this kind is to get the parties to agree to a tribunal whose award they will respect.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Quite so. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that it would be most desirable if we could get them to agree in the first instance. But that is not possible. When they are at war and holding each other at arms' length, an agreement is difficult to obtain. If, at that stage, some third party intervenes and brings them together, by degrees the pressure of public opinion and of the situation brings about peace. In the case in question, with which I am going to trouble the House, the strike on the Boston and Maine Railway, neither party consented. But the board of arbitrators for the state of Massachusetts had power to hold an arbitration. This is the history of the proceedings :

At four o'clock in the afternoon of the 12th of February, 1877, all the locomotive engineers and firemen in the employ of the Boston and Maine Railroad Company stopped work in a body, abandoning their trains. The move was not altogether unexpected, but the operation of the road was seriously interfered with. The commissioners did not at first intervene, neither party calling upon them. Indeed, both parties were unwilling so to do——

I commend this to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition :

—for each was apprehensive, apparently, of adverse action. During several days, accordingly, the commissioners preserved an attitude of silent observation. After the lapse of a reasonable period, however, the board concluded that it was plainly time to recognize the fact that the public was suffering serious inconvenience ; for then the Boston and Maine Railroad was, as it still is, one of the principal arteries of eastern New England. The president and directors of the company and the employees of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers were accordingly notified that the board proposed to take a hand in the business. This it proceeded to do, and immediate investigation was notified. Both parties appeared, for, without confessing itself in the wrong, neither party could help doing so, and professed a perfect willingness to submit their cases. No suggestion of a readiness to abide by any decision that might be given thereon was either asked for or given ; but the board proceeded to hear witnesses and to elicit the facts. The inquiry was continued through three days ; and, on the 21st of February, the report of the board was made public, appearing in full in all the newspapers of that date. In it the commissioners, after carefully and judicially sifting out the essential facts from the evidence submitted, placed the responsibility for the trouble where the weight of evidence showed it belonged ; and thereupon proceeded to make such recommendations as in its judgment the exegencies called for. The effect was immediate. An authentic record was before the community, and public opinion, crystallizing, made itself decisively felt. It is not necessary to enter further into the history and merits—the rights and the wrongs—of that particular struggle. My object is merely to call attention to what was then done, and done successfully, as constituting the nearest practical approach consistent with our American political and social system to what is known as 'compulsory arbitration.' It was compulsory inquiry only, and an appeal thereon to the reason and sense of right of all concerned. Reliance was placed in an enlightened sense of right of all concerned, and an informed public opinion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There was no power, I suppose to enforce the decision ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. None whatever.

Mr. INGRAM. Only public opinion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Nothing but public opinion. Neither party was willing and neither party consented. But the board at the right time, at the psychological moment, intervened, brought about an inquiry, made recommendations, gave them to the public and threw the responsibiliy for further trouble upon the party who refused to act upon them.

Mr. BROCK. After both parties were financially exhausted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) may have information on that point, but I have none except what appears here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How long had the strike continued ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The strike began at four o'clock on the 12th of February. Action was taken after 'several days' according to the report. A strike lasting several days would hardly have ruined the Boston and Maine Railway, one of the main railways of New England.

Mr. BROCK. I thought the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir William Mulock) was speaking of the great coal strike in which the President of the United States intervened.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No; I was not referring to that.

Mr. BROCK. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He had been speaking of President Roosevelt and I thought he was still referring to that case.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I quite understand the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Brock's) mistake.

Mr. INGRAM. The strike commenced on the 12th February and the board reported on the 21st.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That would be nine days.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When did the strike end ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Instantaneously. The account does not say that the effect of the report was magical but it was almost the same. Yes, here are the words— 'the effect was immediate.' So, the strike ended at once. Neither party was willing to assume the responsibility of refusing to act upon the advice of disinterested parties, doubtless men of standing in the community, men whose judgment satisfied the public as to where the responsibility rested. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) used some strong language, I think stronger than he really meant. I do not think he would really wish to be remembered as having spoken in that strong way about the labour unions. I am going to be more considerate than my hon. friend. I think he spoke in the heat of the moment. I do not think that the men who comprise these unions are fairly chargeable with being unmanly or cowardly.

Mr. BROCK. I wish to state my position. We were speaking of the two organized parties, organized labour on one side, and railway companies organized under the law on the other. From the railway companies side damages can be collected, but not from the other. Therefore, as an organized body this is a cowardly body. I did not speak of them individually.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) said. The hon. gentleman is not satisfied with this measure, because he says it is not strong enough. I do not know how far he would be willing to go as an employer of labour. He may be willing to go a long distance. But probably there are employers close to him who would not be willing to go so far. Up to the present moment, I think I am right in saying, the employers generally would not be favourable to any law that would go further than what might be called a moral law, one that would bring to bear the pressure of public opinion. I doubt that the manufacturers, who are the great industrial employers, would assent to a stronger measure than this. If there is any stronger measure that they would assent to, I should be very glad to hear what that measure is. The hon. senior member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has left the Chamber, and I cannot so advantageously refer to his remarks. He took exception to this Bill, putting it in somewhat different language from the other members, but with the same idea. He complained of the measure because it did not contain power to compel obedience to the award. Again I would ask him, as I ask my hon. friend from Centre Toronto, have they no regard for the power of public opinion ? For that is the power to which we appeal, and, in the long run, I think it the most efficient of all powers that govern the action of persons who serve the public. At all events, in this age I think it is altogether fitter to appeal to the power of public opinion than to the power of the policeman or the sheriff. There are only two powers, the local power and the power of public opinion. For the present, at all events, this measure proposes to appeal to the latter only. Now, exception is taken to this measure as being confined to railways. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier said that the Conciliation Act gave all the powers in question. I have already pointed out that the Conciliation Act does not meet the case, simply because it could not be put in motion except by the consent of both parties. But supposing that consent were waived, it would still be inapplicable. A Conciliation Act applies to what are commonly known as industrial disputes, this measure is limited solely to disputes on railways, that may lead to certain consequences. Section 3 reads :

> Whenever a difference exists between any railway employers and railway employees, and it appears to the minister that the parties thereto are unable satisfactorily to adjust the same, and that by reason of such difference remaining unadjusted a railway lock out or strike has been or is likely to be caused, or the regular and safe transportation of mails, passengers or freight has been or may be interrupted, or the safety of any person employed on a railway train or car has been or is likely to be endangered.

Then the minister may proceed. This is dealing with a special class of cases in which the general public have a special interest. Whilst the general public may be interested in a degree in an industrial strike between a private employer and his men, it is a different kind of interest altogether from the interest of the general public in the safe and satisfactory operation of public railways. In these the public have another interest besides the general welfare of the country, they are concerned directly in the safety of the passengers and the satisfactory transportation of freight and mails, all of which are essential to carrying on the trade and commerce of the country. It is a special case of special importance, in which the public are chiefly the interested parties. A railway company is given special rights and powers superior to those of the individual. It is given powers of expropriation, power to operate its railways even though such operation may endanger life and property under certain circumstances. It has extraordinary powers, powers to which the private interest of the individual must be subservient. The railways are undertakings to promote the

public welfare. Those concerned in the operation of railways, either as proprietors or workers, are a portion of the general public. Therefore the justification for legislation of this kind in regard to railways rests entirely upon a different principle from legislation applicable to troubles between private employers and their workmen. For that reason it was deemed wise to bring forward a special Bill dealing with a special case.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier suggested that perhaps there was no power under the British North America Act to pass this Bill. Well, I do not think my hon. friend was serious in that observation. This Bill does not propose to affect property and civil rights in any way ; it proposes to hold an investigation. Is there anything in the British North America Act to restrict us in making an inquiry into any matter or any conditions in Canada ? I know of nothing.

Hon. Mr HAGGART. In other words, it is constitutional because it does not do anything ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is constitutional because it is not unconstitutional. It does not affect property and civil rights.

Mr. CLARKE. It is only intended to affect public opinion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not aware that public opinion is limited to a provincial legislature for its expression. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier contended in the early part of the day that we had ample power to settle strikes, and that we should go down to Montreal this afternoon and settle the strike there. Has the British North America Act undergone any change since this afternoon ? It has just the same force now as it had when the hon. gentleman was addressing the House with such force this afternoon. I think no one would argue that we have not power to issue this commission of inquiry. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) suggested that the fact of the arbitrators being paid might have a tendency to promote strikes.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. What I said was that in Australia they find that paid members of the board foment strikes and difficulties of that character for the purpose of obtaining their daily pay. I did not express my own opinion at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then I misunderstood my hon. friend. But I will point out that the objection cited by the hon. member for East Elgin could have no force here because in the New Zealand Act—the Australian Act is taken from the New Zealand Act,—there is a standing board, and therefore the arbitrators know before hand that they will be called upon to act. In this case there is no standing board, but only an arbitration board to be chosen pro hac vice. Therefore, until a strike is threatened or commenced, there can be no person chosen and no one knows who the arbitrators will be.

Mr. INGRAM. I said if the same conditions existed in both countries the same results might follow.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am pointing out to my hon. friend that the law there is different, no arbitrators are appointed until the difficulty arises, and the commission is only constituted when the parties to compose the board are notified of their appointment. Mr. Speaker, I think I have reviewed the technical objections that have been taken to the measure, and I have no hesitation in inviting the House to read this Bill the second time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has mentioned the fact that the railways have extraordinary powers. I do not exactly see any connection between that fact and anything in this Bill. I would like to understand this : It is expected by the Minister of Labour, if we may judge from the illustrations he has produced to the House, that this measure will produce important results, such results as was produced in Massachusetts in settling an important strike in a period of nine days. Now, if there is any such virtue in this Bill, why should it not be applied to strikes such as that now going on in Montreal ? Is there any reason to suppose that this measure will be less successful with a strike of that kind than with strikes upon railways ? Is there any reason that can be suggested why the measure should not be as useful in one case as in the other ? If it will produce such results, why we might have had this Montreal strike settled already, we might have had the Canada Atlantic strike settled long ago. I have not yet understood from the Minister of Labour any valid reason given why this legislation, from which he expects so much, should be restricted to railway strikes. I am not asking this for the purpose of embarrassing the minister, but only to understand what is in his mind on the subject.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend will see that however sanguine one is in regard to the efficacy of this measure, it must be remembered that it is only a tenative one. It was begun last year with reference to railways alone, and has been continued with respect to railways alone, because of their special character. They stand on a different footing. I stated before and I repeat it now, that we hope public opinion will favour the extension of this principle beyond the present limited scope of railways, but I doubt if public opinion in Canada to-day is sufficiently prepared to say that we should pass even

what some hon. gentlemen call this weak measure and make it applicable generally throughout Canada to all sorts of industrial establishments.

Mr. CLARKE. Why should you have any objection to this measure being applied to other industrial establishments if it depends on public opinion ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are a great many measures that might be passed but it is usual for legislatures to wait until public opinion is reasonably ripe before thrusting them upon an unwilling public. If public opinion were against this mode of treatment, then, to proceed with undue haste might set back the movement rather than accelerate it. There is such a thing as making haste too fast and if, later on, public opinion, from the working of this measure in regard to railways, comes to the conclusion that it will be beneficially extended and made more general that extension will take place and good will come from it, but if we had a large part of the public perhaps resisting it we would be forcing it upon an unwilling public. There is nobody in this House who can speak for the employers of labour and say that they would consent to this measure. There is no member of this House who will say that even the employees would consent to this principle being made general. I, however, believe that a considerable number of them throughout the country would welcome it, but it is impossible for any one to get up in this House and say that the general public want this measure to be extended and to to have general application.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. minister on what authority does he say that no person in this House can speak as to the opinion entertained by the employers of labour as to whether the extension of this principle to their different crafts would be acceptable or not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think there is no member of this House who has any authority to speak on behalf of the employers of labour in Canada. I am not aware that the employers of labour have met and expressed an opinion upon this subject. If they have and if there is any one who could speak on their behalf, no one would rejoice more than myself at such an announcement, and I am sure the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) would agree with me.

Mr. CLARKE. It will be a pleasure to me to agree with the hon. gentleman, though it will be a hard matter sometimes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sure my hon. friend will agree with me at the present moment that even he, however well informed he is as to the state of public opinion, either in the ranks of the employers or in those of the employees, and however courageous he may be, will not at this moment undertake to speak on behalf of either one and to say that either one would give his consent to the extension of this principle.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister is certainly right in saying that I would not undertake to speak for either party, for the employers or the employees. I am sure that every person on this side of the House earnestly desires that all the good the hon. minister expects from this Bill may be accomplished and more than accomplished. I understand from what the hon. gentleman said during the explanation which he made upon the second reading of the Bill, that he had consulted all the employers and employees who will be affected by the operation of this Bill when it becomes enacted. That being the case, and anticipating, as the hon. gentleman does, and I hope rightly anticipating, great benefit from the passage of this Bill, surely if it is to be of any practical benefit to both employers and employees it was the duty of the hon. gentleman to instruct some officer, or officers, of the Department of Labour, to ascertain from employers of labour other than those engaged in conducting railways, and from employees other than those engaged on railways, what their opinion would be if general legislation of this kind were passed instead of leigslation applying solely to the operation of railways. If there is to be any benefit derived from the operation of this Bill in its application to railways, why not extend the benefit to others ? Why not to steamers, why not to those large industrial establishments scattered all through the country, why not have all these great industries brought under the operation of this Bill ? Surely there has been a dereliction of duty on the part of the officers of the Department of Labour, if not on the part of the hon. minister—I say it, of course, with a great deal of respect—in not taking steps to ascertain what the opinion of the employers of labour and of the employees in Canada is as to the general application to other industrial establishments of the principles of this Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has been in public life many years. He is well aware that public opinion is not obtained in regard to great legislative measures by any such procedure as that. You could not send out a bulletin to five or six million people and ask them what their opinion is on a proposed measure. There is a well recognized way of ascertaining public opinion. Subjects are discussed in the House, in the country, on the platform and in the press and gradually public men come to form an opinion as to what is the will of the people, and from their places in parliament they make their opinions known. If the hon. gentleman who is in touch with public opinion

in a great industrial centre is able to speak for his people we may make some progress, but there is no such practicable method as he suggests for ascertaining public opinion. This discussion will perhaps lead to the general public taking an interest in this idea. From time to time discussions on this line are developed. This afternoon I threw out a hint which I hope will bear fruit, that the employers and employees should endeavour to consider this question, and perhaps they might organize with the object of getting representatives together to debate it. But it cannot be done without the fullest discussion, and that is a process involving a considerable length of time. Employers or employees would not be able to give a valued opinion upon the question without full discussion. Discussions such as these prepare public men to consider public questions and to give valued opinions upon them. I have to thank the House for allowing me the privilege of a second time of addressing it on the subject, although I had no intention of suspending action for the purpose of considering any of the points that were raised by the hon. gentleman.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I intend to say a few words in reference to this, what I call, peculiar legislation, introduced by the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), legislation introduced for the purpose of informing the community and which is to be acted upon by public opinion. The hon. gentleman mentioned some legislation of this kind in the state of Massachusetts, and we had legislation of a similar character introduced in 1900, legislation, as the hon. minister says, which is intended to carry out some views, or some ideas of some people in this country with means of enforcement and penalties attached when its provisions are not carried out. This legislation has no effect at all. This Bill is evidently prepared on the lines of the New Zealand legislation, introduced in 1894 or 1895, providing for the creation of conciliation boards and boards of arbitrations. I listened to the hon. minister and he particularly stated that as long as times were prosperous and as long as wages were advancing in the country the awards of the board of arbitrament would be accepted both by the employees and by the employers of labour in the community. But the moment depression comes, it is likely one or the other will object to the award. I have read an American author who speaks highly of the New Zealand system, and who says it is in advance of any legislation in any part of the world. I have also read the report of the Australian commissioners who inquired into the New Zealand system with a view to its adoption in Australia. On the other hand, I have read a New Zealand author who condemns the system altogether, and indeed the opinion now seems to be, that the result of the arbitration law in New Zealand law is not as satisfactory as its friends hoped for. I believe there is a necessity for legislation in some direction for the settlement of these labour disputes, but whether it is within the authority of this federal parliament or of the provincial legislatures is a question for serious consideration. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) pointed out that this Bill took jurisdiction over provincial railways and electric railways, as well as Dominion railways, and the minister replied to him that this Bill was only for the purpose of finding out the facts and influencing public opinion. It is notorious that the control over provincial and electric railways is in the provincial legislatures, and thus it is that we are legislating here to influence public opinion to influence the local legislatures to pass laws to remedy grievances. The minister told us that the simple fact of the finding of an arbitration board in Massachusetts so influenced public opinion that the disputants were compelled to settle a strike. If the hon. gentleman inquires, he will find that the Massachusetts Railway Commission has the power to remedy such grievances, but legislation of this kind, although it may be passed by the legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is not the sort of legislation that is usually adopted by a British parliament. What is the need of this Bill at all, if it is only for the purpose of reporting the facts. The government have power now to appoint a Royal Commission at any time, and the report of that Royal Commission may affect public opinion and what is better still, it brings the matter before this House. There should be an alternative in this Bill, so that if public opinion is not sufficient to enforce the award of the board of arbitration, then the law should step in to enforce it. That is what I would call proper legislation. This Bill is simply parade legislation. It can be of little or no utility when there is no penalty provided to enforce its provisions.

Mr. CLARKE. I congratulate the Minister of Labour upon the decided change he has made in this Bill as compared with the Bill which he introduced last session. Last year's Bill was on the lines of compulsory arbitration, but the minister had an opportunity of meeting those who would be affected by such legislation, and he ascertained public opinion so quickly that the result was that he introduced the measure which we are now discussing. I shall not offer any opposition to this Bill. It certainly cannot do any harm, but I do not expect that much good will come from it. However, the minister hopes a great deal from the Bill, and I trust that his expectations will be more than realized. Last year, with a great flourish of trumpets he proposed compulsory arbitration ; but he recedes from that position now, having ascertained what public opinion was in the meantime.

An hon. MEMBER. What was it ?

Mr. CLARKE. The result was the emasculation of last year's Bill and the presentation of the present Bill, and I think the minister acted very wisely in accepting the suggestions that were made to him. My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) who takes a great deal of interest in matters affecting the working classes, tells us that this Bill is acceptable to the railway employees whom the minister had the pleasure of meeting, and he says that the reason it is acceptable to them is because it does not affect them in any way. They are perfectly satisfied with the provisions of the Bill, because it does not affect them in any way. That I believe is the fact, except in so far as the findings of the arbitration commission may affect them through its effect on public opinion. I hope the Bill may have some good effect, and I am not going to offer any opposition to it; but I have not heard any sufficient answer to the question propounded again and again on this side of the House, why, if this measure is going to work satisfactorily—and I sincerely hope it will—its provisions are only made applicable to railway disputes instead of being made applicable generally to all industrial disputes in the Dominion of Canada. The minister has nothing to fear from making the application of this Act general. I am satisfied that the measure is so harmless, if I may be permitted to use that expression, that its application to all the industries of the country would not be opposed by the working classes. They are always willing to place their side of a case before arbitrators or before the public, and I am perfectly satisfied that if they were all brought under the provisions of this Bill, they would willingly accept it and it might do some good.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Bill of my hon. friend is based on the ArbitrationActs passed in the United States. The first two states to establish boards of arbitration were the state of New York and the state of Massachusetts, in 1886. Fourteen other states have since passed similar laws. These states are: California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Missouri, Montana, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Ohio, Michigan, New Jersey, Connecticut and Indiana. The state boards in the United States are composed, just as the Bill of my hon. friend provides that this board shall be composed, namely, of three members—one an employer, one an employee, who is generally appointed at the recommendation of the labour organizations, and the third of another class. The state board of arbitration may be invoked by the desire of both parties to a dispute, or the board may interfere itself.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the Acts compulsory, then?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What are the powers of enforcement?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When both parties agree to submit a labour dispute, the result is binding. Only in Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Illinois and Wisconsin have state boards been appointed; in all the other states the law has been a dead letter. The report of the Industrial Commission, which I hold in my hand, and which is a very interesting document says:

> It is very difficult to estimate correctly the amount, nature and value of the work of the state boards of arbitration.

The resumé of this report is that these state boards have not done much. There are only three or four states in which they have done some active work. Outside of these states they have not accomplished anything. As some hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this Bill have said, it cannot do any harm. I hope that it will do good; but if we are to judge of the results of this legislation by the results which have been achieved in the United States, I am very much afraid it will not do as much as some of our friends expect it will. However there is no harm in trying, and, so far as I am concerned, I am glad the hon. Minister of Labour has introduced this Bill. We have not so far tried any device for settling our labour disputes, which are becoming dangerous, and it is time we tried something. On that account I think both sides of the House will be pleased that the Minister of Labour is doing something, and if he does not succeed, he will try to do something better in another year.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

On section 1,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I move to insert in the fourth line the word 'may' between the words 'strike' and 'interfere.'

Mr. CLARKE. What is the object of inserting the word 'may'? According to the argument of the hon. gentleman, the reason this Bill is enacted is because these strikes do interfere with the carriage of mails, etc. Is there any doubt about it? What is the sense of putting in the word 'may'? It destroys all the arguments made this afternoon for this legislation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman's objection is well taken, and I will not press the amendment. I was asked to make it, but I had not read it very carefully.

On section 3,

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose by this the government take power to appoint two members of the committee, and three if necessary. The minister may appoint the two first and name a third in case none of the parties make a selection.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Each party will be called on to appoint one, and these two may appoint a third, and it is only when either or both the parties make default that the minister acts.

Mr. LOGAN. This section provides that each party to the dispute may choose an arbitrator, and if the two arbitrators cannot agree on the third, the choice of the third will be left to the minister. But in cases of dispute on the Intercolonial Railway that would give an unfair advantage to the government. The men would choose one of the arbitrators, the Minister of Railways would choose another, and in case these two could not agree, the Minister of Labour would choose the third. So that the government would have the choice of two of the arbitrators and the men would only have the choice of one.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not intend to press the Bill to a final reading to-night. My hon. friend has already brought this point to my attention, and I think there is something in it. It would be quite right, in the case of the Intercolonial, to give the appointing of the third arbitrator to an outside tribunal, in case the two others could not agree, but as I do not intend to press the Bill to its third reading, my hon. friend will have an opportunity to make any suggestion at the final stage of the Bill, and have it amended to meet the difficulty he mentions.

Mr. LOGAN. This objection has been raised by the men on the Intercolonial Railway, and I have written to the principle officers of the union, making certain suggestions. I have suggested that the third arbitrator should be chosen by the Chief Justice of the province or the Governor in Council of the province, but I have not yet received any intimation from the union as to which they would prefer, or any suggestion as to what else they desire shall be done.

Mr. INGRAM. As this Bill has been read the second time this afternoon, I do not think that it is proper that we should proceed with it in committee.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If any hon. gentleman wishes, I shall not press it. I thought that the House was anxious to put it through committee.

Mr. INGRAM. In view of the discussion on the Bill, hon. members on both sides may receive certain suggestions that might improve it, and as it is a government measure, a delay of a couple of days would not interfere with its passing.

Progress reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 109) to correct a clerical error in the Act to incorporate the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick.

RETIRING ALLOWANCE OF JUDGES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. C. Fitzpatrick) moved that Order No. 17, namely: House in Committee on resolution regarding the retiring allowance of judges be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, May 7, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 156) to incorporate the Montreal and Longueuil Bridge Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 157) to incorporate the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 158) to incorporate the St. Chrysostome Railway Company.—Mr. Brown.

Bill (No. 159) to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 160) to incorporate the Stewart River Development Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 161) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Woolf Valve Gear Company.—Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 162) respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, and to change its name to the Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 163) respecting the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Thompson (Haldimand).

Bill (No. 164) to incorporate the Pacific Bank of Canada.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 165) to incorporate the Algonquin Lumber and Power Company.—Mr. Gould.

Bill (No. 166) to incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

Bill (No. 167) respecting the Montreal Bridge Company to change its name to the Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 168) to incorporate the Chicoutimi and North-eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Beland.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY LAND GRANTS.

Mr. SCOTT asked:

1. With respect to so much of the railway land grants as has been reserved for, earned by, and selected by each company to which such grants have been voted, what is the area remaining unpatented in each case, (a) in Manitoba, (b) in North-west Territories?

2. What is the date on which it is intended in each case that these lands shall be patented?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The answer is as follows:

In Manitoba.

Name of Railway.	Area earned and selected and not patented. Acres.
Canadian Northern Railway..	253,698·53

The company is proceeding with the selection of its lands and has advised the department from time to time of parcels of land it is willing to accept if found to be available. Patents are being issued for the lands selected.

Manitoba South-western Colonization Railway, 313,402·82 acres.

Patents for the lands earned by this company up to 900,000 acres can only be issued on the order of the Manitoba government, under the provisions of an order of His Excellency in Council, dated April 5, 1886, that province having aided the construction of the railway by the issue of debentures to the extent of $900,000.

In the North-west Territories.

Name of Railway.	Area earned and selected and not patented. Acres.
Alberta Railway and Coal Company....	22,048·42

The issue of patents for these lands is stayed at the request of the company for a short time pending readjustment as to a few hundred acres.

Calgary and Edmonton Railway, 304,288·90 acres.

The above area of selected lands, which is now in course of being patented, closes out the land grant of this company except an area of 407,402 acres held as security by the government under the transport contract between the government and the company, dated June 21, 1890.

Canadian Pacific Railway, main line, 3,044,635·53 acres.

These lands are in the Edmonton district and are unsurveyed. Contracts for the surveys are let. The lands will be patented as soon as surveyed.

Canadian Pacific Railway, Pipestone extension of Souris branch, 200,320·00 acres.

These lands are in a block of townships about thirty miles north of Battleford and are unsurveyed.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Manitoba South-western Colonization Railway, 680,189·28 acres.

Patents for the lands earned by this company up to 900,000 acres can only be issued as already stated.

Manitoba and North-western Railway, 354,000·00 acres.

A large proportion of the lands are unsurveyed. Survey is to be made this year. There remains only a small area to be selected by the company to complete the area earned, and patents to close out the grant, so far as surveyed, are in course of preparation.

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company, 169,434·00 acres.

These lands are partly unsurveyed but the contracts for the surveys are let. Patents are being issued for selected lands where surveyed.

SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR RAILWAY.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. Were tenders invited for building the railway between Southport and Murray Harbour, in the province of Prince Edward Island?

2. If so, how many tenders were received; what were the names of the tenderers; and amounts of their respective offers?

3. If tenders were not invited for building the whole line, what part of the work was let by public tender; and what part by private contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

These questions were answered last session, but I repeat the information.

1. and 2. No, tenders were not invited for the whole section from Southport to Murray harbour.

3. Tenders were invited for the first section—Mutch's Point to Village Green, 11½ miles. The second section extending from the 11½ miles to the terminus was given to the contractor, who had the work of the first section, by extending his contract to cover the said section.

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. What is the name of the contractor building the Hillsborough bridge, Prince Edward Island?

2. Were tenders invited for said work, and was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?

3. What were the terms and conditions for carrying out said contract?

4. When is the contract to be completed; and is the work being satisfactorily prosecuted?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. M. J. Haney.

2. Yes, tenders were invited for this work, and the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer.

3. The work is being carried out under the usual terms and conditions embodied in the form of contract adopted by the department.

4. The date for the completion of the contract is December 31, 1903. Yes, the work is being satisfactorily prosecuted.

TELEPHONE COMPANIES IN THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. What telephone companies are operating in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island ?

2. Who are the shareholders in the said companies ?

3. What is the par value of the shares of the said companies, and what is their present market value ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The government has received no official returns from the telephone companies referred to. These companies are organized under provincial charter and make no returns to us. We are not supplied with lists of their shareholders, nor do we know what their stock is selling at or anything of their business.

THE RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways, was read the second time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) moved that the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) to state whether he intends to refer this Bill to a special committee for the purpose of giving the railways interested an opportunity to state whether the Bill is acceptable to them or not, and to offer any suggestions they may desire to offer. I would also like to know whether he has received any representations from the different railway companies throughout the country or from boards of trade and others with reference to the scope and nature of the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not contemplate making any motion to refer this Bill to a special committee, at this stage at all events. I have not heard from the railway companies. I put the companies in possession of copies of the Bill as soon as it was printed and introduced in the House, and gave them to understand that I would be much pleased to receive from them their views with regard to any of its provisions. There was an understanding that they would meet to discuss the question and put their views in writing. They had hoped to do this before now, but they have not been able to hold the meeting yet. Still, I think we are in a position to make considerable progress with the Bill, in relation to those portions of it that may not be contentious, reserving, if need be, for later consideration, any clauses in which the companies or parties interested state they desire to be heard. They may be heard in the form I mention—that is, they may communicate their views in writing as I suggested they should, and these communications could be printed and distributed for the use of hon. members on both sides. It is not customary to refer government Bills to a special committee or to a general committee for that matter; and nothing has yet appeared that makes it seem desirable or necessary to make an exception in this case.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). I presume that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) would not object to my stating what the proceedings were in relation to the last consolidation of the railway law in 1888. Mr. Pope was then Minister of Railways, and, if I remember well, Sir John A. Macdonald was acting Minister of Justice, or, possibly, it may have been Sir John Thompson. The Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Justice met at different times with the counsel of the railway companies; for, after all, while parliament controls all legislation, yet, there are none so largely interested in any proposed changes in railway laws as are the railway companies. A discussion, taken part in by the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Railways and the representatives of the railway companies, would boil down, to use a common expression, all disputed points. As a matter of fact, the procedure followed in that case expedited the progress of the Bill very materially. This Bill is a great deal broader than that of 1888. That was simply a consolidation with certain amendments—quite numerous—and the introduction of the system of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The changes in the present Bill are not only in regard to the establishment of the Railway Commission itself, but that commission is given powers far beyond anything for which we have a precedent in our legislation. So, it seems to me, it would relieve the House a great deal and ensure more rapid progress if the minister would follow out some such plan as a preliminary step. Of course the Bill would have to come again into the Committee of the whole House to be fully considered here. Not only did the procedure in 1888 lessen the labour of dealing with the Bill, but the minister was in a position to give us information as to any objections which had been raised, and he was able to refer to the Minister of Justice where necessary. It is true that the Bill of 1888 was not referred to a special committee. But it is also true that since that time we have generally sent amendments of the railway law to the Railway Committee. The scope of the present Bill is so large that I would not, for my

part, suggest its being sent to the Railway Committee, but I would suggest, that it would be well to consider sending it to a special committee, particularly, if the minister found it was going to take too much of his individual time. A special committee of twenty or twenty-five members could best deal with legislation of this sort involving many details and matters of great importance. This Bill is not a consolidation. I find, on reading it that it is not like the Bill presented by the minister last session. That was a consolidation but this is a new law, and, above all, it introduces the system of a railway commission and gives that commission far more extensive powers than the Railway Committee of the Privy Council ever had. I venture to suggest that better progress would be made, if the minister would agree that, in view of the importance of hearing railway authorities on the subject, this Bill should be sent to a special committee to be threshed out there. This would have the effect of lessening the labours of the Committee of the Whole. It was found in the case of the Criminal Code and of some other matters, that the work of a special committee greatly lessened the labours of the House, and when the Bill came into Committee of the Whole it was found that the work had been much shortened by the labours of the special committee, assisted by the ministers, and reduced the time that the House found it necessary to give to the consideration of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may be allowed to make a remark in answer to my hon. friend. I suggested in my previous remarks that I had invited from the railway people a full expression of their views, and wished them to criticise the Bill in the amplest manner. I have not the slightest desire that this legislation, though I am promoting it, should be adopted if, upon full consideration, it is found that any of its features are not well calculated to further the object which we have in view ; that is, while not injuring the railway interests of the country, to promote the interests of the country as a whole. I have asked the railway people to put their views before me in writing, and if they have not done so it has been through no fault of mine. They have no doubt good reasons for having failed to do so. I understand that Mr. Hays has been absent, and the other gentlemen who are associated with him did not wish to take action until his return. We have hesitated in proceeding with this Bill for that reason, and for that reason alone. I am anxious to make progress with the Bill, and it is important that the session should not be delayed and made to drag along from this cause. There are many members of this House who are interested in special features of the Bill, and in respect to which they desire that some legislation should take place this session ; and I have promised them in the Railway Committee, where these subjects have come up, that this Bill would be put through, and that it was the intention of the government to press it upon parliament. We have been delayed in doing so because we were waiting to hear from the gentlemen of whom I have spoken. I think it would be an advantage if we were to proceed with the Committee stage and dispose, at all events, of many features of the Bill, which I think are entirely non-contentious, about which there will be no difference of opinion. I think it is important to do this for the further reason, that the Bill is not entirely a transcript of the existing laws, nor was the Bill introduced last year a mere transcript of previous laws. It is a revision of the existing railway Acts, as was the Bill last year, and I think it does not differ in many material respects from the Bill introduced last year, except that we hope to perfect it in its phraseology and in its form. I think it is much improved in that regard. Now if the House is prepared to adopt that course and take up the sections one by one, I am sure it will be an advantage ; and even though we may come across some features of the Bill about which there may be a difference of opinion, I think it would be an advantage if we were to have the views of the members of the House upon those points. The discussion could not be otherwise than helpful, and I am sure time would not be lost. Any feature of the Bill about which a difference of opinion might develop, and which might specially interest the railway people, we would defer for further consideration.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We know that the railways are greatly interested in this Bill. To my knowledge, I think all the managers of railways have formed themselves into a committee for the purpose of considering the provisions of this Bill, and the Committee have had it under serious consideration ever since it was introduced into this House, along with the legal talent of the different railways who have been suggesting amendments to it. I believe they have prepared a report. It may be the fault of Mr. Hays

---

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The report has not yet been prepared, at least the railway people have not yet matured their report.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not know whether they have or not, but I am sure they have prepared the report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am giving the hon. gentleman Mr. Hays' statement.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I cannot say that I have under my hand the printed report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman appears to be better informed than I am.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister may not know about the report; but it would assist the Committee and assist the minister in the consideration of this matter if the report containing the objections of the railway people were in the hands of the House before we proceed to consider the Bill. The hon. gentleman may or may not have seen the report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I assure the hon. gentleman I have not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, and take it for granted that he has not seen the report, but others than the minister are really in possession of the report. The fact that the minister has not seen the report does not prevent others from having seen it. Perhaps it would be better to wait for that report before we proceed with the consideration of the Bill.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). The two parties who are interested in this Bill are the railways and the public. It was reported two or three weeks ago in the press that the railways would make very important representations to the government in regard to the terms of this Act. They have since been working on it, I am informed. I am also informed that certain bodies representing the general public have been corresponding with the Minister of Railways, telling him that they desire to be heard in respect to this Bill. They have noticed in the press reports that the railways intend to ask for amendments, and they have been waiting until the government were in possession of these amendments before they came themselves to interview the government. I understand that the Toronto Board of Trade are in that position. They have been making representations to the Minister of Railways, and desiring to be heard after the railways have made their representations. If the Minister of Railways sees fit to adopt these amendments which the railway people produce, then the board of trade desire to be heard in regard to these amendments. But they do not want to make two trips here for that purpose. Perhaps the Minister of Railways may have representations from other bodies representing the general public, as we know that the public are a good deal interested in this Bill. I would urge the minister of Railways to postpone the second reading of this Bill until he has the representations of the railways, and until he hears the organizations representing the public, neither of which bodies have yet been heard by him. It seems to me that it would be a waste of time to go on and read this Bill a second time, and consider it clause by clause, until we have heard more from the parties interested. I hope the hon. minister will give these organizations which desire it an opportunity to be heard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp), that I was communicated with by the Toronto Board of Trade and I am not sure but that there may have been one or two other associations, perhaps the Manufacturers Association, and perhaps some other associations which also communicated with me; but I know the Toronto Board of Trade has done so and I stated to them what had transpired. I very frankly stated to them that I had asked the railway people to present to me, if they could, a statement of their criticisms upon the Bill, and when I received that I said that I would put them in possession of it. Then, I thought would be the proper time for them, if they wished to formulate any views, to do so. I have not received that information from the railway companies. It is apparent that these gentlemen have been communicating in the wrong direction. Instead of communicating with the Minister of Railways and Canals, they should have communicated with the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals because the ex-minister has been taken into the confidence of these gentlemen to a much larger degree that the present minister has been favoured. Therefore, I have not been able to carry out my undertaking with them. If I have failed I have not failed for any other reason than for that stated. I still adhere to the view that nothing would be lost and that everything would be gained by proceeding into Committee on this Bill. I know very well the clauses of the Bill that will invoke the most criticism and I am sure the House will accept my statement and that when in committee the committee will accept the statement I make, that I will not press any of the clauses which I have reason to believe are likely to be contested in the interests of the railway companies or anybody else; but that I will be willing to afford them every opportunity of being heard.

Mr. KEMP. I do not think the hon. minister's mind is sufficiently ingenious to imagine what the Toronto Board of Trade have in their minds in regard to this Bill. I have been informed that they have a great many amendments to suggest and I think we would only lose time by proceeding with the Bill.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) to another difficulty in discussing this measure; that is, if the hon. minister proposes to go on with the clauses relating to the commission. Personally, I am in favour of the principle of a commission, but I doubt whether I can vote for the clauses as they stand until I know how far the clauses will extend; that is to say, whether they are to be binding upon all the railways of this Dominion, or only a few of them. Strongly as I feel there would be

an advantage even to the railways themselves from the appointment of such a commission as this, I feel also that the effect of the Bill would be mischievous if one or more of the large companies were exempted from its operations while others were bound by them. We all know that the Canadian Pacific Railway, at least, claims to be in such a position under its special Acts that you cannot do with it what you propose to do under this commission. I think it would be a grave injustice that one company should be made subject to this commission and to the decrees of the commissioners, while the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company should be absolutely free. I think that must be a proposition which no hon. gentleman in this House can dispute. We cannot very well, in the absence of the representatives of the Canadian Pacific Railway and other companies, decide here for ourselves which company is bound, and which is not bound by the provisions of the Bill as it stands. The only way, it seems to me, in which we can deal with that question, is the way which has been suggested; that is, to appoint a committee to hear the contentions of the several railways as to whether they are possessed of parliamentary powers which prevent this Bill being applied to them. We may spend hours and hours and days and days in going over the various provisions of this Bill and ultimately find all our work useless simply because we have no power to deal with some particular railway company whose freedom from control would make the Bill of very little use. I do not want to refer here at length to the question of the government railways. The hon. minister has said that he exempts the government railways from the operation of the Bill. I think that is wrong. I do not agree with him in that, but I am dealing now, simply with the question of other railways which cannot appear in this House and state the objections they may have to what is proposed against them here.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

On section two, paragraph (m)—

Mr. LANCASTER. I would ask the minister why he limits the authority, of the judges under this Bill to judges of the Superior Court. The judges of the High Court which is the Superior Court in Ontario, are located in Toronto when not on circuit, and as a great many things may arise under this Bill which would require immediate attention, I would suggest that the County Court judges who are perfectly competent to act should be clothed with powers under the Bill. It would save a great deal of expense and would greatly facilitate the operation of the law if the County Court judges were given jurisdiction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Since the Railway Act was passed it has been the law that the Superior Court judges should have jurisdiction, and I would be inclined to adhere to the existing law unless very strong reasons were given for the change. The judges have not many duties to perform under this Act. One duty of theirs, which occurs to my mind, is, that they have jurisdiction in connection with the expropriation of land, and I personally would not think it desirable that we should change the law in that regard. Then again, when rules are made by the commission, in order that they may become rules of court, application has to be made to a judge of the Superior Court, and I can see no reason at present why that should be changed.

Mr. LANCASTER. The procedure in expropriating land is, that the railroad gives notice to the land owner, and in that notice the company appoints an arbitrator, and they ask the land owner to appoint another arbitrator, then those two have to agree on a third one, but if they cannot agree, application has to be made to a judge of the High Court at Toronto. Suppose the land is in the county of Lincoln, which I have the honour to represent, could not the judge of the County Court there pick out an arbitrator a good deal better than a judge sitting in Toronto? The judge in Toronto has to rely on affidavits and he generally appoints a judge of the County Court, but if the judge of the County Court himself has the appointing power he could appoint the judge of another county court, or he could appoint any one he thinks fit. The application could be made to the county judge at home and it would save a great deal of expense and trouble. I think the legal gentlemen from Ontario on both sides of the House will agree with me that better and cheaper results would be obtained by giving the County Court judges power to deal with the expropriation of land. In Ontario we have railways incorporated by the province, and in relation to every one of these the County Court judges have to do with the expropriation proceedings and not the Superior or High Court, and practical experience has taught us that it works very satisfactorily. There has not been the slightest complaint against the manner in which the County Court judges have discharged these duties. As to making an order of the Railway Commission a rule of court, I would remind the minister that in the province of Ontario the County Court judges are local judges of the High Court, and every day of their lives they are making just such orders in regard to other equally, or more, important matters as they would be called upon to make under this Act. There are only ten judges of the High Court in the whole province of Ontario who have original jurisdiction. I firmly believe that it would be a great improvement in the Bill if we conferred this power on the County Court judges concurrently with the judges of the Superior Court if you like.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The matter brought to the attention of the House by the member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is well worthy of consideration. The hon. gentleman is much more conversant with the later rules of procedure than I am, and he no doubt knows from practical experience whereof he speaks. The old principle of the Railway Act, as the minister truly says, was adopted a long time ago, and things have changed since then. While I would not, without further consideration be prepared to confer this power on the County Court judges, yet I think the minister should seriously consider the suggestion. The difference between the High Court judges and the County Court judges was more accentuated in times past than it is at present. The judges of the County Courts are now judges of the Superior Court in local matters, and this jurisdiction has been conferred on them for the very purpose of saving litigants the expense and inconvenience of going long distances from home when they are interested in litigation. From my experience, I would be as well satisfied to have the County Court judges appoint arbitrators as the Superior Court judges. They would be not only much cheaper but more quickly got at, which are advantages not only to the localities but to the railways themselves. There might be a number of other cases in which a County Court judge might very well be substituted for a Superior Court judge in Ontario. I would not be prepared to say that I would make this substitution in all cases. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Lincoln is well worthy of consideration.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The clause must stand for further consideration. The argument which the hon. member has presented on the score of reduction in the expense of expropriation proceedings is one that occurred to my mind.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me the question raised by the hon. member for Lincoln does not properly come up for discussion now. This clause simply says that judge shall mean a judge of the Superior Court where the context does not otherwise indicate. If it is desired to give jurisdiction to a County Court judge or a District Court judge, that will have to be specially provided for and will not interfere with this definition. I doubt very much if these definitions are of any real utility, because I cannot conceive of any case in which the statute itself should not say which court or which judge should have jurisdiction. But in any case there can be no difficulty in letting this definition stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 2, subsection t,

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. What object is there in leaving out the word 'map'? In some cases, if the words, map or plan are not used, there may be an uncertainty in the sense, because I understand that the two words have been held to have different meanings.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When the clause says that the word plan means the ground plan, it means all that it is required to mean, and all that the word map means. You could not make any more or any less of it than a ground plan.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Unless the minister has some reason for considering the old language defective, I think it would be wise to stick to it, because there have been decisions based on different meanings for the two words.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What difference would the hon. gentleman suggest there could be between a map of the land proposed to be taken and a plan of the land proposed to be taken?

Mr. CASGRAIN. It seems to me that the word map means much more than the word plan. The word map includes the land, its ridges, rivers, streams, &c., whereas a plan may simply be an indication of the running of the line over the land. This is probably the reason why both words are used in the old Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you refer to section 122, you will find that it defines just what the plan must disclose.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. But the old law used the words map or plan even in that section. If you take section 123 which is the same as section 122 in the new Act, you will find that the expression is 'map or plan.' The minister rightly asked me to point out a distinction. Well, one can put on a map more than on a plan. It may be a good thing that more should appear than on the plan, but if you have more, it would not be the plan. There may be topographical information which would be very important, but in the interpretation the court would infer that, as we had changed the wording from that of the old Act the change was intentional on our part, and they might rule that because more was put on it than was necessary for a 'plan' and that the Act was not complied with. I agree with my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Casgrain) that the word 'map' is a larger expression than the word 'plan.' And we must remember that we are dealing with technical construction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) to press the view that if the plan were to show more than would be required, it would be ruled that this was a defect in the plan.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. They might do so, as we are changing the law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can hardly imagine that such would be the case. The Act provides that if there is a deficiency in the information on the plan, the minister may require additional information to be shown.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I agree that if section 122 stood alone this would be a definition of the word 'plan' and would include 'map.' But there may be other sections in which the word 'plan' only is used, and it seemed to me, therefore, the wider term should be used in the interpretation clause, subject, of course, to any other section where it is necessary that the word 'map' alone should be used.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The point seems to me of no great importance, and if hon. gentlemen desire to put this in, we will not object.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. What do hon. gentlemen who have had experience as counsel for the railways say on the subject? The words in the old law have stood for a great many years, and I do not see any reason why in this Bill the two terms 'map' and 'plan' should not be used. I think that, unless there is some distinction, you will find that in every case they are used as corelative terms. In the case of the word 'judge,' my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) showed that, owing to the extension of the duties of the County Court judges, there was a reason for changing the wording. But in this case it is simply the cutting out of one word.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But we indicate in the Act in explicit terms just what information we want, and, if that is supplied, it does not matter what we call it. And, if the word 'map' means more than the word 'plan,' why should the meaning of it be circumscribed? What you want is, before the land is expropriated, that it shall be clearly shown what the boundaries and other facts are. It seems to me it makes no difference whether you call it one name or whether you call it another.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I may be unduly adhering to the idea of no change, but I think I can see something more than is in it. A map may cover all that a plan covers and more.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If it covers more than we require, we do not want it.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. But there might be cases where you would be quite willing to accept it. I agree that this section 122, though longer than section 123 of the old Act, is an improvement. I believe that all these clauses should be terse, but I agree that certain additional requisites have been included in this section and that the section has been improved thereby. But I cannot see any reason for cutting out a very significant word, particularly as it has been there so long.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to the old Act, upon which he rests so much, and which he thinks must be adopted if we are to avoid danger of misapprehension:

> The expression 'map' or 'plan' means——

What?

> —a ground plan of the property taken or intended to be taken.

'Map or plan' means a plan. Then, what is the use of adding 'map'? How is there any possibility of misapprehension about it?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. In this way—as I understand the interpretation clause—wherever it is used it means a plan. There is a distinction between a map and a plan, but in the interpretation clause we can make them mean the same thing.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Why should we?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Because the interpretation clause will make an article what it is therein termed no matter what it might otherwise be. Whether it be a map or a plan, you make it a plan.

On section 2, subsection U:

> The expression 'railway' means any railway which the company has authority to construct or operate, and includes all branches, sidings, stations, depots, wharfs, rolling stock, equipment, stores, property real or personal and works connected therewith, and also any railway bridge, tunnel, or other structure which the company is authorized to construct.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to inquire why express companies have been omitted from the operation of this Bill?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We have not come to that yet.

Mr. KEMP. I should have brought this point up under subsection C, which defines the meaning of the expression 'company,' but that subsection was put through rather hurriedly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman wants to raise any point regarding express companies, he must do so in some other connections than this, because so far we have not dealt with any provision excluding express companies. We have not passed any clause declaring that express companies are excluded from the operation of this Bill, and have not changed the law in that respect.

Mr. KEMP. When subsection C was under discussion, I did not notice that the expression 'company' was confined to railway companies, or I would have asked that it should also include 'express companies.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why 'express companies'?

Mr. KEMP. Because they are closely allied to railway companies, and this Bill should control express companies as well as railway companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would never do to say that all the provisions we are making in this Bill with regard to railway companies should apply to express companies. If the hon. gentleman wants a certain control exercised over express companies by the Railway Commission, it will be open to him to ask the committee to adopt some provisions with regard to that subject.

Mr. KEMP. But should not that come properly under paragraph C, which defines what the expression 'company' means?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Paragraph C provides that whenever the word 'company' is used alone, it means a railway company, and that is in the law as it stands to-day. If you want to make any enactment with regard to express companies, it is quite open to you to do so, but such enactment would not be germane to the subject we are now discussing.

Mr. KEMP. Is there any other place in the Act where I can bring this point to the attention of the committee?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The present law provided that express companies should be given every facility, and that no discrimination should be exercised regarding them by the railways. We are not changing that.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. minister intend to take jurisdiction over the rates of express companies?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope the hon. gentleman will not bring that question up now.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am reserving the right to bring it up later on and am simply asking the hon. minister whether he has taken such jurisdiction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When we come to that phase of the Bill, we will discuss that point.

Mr. MACLEAN. When we come to that phase of the Bill, we will find no provisions for express companies and may overlook the matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is not likely to forget. Do not let us be drawn into a discussion as to whether the Bill should include express companies when we are dealing simply with explanatory clauses.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This clause is different from the old Act. The present law says: 'Which any company is authorized to construct under a special Act.' You make it read: 'Which the company is authorized to construct.' You leave out the words 'under a special Act,' and change the word 'any' to 'the.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can well understand why we should not put in any reference to a special Act. It makes no difference whether the Act is special or general, under which a company is authorized to construct. What particular service would there be in adding these words 'under any special Act'?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not know why they are in the present law or what effect they had, but I am asking simply why they were left out.

Mr. BARKER. I think I understand the reason. They are properly left out. Branch railways of six miles are now constructed under the general Act, and it is necessary that this clause should cover these as well as those constructed under a special Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It covers all.

Mr. BARKER. I am arguing in favour of the section. I say that the reason is, the word 'railway' must apply to other railways than those constructed under special Acts, because every railway branch of six miles comes under the general Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, it does not. The company gets power under a special Act to construct additions to the road, and the provisions of the general Act are made to apply to this special Act. I do not know that it makes any difference, but I could not understand why these words were left out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If they have power to construct a railway, it does not matter whether that power is given in a general or a special Act.

On section 2, subsection V:

The expression 'rolling stock' means and includes any locomotive, engine, motor car, tender, snow plough, flanger, and every description of car or of railway equipment designed for movement, on its wheels, over or upon the rails or tracks of the company.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. That is an entirely new clause and requires particular care. It may have a financial effect. There are many decisions as to what constitutes rolling stock, because rolling stock is often held under lien and may be liable for the payment of bonds. Why should it be necessary to make this definition at all?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has been found in actual experience, and in conferring powers upon the Railway Commission with respect to furnishing this description of rolling stock

or that description of rolling stock, that the provision contained in this clause was desirable.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Has the minister considered what might be the financial effect of it? I think the Minister of Justice will agree with me that when we make a definition of the words 'rolling stock,' nothing else can be included. The words 'rolling stock' has been defined by a long series of decisions, just like the words 'working expenses,' which we have never changed, and millions of dollars depend upon the meaning of the phrases 'working expenses' and 'rolling stock.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This clause will have no retroactive effect, it only applies to what may be ordered hereafter. If there has been any contract in which the words 'rolling stock' are used, that contract would not be affected by this Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am afraid this clause goes a little further than the minister intends. We are now discussing clause (v.), which is a part of section 2 of the Bill, and the very first words of this section are :

In this Act, and in the special Act incorporating any railway company to which this Act or any part thereof applies, unless the context otherwise requires——

The context might mean a good deal more than this Act provides for. We must read clause (v.) in the light of the first words of section 2. As my hon. friend from Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) says, these special Acts are passed every day, and it might be the context of a special Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I understand the hon. member for Norfolk to say that it is dangerous to introduce this change because it may affect existing contracts. I do not think it is possible it can affect any existing contract. That is my opinion, expressed off-hand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). According to the views expressed by my hon. friend from Norfolk, that word 'rolling stock' has attained a meaning through a long series of decisions. Assuming that he is right, then certainly you might possibly change the meaning of a contract by this legislation. The Minister of Justice will see that it would be possible. For example, if the words 'rolling stock,' as used in this Bill, had a particular meaning assigned to it by a series of decisions, then it would bear that meaning in the contract. You have the meaning of the words 'rolling stock' ascertained by judicial decisions. A contract has been made reciting the provisions of the special Act, reciting the provisions enabling rolling stock to be charged, and you have this Act affecting the meaning of the words used in the special Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend suggests that possibly, if a contract had been passed previous to this Act coming into force, the meaning of the words 'rolling stock' in it, might be affected by this Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, I would not go that far. There might be a good deal of force in the observations of the Minister of Justice with regard to that, but you do not need to go that far. You might take a case where arrangements have been made for drawing up a deed. Negotiations have been going on, you draw up the deed, and it would have possibly the meaning assigned to it by this statute.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If hon. members will reflect upon the nature of the questions likely to arise, their minds will be set at ease. If you turn to the old Act, subsection (x.) of the corresponding section, you will find the question of rolling stock comes up in this way :

The expression 'working expenses' means and includes all expenses of maintenance of the railway, of the stations, buildings and works belonging thereto, and of the rolling and other stock, and movable plant used in the working thereof.

The term 'rolling stock,' I think, is never used in any special Act, according to my recollection. There is no possibility of any misapprehension arising as to the interpretation and meaning of it, if I am correct in what I say, and I think the recollection of every hon. gentleman will coincide with my own. The object of the incorporation of this clause in the Bill is more particularly to define for the purpose of this Act and of the administration of a railway commission under it, what is the meaning of 'rolling stock' rather than leave it to uncertainty. I do not know of any legal interpretation that has been given by a court in any case of the word 'rolling stock,' but we have proposed that this commission may require that a certain kind of rolling stock shall be provided for a certain purpose and they may indicate just what shall constitute that rolling stock. They shall say whether there shall be a snow plough or a flanger as part of the rolling stock, or whether it shall consist of any other of these particular descriptions of cars which are mentioned in paragraph (v.) It is only in the matter of administration that there might be any serious question arising at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The argument of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is, that any railway can come under the special provisions of this Bill and can get its charter under the Act. Is there any provision of that kind in the Bill?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These railway companies would come under the control of this commission.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not under the control but the provisions as to the charter would apply to them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the provisions would apply.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They would come under the special provisions of this Bill just as if they had received their charter under it and the argument of the hon. minister is that if they came under this Bill the terms of this Bill would apply to them as to rolling stock and as to the railway equipment just as if the charter had been issued under this Act and this might effect their bonds.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It cannot effect any existing contract at all. It does not apply to any existing contract. How could it affect any existing contract by any possibility ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is just the question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If so you could never change the law at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. My argument is this : Here is a railway, say, the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Company, which has received a special charter. It chooses, instead of continuing under its special charter, to come under the provisions of this Bill and all its provisions in reference to railways will apply to that company and all the other special provisions of its charter are annulled. It is just in the same position as if it had received its entity under this Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, there is nothing annulled. This Bill recognizes that any special privileges or provisions or powers which have been conferred upon a railway company by any special Act are not taken away. They continue. This is a general railway Bill which applies to all railways, except where, under a special Act there has been an exception from some inconsistent provision named or power conferred. The General Interpretation Act says :

> The repeal of an Act, or the revocation of a regulation, at any time, shall not affect any Act done or any right or right of action existing, accruing, accrued or established, or any proceedings commenced in a civil cause, before the time when such repeal or revocation takes effect ; but the proceedings in such case shall be conformable when necessary, to the repealing Act or regulation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is the General Interpretation Act ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. We could not change the law at all for any purpose without damaging anybody unless we could do it in this way.

Mr. LANCASTER. We have a special interpretation clause in this Bill and one in the General Interpretation Act, and I would like to ask the hon. minister whether these do not more or less conflict. The hon. minister has quoted the General Interpretation Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That gives the effect of the repeal of a law.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would it not be better to put in the very words he has mentioned and to say that this Bill shall not apply except in such and such cases ? He says it would not apply to those companies that are operating under their special Acts. Would it not read better if that particular exception were put into the clause that we are now passing ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We would have to put it into every clause in the Bill. Unless the context of any Act incorporating a railway company, or any special Act, requires otherwise, then, these general provisions apply. What more could you possibly ask ?

On section 2, paragraph (aa)—

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You extend this to passengers as well as to freight ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I want to make a change. I beg to move that we insert in place of 'the expression' 'to charge,' the verb 'to charge.' My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) asked me whether we include passenger rates as well as freight rates. Certainly. We have shortened the expression. You will find the word 'tolls' as it is defined.

Paragraph (bb) reads :

> The expression 'traffic' means and includes passengers and all goods conveyed by railways and also all rolling stock.

I propose to strike out the word 'expression' and insert 'verb.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does my hon. friend the minister think it a desirable amendment. I should think 'the word' would be much better, because later on you would have to say 'the definite article' 'the noun' and so on.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not see any objection to the word which my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) thinks so ridiculous. I do not see why he should not say the verb 'charge' should mean such a thing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I never saw any drafting just of that kind. It may make it more definite but it is rather unusual.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. In the old law the expression 'toll' or 'rate' was made to apply to passengers, but in this section you leave out the word 'passengers.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will find in section (bb) that the expression 'traffic' includes passengers.

Mr. LANCASTER. You want us to play hunt the slipper through the Act to find out what it means.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If you insert the word 'verb' here you will have to say in (bb) 'the noun traffic' because the word 'traffic' is used as a noun and also as a verb, and in (cc) you will have to use the expression 'the noun train.' I never saw an expression like that in an Act before.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure I have seen it, but I do not remember where.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is very unusual. I should think the clause as it is at present is perfectly plain.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. If I were to look hurriedly at this Act to find out what 'toll' means I would say that it did not include 'passengers.' You would never think of looking under the word 'traffic' to find out what 'toll' means.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These definitions take these forms in the present Bill, because they are precisely a transcript from the English Act.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Very well then.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman thinks it important, I have no objection to insert the word 'passengers.'

Mr. MACLEAN. It is clearer the way it is now, and we are following the English practice.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose we can do almost anything by Act of parliament, but is it not stretching our powers by saying: that traffic means and includes passengers and all goods conveyed by railway and also the rolling stock.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The old definition is worse.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The old definition says that traffic means animals, cars trucks and vehicles, and it is a wonder my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has not had many a hearty laugh over this clause in times past. I think this present definition is a great improvement on the old one, and I propose to improve it still further by eliminating some unnecessary words so as to make it read:

The expression 'traffic' means and includes passengers, goods and rolling stock.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

On section 2, subsection ee,

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. That is new; what does it mean?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is all right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the first place, what is the use of saying that undue preference means and includes an undue preference?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The operative section in the Act is section 253. It is an important clause, and I think it is pretty comprehensive.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It seems to me the expression undue preference is defined in that section. If that is the only section relating to it, I do not see why you need this definition here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The expression undue preference is used in other parts of the Act. This clause may perhaps not be really necessary, but I do not think it is harmful.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Does the minister not think it might limit the meaning of the expression, and take away from the court the discretion which they should exercise? They would have to refer to this clause to find what undue preference meant, and they could not go beyond that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it is covered by section 253, why not limit it to that section? At any rate, I cannot see any reason for saying that undue preference shall mean undue preference.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The courts have placed a distinct and precise meaning upon these words. What was aimed at here was that undue preference should be included, so that whatever meaning might be attached to those words should not be in the slightest degree circumscribed, but that if there was any additional expansion of the idea possible, it should be included. I do not attach very much importance to the clause.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It is a new clause, and section 253 is very full.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will strike it out.

Subsection struck out.

On section 2, subsection ff:

The expression 'working expenditure' means and includes all expenses of maintenance of the railway, and all such tolls, rents, or annual sums as are paid in respect of property leased to or held by the company, apart from the rent of any leased line, or in respect of the hire of rolling stock let to the company; also all rent charges or interest on the purchase money of lands belonging to the company, purchased but not paid for, or not fully paid for; and also all expenses of or incidental to working the railway, and the traffic thereon, including all necessary repairs and supplies to rolling stock while on the lines of another company; also rates, taxes, insurance and compensation for accidents or losses; also, all salaries and wages of persons employed in and about the working of the railway and traffic; and all office and management expenses, including directors fees, agency, legal and other like expenses; also all costs and expenses of and incidental to the compliance by the company with any order of the board under this Act;

and generally all such charges, if any, not above otherwise specified, as in all cases of English railway companies are usually carried to the debit of revenue as distinguished from capital account.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I see that in this clause it is provided that working expenditure shall include 'all necessary repairs and supplies to rolling stock while on the lines of another company.' But supposing they are on the lines of the company itself ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are included in the general definition of a railway. Rolling stock is included in the general definition of a railway, which is found in subsection U.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. This section covers 'also all costs and expenses of and incidental to the compliance by the company with any order of the board under this Act.' This board can do almost anything, and under this clause the company might have to assume a large financial responsibility and give that a preference over the securities of the company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Suppose a company was in the hands of a receiver, and some question arose as to whether or not the receiver would be entitled to take out of the earnings of the company what might be necessary to comply with any order of the railway board, it is clear he could do that under this Bill. But in the absence of any such provision, the receiver might hold that he had no right to appropriate that money but that it should go to the bondholders, or even though the expense was ordered by the railway commission. If the railway commission ordered something to be done in the interests of the public, the expense of doing that should be paid as proper working expenses.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I have not had an opportunity of giving the requisite consideration to the Bill to know what the board could or could not order. It would require a great deal of consideration to know that. The point I am making is that the powers given the board are so broad that they might impose a pecuniary obligation on the company and give that a preference over the bondholders.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then curtail the powers of the commission when you come to that.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Suppose there was a question of damages. The board have considerable authority even in fixing damages. Would it be right to give into the hands of this board, from whose decisions there is no appeal, the power to say that any order they may make for the payment of money shall become a preference over the bondholders without their consent ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that my hon. friend correctly comprehends the meaning of this clause : 'and also all costs and expenses of and incidental to the compliance by the company with any order of the board under this Act.' That would not cover the case of damages such as the hon. gentleman refers to. This simply means that if any costs are incurred in any proceeding by reason of any order of the board—for instance, suppose the board should require an investigation into some matter or should require some returns or statistics which would entail some expense —it would be proper that the costs should be paid out of working expenses.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the term 'working expenses' is used in contradistinction to capital expenditure. Will it be possible for the board to make an order upon a railway company which would involve what would properly be capital expenditure ? May not confusion arise from this definition ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Suppose the railway commission were satisfied that certain appliances ought to be put on a train, a compliance with that order might involve the necessity of capital expenditure by the company. The company might not be able to meet that expenditure out of ordinary revenue. But I think that I am correct in saying that this section could only be interpreted as having reference to the case of a defunct railway, which has gone into the hands of a receiver and in which the question might arise as to what are working expenses and as to what is capital expenditure. This question does arise, and it was deemed advisable that we should provide for it in this Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, these elaborate interpretation clauses sometimes lead to curious results. For instance, there is the expression 'working of the railway and the traffic thereon.' Now the word 'traffic' includes passengers. This would mean then, working the passengers as well as the railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not follow, because 'traffic' includes passengers that it must always be passengers.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. If I understand the minister aright he is doubtful whether under the present law regarding working expenses the board would have the right to take costs and expenses out of that fund. Under this section working expenses includes 'all costs and expenses of and incidental to the compliance, by the company with any order of the board under this Act. This would not mean any pecuniary——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Or anything that the court might order them to pay ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Only their costs and expenses incidental to such cases, but not damages.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I do not think so.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The end of subsection 2 is absolutely new. Would the hon. gentleman say what the object is ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I confess that I am a little at sea to understand it. The subsection says :

The provisions of this section shall apply to the construction thereof, and, to the words and expressions used therein.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. That is to say you read the sections together and use one to interpret another ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is it not the general rule in the interpretation of statutes ? I think it is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have always heard that rule expressed by the court wherever a statute was to be interpreted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It may possibly be.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not unusual. You will find it in the General Interpretation Act.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 1 as amended be adopted ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Carried.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, it may be necessary to come back to this at some future time.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Better leave it open.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No; if any hon. gentleman desires to reopen it, I will raise no objection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In this subsection (gg) appears the words :

And the expressions 'clerk of the peace' and 'sheriff' respectively include the like persons as in other cases.

What is the meaning of that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is based upon 51 Vic., Chapter 29, section 2, where these words appear. I must confess I do not quite see the object of them. But I apprehend they must mean something, and it did not look to me as if it would be harmful to leave the words there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not suggesting that it is harmful, but I do not quite see what it means.

On section 3,

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I would suggest to the hon. minister that he should allow the sections under this heading, 'application of Act' to stand. This is really a most important division and the matter dealt with, I submit is one that he should discuss with the railway people. The next division deals with the Railway Commission. That is a section more fitting for a general discussion, and does not involve the technical considerations that this part involves.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to discuss that very question, the application of the Act, now.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. My suggestion is that, as the question is so technical, it would be better for us to go on with the consideration of the Railway Commission until the hon. minister has had some discussion of this subject with the railway people. Of course, if the committee desires to discuss the matter now, I have no great objection.

Mr. KEMP. Can we inquire now from the minister under this heading whether express companies are excluded in the Bill, and, if not, will he include them ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not come to express companies yet.

Mr. KEMP. But if section 3 was made to include express companies, it would cover the whole thing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) would, after consideration, think it well to insert anything about express companies in this portion of the Bill.

Mr. KEMP. The only other place where it could come in is section 278.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. member succeeds in satisfying the committee that the proposed legislation is not ample to cover the matters he has in mind, and if we agree upon an amendment to the Bill, we can easily refer back to this clause and put it in. I think we had better proceed with the next portion of the Bill. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) that he do not press his objection to that. The subject is very easily understood.

Mr. KEMP There is express freight as well as ordinary freight and, if the minister intends by this Bill to regulate freight rates, all kinds of freight rates should be included. There is no place in the Bill where this question can be discussed to better advantage than now. The only other clause that refers to express companies is 278, and under that there is no power such as I refer to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would much prefer that the

hon. gentleman should defer this, because we come to the question in due course, and then the matter of express charges will come up when our minds are directed to it. If he insisted on it what amendment would he propose ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Has not this Bill for its object the regulation of railway charges? An important part of the charges on railways are the express rates. If the Bill is to apply to railway freight and passenger rates, it ought to apply to express companies, especially now when the railway companies are their own express companies. The Minister of Railways and Canals comes down here with a general Act dealing with railway questions, and ignores the question of express charges. I think he is failing in his duty, and we ought to bring the express companies forthwith under the operation of this Act. As I am referring to that, if it is the intention of the government to establish a board of Railway Commissioners, I want to tell the minister that there are other companies that ought to be brought under the jurisdiction of that board and within the scope of this Act. Now they all ought to come under the jurisdiction of this board of commissioners. The Minister of Justice has been looking for a way, I am told, how to regulate the telephone and telegraph companies. Here we are creating the very board that ought to do these things. I make the suggestion now, and I think it will help the minister to solve the question that the special committee has before it now dealing with these telephone companies, that here we are creating an important board that can deal, not only with telegraph and telephone companies, but railways and express companies. I hope the minister will tell the House now that, in appointing a commission to regulate railways, that commission will have jurisdiction over express charges put upon traffic in this country.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). The board has now jurisdiction over the tolls.

Mr. MACLEAN. Where ?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). If you turn to the latter part of section 279, you will read :

> Whenever the company files with the board and publishes any tariff, and such tariff comes into force and is not disallowed by the board under this Act, or participates in any such tariff, the tolls in such tariff while so in force shall, as against such company, its officers, agents or employees, in any prosecution under this Act, be conclusively deemed to be the legal tolls chargeable by such company, and any departure therefrom shall be an offence under this Act.

Mr. MACLEAN. But the 'company' means a railway company.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). But it should apply to express companies.

Mr. MACLEAN. So it should, but it does not, by the present Act. Express companies are levying immense charges on the traffic of this country, and if we are dealing with railway companies in connection with their charges on traffic, we ought to deal with express companies in the same way. This board of commissioners should have them under review, and should pass on their charges. A great deal of the traffic of this country is handled by express cars and companies. Year after year I see three or four express cars on the main trains, both of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now we are here creating a board of railway commissioners, and why not give them jurisdiction over this matter ? Now the Prime Minister has come in, and I will say to him what I said to the Minister of Justice a moment ago, that here an opportunity has come to widen the jurisdiction of this board of railway commissioners and to give them jurisdiction and control over cognate matters, namely, telephone and telegraph companies, and their conduct towards the people. I am in favour of the establishment of this board of commissioners, but I want their powers and jurisdiction widened so that they will not only deal with railway charges, but with express charges, with telephone charges and telegraph charges, in their relations with the general public.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said a little while ago that it is very inconvenient to take up these questions out of their order.

Mr. MACLEAN. But it may be necessary.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let my hon. friend have a little patience. That is his great fault, an entire absence of patience. He cannot restrain his impetuous ardour, if he has anything in his mind that he thinks ought to be kept prominently to the front. What I have said to the hon. member for Toronto, and what I repeat to my impetuous friend who has just spoken, is that he should have patience, and wait until we get down to the subjects of this Bill that are germane to the matters which he is anxious to deal with. If this Bill is found to fall short of dealing with these matters he has in mind, it will be open to him to propose amendments, and he will find a disposition on the part of the committee to yield to any reasonable suggestions. There are provisions in this Bill touching upon those cases. If there are not, let us make such provisions when the time comes.

Mr. MACLEAN. Where are they ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not there now.

Mr. MACLEAN. We are dealing with companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend would put the

cart before the horse. He declares that the express charges should be dealt with, and we declare that we should first provide for a commission. I can well understand the trouble of my hon. friend. He is here just now, and he may be flying away next day, and may not be back. It may not be convenient for him to be here when the subject comes up for consideration in its proper course. I say to him that he must have regard for the convenience of other people and allow us to proceed with this Bill in proper order.

Mr. MACLEAN. If there is anything germane to the discussion of this clause, it is just what I now propose. We are here deciding what companies the Act shall apply to, to railway companies and their charges, and I say, let us make it apply to express companies and their traffic charges. Now does the hon. gentleman say that he is introducing a broad and general railway Act, appointing a board of railway commissioners to deal with railway questions, and yet that he will not declare in this Bill that he deals with express charges of railway companies?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because there are express companies operating who do not do one-half of their business on railways at all. When we come down to tolls and charges imposed in respect of traffic——

Mr. MACLEAN. I think it is the hon. gentleman who is impetuous, who is impatient. Now I repeat again—and I hope his colleagues will take him in hand in this matter—he has a Bill dealing with this question of transportation companies and charges, and he says that when he comes to some subsequent details he will see about these other companies. I say now is the time when he is defining his jurisdiction to say what companies are to be included. I say we ought to include express companies and their charges. If he is to regulate only the freight and passenger charges, the Bill is altogether insufficient. We were told that we were to have a broad, general Act. Why does he wish to let express companies out? Traffic on the express companies is increasing all the time. I hope the hon. gentleman will let the matter stand. We had better call it six o'clock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know my hon. friend is anxious to get off this evening, so I move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Public works—chargeable to income—dredge vessels, repairs, $30,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). We are asking for this $30,000 to make provision for paying the expenses of the general repairs required to be made to the hulls, machinery, dredges and scows in the different provinces which are the property of the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. This is to cover repairs to all of the dredging plant?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for general repairs and improvements.

Mr. SPROULE. How many dredges have we now belonging to the government?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think there are twenty.

Mr. SPROULE. That is $1,500 apiece. Is this repairing done at Sorel, or at the points at which the dredges are stationed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Those dredges that are in proximity to Sorel are repaired at the government shop there. But when they are in other localities they are repaired by contract at some of the shops in the towns or cities where they may be. Of course, this includes scows as well as dredges.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the work done by contract or by day labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is done by contract generally unless in the case of some small repairs, which are done under the supervision of the officials.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like to inquire what progress has been made in the construction of the new hydraulic dredge for the maritime provinces, which is being built at Sorel?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would like to say that if that question were brought up when the vote for that work is under consideration it would be better, but I have information from the department that progress has been very slow unfortunately, rather slower than the hon. gentleman would expect or like.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is not a very clear answer. When I left office it was understood that the dredge would be ready by the month of July this year. I do not know what has been done since my hon. friend has taken charge of the Department of Public Works. I know how the office should be managed in Sorel. I would like to know what progress has been made in the construction of that dredge and when we can expect it will be ready for work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information is that there is no such un-

derstanding in the department. The officers of the department inform me that they had reported to the minister that they could not expect to have the dredge finished this year. There has been no change, so far as I know, or any action taken that might cause delay, so far as I am personally concerned. And so far as I know, regarding the officers of the department, they have been urging the progress of the work in every way. From the first I was informed that it was not possible to complete it this year.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is out of the question to tell that to me, as I happened to be there a month before I left office. There is correspondence in the Department of Public Works—my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) will find it—to the effect that the dredge was to be ready by the month of July, and it should have been ready by that time. There is no reason, unless the work has not been proceeded with with the celerity and activity which should have been displayed, why the dredge should not have been ready by the first of July. The hull was very far advanced, the material was nearly all delivered, and I cannot understand why the dredge will not be ready by the first of July. I invite my hon. friend to look personally into that matter, because I know how difficult it is to administer patronage in Sorel. I do not know what changes my hon. friend has made in the way of distributing patronage there. I had any amount of trouble when I was in office. Although I was born near there, although I know nearly everybody there, I had any amount of trouble, and I was obliged to act in a pretty stiff manner at times. I do not know who is managing the Sorel patronage now, or in whose hands it is, but I know very well that without strict supervision it is a very easy thing in Sorel to employ three men instead of one. I invite the minister to be careful. His officers will tell him, if he takes them into his confidence, something about that. The shipyard in Sorel is one of the best on the continent, but of course it has to be administered according to strict business methods. If there is not strict supervision exercised, it will be a sink hole. I again invite the minister to be very careful as to the way patronage is to be administered there. I make these remarks because I do not want to be responsible for the delay. The officers of the department know that I am within the truth when I say that that dredge should have been ready by the first of July, or at the outside by the first of August. I cannot understand the reason for that delay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In view of the statements made by the hon. gentleman on previous occasions, and in view of the urgent necessity of having a dredge in the lower provinces I did look into this matter. I may say to the hon. gentleman that he will be fully responsible for the conduct of the department, for the reason that there has been no change made at Ottawa and neither has there been any change made at Sorel. The supervision is the same now as it was before. If there is any correspondence in the department to which he refers between any of the officials, I wish he would give me the names because I am giving the information to the House and to him as it is given to me by the chief officers of the department. There has been no change made whatever; no change in the instructions; no change in the supervision, and so far as I am personally concerned any action that I have taken and any intimation I have given has been in the direction of urging that all speed be made towards carrying out this work. I have no information from any of the officers of the department or from any source, that there has been any change made whatever. The only personal action I took was to urge on the officers the necessity of having this dredge completed as quickly as possible.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Might I inquire whether the whole work will be done in Sorel or if part of the work will be done outside.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was so anxious that this work should be completed this year if possible, that I consulted the engineers of the department to see whether or not some assistance could not be had from outside. After full consideration they reported to me that the work had gone so far and was in such a state of progress, that they did not think we could get a great deal of assistance by having any of the work done outside. It was decided on their recommendation to go on and try to complete the work as quickly as possible in the shops at Sorel.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell me what are the reasons why the dredge is not ready now; what part of the work is behind; is it the hull or the machinery.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Generally speaking it is both. Some of the machinery has been bought and delivered but the building of the hull, &c., is not far enough advanced to use the machinery that has been delivered. There has been delay in regard to all parts of the dredge.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If my hon. friend will look again himself into that matter from a business standpoint—let me say immediately, not from a political standpoint exclusively—he will find out that why the dredge is not ready is because there have been changes in the way of administering patronage in Sorel. I take it upon myself to say that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman has any information with regard to changes I wish he would give it to me, because, not with my know-

ledge has any change been made and the officers of the department report to me the same. I may say that I did not know there was politics in it in any respect. I thought the shop was being conducted as nearly as possible on business lines, and that when I took over the department the men in charge were men who were worthy of the confidence of the minister. If there is any information to the contrary I would like very much to have it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not in any way impugn either the ability or the good will of the officers of the department; very far from it. But I invite my hon. friend to administer the shops at Sorel not from a political standpoint, and I weigh every word I say now because I have passed through the mill. There are reasons which are not desirable to state in the House, why I say what I am saying, and if the minister carefully looks into the matter again with his officers—I know that the officers of the department are not going to say anything else than they say now; they have to be loyal to their department—but I am very much afraid that a change has been made in the way of administering patronage in Sorel. I happen to have a certain number of friends there and I believe I am right in saying what I say now. I have very strong reasons to know that a change has been made in the way of administering that part of the department of Public Works. I do not wish to say any more except this : that shipyard has cost a large amount of money and it is a credit to the government and to the country, and it would be a great pity indeed if that shipyard be destroyed through improper administration of patronage in Sorel. All those who know the state of affairs in Sorel—I am speaking within the hearing of several members of parliament who know what I mean—all those who know the way things may be at times managed at Sorel will agree with me that it would be a great pity indeed. I am very sorry that the dredge is not ready. The port of St. John and other ports badly need that dredge, and for the life of me I cannot understand why it is not ready at the time I know it should have been ready. I have given my personal attention to that work; I have inspected the shipyards over and over again, and well—all I can say is that it is a great pity that such delays should take place when a work of that importance is on hand.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works a question, not from a political but from a practical standpoint. If there is anything more than another that the present Minister of Public Works prides himself upon it is that he is a practical man. Here the minister is asking for a vote of $30,000 to repair twenty dredges. He asks a blanket vote of $30,000 for general repairs on these twenty dredges. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that no public company, concerned with such a matter as this would give a blanket appropriation of $30,000 to its management. I do not understand that the practical affairs of this department are to be treated in any different way from that in which business corporations carry on their business. I say that it would be considered an absolute absurdity for the management of any corporation to ask for authority in a blanket form to expend a round sum of money over so many dredges. One dredge may require $5,000; another $1,000, and not until two years hence will the parliament of this country know how this $30,000 has been expended. At the end of that time we may find that what would only require $1,000 to repair, will have $5,000 spent on it, while another that requires a very large repair has not had one dollar expended on it, but the latter will come up later for a very large expenditure. I think it is almost useless for the opposition to attempt to criticise the estimates unless we are informed more fully than we have been in the past what the minister proposes, not as to twenty dredges in bulk, but as to each of them. I do not ask him to state in the printed estimates what he is going to do, but he must have from the officers of his department a report as to what each dredge requires, and I think we are entitled to that information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are twenty dredges and perhaps sixty tugs, barges and scows. The estimate is of course made upon the experience of past years, and we must depend considerably on the ability and honesty of the engineers and other officials. No person can foresee the damage that may occur to plants such as this. It is to be hoped that the money will be expended under proper supervision, and only when it is required. This vote is taken for general repairs which may be urgently required, and we are depending, as any business man must, who has a plant of this kind, on the integrity and ability of the officers in charge. I cannot imagine that it will be of any benefit to any of the officials to expend any of this money on the plant unless it is really required. While I cannot speak personally on the matter, the chief engineer of the department informs me that this is the usual vote. I shall be very pleased, when I have an opportunity, to look into the matter and see if any change can be made to advantage. At present I do not see that anything can be saved.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Does the minister intend to expend part of this $30,000 on repairs to the dredges employed on the St. Lawrence channel works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. it does not apply to the St. Lawrence fleet at all.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will he be good enough to tell me, then, on what dredges he intends to expend it this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the maritime provinces, on the 'St. Lawrence,' the 'Canada,' the 'New Dominion,' the 'Prince Edward,' the 'Cape Breton,' the 'George Mackenzie,' the 'New Brunswick,' the tug 'Cricket'; in Quebec and Ontario, the 'Challenge,' the 'Nipissing,' the 'Ontario,' the 'Queen,' the 'St. Louis,' the 'Richelieu,'; in Manitoba, the 'Winnipeg,' the 'Sir Hector'; in British Columbia, the 'Mud Lark.' The other votes to which my hon. friend refers are, I think, special votes for special purposes. When we come to those items, I shall have the explanation.

Mr. BARKER. What I would like to get at is this : Has the hon. gentleman received from his officers a statement of what these several dredges require now in the way of repairs ? That is the way every business man conducts his business. He does not allow a blank sum to be voted for repairs but he has a report to show either that machines are in good order, or, if they require repairs, stating just what repairs they require. If we are to be told two years hence that these dredges are all out of repair, then I think we are entitled to know now how much the minister proposes to expend on each dredge, to put it in a proper state of repair.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These estimates are made up on the very basis the hon. gentleman suggests. The estimate made by the officers of the repairs required in each case is as follows : The 'St. Lawrence,' $3,954; the 'Canada,' $3,500; the 'New Dominion,' $2,000; the 'Prince Edward,' $2,500; the 'Cape Breton,' $3,500; the 'George Mackenzie,' $1,000 ; the 'New Brunswick,' $1,200 ; the tug 'Cricket,' $750 ; a new sand pump for the maritime provinces, $1,500 ; Ontario and Quebec, tugs and scows, $2,500 ; the 'Nipissing,' $2,500 ; the 'Ontario,' $2,500 ; the 'Queen,' $2,500 ; the 'St. Louis,' tugs and scows, $1,800 ; the 'Richelieu,' $2,000 ; the 'Sir Richard,' $2,000 ; two stone lifters, $2,500 ; one marine boiler, $2,500 ; a new dredge now being built at Sorel, $3,000.

Mr. BARKER. I think the hon. gentleman has got beyond $30,000 already.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so. These are the reports of the chief engineer of the department. So far he has asked for only $30,000, which is in the Main Estimates. He goes over in detail the requests of the resident engineers and the officers in charge, and does not always allow them. He cuts these down.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Are not all these dredges at work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are commencing work now.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If I understand correctly, that money is asked for repairs next year.

Mr. BARKER. It is for repairs made now.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, all those dredges are in working order. I think they were in fairly good shape last year. We had them all repaired.

Mr. BARKER. The question I asked the hon. minister is what amount is required now to put these in good order at present.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We are simply being asked to vote $30,000 for repairs next year. These dredges are at work now.

Mr. BARKER. The question I asked the hon. minister was what is required at present to put these dredges in repair. We can then ascertain what is likely to be wanted for incidental repairs during the season.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Most of these dredges only work during the summer season, and are repaired during the winter. In every instance except one, they are at work now. If we were left without a vote of money, and with twenty dredges, scows and barges on our hands, and nothing to keep them in repair, they would soon all stop work, I am afraid, judging by our experience in the past. The expenditure for the year before will be found in the Auditor General's Report, but up to the 30th of December this year, we expended $10,654 out of this vote. The chief engineer tells me that the repairs necessary since that time have swallowed up nearly the full amount remaining.

Mr. BARKER. Then I understand that the department has spent $10,000 more than parliament has authorized.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that. What I said was that up to the 31st of December, 1902—which is six months later than the Auditor General's Report—$10,654 had been expended out of last year's appropriation.

Mr. BARKER. Are all these dredges at present in good working order ? I ask that because two years hence somebody will be here criticising the figures in the Auditor General's Report, and should be able to know whether we started with twenty dredges in good working order, and what was the amount expended from this date on incidental repairs. Does the hon. gentleman say that at present everything is being kept in perfectly good order ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not like to go so far. Many of these dredges are old, but they are all in fairly good shape to go to work, with one exception.

Mr. BARKER. Then the money you propose to expend out of the $30,000 is simply to cover incidental repairs during the year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I have explained, this vote was taken for the general repairs to these dredges, scows and barges for 1903-4.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman says that all the dredges except one were in fair working order. What is the name of that one ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The 'Challenge.'

Mr. CLANCY. There seems to be a peculiar uniformity in the sums required for the repairs of the dredges. The sum is estimated at $2,500 in each case. Has it been found that the expenditure is of this uniform amount in each case, or has the hon. minister simply taken the whole sum and made a rough average ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend could not have listened very carefully to the estimates I gave. They ran from $750 to $3,954. It is perfectly true that in the case of dredges of the same capacity, having the same tugs and barges, it has been found that $2,500 is the average amount required to put them in repairs and keep them in order. That is the report of the engineer of the department.

Mr. BARKER. I presume, as this money is required for incidental repairs, that the work shall be done by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If a new boiler is required, we call for tenders. In the case of a breakdown, we get the parts of machinery required from the different manufacturers. Where it is the question of some repairs—iron work or carpentering—that is done by day labour. In a city or town, where there is a shop, we go to the shop.

Mr. GERMAN. In my opinion the government should consider carefully whether or not any more money should be voted for the construction or repairing of government dredges. In my opinion the government would do well to dispose of every dredge it has, and instead of endeavouring to do the dredging of harbours by government work, it would be more advantageous to have that work done by contract. Tenderers would then have the desire to procure and maintain sufficient plant in Canada to do the work called for. At present we have not many contractors with sufficient dredging plant to do the work which is frequently offered, and we find that the government will employ American dredges to do work which our Canadian contractors should be allowed to do. My information is that in the United States all the harbour work is done by contract. It is well known that the contractors will do more work and better work in the same length of time than can be done by government dredges. I know something of the government dredges at the present time, and I know that the government scarcely have one dredge that will do half the work in one day that can be done and will be done by a contractor, and better done too. The government dredges do not work the same number of hours as the others, nor do they work at the same rate of speed. The government have a lot of old dredges on which they are spending money year after year to maintain, but which it would be better to tie up at a dock and leave, and do the work with up-to-date dredges under men who understand their business. This would be very much better and cheaper than to continue the dredging situation that now exists.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. So far as Ontario is concerned, my hon. friend (Mr. German) is about right. The government has only old dredges there. The case was absolutely the same in the St. Lawrence when this government took office. But the hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says that the government dredges that have been built during the last four or five years are not equal to those owned by the contractors. He is altogether mistaken.

Mr. GERMAN. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, two and two make four, not five I am able to say there is not one contractor in this Dominion who has a dredge equal to those that are working on the St. Lawrence to-day. That is a clear statement and it cannot be disputed. The dredges that have been built at Sorel and the one built by the Polson Iron Works are about the best dredges on this continent. And I say, more than that, that the new hydraulic dredge that has been built by the Polson Iron Works and which is working on the St. Lawrence to-day has a greater capacity than that of any other dredge in Canada. It has a capacity of about a million yards a month; and there is no other dredge in this country—there are very few on this continent—that can do the same amount of work. The hon. gentleman (Mr. German) says that he has had experience so far as government dredges are concerned. Well, I have had some experience too. I know that the dredging on the St. Lawrence, is carried out for three or four cents a yard—not more than five cents a yard—and that the contractors elsewhere are charging as high as fifty cents a yard.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is not my fault Yes, there are contractors who are charging more than that to-day.

Mr. CLARKE. Where ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Public Accounts Committee may investigate. It is not my business. I speak of the Department of Public Works, with which I was connected,

and I make bold to say that the dredging carried on by that department with dredges owned and controlled by the department costs three or four times less than the dredging carried on elsewhere by contract. The Public Accounts Committee will meet soon; my statements will be clearly printed, and nobody can prove that they are not right. The dredging on the St. Lawrence to-day is carried on at a cheaper rate than dredging has ever been carried on in this country. Now, if my hon. friend will think over the position twice, he will admit that the work of improving the St. Lawrence cannot be carried out unless you have ship-yards to repair your plant. The department has a large plant. Of course there will be breaks every day. The dredges are working in hard material, taking up stone and rocks, and there are sure to be breaks and all sorts of accidents. To carry out successfully a work of that kind you must have ship-yards of your own. The plant that is at the disposal of the government to-day is the finest plant that any concern on this continent owns, and it would be a great pity indeed if it were ever destroyed. But, of course, if we are contented with old dredges such as the hon. gentleman has seen at work, I freely grant that we are working in the wrong way. These old dredges should have been replaced. But it requires money to build dredges. Every time I came before this House and asked for money, I was told that I was spending a lot of money. We have not spent enough in improving our waterways. One of the most competent men on transportation, Mr. Hays told us to-day elsewhere that we could not handle the trade that is in store for us; and he is perfectly right. The St. Lawrence channel should have been deepened and widened long ago. But it takes time to build dredges. There are not in this country any contractors who have dredges to carry out the work on the St. Lawrence and we have been obliged to build, year by year, the dredges that are carrying out the work. Now, the dredge that is being built in Sorel for the maritime provinces will probably be the best dredge in the world.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). When will it be ready ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) has given us to-night the very sad news that it will not be ready this year. I am very sorry for it. The plans for that dredge were carefully prepared by a man of large experience who was in a position to take advantage of the knowledge of the world in building dredges. He was employed first by the Harbour Commissioners in Montreal. He then went to the United States and was employed on very large works on the Mississippi river and elsewhere. He came back to this country. Then he made a trip to the old country to take advantage of the new knowledge on the Clyde and other places there. So that plans for that dredge was prepared with all that knowledge available. I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. German) on reflection, will admit that, under the present circumstances it would be very bad policy indeed for the department to discard all that magnificent new plant which has been built with every possible care and on which we have spent large amounts of money, and replace it with dredges owned by contractors. I say again there is no contractor in this country, no firm of contractors that has dredges, I will not say equal, but dredges that can be compared with the new modern dredges that have been built by the department during the last year. Let my hon. friend look carefully into that question, and I say again he will find that the dredging carried out in the Department of Public Works with dredges owned by the government and under our own control costs three or four times less than the work costs when it is carried out by outside men. You cannot possibly get contractors to carry out dredging for less than twenty or twenty-five cents a yard, or eight dollars an hour—and small dredges at that. The dredging carried out on the St. Lawrence does not cost more than four or five cents a yard. These are the facts as they are.

Mr. GERMAN. Notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. Tarte's) assertion that the government is doing work cheaper than the contractors are, I beg to differ with him. And, as this government seems to be prolific in commissions, if they will appoint a commission to look into the whole matter, they will find that the work can be done by contractors cheaper and with greater satisfaction to the country than it can be done by the government. Now, I am well aware of the fact that the late Minister of Public Works did, with a great deal of eclat, construct and launch an enormous dredge in the city of Toronto. I believe it is called the 'J. Israel Tarte.'

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Not a bad name.

Mr. GERMAN. Not a bad name, a very good name. It cost an enormous amount of money. It can do a certain class of dredging work, but in soft material only, and when that class of work is exhausted the dredge will have to tie up, and will lay there as a white elephant on the hands of the government. The hon. gentleman says that the government has much better dredging plant than the contractors. I do not dispute that, because the government is in the dredging business. But I say the government, instead of going into the dredging business, should allow this work to be done by contract. They should follow in that respect the example of the United States government. If they would inquire

into this matter carefully they will find that in the United States the work in harbour improvements is done much cheaper than it is done in Canada by government labour. Now, I think that our whole system of letting work by contract in this country is wrong, our system of tender is wrong. It could all be changed with great advantage. But when the hon. gentleman says that the government can do this dredging work for from three to five cents a yard, while the contractors get from twenty-three and twenty-five to fifty cents a yard for the same class of work, I differ with him, because he is entirely mistaken. He says that the work which that large dredge, the 'J. Israel Tarte,' is doing, is being done for three or four cents a yard. I doubt its being done at that figure, and I venture to say that any firm of contractors would take that work and do it cheaper than the government is doing it. Dredging work is being done on the Welland canal to-day for less than one-half of fifty cents a yard, and it is a very expensive class of work. It is being done for twenty-three cents a yard. But that is just taking two feet off the bottom of the canal, a skimming process, which is exceedingly expensive. But when contractors get into a class of dredging where they can get, in contractors' parlance, a face for the dredge to work on, ten cents a yard is not a high figure, with any kind of a good dredge. Eight, ten or twelve cents a yard is a good figure, and even less in a certain class of work. I still assert that the government would do well to consider carefully whether they should not go out of the dredging business and get their work done under a different system altogether. Then we would get rid of having every year $30,000 to $50,000 to quarrel over in this parliament for repairs to these old dredges; because they will all be old shortly, and it costs an enormous amount of money to keep dredging plant in repair. Every winter contractors have to spend a considerable amount of money in repairs to their plant. It is a difficult plant to keep in repair, and parliament will have to spend a great deal of money year after year for the repair of their dredges. Dredges are continually getting old, and as they get old it costs more to keep them in repair. I say again that I believe it would be well for the government to consider whether they should not do away with the whole system of doing this class of work by government dredges.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When I spoke of that figure of three or four cents a yard, I did not refer to the dredge which, unfortunately it seems, bears my name. That dredge, I believe, will do work for less than one cent a yard, but the elevator dredges that are doing work on the St. Lawrence cost three, or four, or five cents a yard. There is no contractor in this country to-day who has dredges that can do work for the same price. I know what dredges are available, I know the kind of work which is being done on the Welland canal. If one of our dredges was there, it would not cost twenty-three cents a yard. The contractor who has that work must make large profits indeed. I know what dredging costs, I have inquired into it carefully, and I say without hesitation that the dredging work carried out by the Department of Public Works costs a great deal less than any dredging done by any other department here. Let us compare notes at the next meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. I make bold to say that the dredging done by the Department of Public Works under the control of the head of that department, though it may cost three, or four, or five cents a yard; you will find by comparison that it will cost twenty to twenty-five cents a yard, the same kind of work, when done under the system my hon. friend advocates. The contractors are realizing large profits indeed out of this business. Let the House understand me well, it is the best business that the contractors have on hand. I know what I am saying, I have gone carefully into the figures. I know that the contractors are all anxious to see the Public Works Department dispense with their dredging plant. There is no jobbing, and no profit to be made out of a government dredge that is being worked by the department. The contractors are perfectly right in desiring to get the contracts. They are not in the business for love. But I strongly protest against the idea of dismantling those splendid modern dredges that have been built during the last five or six years, dredges that will do work three or four times cheaper than any contractor has done so far.

Mr. SPROULE. It has not been the experience in our part of the country at least that contractors will do dredging cheaper than the government. For many years we have made it a point, when an item is put in the estimates for dredging harbours in our part of the country, to endeavour to get government dredges, because government dredges will do twice as much work for the same money as contractors will, and do it much more satisfactorily. No contractor will pretend to dredge for less than eight or ten cents a yard, and it is a fact that the government dredges have taken it out time after time for five cents a yard. Then there is this in favour of a government dredge: When a government dredge is put into a harbour it will take out the material whether it is hard or soft. When a contractor does the dredging and is paid so much a yard, the dredge goes into a locality where the material is soft, and he will take it away down very much deeper than is necessary, because he is paid for it by the yard and he is getting out

so many yards. Then when he comes into a hard place he will skip over it, and you will find that the bottom of the harbour is very uneven after the work is done. That has been the experience in our country over and over again. For these reasons I know that when an appropriation is made for dredging, an effort is always made to get a government dredge if possible.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I should be glad indeed if one or two of these old dredges that our hon. friend wishes to see condemned, were sent down to Nova Scotia, where we have been suffering for years for the want of dredging. I think it is over two years since this modern dredge was promised to us, and apparently it will be two years more before it is given to us. Now, after that dredge is completed, I am not so sure that it will be a success in some places in Nova Scotia. It will succeed well where there is a sandy or muddy bottom, but when you get hard and rough work it will be found that the spoon dredges are the only dredges that will be successful. But we will leave that alone and we will plead with the hon. Minister of Public Works just now to send a couple of those old dredges down to Nova Scotia, where we are suffering for the want of them. Money has been voted for dredging in the county of Lunenburg year after year, but there is no dredge to do the work. There is no part in the Dominion that is suffering so much to-day from the want of dredges as the province of Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And there are not dredges enough to do the work elsewhere.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) has raised a very important question that requires the very serious consideration of this committee. I find that in the various parts of the Dominion the work that seems to be most necessary and urgent is dredging in the harbours and ports. I have to some extent been looking into the matter and I find that we are in this position in Canada, notwithstanding what my hon. friend says about it being a profitable business, that we can hardly get a contractor to undertake dredging work for us. Some dredge owners have notified us that unless we pay higher prices, owing to the increase in wages and the cost of living, they will go to the United States where they say they can get plenty of work at higher prices. If we are going to do the urgent work that is required in some parts of Ontario and elsewhere in the Dominion we will have to pay higher prices this year than we have been paying in the past. It may be that some of these dredge owners have lost money. If any hon. gentleman states that dredging can be done at so much a yard, unless he is referring to some particular location, and to some particular kind of material, his statement is likely to be very misleading. A man may have a contract at sixty cents a yard and lose money on it, while, if the work is to be performed at another place, he may make money at ten cents a yard. It is no criterion to go on to say that dredging can be done at so much a yard unless we know the conditions. I may say that in almost every case, unless we are prepared to give an increase in price to the contractors, we cannot get them to enter into a contract at all. We prefer to give the work to such dredges as we have in Canada but the work is so pressing in some of our more or less national ports that unless we bring in dredges from the other side we will be unable to meet the demands of the country. If we do so, we must pay the same rates as they are able to get there. We have not been able to get any offers this season from dredges on the other side. The report of the department shows that for a dredge of 500 yards or 600 yards capacity per day, we have been in the habit of paying, in past years, under certain conditions, $8 per hour, or $80 per day. There are very few places now where we can get dredges of that capacity for less than $10 per hour, and for much larger dredges we have to pay as high as $12 and $13 per hour. The dredges, it is true, that we have, are somewhat old, but I am told by the chief engineer of the department that the average is about $35 per day for the size of a plant of a capacity of 500 yards or 600 yards per day. That is a matter that has to be looked into most carefully. I am not prepared to say offhand whether it is cheaper to have dredges under the control of the department or whether it would be better to let all the work by contract. At the present time we cannot get anything like the amount of work that is urgently required to be done taken by contract at all. We are applying to the owners of plants on the other side of the line to see if we cannot reach some of the most urgent cases. The information of the department is in contradiction of my hon. friend from Welland, because the figures show that dredges of the same capacity are averaging about $35 per day. The most urgent work from one end of the Dominion to the other that I know of in the way of public works is the dredging which is required to be done, and I think every dollar we vote ought to be expended to the best possible advantage according to our best information. At the same time I think we would make a great mistake if we hesitated to vote a reasonable amount of money to make the necessary improvements to our ports and harbours.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did I understand the hon. minister to say that the cost of dredges ran as high as $35 per day ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Small dredges.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer says that the average

cost of the dredges of the class that we are now referring to that will be repaired by this vote is $35 per day.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is that a dredge of 500 yards capacity, and does it include attendance, scows, and tugs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That includes everything.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the fact that a dredge is very badly needed to improve the navigation of the lower St. Lawrence from Quebec down. On several occasions the corporation of pilots and the harbour commissioners of Quebec have applied to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to have a certain point of the lower St. Lawrence called Chenal Beaujeu, below Crane island, widened and deepened. There is a pass at that point where at low tide steamers have only twenty-five feet of water, and in cases where they require from twenty-seven to thirty feet of water they are delayed from two to three hours. In every case where a request has been made to have this work done the explanation has been given that the Department of Public Works had no dredges for the work for that particular point, but that all the dredges were occupied between Quebec and Montreal dredging the river. The work to which I refer has not been done and the condition of the river at this point is a great impediment to navigation. The pass is a rather narrow one, being about 800 feet in width and it is curved so that not only has the river at this particular point to be deepened but it has to be widened and straightened. There are also several sand banks formed at a certain distance from the several wharfs which the government own on both sides of the St. Lawrence from Quebec down to Rivière du Loup. The shore ice in the spring of the year will lift large boulders from the two shores of the St. Lawrence and they will be carried down by the stream, the ice will dissolve by the action of the water and by the rising of the temperature and these boulders will be deposited wherever the ice happens to break up. In several instances these sand bars and rock obstructions are formed by the ice dissolving near these wharfs. I know several localities which have applied for relief. In these localities, some thirty or forty years ago, we had at the end of our wharfs, six, eight or ten feet of water while now we have only three, four or five feet of water. I have on previous occasions drawn the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this matter and I know it is no fault of his that it has not been done before this. I believe it would meet with the endorsation of the House and the country if money were appropriated to improve the lower portion of the St. Lawrence, which, after all is the most important part of that navigation. You talk about dredging the channel between Quebec and Montreal, but to my mind it is a secondary consideration, because all the steamers that go to Montreal have to pass by Quebec, and the port of Quebec is the only port where you have a great depth of water on each side without any dredging being necessary. I appeal to the Minister of Public Works to ask parliament for a certain sum of money in order that we may have a dredge for the lower St. Lawrence. We are told now that the dredges are all occupied between Quebec and Montreal, but we are urgently in need of relief in that part of the St. Lawrence to which I refer. I urge the minister as strongly as I can, to look into this matter carefully and to give prompt relief to the situation.

Mr. McLENNAN. I desire to direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact, that the county of Inverness, which I have the honour to represent has within its confines three large coal mines now in course of development. One of these is owned by the well known firm of Mackenzie & Mann, and with the assistance of the Dominion and provincial governments and the municipality of Inverness, they have been able to build a railway to facilitate the shipment of their coal. The other two companies are not so fortunate. They are depending on the natural harbours in their vicinity, but their shipping trade is hampered because of the want of a dredge to deepen these harbours. Both American and Canadian capitalists are interested in these mines, and a greater depth of water in two of these harbours is absolutely necessary to the successful pursuit of their undertaking. From this time out it will be absolutely futile for these gentlemen to develop their mines further, unless some assurance is given them by the government that dredges will be sent to work in these harbours. The remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) remind me that the coal mines of the county of Inverness are the nearest coal areas to the St. Lawrence. A reference to the map will show that the western coast of Inverness is right opposite the mouth of the St. Lawrence across the gulf. That being so the greater is the pity that accommodation is not afforded to these enterprising people who have taken hold of these mines to take advantage of their geographical position. I have every hope that the Minister of Public Works will see to it that the development of these valuable properties will not be impeded for want of dredging in those harbours. A dredge was employed there before, and I trust that that dredge will be sent back to complete the work so vigorously begun. I leave the matter entirely in the hands of the minister, feeling confident that he will do justice to that important part of the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I wish to say in reply to my hon. friend

from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) that I fully recognize the importance of the matter which he has brought to the attention of the House. In view of the great necessity and urgency there is for dredging below the city of Quebec, I cannot understand how it is that they have not had a better dredging plant there. I realize that nothing will so check the development of the resources of the country as lack of shipping facilities in the various harbours; and recognizing that, we have put a vote of $75,000 in the estimates to enable us to build or purchase a dredge to be used below Quebec. Now, as to the remarks of my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) I can assure him that with such plants as we have at our disposal, it is the intention to go on with that work to which he has referred.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The government works are now completed on the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Kingston, and there will be more or less dredging required there. Is it the intention of the government to put a dredge on that section ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have some dredges on that stretch of the river now, and wherever we can hire a dredge we are doing so to carry on some of the most urgent work. I think I have been able to hire a dredge in the last day or two to work in the hon. gentleman's constituency, so that ships may enter the harbour and go up to the wharf. There has been a great demand from merchants and shippers in that district, and I believe I have now been successful in meeting their wants.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In looking up what the government has been paying for some of these dredges, I fully agree what has been said, that it would be much cheaper and in the interests of the country, if the government had a good dredge of its own rather than to engage at exorbitant prices some of these small dredges that are practically worn out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid). The new dredge for use in Ontario will, I hope, be completed and be working during the next month or so.

Mr. LAW. I do not feel that I would be doing my duty to the constituency I have the honour to represent, if I did not avail myself of this opportunity to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the urgent necessity for dredging in the county of Yarmouth. Anybody who has visited the town from which I come, knows that we are handicapped to a very great extent in our harbour facilities. It is true that the government has favoured us with a dredge for two or three seasons, but the work is incomplete and consequently not much good has resulted from it. The government had plans made of the harbour a year or two ago, and if the government would give us for one other season such a dredge as the new one which is being built, I have no doubt that the plans made by the resident engineer could be fully carried out, and it would be a very great convenience for the county of Yarmouth. We are the stepping stone as it were between the United States and the maritime provinces. We have one or two boats a day coming in there from Boston, carrying a very large number of passengers who are distributed over all parts of Nova Scotia. Our harbour is nothing but a zig-zag channel, and it is almost impossible for steamers to get in or out during foggy weather or in the dark. While I am on my feet, I would like to say in reference to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. German) about the government selling its dredges and getting the work done by contract; that I do not agree with him at all. I cannot see why the government is not in a position to do the dredging as cheaply as any contractor can do it, and more cheaply. The dredges which contractors would buy and work would get old, just like the government dredges. I can only speak of the dredge 'Canada' which we had in Yarmouth for a few seasons. I doubt if any contractors on earth could do better work than was done by that dredge for her capacity. She worked late and early, and did good work. I hope parliament, instead of curtailing this vote, will see its way to vote larger sums for dredging throughout the whole country, especially in the maritime provinces. No money that parliament votes does more good than the money voted for dredging purposes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has just said that he cannot understand why no dredging plant has been used below Quebec. When he has been a little longer in the important position he occupies, he will understand readily. There is a high tide below Quebec which allows the largest ships to reach the inner St. Lawrence. When we took office, there was really not one dredge available for work done there. It was solid rock that had to be excavated.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Solid rock at Chenal Beaujeu ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. At Crane Island it is solid rock.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The department has heretofore represented differently, that it is sand.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No.

Mr. TALBOT. Have any soundings been taken by the Department of Public Works at Crane Island ? If soundings have been taken, the report must be that there are several feet of sand on the top of the rock.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. But there is solid rock at the bottom.

Mr. TALBOT. And that steamers are fairly ploughing their way through that mud at the risk of their boilers.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I quite agree that there is sand, and there is rock also. However, there were no dredges available, and that work could not be carried out just then; and there was not so much hurry for it because of the tide. I would have been only too glad, if it had been possible, to have that piece of work done, which, if I remember rightly, is only two or three thousand feet long; but the reports in the department were to the effect that the dredges that were available were not capable of carrying out that work. It is unfair to insinuate that I am to blame because that work has not been done.

Mr. TALBOT. I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Minister of Public Works said he could not understand why that work was not done before. The tide was there, and it is still there, and there was more pressing work to be attended to. If the House will allow me to give my candid advice as to what should be done, I will say this : We all admit that there is a large quantity of dredging necessary in all parts of this country. Business is developing; harbours and rivers urgently require dredging. If I were in the position my hon. friend occupies, I would not hesitate one minute to come before this parliament and ask for all the money necessary to build a proper plant to carry out that work. I quite grant that in some parts of the country it must be as well to hire dredges; but there is so much dredging to be done in all parts of Canada that for twenty-five years to come the largest fleet of dredges we can supply will be required. My hon. friend has only to look at the records of the Public Works Department to find thousands of requests from all parts of the country for dredging. We have to face the situation. We have been too cheese-paring in the past; we should have spent more money to improve our waterways. My frank advice to the government to-day is not to hesitate, but to go ahead. Parliament will not at all grumble at the demands which it may be necessary to make upon it for improving our waterways.

Mr. TURGEON. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the necessity of dredging along the north shore of the province of New Brunswick. The trade of that district has been very much hampered for the want of it. I may say that the harbour of Caraquet, the harbour of Shippegan and Little Shippegan, in fact, all the harbours of the counties of Restigouche, Kent, Northumberland, as well as in the county of Bonaventure in the province of Quebec, are in much need of dredging. The hon. Minister of Public Works has referred to the great appliances for dredging now used in different parts of the country; but if we have to wait until such appliances have completed their work in the large places, before they can come to the smaller harbours, our trade will have to take another direction. I know that the hon. minister is endeavouring to give every case his best attention. I called his attention yesterday to the necessity of doing some dredging in the harbour of Tracadie, where large lumbering interests are suffering. I hope he will be able to meet the necessities of these cases, on which I think reports were made by his own officials. A report was made in 1893, I believe, recommending some dredging in the harbour of Bathurst, one of the greatest in northern New Brunswick, and ever since we have been waiting from year to year for a dredge. I would ask the hon. minister to consider the suggestion that he should purchase at once either in Canada or in the United States a dredge for service on the north shore of New Brunswick, or in the Baie des Chaleurs. I believe we should have a dredge for that locality which could be moved from place to place according to the most urgent need. There is trade enough to be done on both sides of the Baie des Chaleurs to warrant such an expenditure, and I hope the suggestion will receive his best consideration.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It seems to me that this question has developed considerably. We started by discussing repairs generally, and we have had speeches from several hon. gentlemen, including the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Law), and the hon. member who has just taken his seat, asking for dredging to be done in their constituencies. We have an hon. gentleman who is interested in the policy of the Department of Public Works. I refer to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine). That hon. minister distinctly stated that it was the intention of the government to give the Department of Marine and Fisheries the work of improving our harbours and rivers. If that be the policy of the government—and that policy was solemnly stated during an election contest—we ought to have the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries here to give his views as to what will be done in the future regarding the various matters brought up in this debate. No doubt the Minister of Public Works is giving all the information he can, but, under the circumstances, he is not in a position to formulate before this House the policy which the government intends to pursue in the future with regard to the different works which hon. gentlemen opposite have pressed on the government to-night. We should have the hon. Minister of Marine here to tell us what will be his policy in these matters, when he takes over into his department that branch of the Public Works Department which deals with our harbours

and our rivers. We should have a definite policy laid down by the minister who is to be responsible.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A definite policy about what? Is it about repairing dredges, or what else?

Mr. CASGRAIN. As I have said, the question has drifted far away from the repairs of dredges. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been permitted to go into other questions.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the hon. gentleman speaks about a policy, it is only fair that he should say upon what matters he wants a policy pronounced.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We have had the hon. members for Yarmouth, Inverness and Bellechasse urging their views, and we ought to have some definite announcement as to what is the general policy of the government on the matters brought up by these hon. gentlemen, and in order to have an authoritative statement of that policy we should have here the hon. minister who, according to the declaration made by him at his election, is very shortly to run that branch of public works which has to do with harbours and rivers.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Is it possible to very much improve on the advanced policy inaugurated in 1896 and carried on up to last year?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have not any opinion to express on that point. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) no doubt did a great deal to advance the policy which the late government had begun. But I would like to know whether there is to be a change in that policy, or whether it is to be followed out?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It seems to me that the answer I gave my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) was plain, frank, clear and distinct, when I said that I had already placed in the estimates appropriations to provide dredges for the important works which he and others have represented as so much required below the city of Quebec. As long as I occupy the position, I shall be responsible for the policy of the department and be prepared to declare it as soon as I have received the sanction of my right hon. friend the Premier and my colleagues. I agree that my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works appreciated much more than some others the requirements of the country, and very much more than those who preceded him. I trust that we all recognize the great necessity for the improvements started in 1896, and I have no doubt that the policy then begun will be continued even to a greater extent.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I trust that my hon. friend will go ahead quicker even than I endeavoured to do. If he does, he will get my cordial support. I did the best I could and the Department of Public Works did the best it could. I should be very sorry indeed if that department were dismantled, as seems to be announced. The department is a unit to-day. It is organized on a solid basis. Its officers work together. They are proud of their work. As a French Canadian, let me say that the Department of Public Works has been largely manned by men of my race. I should be very sorry if that department, which is the only one where French influence has a good deal of weight, were dismantled, and I would appeal from such a decision to the larger tribunal of this country. I hope such will not be the case. The announcement has not been formally and clearly made. The Department of Public Works has done splendid work during the past few years. All the officers have given their best energies to the work. It has been said that we have drifted a little far from the $30,000 for repairs to dredges, but perhaps I may be allowed to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works whether he has taken into consideration the report made to him with reference to the dredging of the north channel below Quebec, and whether any decision has been arrived at?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not had an opportunity of considering that report yet.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is one of the reasons also why the other channel has not been dredged so far. The two departments of Marine and Public Works have been discussing whether it is better or not to improve the north or south channel. That is one additional reason why the improvement of the south channel has not been made. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has said, in discussing the item which is under debate, that he fears that he will be obliged to pay more this season for dredging work. I would like very much to know in what parts of the country and on what works he expects to be obliged to pay more?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was referring more particularly to the arrangements we are trying to make for dredging on Lake Huron and Lake Superior.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. These are very broad limits.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, it is a very broad question.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. But my hon. friend knows the works on which he expects to spend money. He says that he expects to be obliged to pay more for dredging in certain places. Surely it is a fair question to ask him what these works are. I do not mean to embarrass him——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not feel at all embarrassed. I said the hon. gentleman's question was a general

one, and I thought it called for a general answer. I thought the answer I gave him would indicate to one familiar with the work, as he is, the points I wished to refer to. But if he wishes the details, I may say that on the Kaministiquia river we have been paying fifteen cents a yard. The owners of dredges there decline to work any more at that figure. At Point Edward, Sarnia, where the great transportation companies of the country are urging us to carry on dredging so that the vessels may approach the wharfs, and not be obliged to do business through American ports, we have to pay from $1 to $3 an hour more. We have no option, for there are no dredges offering. We have advertised and communicated with different parties and are doing our best to make an arrangement at the lowest possible price. I think it was in answer to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) that I said we might have to pay higher prices. We have to take into consideration the question of departing from the policy of maintaining our own dredges. It is a serious question, and the mere statement on the part of anybody that it costs more will not be sufficient. It will have to be decided by a careful calculation based upon the actual figures.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If the hon. minister has the information at hand, I would very much like to know how much dredging he will do at Point Edward ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The appropriation for the current year is $10,000. But I do not think it will complete the work. The main estimates now under consideration, contain amounts that, with few exceptions, are for works that have been undertaken and are in progress. When we are discussing new works, I shall be able to give further information. The chief engineer advises me, that, with the amount of money we have we shall make a fairly good approach to the wharf, so that the trade will not be stopped at that port.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is a very important work.

Mr. CLARKE. How much does the hon. minister expect to have to pay for dredging at Fort William ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The material to be removed there varies very much. We have rock, hard-pan, boulders mixed with sand—a great variety of material. As has been explained, it makes a great difference whether a dredge has work to do that allows it to stay in one place and go deep, or whether it can skim along and take off only a few feet. Also, the distance to which the material has to be removed is a factor in the calculation. We have been asked as high as twenty-five cents a yard in that section.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the hon. minister going to pay twenty-five cents a yard ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not if we can help it. That is a serious question that has to be considered. The government is like a merchant or anybody else, it must simply make the best arrangement it can. We are negotiating now, trying to get the best prices possible. If we cannot get the work done at the price we want to pay, then it becomes a question of paying the price demanded of us or stopping the work.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope the hon. minister will be able to give us further information with regard to the work at Port Arthur. I was there last fall, and I know that the people are very anxious to have the work gone on with. I believe it is a work of very great importance, for Port Arthur and Fort William are ports that are increasing in importance every day. We are indebted to the minister for the information he has given us, and apparently given us under great difficulties in view of the fact—as it appears to be from what has been said by the hon. ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that this important department is to be disorganized. We are also indebted to the hon. ex-minister for the valuable information he has given us. I agree with that hon. gentleman that the policy of the department ought to be to construct first-class modern dredges, and carry on the work as a government work. The hon. minister says that the cost of operating one of these dredges, with a capacity of six or seven hundred yards, including tugs and scows, is about $35 a day. If the hon. gentleman's statements are correct, and contractors are not satisfied with $8 an hour or $80 a day, I think he should take a larger appropriation for the purpose of constructing government dredges, for it is evident that it will pay to have new dredges. It is better to spend money in building modern dredges than to pay $8 or $10 an hour for dredges of no greater capacity than 600 yards a day. But would not the ex-minister be a little more explicit ? He has warned the committee that there is some scheme on foot to dismantle or disorganize the department. If the department is well equipped—and I understand that it is—it would be a national misfortune to have it destroyed. If it is the policy of the government to give up this national workshop at Sorel, and give over the work to contractors, we should be informed of it. It is of great importance to us that we should know what the hon. gentleman means by the warning he has given us. Would not the minister (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) frankly give us the information?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What information does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) refer to ?

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman's predecessor in office has twice drawn attention to the fact that there is a scheme on foot to dismantle this department, to disfigure it, to render it less efficient than it is, to discontinue the policy which has been followed for the past five or six years, and which has been attended with such gratifying results. If there is anything in that statement I think we are entitled to know it before we vote any more money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give information on a subject of which I know nothing. I think I have answered every question the hon. gentleman has put me frankly and courteously. If the hon. gentleman knows of any scheme, it is for him to answer and not for me.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am ready to answer it. We have read a lot of electoral speeches and newspaper articles to the effect that the dredging branch of the Department of Public Works and the harbour improvements are to be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. But as the government has not yet proposed any such change to the House, I do not think this is the time to discuss it. The hon. gentleman is quite right in asking for information. But as the Prime Minister is not here, I suppose nobody will answer it in his place. While I am on my feet, I will take the opportunity of advising my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to be very careful indeed in the work to be carried out at Port Arthur and Fort William. Perhaps he has not yet had time to look carefully into that important question. Fort William and Port Arthur are the centres of the trade between the west and the east. We should provide those two harbours with every possible improvement. There has been some work done in the past, but a good deal more requires to be done in the future. I think my hon. friend would do well not to make any bargain that would bind him to do that work piecemeal. The Mission river should be dredged, deepened and widened. Before I left office I instructed one of the ablest officers of the department, Mr. Coste, to make a report of the whole situation. I have been there myself and have inspected all these points, which are of great importance indeed. Let us make Port Arthur and Fort William the rivals of Duluth. Duluth is but a comparatively short distance from these centres of Canadian trade. Fort William and Port Arthur are outlets to our grea North-west, and they should therefore be equipped in a proper way. This is not the time perhaps to discuss that question, but I thought it was well for me to ask my hon. friend not to give any contracts now before looking carefully into the situation and coming before us with a complete plan. I thought last year we had about completed all the necessary works in the Kaministiquia river. There was not much left to be done.

Mr. CLARKE. Some dredging to be done near the mouth, I think.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is always dredging to be done if you want to do it. But a general plan should now be adopted and carried out.

Mr. BRUCE. I beg to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that there is nothing in the estimates for the port of Hamilton. I notice that there are applications for all the little fishing villages along the coast of the St. Lawrence, but there is nothing in the estimates for the great port of Hamilton, a port large enough to float the whole British fleet. Looking over the Public Accounts, I notice that $40,000 was expended last year on a little ditch leading through the shallows into Toronto, but not a dollar for Hamilton. I trust the Minister of Public Works will not forget Hamilton when he comes to disperse his $13,000,000 of a surplus.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of Public Works referred to Point Edward in Sarnia as if he intended to do some dredging there. I might ask him what he intends doing at Port Stanley ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have completed arrangements to have a dredge at Port Stanley very early during the season. Probably it will be necessary to go more fully into that matter when the supplementary estimates are brought down.

Mr. INGRAM. I was not in when the item was first read, and do not know what explanations the minister gave. May I ask him how many dredges there are in Manitoba now, and if the 'Sir Hector' is one of them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe one of the tugs in connection with the dredge there is named 'Sir Hector.'

Mr. INGRAM. Is the dredge you have out there an old one or a new one ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One is an old dredge and one is comparatively new.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year the department was doing some repairs on the old dredge. I would like to know whether the repairs are completed, and if they are, will that complete all the repairs ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I want to say a word to the committee at this stage. I allowed a wide latitude to the discussion of this first item so as to give the members of the committee an opportunity of expressing themselves on the general question of dredging, but they are now leaving that and taking up some items which are immediately below, which they can discuss when they reach them. I now desire to inform the committee that having given them such wide latitude in discussing the question of dredg-

ing, when I call the next items I expect a relevancy of discussion on each of them. Now, in order to give the hon. member for West Elgin an opportunity of speaking, we will call the second item, which has reference to the Manitoba dredge.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We have not called that yet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No, but it is not in order to discuss the general dredge question on the item of the Manitoba dredge.

Mr. INGRAM. Very well, I will put myself in order by asking about the first item. What about the vessels comprising this item of $30,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have explained at considerable length this item of $30,000. But as the hon. gentleman may not have been in, I will explain it again. This is to provide for defraying the expense of urgent and general repairs to the hulls and machinery of the dredges, tugs, scows and barges, which are the property of the government, in the different provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). We have wandered considerably from the matter that is before the committee, but there is one question which I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works, and that is if the government own any dredge of sufficient capacity to dredge out the present administration ?

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Chairman, you have been good enough to allow me the same latitude as you have allowed other hon. gentlemen before me. I would like to refer to a question which was asked the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) last week, and to the answer that he was supposed to give us before this. Last week a question was asked in regard to the division of the Public Works Department and the right hon. First Minister promised to bring an answer down last Monday, but the answer has not yet been given to the House. I think it is quite important that we should know something about that subject, that we should know whether the department is going to be dismantled or not. Several days have elapsed since last Monday and I will say——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I decided upon this matter the other night that the question of the policy of the government in dividing the various duties in connection with the Public Works Department and the Department of Marine and Fisheries was not a question that was referred to the Committee of the Whole and that it was wholly and entirely irrelevant to the discussion of the questions that were placed before us for consideration. Having looked into that matter more carefully since I gave that decision the other night, I must inform the committee that if they want to find out the policy of the government they must find it out in the House when the Orders of the Day are called. Any hon. member can ask the government to explain their policy in regard to this matter, but it is a question, in my opinion, that we cannot take up and discuss in committee. It is out of order. It is irrelevant.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Chairman, of course I bow to your ruling, but I think we can get over that difficulty. I am going to move that the committee rise and report progress. I think we should not pass any more of these items before we know what is the policy of the government upon this question. It is an important question. It is perfectly well understood in this House and understood by the country that an announcement in regard to it has been made in the speech from the Throne. In the speech from the Throne I find this :

> Bills with respect to the creation of a railway commission, the amendment of the patent laws, the militia Act, Chinese immigration, the reorganization of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the settlement of railway labour disputes and various other subjects will be submitted to you.

Here we are far advanced in the session, probably not so near the end of the session as some hon. gentlemen may desire, but fairly well advanced in the work of the session, and we have not had any intimation from the government yet as to what is the policy of the government in regard to what my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) called the dismantling of the Public Works Department. Here we are asked to vote large sums of money in connection with public works that, if report is true, will be spent next year not by the Department of Public Works, but by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It is in the remembrance of every hon. member of this House that when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries went before his constituents, one of the excuses which he gave why he accepted the Department of Marine and Fisheries and why he did not insist upon having the Department of Public Works which my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Mary's, had just left, was that he was to get one of the most important portions of the Department of Public Works transferred to his own department; that is the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It was laid down then by the government candidate, not only by the government candidate, but by a minister, speaking, I take it, for the ministry itself, that this part of the Public Works Department which deals with the question of transportation, the most important question now before the country, the question of improving the harbours and rivers in this country, was to be transferred to his department. That was the language which was used in regard to

the policy of the government by the hon. minister who then went before his constituents, that was the reason which he gave to his constituents for not insisting upon the right he had of succeeding the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, in the Department of Public Works. Now, as I said before, we are asked to vote large sums of money for the Department of Public Works, which, in all probability, if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was telling the truth, which I do not doubt for one instant, will be spent by him, will be spent by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and which will not be under the control of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. I know my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works means well, I know he is doing everything he can to give all the information in his possession to this committee, but I say that if he is to be succeeded in a short time, or at the end of this session, in a part of his department by the hon. gentleman who is now at the head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, he cannot really tell this committee what will be the policy of the department when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries takes that part of his department over. Therefore, it seems to me that it is a most important question that we should have solved at this moment and before we go any further in voting money, before we put into the hands of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, any more money, before we give him the spending of any more funds, we should have the policy stated which is to be carried out by his successor in regard to that important part of the public works of Canada. What is his successor going to do ? Can my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works give us what is going to be, as the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, put it, the ensemble of the policy of the Department of Public Works ? How does my hon. friend know that if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries becomes vested with this part of the department he will follow out the policy which the hon. Minister of Public Works is laying down to the committee now ? How can my hon. friend say that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not follow the policy which was propounded to this House by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), that he will not tie up all these dredges which have cost such a large amount of money and will not employ contractors to do the dredging ? Can my hon. friend say that this will not be the policy of his successor ? Probably his successor will be appointed at the end of this session, if the rumour which is now current turns out to be true. I think that we should get the unanimous support of this committee in not voting any more money, in not putting any more funds into the hands of the hon. Minister of Public Works until the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is here to tell us if he is going to follow the policy which is laid down by my hon. friend. But, the principal question and the question which we must insist upon having an answer to now, is : What is the policy of the government in reference to the Public Works Department ? Is it true that the Public Works Department is to be divided into two, is it true that this most important part of the Public Works Department; that is, the administration of the questions which we have been discussing here to-night and the spending of this money which we are asked to vote to-night, is to be left in the hands of my hon. friend, or is to be transferred to the hands of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries ? Is it true that the Department of Public Works, which, since confederation, I believe, has been what it is to-day, is to be dismantled, to use the term employed by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, or is it to remain as it is to-day ? In other words, are the pledges which were given to the electors of Maisonneuve to be carried out ? Are the promises which were given to the electors of Maisonneuve to be realized by the government ? Is that the policy of the government, or is the Department of Public Works to remain as it is with my hon. friend, who so worthily fills the chair ? Is it to remain in his hands, or are we to have it divided and this part given over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries ? Even the supporters of the government should insist upon a categorical answer being given, before we vote any more money to this department.

Mr. INGRAM. This is a very serious matter. We find that a minister differs from his colleagues and he is obliged to leave them. What follows ? A number of gentlemen come here to Ottawa to urge the appointment of a successor to that minister, and finally Mr. Préfontaine is selected. But instead of getting the Department of Public Works he was trusted with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and he returns to Quebec and holds out the hope to his electors that the departments will be divided, and that he will administer the Department of Marine and Fisheries as well as a large portion of the Public Works Department. I would like to point out to the Minister of Marine——

An hon. MEMBER. He is not here.

Mr. INGRAM. He is not here and is hardly ever here. I want to point out that while the province of Quebec administered the Department of Public Works—and probably it was right that a minister from that province should preside over that department—yet now that the department is put in charge of a representative of the province of Ontario it will be a reflection on the largest province of the Dominion to have that department cut in two. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) who is

now the minister discharges the duties of his position with credit to himself and the country in view of the short period he has been in office, and it would be a reflection on the province of Ontario to denude him of any portion of his functions. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) no doubt took part in preparing the announcement in the speech from the Throne, that there would be a reorganization of this department. He was bold to take upon himself to declare in the province of Quebec that the department would be divided and to circulate his declaration in the press, but when he sat in this House a few nights ago he was not so bold. He was not—may I say, man enough—to get up and say whether the statement he made in Maisonneuve was true or not true. We found the other evening that the gentleman who is now leading the House (Hon. Mr. Fielding) was afraid to trust his friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) who had been too glib on many other occasions, to reply to the question put to him, and so he endeavoured to protect the baby Minister of Marine and Fisheries—I mean baby in the sense that he is the younger member of the cabinet. Then, when the attention of the Prime Minister was drawn to this matter, in order to relieve the tension, he promised that he would announce the policy of the government on this question in a day or two, but we have waited for many days and no announcement has been made. In view of the announcement in the speech from the Throne; in view of the statement made in this House a few days ago, we want to know now what the policy of the government is before we vote any more money. I warn the government that it will be a very dangerous thing for them if they attempt to divide that department. If the present minister (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is not administering his department well, then the honourable thing to do is to ask him for his resignation, but do not cast a reflection on the province of Ontario by saying in effect that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is not capable of administering the Department of Public Works. If I were to believe all that I have read in the Montreal 'Herald,' and all that I have read in the Montreal 'Witness' with respect to the conduct of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) when he filled an important office in the city of Montreal; if I were to believe all the statements that have come from his own political friends, then I would hesitate much to see a change made in the Department of Public Works, which is one of the great spending departments in this Dominion. I warn the government that in the province of Ontario, and I have no doubt in the other provinces as well, there will be a strong feeling of resentment at such a change taking place. I trust that if the government have any idea of making this change, they will at once change that idea, because I can assure them that this country will not tolerate a change of that character.

Mr. INGRAM.

Mr. CLANCY. The ministers cannot afford to sit there in complacent silence and take no notice of what has been said from this side of the House. I ask the leader of the House if it is not fair play that we should now know what the proposed reorganization of the Department of Marine and Fisheries is to be. It was announced in the speech from the Throne, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries no doubt sat at the Council Table when that announcement was prepared. Knowing what the mind of the government was before that, he went to his constituents and made the announcement in more detail, and now the leader of the House is in all justice bound to tell us what is the intention of the government with regard to this matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no wish to be discourteous, but I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) has overlooked the fact that the question was asked some days ago, and that all the information that it was proper to give to this question was then politely given. Life is too short to have these things repeated every day.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has with politeness and splendid indefiniteness answered my question. Let me remind him, however, that when questions are not answered they can be asked again. We will take care to remind the hon. gentleman that the question is not properly answered. Does he mean to say that when a policy is announced in the speech from the Throne, it becomes a state secret. Does he think that this is not a proper thing for the country to know, especially when we are voting money for this department, what are the details of a change of such importance. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is dealing with the House as candidly and frankly as he ought to on a question of this kind? When he says that life is too short to answer, he is not quite courteous, implying that it was not a proper question to ask. That is not the way to dispose of the matter, because it is a question on which the House has a right to have information when we are proposing to vote money for the services of the country. I would be the last to press for information on an important question of policy that had not been matured; but this matter has been thought out, and now the hon. gentleman says life is too short to answer the question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Life is too short to keep on answering it.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the hon. gentleman ever answer it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the answer?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps my hon. friend was not here. The answer was that when any Bill for a change in any of the departments was presented, the House would be fully advised of its object and purpose.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows that we have not to depend on the courtesy of the hon. gentleman leading the House when a subject takes the shape of a Bill, because it is public property.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend knows, he need not ask.

Mr. CLANCY. It is because I do not know that I ask. For the hon. gentleman to say that the information will come with a Bill is not an answer. The hon. gentleman knows that the First Minister thought the matter of sufficient importance only a day or two ago, to say that he would put the House in possession of the information in the early part of this week. We have reached past the middle of the week, and I think the hon. gentleman ought to say that he will give the House the information, as promised by the First Minister.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In view of the announcement in the speech from the Throne, that this department was to be reorganized. I think it most unfair that these estimates should have been placed before this committee first; and also, in view of the fact that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries absents himself from this House while these estimates are being passed, and when he could have stated his policy in case he should have the spending of the money. Under these circumstances, and as there is no doubt of the reorganization of this department taking place during the present session, I think these estimates should be allowed to stand, until this reorganization takes place. I therefore now beg leave to move——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I wish to suggest, then, that these estimates stand until the reorganization is announced to this House.

Mr. McCREARY. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is about time this wrangling were at an end. We sit here night after night endeavouring to pass estimates, and we have not yet got half through with the estimates of one department. I think that if some of these gentlemen lived three or four thousand miles away from here, they would not be so much disposed to waste the time of the House. The hon. member for East Elgin said that it was a serious matter whether this money was expended by the Minister of Public Works or by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It may be a serious matter, from a party point of view, but I submit that not one per cent of the people of Canada care which department spends the money, so long as it is spent properly and well. I see three or four officials here, who have been coming here for several nights, while these estimates have been before the House. How long is this thing to go on? It is a crying shame that the money of the people of Canada should be wasted in this manner. If there is anything in these items which hon. gentlemen opposite object to, it is their duty to move that it be struck out; but they are afraid to do that, because it might affect some of their friends. If this thing is to go on we should meet here on Monday morning at nine o'clock, and sit right on doing business till Saturday night. I thank God the time is coming when the dog will wag the tail instead of the tail wagging the dog—when the western members will make these members come here and stay here. It may not be at the end of this census, but it will be at the end of the next census. We had three or four weeks of oratorical fireworks over the budget, during which we had a rehash of speeches that are gray with age—yes, some of them are bald-headed, and with whiskers on them. If you look at 'Hansard,' you will find some of these same speeches were made twenty-five years ago. I trust that the men who are objecting to these estimates will seriously consider the losses that many western business men have to suffer in coming here. It is no wonder that it is hard to get men in British Columbia or the North-west Territories to come down here. If they could get through in two or three months, they would not mind; but, very few can afford to be away from their homes half the summer. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to take these things into their consideration.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not one of those who take up the time of the House speaking on the budget. I have not spoken on the budget since I have been in the House. I have my own reasons for that. I think a good many government supporters wish to have an opportunity of speaking, and that is a good time for them to do so. I think the hon. gentleman has not seriously considered this question, or he would not have spoken in the manner he has done. We find a minister leaving the city of Ottawa and going to the province of Quebec and giving the public information which has been refused to the members of this House. Is that a proper position in which to place the members of this House. If the hon. gentleman, when he made that statement in Quebec, made an incorrect statement he should be manly enough to get up here and deny it.

An hon. MEMBER. What was the statement?

Mr. INGRAM. That the Department of Public Works was to be divided and that

he was to administer a portion of that department in addition to his own. That declaration the hon. Minister of Marine has not contradicted in this House. He was accompanied by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) and North Ontario (Mr. Grant) to the city of Hamilton, and if we cannot get the information we desire from the hon. Minister of Finance, perhaps these hon. gentlemen, who had the confidence no doubt of the Minister of Marine at Hamilton, may be able to enlighten the House. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) is not open to the charge of criticising the items of the expenditure. If we were to depend on the government supporters for criticisms of these items, there would be no check on the expenditure at all. We are therefore within our rights when we ask for information on these important items, and in doing so we are not asking any favour from our hon. friends opposite. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very apt during elections to accuse the opposition of not having moved to strike out certain items of expenditure. But do they forget that during the eighteen years they were in opposition, and when they were given credit in the press to some extent for the manner in which they discussed the estimates, out of over $600,000,000 asked by Conservative administrations, only a trifle of that total was objected to by the then opposition. It is not the duty of an opposition to simply object to an item and then call for a division. You cannot point to any opposition in any enlightened country which follows that course. If we were to do that, we would be here from January to December. It is not our policy, nor is it our duty to place ourselves on record, by calling for a vote on every particular item. We recognize that the hon. Minister of Public Works has not been long in the position, and are therefore not harrassing him with all kinds of serious questions. We could ask him very important and serious questions, but as he is a new minister in that department, it would be unreasonable to expect him to answer serious questions in connection with items with which he cannot possibly be acquainted. Therefore our courtesy to that hon. gentleman has been such, that we even find government supporters finding fault with us for the mildness of the criticisms we offer from time to time on the expenditure of his department. The opposition are entitled to ask any questions they chose with reference to the estimates, and we propose to exercise that right. Whether our criticisms be mild or severe it is for us to consider. We are not here by reason of the good graces of hon. members opposite, but are here because we have secured the votes of the people in our respective constituencies and have won our elections in an honourable manner and are proud of it. I am very glad that these remarks are so highly applauded and that hon. gentlemen on both sides appreciate that fact. I would wish very much that hon. gentlemen opposite could make the same statement.

An hon. MEMBER. What about Gamey?

Mr. INGRAM. I am very glad to have that interruption. Sir, if the gentlemen who who have sworn against Mr. Gamey, if I may put it in that way—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. INGRAM. I am quite in order. If the gentlemen who have sworn against Mr. Gamey have sworn quite truthfully, there is one thing I can congratulate Mr. Gamey on, and that is that the money deposited in court and before the commission, if the statement of these hon. gentlemen are to be believed, he will have the satisfaction of spending for his private purposes or whatever purpose he chooses.

An hon. MEMBER. What has that to do with the items ?

Mr. INGRAM. We are not confined to the items now, but have a roving commission and we propose to take advantage of it until the government are prepared to come down and give us the information we require. The chief object of this government seems to be how best they can accommodate themselves to every wind that blows in order to secure votes and keep in office. I remember when the government came into office in 1896, they were most innocent and unsophisticated, they were in their childhood and kindergarten days, and whenever the opposition asked a question, they got up and answered it frankly. They changed their tactics, and you cannot get them to answer any question now until they get a good 'ready' on, and I tell you it takes a long time for the government to get a 'ready' on. I am glad to find my hon. friends opposite so heartily enjoying themselves. I am glad to find them taking my remarks so pleasantly, and I trust I shall always have my remarks accepted as pleasantly by hon. gentlemen opposite. The members of the government seem lost to all sense of duty and fair-play, and persist in remaining silent in their places and refusing to give the information we ask and to answer the very important question we have put. I do not know whether my hon. friend the Finance Minister considers that the very indefinite answer he has given is going to satisfy the public or the opposition. But I can assure him that from time to time, we will persist in our efforts to secure the information we ask. The government will certainly make a very great mistake if it should divide up the Department of Public Works and hand a portion of it over to the Minister of Marine (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine), who seems to think that it is no part of his duty to occupy his seat in this House

at any time in the day. Considering the fact that he is a kindergarten minister, he is not making the best use of his opportunities. One would naturally expect him to attend school and try to get information from time to time as to how he should administer his department. But he does not seem to think it any part of his duty to remain in this House. But let me draw attention again to this fact, that it would be of great service to the hon. gentleman, who is now filling the position of Minister of Public Works, to have the hon. Minister of Marine in his place to give him his assistance on items affecting the harbours and rivers of the province of Quebec. If he were in his place and ready to give information that would be of advantage to the House, there would not be members on the other side, like the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) finding fault with us. Why does not he lecture the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries for not being in his place and doing his duty? Where is the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I think that in justice to the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) it ought to be stated that he is in Montreal attending a conference with the Minister of Labour, the representatives of the steamship companies and the representatives of the stevedores, for the purpose of trying to bring about a settlement of the strike.

Mr. INGRAM. I am very glad to hear that, and I am prepared to compliment the hon. minister on doing his duty in this particular instance. Now, will the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) explain why the hon. minister absents himself so much as he does on other occasions? There is not a single man to explain why the minister's place is vacant from day to day. But one hon. gentleman rises when it happens that there is a defence to be offered for the minister's absence.

Mr. TALBOT. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) will allow me one question, I would like to ask him why this question is not put when the hon. minister is here?

Mr. INGRAM. The question was put the other day when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was in his place, and he had not the moral courage to answer it. But he blushed over it—he blushed a deep red, when he found the Prime Minister taking his place.

Mr. TALBOT. He could not blush blue.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps not, but I think he felt very blue at the time. I do not wish to take up more of the time of the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. GALLIHER. Go on.

Mr. INGRAM. Some hon. gentlemen who live a long distance from Ottawa, evidently are not anxious to go to their homes.

Mr. GALLIHER. I don't mind.

Mr. INGRAM. Evidently the hon. gentleman is comfortably situated in Ottawa, and has made up his mind that it will take up some time to get through the business of the House. I did not think he would be content to stay here considering the black eye he got the other day. This lead question is as serious a question in its way as the question of the Department of Public Works. It might be a good time now for the hon. gentleman to put his oar in, to use a common phrase, and ask the government what they are going to do with regard to lead. This is a broad motion we are discussing now, and all the malcontents in the House have a golden opportunity, an opportunity they should take advantage of, especially as the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) seems to be in good humour. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) might impress upon the minister the importance of putting a duty on lead. I will give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to rise. Well, the hon. gentleman does not speak. Now I do not wish him to go back to his district and say he has not had an opportunity of drawing the attention of the Minister of Finance to this question.

Mr. GALLIHER. I thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) for so carefully looking after the interests of my district; but I do not mind informing him that I am quite capable of attending to that myself.

Mr. SPROULE. We have had some valuable information from the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). He says that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is attending a strike. It would seem that most of the members of the government have been on strike all session, for they have not been here. Nor will they allow any body else to work in their places. They have their pickets out, one in China, one in England, one in Montreal; and I do not know where the rest of them are, but when we require information of them, there is a notable absence of them from this House. which makes it very difficult to carry on the work of the session. I think we are quite within our rights and properly discharging our duty when we ask the government at the earliest possible moment not only to make, as they did early in the session, an explanation of the ministerial changes which took place before the opening of parliament, but an announcement of their policy. They have intimated in the speech from the Throne that they are going to reorganize some of the departments. Surely we are not going to continue the work of the session until we know what reorganization is to take place. We are voting money on the demand of the Minister of Public Works to be spent—if we are to believe what we see in the ministerial press —by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, yet we have nothing from the Minister of

Marine and Fisheries as to the line of policy he will follow in spending the money. This House has a right to know the facts; and I respectfully submit that it is the duty of the government to state those facts at the earliest possible moment. The Prime Minister, in giving the explanation of ministerial changes, said that it was not so important to give this information now as at one time in the past, because, in these modern days these changes had not the importance they had at one time, for in these days of publicity there was nothing he could tell the House of which the House was not already informed through the press. That is exactly why we are asking these questions—because an intimation was given through the press some time ago, and notably in the province of Quebec during an election campaign by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that certain important changes would take place whereby a great deal of the work now being done by the Public Works Department would be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, so that he would have the expending of large amounts of money and would be able to inaugurate a policy of his own. I would like to inquire, Mr. Chairman, what so greatly amuses the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman). Has he no interest in the business of this House ? When will he be able to give information as to the changes to take place in the department he is going to come into ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not know why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) should draw attention to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPROULE. Simply because I saw the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) doing that for which he often, as Chairman, calls members to order in the Railway Committee.

Mr. HYMAN. For smiling ?

Mr. SPROULE. No, for interrupting a member of this House when he was speaking. I was interrupted——

Mr. HYMAN. I beg to say, Mr. Chairman, that I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman in any possible way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPROULE. I have nothing to take back. I want to say what I intended to say when I had only part of the sentence out. I was interrupted by an outburst of mirth that could be nothing but an interruption—there was no sense in it.

Mr. HYMAN. I inform the hon. gentleman that it is the leader of the opposition who is smiling.

Mr. SPROULE. A smile carries with it no noise, but the noisy laughter from the other side—if I were to quote Scripture, I might characterize it, but I will refrain from doing so. I say that we are not only within our rights, but we would be doing less than our duty, if we do not ask for this information and demand an explanation from the government. What are going to be the departmental changes they are going to make? What is going to be the policy of the government with respect to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which has been charged with the expenditure of the money we are asked to vote to-night ? We have a right to know that before we allow a dollar of this money to be voted. There is no justifiable reason for making any reflections upon the opposition when they are only doing their duty in this House to the people who sent them here. I think the government would greatly facilitate progress of business if they availed themselves of the earliest opportunity to give that information to the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think at this stage it would be in order to read from what I may call an official report of the speech made in Montreal by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on the occasion to which I have alluded just now. The speech was not made during the election campaign, it is true, but a little while previously, before a Liberal club in the east end of Montreal. This is a verbatim report of the speech which he made.

An hon. MEMBER. Are you going to read it all ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I will if the hon. gentlemen opposite wish to hear it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If it is a good speech read it all.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was a good speech, well reported. I will begin by reading it in French. I call the attention to this of my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Cowan), who has a great many French Canadians in his constituency, and he may understand himself the version which I am going to read.

An hon. MEMBER. From what paper are you reading ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. From 'La Patrie.' Have hon. gentlemen any objection to 'La Patrie' now ? Do they think a verbatim report of a speech in 'La Patrie' is not a correct report ? I may say that the same reports were published in the 'La Presse,' which I do not think hon. gentlemen will repudiate. Here is what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said on that important occasion, when he was giving what he called the policy of the government :

"REPARTITION DES TRAVAUX PUBLICS."

Mais on vous dira : le département des Travaux publics est un département qui dépense des millions, qui a un patronage énorme et, par le fait qu'on va l'enlever à la province de Québec, on va enlever tout ce patronage-là à la province de Québec. Messieurs, soyons raisonnables, examinons la situation telle qu'elle est. Les travaux publics, à l'heure qu'il est,

ont, en effet, une dépense à contrôler de plusieurs millions. Ceci est dépensé en bâtisses publiques, en entretien de bâtisses publiques, y compris les bâtisses du parlement d'Ottawa, et la construction de nouvelles bâtisses partout, dans chaque partie du pays, où il est besoin. De plus, le département des Travaux publics, jusqu'à aujourd'hui, s'est occupé à faire le creusage de nos rivières, à faire les travaux d'améliorations dans le port de Montréal avec l'aide, bien entendu, de la commission du havre et avec l'aide du département de la Marine et des Pêcheries. Mais si l'on met chacun à sa place et si l'on dit au département des Travaux publics, et cela non pas purement et simplement par des paroles, mais par des actes ; si l'on dit simplement vous n'aurez sous votre contrôle, strictement parlant, que les travaux des bâtisses publiques et les améliorations publiques qui ont rapport avec l'entretien du pays ; mais tout ce qui a rapport à la navigation, tels que les travaux de creusement des rivières, tels que les travaux de construction de quais, de construction d'élévateurs, tels que les travaux de cales sèches et ainsi de suite, si l'on dit : Tout cela, cela dépend de la navigation, et cela dépend par conséquent du département de la Marine et des Pêcheries, et qu'on le mette dans une loi, est-ce que vous n'avez pas là toutes les garanties que vous pouvez désirer? Mais l'on vous dit aussi : " C'est pour en faire accroire à la province de Québec qui a toujours été sacrifiée." Eh bien, messieurs, encore une fois, je vous le répète, soyons raisonnables. Si je vous dis, comme je l'ai dit d'ailleurs deux fois, que j'ai accepté un portfeuille dans les conditions qui viennent d'être sanctionnées, c'est parce que j'ai cru sincèrement aux promesses qui ont été faites, aux déclarations qui ont été faites, et c'est parce que je suis convaincu que cette parole donnée, cet engagement pris seront réalisés. Il ne peut pas y a voir de doute là-dessus. Et je peux vous dire plus, messieurs, et je demande si l'on peut me contredire. On a prétendu que l'honorable James Sutherland, actuellement ministre des Travaux publics, avait intrigué et avait insisté pour avoir ce département. Eh bien, je vous déclare ici et pe défie la contradiction là-dessus : l'honorable M. Sutherland n'a abandonné le ministère de la Marine et des Pêcheries qu'à contrecœur et malgré lui, et parce que tout simplement il était entendu qu'une partie des travaux, ceux dont il ne veut pas s'occuper et qu'il prétend de voir appartenir au département de la Marine et des Pêcheries, devaient paser au département de la Marine et des Pêcheries. Je pourrais vous dire qu'il a même été suggéré —ceci je ne suis pas en position de l'affirmer— mais il a été même suggéré que tous les canaux du Saint-Laurent seraient mis sous le contrôle du département de la Marine et des Pêcheries.

Now, in case my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has not understood all this quotation, with the permission of the committee, I will translate it into English :

But we will say, the Department of Public Works spends millions of dollars and has an enormous patronage, and therefore we are going to take away from the province of Quebec this patronage which has always belonged to Quebec.

Mr. BUREAU. You say 'we.' Is the French 'we' or 'on' ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. It is 'on' here. In the bad French in which this speech was delivered, 'on' means 'we.'

Gentlemen, let us be reasonable, let us examine the situation as it is. The Department of Public Works at this moment are spending several millions of dollars. This sum is spent in public buildings and their maintenance, including the parliament buildings at Ottawa, and in the construction of new buildings in every part of the country where they are needed. Moreover, the Department of Public Works until now has had the dredging of rivers, has carried on the improvements in the port of Montreal, with the assistance, of course, of the harbour commission and of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. But if we put every man in his place, and if we say to the Department of Public Works, not only by words but by deeds, you shall only have under your control the works on the public buildings and the public improvements which relate to the maintenance of the country, but everything which concerns navigation, such as dredging the rivers, the construction of wharfs, the construction of elevators, the building of dry docks, and so on, if we say that all this concerns navigation and therefore concerns the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and if you put this into a law, is it not true that you have there all the guarantees which you can desire ? But you are told: This is to make the province of Quebec believe that you are not sacrificed. Well, gentlemen, again I repeat, let us be reasonable. If I tell you as I have already said twice, that I have accepted the portfolio under these conditions, and that they have been sanctioned, it is because I sincerely believe the promises which have been made, the declarations which have been made, and it is because I am sincerely convinced that these promises and declarations will be realized. There can be no doubt of this. I could say more gentlemen. I will not be contradicted upon this point : It has been pretended that the Hon. James Sutherland, the present Minister of Public Works, has intrigued and insisted upon having this department. Well, I can tell you, and I defy contradiction, that the Hon. Mr. Sutherland gave up the Department of Marine and Fisheries against his own will, and because it was understood that that part of public works with which he did not wish to busy himself, and which he pretends belongs to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, should pass to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I could go further. It has even been suggested, though I am not in a position to affirm this, but it has been suggested that all the canals of the St. Lawrence should be put under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Now, Sir, there can be no two opinions about the declarations that were made in this important speech. It was not a speech made in the excitement of an electoral contest, it was not a speech made upon the hustings, where you are face to face with your opponents, but it was a speech deliberately made before a Liberal club, by this minister who came there to propound what he called his policy and the policy of the government. He said there in so many words that everything which related to navigation, the building of wharfs, the dredging of rivers and harbours, the building of dry

docks, &c., was to be put in his department. Now, Sir, have we not a right to ask the government whether this is really their policy? After what has been said in the speech from the Throne, have we not a right to know whether this is really the policy of the government? Have we not the right to have that policy of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which will control these important works, and to have a statement given to the committee by the hon. gentleman who is authorized to give those explanations, and who will have these works under his control? Will any hon. gentleman say that we are wasting the time of the committee in bringing this question before us? I will not retort by saying that there are some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, particularly some hon. gentlemen who come from the same part of the country as the hon. gentleman who spoke a little while ago, who are wasting the time of the House. They come here to express the views which they think they should express in the discharge of their duties. We come here to do the same thing. We are all animated with the same wish to do our duty to the best of our ability, but at this advanced stage of the session, taking these declarations into consideration, and taking the importance of these works into consideration, I say that we should be in a position to know whether or not this policy of dividing the department of Public Works and giving part of it to the Marine and Fisheries is to be carried out by the government, and whether or not it is to be carried out at this session.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I do not make any apology for again renewing what seems to me to be a very fair request. I quite agree with hon. gentlemen who say that we have no time in this House to waste. A very serious charge is made. It is that an hon. minister of the Crown absents himself from his place in the House because he is unable to rise and make a denial of a serious charge which was made against him. I was not present at the time and I wish to be set right if I make an incorrect statement, but I have been told that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) was in his place in the House when he was confronted with having made this statement by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, that he refused to answer, and it is a noticeable fact that the hon. minister has not been found in his place since, when this question has been likely to come up. I see it reported in two papers in Montreal that the hon. gentleman is not in Montreal but that he has returned to Ottawa, though I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman who had the courage to make the explanation believed that he was presenting a statement of fact. I repeat that it is not wasting the time of the committee to insist upon the rights of the committee to have an answer to a question of that kind. It is not taking any unfair advantage of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to discuss this question, because the charge is made that he has absented himself from the House and is absenting himself from the House in consequence of this very awkward question. If a minister of the crown will publicly make declarations of that kind they are not to be taken as individual utterances. The country understands too well and hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House understand too well the gravity of an utterance of a minister of the crown. He is always supposed to speak for the government and especially upon such an important question as this. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) has read here, and no hon. gentleman, it seems, is prepared to get up and contradict it, from a speech in which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, speaking before the Liberal Club only a few months ago, in the city of Montreal, declared that it had been the work of certain newspapers unfriendly to the government to say that the present hon. Minister of Public Works had been conniving against the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in regard to the shuffle of the portfolio. He gave that statement a denial but he added the very important statement that the Department of Public Works was to be divided, and he went so far as to specify the items which were to be taken from the Department of Public Works and placed under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It was said by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that that great spending department had been administered by a minister from the province of Quebec for many years. I am not going to discuss the propriety of placing the department under the charge of a minister from the province of Ontario. I have no right to discuss the propriety of doing that, but I have the right to call the attention of the committee to the fact that a compromise was to be made, that if the department was to be taken from some gentlemen representing that great province—I will not say from the people—that gentleman was to be compensated in some way by dividing the work and giving it over to him. This is not a light matter and it is not one upon which there should be a single moment of the time of the House wasted. I think it is a serious question and I am disposed to discuss it in that light. I repeat again that a minister of the crown was charged with having left his place in the House, with having refused to answer any question when he was in the House, and that he is not found in his place when he might know that this question would come up at any time. The government have been silent on the question, and I was astonished at the hon. gentleman who claimed that the time of hon. members from the western part of this Canada of ours is more valuable than that of hon. gentlemen from

the east. He said that the eastern members of the House were wasting time. I confess that I expected a good deal more from that hon. gentleman. I did not expect that he would rise in a spirit of banter and take upon himself the right to lecture this side of the House upon what is the proper course to adopt. I think it is the proper course to adopt to insist that hon. members of the House should be in possession of such information as they are entitled to. I think this is a matter of such gravity that the government cannot afford to entirely ignore it. These hon. gentlemen sit silent in their places afraid to make a declaration upon a matter that is so pressing in its nature that it does not seem to me that a single moment should be lost in placing before the committee the information which is asked for. If hon. gentlemen were desirous to get on with the work they would give the information that we are asking for. I regret that we have not accomplished more than we have up to this time, and I would ask the hon. gentleman who is now leading the House (Hon. Mr. Fielding) if he thinks it is the best way to get on with the work of the committee to pursue the course which he is pursuing in regard to this question. I am sure that there is nothing about it that the committee cannot fairly ask to be given to it. On the other hand, I am well persuaded that the course adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite will not facilitate the work of the committee.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Chairman, I would take the liberty of asking the hon. gentleman who is now leading the House (Hon. Mr. Fielding), in view of the very serious statement that has been made here to-night, that the present hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) said that this divison had been sanctioned by the government, if an Order in Council has been passed, or if any action has been taken by the government in reference to dividing this office, and, furthermore, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) if it is true that he voluntarily handed over such work as was too onerous for him and that he was willing to make over to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries the work which was outlined by that hon. gentleman in his speech in Montreal. I would ask the Finance Minister, who is leading the House so ably, and in his own inimitable manner: what are the facts of the case ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I much regret that I am unable to add anything to the very valuable information I have already contributed to the debate.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) if the statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is true; that he voluntarily said he could not carry on all these works and that he was willing to hand over certain of them to his brother minister from Quebec.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not imagine that the statement was ever made.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is a serious reflection on 'La Patrie.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as I am personally concerned I never said to the Premier, or to any other person either in this House or out of it, that I wanted the portfolio of Public Works or any other position in the government.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Or did not ask to be relieved from these works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I had my own way I do not think I would occupy any position in the government. I consented on the request of the premier to take the position. I think, Mr. Chairman, this matter has been very fully discussed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are a few items under the consideration of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The premier has made an announcement to the House on this matter. So far as these individual items are concerned they are matters of routine for maintaining the plant that belongs to the government, and whether there should be changes or not it would make very little difference. We have had a very lengthy discussion and we know what the feeling of the opposition is, and we might proceed with the business of the House. When the Prime Minister is in his place, he will make any announcement he has to make in regard to the matter.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I did not expect that this debate would be raised to-night, but the question we are discussing is of pretty large importance after all. There is no doubt whatever that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made the speech that has been read to-night. The speech was reported word for word verbatim by Mr. Haines who was then my private secretary. It was reported for 'La Patrie' and 'La Presse' at the same time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). By different reporters.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, by the same man.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They both must be right then.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is no doubt whatever that the report is altogether correct, word for word. It was stenographed in the ordinary way. I had taken charge of

'La Patrie' and I instructed Mr. Haines to go in the ordinary manner and take a report of what the Minister of Marine said. It was a very interesting occasion indeed. A minister of the Crown was making his first speech as a minister. The speech was reported in all the newspapers, in the English papers as well as the French. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said then, and he stated it over and over again, not once but ten times at least during this election campaign, that the dredging part of the Department of Public Works would be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. As to that there cannot be any dispute whatever. The point has been raised here now and it is just as well to have it out. We are discussing the items of dredging for the Department of Public Works, and if this money is to be spent by the Department of Marine and Fisheries then the minister of that department should be the man to answer the questions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is not fair to ask the House to vote money for the Public Works Department if that money is to be spent in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Whether the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) has said what he was not authorized to say, or whether he has said what he was authorized to say; that is his own business, but there is no doubt that he said it. He stated so in his own election and also in the election campaign in Terrebonne and Two Mountains.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And he has never been asked for his resignation.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It has never been disputed that he made the statement. If the policy he then announced is not going to be carried out, well and good, and I hope it will not be carried out; but if it is to be carried out, then the House should be informed of it so that we should not be asked to vote money for one department and for one minister that would be spent by another department and by another minister. There might be questions asked from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) that would not be asked from my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland). I for one would ask from the hon. gentleman who is Minister of Marine and Fisheries questions that I am not inclined to ask from my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend who leads the House (Hon. Mr. Fielding) should recognize that we should not proceed any further until we know. The Prime Minister stated a few days ago that he would be prepared to make an announcement within a short time, and it is only good parliamentary practice not to proceed any further unless the present leader of the House is prepared to tell us that no change will be made. If the Department of Marine and Fisheries is going to spend the money which we are voting to the Department of Public Works, we have the right to know it. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had not made this statement I would not speak as I do but he has made the statement, and he is accountable for it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have been asked to account for what I have said on former occasions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is my right and the right of parliament to know whether the statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been authorized or not. If it has been authorized we have no right to vote the Department of Public Works, money that the Department of Marine and Fisheries will spend.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. He should be treated as——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. Say it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How will I say it? He should be treated as constitutionally as I have been treated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. Since I spoke last I have to announce another very important bulletin. I did not question the statement made by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) until I read the Montreal 'Herald,' and I cannot account for the friendliness of the Montreal 'Herald' to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries these days, unless it is that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is in Japan, and his newspaper is taking liberties that it would not take if he were here. The Montreal 'Herald' in its Ottawa news announces that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has returned to Ottawa, and for the information of the House I will read what he says. I am sorry I am not able to read the same article in French, so that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) could see again the word 'ungh.' With us that is a common word in the Indian language; but I was not aware that it was so commonly used in French. Here is the correspondence in the 'Herald.'

Ottawa, May 7.—Hon. Raymond Préfontaine returned from Montreal last night where he was looking into the situation with respect to the longshoremen's strike.

Mr. Préfontaine says he saw both the shipping interests and the longshoremen, and from what he has heard of both sides he does not see any possible solution to the strike, other

than that it will have to be allowed to work itself out.

So it would appear that neither the government nor the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are in a position to render any assistance to bring to an end the strike now going on in Montreal. Then, he said :

So far as the longshoremen are concerned, the strike is practically over.

That seems a strange sentence to follow what I have already read.

They admitted this to him, and said that until they were willing to submit to the stevedores terms, with respect to discrimination against union men, the fact that the stevedores have now some 1,500 men engaged in their places, shuts out all but five hundred of the strikers and they now say, what is the use of giving in, it will, they say, do them no good. They argue that they may as well stay out and endeavour to bring out other unions in sympathy with them.

Yesterday, the stevedores had at work 1,111 longshoremen, 146 carpenters, 188 checkers, and 126 teamsters. These men have all been engaged for the season, and the strikers recognize that if they are taken back that the shipping interests will have to pay compensation to the men now engaged in their places

Mr. Préfontaine says that there will undoubtedly be large loss to trade and to shipping, but there is no way to help it. Of course the entire number of men cannot be replaced at once but they will be replaced in a very short time. the most important feature to his mind is the replacing of the teamsters who have left a job paying $10 per week. The transportation companies claim that they will be able to do this and are doing it. Mr. Préfontaine thinks that it will be but a short time until the whole matter is straightened out.

These contradictory sentences are something I do not understand.

Mr. TALBOT. Reporters' work.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I suppose, is not to be held responsible for this. Would the hon. gentleman say that the reporters who reported his speeches on other occasions made incorrect reports ?

Mr. TALBOT. That is not a report of his speech.

Mr. INGRAM. It is a report of an interview. I am not bale to trace out the closing sentence in the interview, and therefore I will have to leave it. What I want to point out is that the statement made by the hon. member for Bonavénture (Mr. Marcil) does not appear to be in accord with this statement.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I would state that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries came to Ottawa last night, but returned to Montreal this afternoon at 4 o'clock along with the Minister of Labour to attend a conference between the shippers and the longshoremen, as a result of a visit to Ottawa this afternoon of the president of the longshoremen's union, Mr. O'Neil. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is certainly performing a great duty for the city he represents in attending that conference tonight.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, in view of the absence of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I think these items should stand until he is present, because they may come under his department. Now, I propose to deal with some questions which have been raised here before. I do not see the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) in his place. I notice that when the North-west members have a field day in this House, such as they had yesterday, they generally follow each other. But the hon. member for Selkirk did not take part in it; he was the silent member yesterday. He has broken out to-day. We were told in that discussion that freight was congested in the North-west; but we heard to-day in another part of this building that in the city of Montreal 1,500 cars had lain on the sidings for months. If one of the members for Assiniboia were here—I understand that we are not going to have him long with us, because he is going to accept a seat in another part of this building—he could explain why this congestion took place in Montreal. Perhaps he could also explain why the discussion was entered into yesterday. In my innocence I said I did not believe the hon. member for Western Assiniboia had any ulterior motive; but I found that in another place to-day reference was made by the mover of a certain Bill to the importance of moving the congested freight in the North-west Territories. Whether there was any connection between that discussion of yesterday and what took place in another part of this building to-day, I do not know. Then, I do not wish to miss the chance of giving the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) an opportunity to explain about those market gardeners. That is another serious question; and I am bound to say, from my long acquaintance with that gentleman, that he does not lack moral courage in getting up in this House and expressing an opinion. I know he did not miss an opportunity when he used to discuss the question of free trade. I do not know whether he has changed his views; if he has, I would like him to explain the change. An hon. gentleman interjected the question to me, what about Mr. Gamey ? My leader, who came in a few moments ago, may wonder why the remarks I am making are so rambling. I may say that while I was making a few remarks a short time ago, strictly to the question under discussion, several of these interjections were made, and that is my excuse for making these rambling remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. I am glad the expressions of assent on the other side of the House bear out the statement I am making. I

am glad to see the hon. gentlemen smile. It is only on rare occasions that they do.

Mr. COWAN. A pretty dry smile, though.

Mr. INGRAM. I heard one hon. gentleman remark that the House was not very full to-night, and my observation is that hon. members are not full except on this important question. On this important question they are full——

Mr. COWAN. Of wind.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman refers to wind. I am aware that the only representative of a gas county comes from Essex. And finding that he has a large supply on hand, I will give way to him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Apart from any jesting manner in which this subject may have been dealt with to-night, I would submit to the hon. Minister of Finance that the period has arrived when we should have some information on this matter. It was announced in the speech from the Throne that a measure would be introduced for the reorganization of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Yet, although this House has been in session for two months of the four during which it is supposed to last, this measure has not yet been brought down. We also had the announcement made previously by a Minister of the Crown that this department was to be reorganized in a particular matter. This question was brought to the attention of my hon. friend the Prime Minister in a rather urgent manner as far back as last Friday, and he promised that a statement of the policy of the government would be made at a very early day. Is there any reason why it should not have been made long ago? The announcement that the Department of Public works was to be reorganized was made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries some three or four months ago. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister lectured Lord Dundonald yesterday by stating that he should only give advice to the people through the hon. Minister of Militia, and I presume that, on the same principle, an announcement of this kind should properly be made in parliament, so that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has laid himself open to the same strictures as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister passed on the General Officer Commanding our militia. As has been said by the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte), this is a question of some importance to the country, and certainly now that parliament is in session we should have an authoritative announcement regarding it. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when in opposition, always insisted that the proper time to ask for a redress of grievances was before the passage of supplies, and it certainly is a grievance that when a minister of the Crown was able to announce the details of a measure months ago, the government should be unwilling or unable, now that parliament is in session, to declare its policy. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works appealed to me. Well, while I am glad to assist him in passing the routine items, he must be aware that there is force in our objection that we ought to know when voting this money, who is to have the expenditure of it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am quite willing to take the assurance of the hon. Minister of Public Works, if he is in a position to make an announcement, for I have never yet known my hon. friend to make any promise, either in public or private matters, which he has not carried out. I am quite willing to accept his statement, if he is in a position to make one, but I do not think that, in justice to the House, he should expect us to pass these items until we have some definite declaration as to whether the expenditure is to be made by the Department of Public Works or by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I am sure that my hon. friend will look at this matter in a reasonable way and either make some definite announcement or allow the item to stand until the government is in a position to do so. I think that is a fair position to take and one which I think my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works would be prepared to take if he were on this side.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In asking the House to vote these items, I have not the slightest hesitation in stating that I have every reason to believe that, as long as I occupy the position of Minister of Public Works, I will be responsible for the expenditure of this money.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is that in contradiction to what the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From my standpoint at least, I have felt called upon in my position of Minister of Public Works to answer every question put to me directly, and have always endeavoured to do so, and I can assure the House that I have every reason to believe that the statement I have made is correct.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Then we are to understand that these items will be expended by the Department of Public Works the next year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is what I have said.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In that case, we on this side ought to accept that assurance.

Item voted.

Dredge vessels, Manitoba, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is intended to practically renew the dredging plant which has been in service a long time. There is considerable work to be done there.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is the dredge at work now or is it going to be put at work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am told that it will be able to do the work this season.

New dredging plant, maritime provinces—hydraulic dredge, $200,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is a very large item and we should have full information regarding it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for a new hydraulic dredge which is not yet completed. It is to be hoped that it will be completed and ready for service at the beginning of next year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is $520,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it a suction dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Combined suction and elevator.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that this refers to the dredge 'Fielding' now being constructed at Sorel, and that the hon. minister says it will not be completed until the end of the year. Does he refer to the fiscal or calendar year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The calendar year.

Mr. CLANCY. That is, it will not be ready for work this coming season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The best hope I can give, after consultation with the engineers of the department, is that it will be ready for a year from now.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has the hull been launched or is it still in the yard ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has not been launched.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When was it begun ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) seems to be anxious to know more about that dredge—

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I put a question which I think I have a right to do—

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Quite so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Perhaps, I ought to apologize to the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte)—

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Not by any means. I was merely offering to answer a question, on which, perhaps, I am a little better informed than the Minister of Public Works is. That is all I meant.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was begun a little over two years ago.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, it was begun about a year ago. Let all the information be brought down. I know what all this means. Some of my hon. friends mean to convey the idea that the work was not being pushed as quickly as it might have been. Some of my former colleagues seem to be anxious to throw blame on me. They have no right to do so. Let me say immediately that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice was altogether wrong in taking offence at what was simply an offer on my part to answer a question on a point concerning which I was informed. That dredge was begun a little over a year ago. It was a difficult piece of work. The engineer, Mr. Robinson, who is one of the best engineers on this continent, prepared the plans. He was obliged to change those plans after a trip to England. There is no other dredge of the same kind in the world—it is an experiment. It is being built as a sea-going dredge. It is really a steamer, a self-propeller, and will be both a suction and an elevator dredge. It is to be a self-hopper, but, at the same time, the department will be in a position to use scows when necessary to do so. So, it is a difficult and very complicated piece of work. Mr. Robinson, in spite of his ability and knowledge has been obliged to change his plans. This took some time. Then, we had a great deal of trouble to buy material. All those who are engaged in ship-building or in iron construction of any kind know how difficult it has been to procure material. A month before I left office I went to Sorel and had a consultation with Mr. Desbarats, who has been specially in charge of the work. Of course the chief engineer, who is on the floor of this House to-night, has only a pretty remote supervision of the work. Mr. Desbarats being in direct charge. That gentleman told me that the dredge would be ready by the month of July, or August. Not only that, but the Minister of Public Works will find correspondence to that effect in the department. I do not say that the dredge is not ready because I left office. I do not desire to blame my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland). I am sure he has done everything he has been able to do. At the same time I must disclaim responsibility for the delay—I know what a change in the head of a department means. It may be that there have been changes in the way patronage has been administered there. I believe there has been a change, and this may be one of the reasons why the work has not been proceeded with as quickly as it should have been. I believe I am not

far from the mark in saying that. At any rate I do not blame my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. He has no interest in delaying the work, and I am sure he has done everything he could to push it forward. I do not know whether he has gone down to Sorel to visit the shipyards. But I know that his colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Prefontaine) has gone several times—in view, I suppose, of the fact that he thought he would be entrusted with carrying out these works. But I have only to say that I am surprised that the work is not to be completed by the time it was understood that it would be completed when I left office.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We have had a most interesting discussion on the subject of dredges and dredging. There has been a considerable conflict of opinion on the question whether this work ought to be carried out with dredges under the control of the government or let out to contractors. It seems to me that an important element in the consideration of the question is to know how soon the dredges can be got ready. We have been told by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that when he came into office in 1896 there were practically no dredges at all, and that it has been necessary, in the time that has since elapsed, to equip the department in this respect. It seems to me that it was a very fair question to ask when the dredge was begun, and it is only proper that when a question of that sort is put, that we should have an answer that we can rely upon. I put the question to the minister in whose department the work is being done and who ought to be able to give the information. After consulting his officials on the floor, he told me that the work was begun two years ago and that it will take another year before it is finished. Is that correct or not? For the ex-Minister of Public Works says it is not. The House ought to be enlightened on that point.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Let us discuss it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) must know that when I make a statement with regard to matters that have taken place in the department, I make it on the authority of the officials of the department and not from my own knowledge. I remember very well the hon. gentleman's statements in the House and out of it to myself privately. We were all anxious that the work should be proceeded with, as the hon. gentleman's idea was that the work could be carried on more quickly at Sorel than it has actually been carried on. I felt anxious about it because I knew that the dredge was urgently required. After examination I do find that there is a difference of opinion between the officials of the department and my hon. friend as to when it may be completed. If everything goes well, we expect it will be ready at the beginning of next year. The first vote—

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The first vote I know all about.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can only speak from the information I find in the records of the department. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that there is no official of the department who would willingly make a wrong statement with regard to the business of the department. I found that the first vote was in 1901-2. The work in one sense was not commenced then, though it was fully in hand. The material was purchased, goods were purchased, and the work has been going on more or less ever since. Up to the present time there has been expended $285,000 on this work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I want to explain further in regard to that work. The Minister of Justice seems to be anxious to know all about it. The first time an amount of money was placed in the estimates was in 1901-2. Everybody knows that after an item is voted in the House, the work does not start immediately. Parliament is prorogued, and then preparations are made to go on with the work. The money was placed in the estimates, but that was not the beginning of the work. I instructed Mr. Robinson, after a certain time, to prepare plans, and that took a good deal of time. Practically the work has been going on for over one year. Now I do not wish to leave the committee under the impression that I blame the Minister of Public Works for the delay. Nothing of the kind. I know he has done everything he could, and I am only sorry that the dredge is not completed.

Mr. CLARKE. As I understand the ex-Minister of Public Works, he complains that possibly the distribution of patronage in a different way is causing the delay. Is there any information to be given to the committee on that subject? This is a serious matter. This dredge is going to be a valuable addition to the force, and is going to cost a large sum of money. The hon. gentleman, before leaving office, I understand, had purchased the greater part of the material for the construction of the dredge, and he makes the suggestion tonight that possibly the method of administering the patronage of the department is causing delay. Is there any change in the method?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am unable to answer that question with regard to time. The first vote was taken in 1901, the second in 1902, the next in 1903. This is the fourth vote that is being asked for in connection with this work. I may

say that no change has been made that I am aware of in regard to this work.

Mr. LENNOX. The ex-Minister of Public Works appears to be speaking of something that he knows pretty well when he says definitely that there is a question of patronage that enters into this matter, and prevents the rapid completion of the work. He suggests what has not been answered by the Minister of Public Works, that by reason of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries having in contemplation to carry out that which he had announced upon a public platform, and to secure for himself enlarged powers and patronage, is himself delaying the matter in order that he may secure that larger control of public works, and obtain possession of that larger patronage. I think we should have some explicit statement by the present Minister of Public Works that this difficulty which seems to have arisen will in some way be averted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What difficulty does the hon. gentleman refer to ?

Mr. LENNOX. I will explain more fully. I say that he should assure us that this difficulty shall not continue to stand in the way of carrying out this work. I repeat that it appears that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries has promised in the province of Quebec that he is to have a larger share of public works.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I call the hon. member to order. The question of the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in regard to the division of the duties of the two departments has been ruled out of order.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, only as to one item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it is not relevant to one item, you cannot raise it on another item.

Mr. SPROULE. I draw the attention of the Chairman to this fact, that we are endeavouring to get information as to the cause of the delay in finishing this dredge, and it is in connection with that item for the dredge that we are discussing the statements of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am now ruling on the position taken by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), who was going on to discuss the question of the division of the duties pertaining to the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a question that had been under discussion the whole evening on another item. Now this is what Bourinot says :

> It is irregular to discuss any matters in committee which are not relevant to the resolution under consideration.

Now I do not see any relevancy between the statements made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to the future intentions of the government to make a division of the duties pertaining to these departments, and the item in the estimates which is before the committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think, Mr. Chairman, you misunderstood the matter which has been brought up. I do not think the hon. Minister of Public Works has the slightest objection to giving the information. The question is simply as to whether the money is to be expended by the Department of Public Works, or by some other department. It is absolutely relevant and it is not exactly the question which you have been settling.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman was not in when I made that statement before, and I am sure if he had been he would have been perfectly satisfied. As to any change of patronage, or any change in the officials, I have stated most distinctly that there has been none at all. There has been no interference in any way and no change that I am aware of. If there is anything more in this regard upon which he wants information, I have not the slightest idea what he is hinting at.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman, I am quite willing to submit to your ruling in the matter. It is not very material to my purpose in dealing with the question that I have to deal with whether I shall pursue exactly the same lines that I was pursuing or not. But I was asked a question by the hon. Minister of Public Works and I propose to answer it, and I hope, that I shall have the hon. Minister of Public Works copying my example and answering the question explicitly and definitely. What I submit is this : We have had a statement by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that the difficulty which has arisen and which has caused the delay has been the question of patronage. We have had it further stated by the ex-Minister of Public Works that it has arisen in connection with the question as to what power shall be exercised hereafter by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works to state whether that state of things exists or not. If it does exist, why then, it is a very serious difficulty and one that should be developed by this committee and one that should be a reason for not passing this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will answer in the hon. gentleman's own language and say that it does not exist. I hope that is clear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We, of course, understand in regard to all the other items the assurance which the hon. minister has already given equally applies ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

New dredging plant—Ontario and Quebec, $75,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am asking for this amount of money that we may be able to provide a new dredge for the important work that is necessary to be done below Quebec. I know that it will take some time to build this dredge. If it is possible to purchase a dredge, as I have been ready to do, I would be very glad to do it. But we cannot commence, I think, too soon to appropriate some money for the purpose of building a new dredge. I am informed by the chief engineer that a dredge suitable for the work can be built for $75,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is that a dipper dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If I understand the hon. minister, this dredge is going to be used below Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is a dipper dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Must we understand that this is to dredge the channel opposite Crane island, for instance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. This is for dredging at various points along the river and harbours and at the approaches to wharfs.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That dredge will not be called upon to work in deep water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will not be used for channel work. It would not be suitable for that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is that dredge to be built to dredge, for instance, the approaches to wharfs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, for instance, we have an application from Murray Bay.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is it going to be a steel dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What will be its capacity ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between 2,000 yards and 2,500 yards.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Where is that dredge going to be built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If we could have it built at the government shops it is the intention to do so. There is such an urgent demand that if we could purchase a dredge we would be glad to do it, so as to be able to do the work during the present year. If not we will have to build a dredge.

Mr. REID (Grenville). About what capacity of dipper is used on a dredge of that size ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that it will be a three or four yard dipper.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Of course, there is some difference between buying a dredge and building one. I think the committee ought to know whether the hon. minister intends to buy a dredge or build one.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think there is a very material difference. There is a lot of work that we must do. It has been represented to me that we might possibly buy a dredge. I do not know of any dredge for sale at the present time; in fact, from the inquiries the department has been making, I do not believe there is one in the Dominion of Canada to-day suitable for the work that can be bought. If we could buy a suitable dredge, I think it would be the best policy to buy one. But we are taking the vote for the purpose of procuring a dredge and from my information there is not one which could be bought and we may have to build one.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What are the dimensions of the dredge going to be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the dimensions or plans prepared yet. I am asking for this vote for the purpose of procuring a dredge or building one.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. minister a question in connection with the item we have just passed which I did not have the opportunity of asking at the time. What will the other dredge cost to complete and what will be the cost of this dredge that we are now discussing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The large dredge is estimated to cost $520,000, and the chief engineer informs me that according to the plans and specifications which he proposes to draw for this one, it can be completed for $75,000.

New dredging plant, Manitoba—self propelling snag-boat to work in Red and Assiniboine rivers, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you purpose building that in Manitoba ?

Mr. PUTTEE. I would like the hon. Minister of Public Works to explain this item and to state whether there is any probability of having that boat built this year ? This is a revote. This boat has been needed

badly on those rivers for some time. The item, I believe, has had a great deal of consideration. I would ask if there is any probability of having the boat built this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that this amount has been voted for some three or four sessions, and on inquiry from the engineers I find that no action has been taken. I have asked for a further report as to what work is to be done and as to the necessity for this snag-boat. Until I get that information from the resident engineer, I could not pledge myself to spend this money, although we are asking for it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I see that the item just passed of $75,000 is for Ontario and Quebec. Is there anything for Ontario in that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will have the new dredge for Ontario ready in four or five weeks. It has been customary to take this vote in this way.

Mr. McCREARY. It was almost impossible to get material or labour for this class of work in the west last year. As a matter of fact, I believe it will require 25 or 30 per cent more to build the same kind of a snag-boat this year, because material and labour have advanced, and I think the resident engineer will ask for $12,500 more in the supplementaries.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where do the snags come from ?

Mr. DAVIS. You will strike one soon.

Mr. McCREARY. The Red River and the boundary line of Lake Winnipeg is filled with trees and snags and one thing or another, and vessels drawing two or three feet of water cannot pass along that river at low water until it is cleared.

New dredging plant generally, $60,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the construction of new plant to meet the exigencies of the government dredging service. I may say that these applications have been sent in as urgent in regard to the dredges in the various provinces. It covers new barges and tugs, &c. I may say that if all these applications were granted they would amount to over $300,000, but the chief engineer after going over them thinks he could do with a vote of $60,000 to keep the plant in working order.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for new plant or repairing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Practically for new plant.

Mr. SPROULE. Where will these be built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They will be purchased by contract.

Mr. BLAIN. How many shops has the government for the construction of dredges?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have only one shop at Sorel.

Mr. BLAIN. How is it possible to construct this new $75,000 dredge when the $500,000 dredge will not be built until next year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That large dredge will be out of the way and the other work will be going on. I have had little opportunity of looking into the shop at Sorel, but the information I have received from the engineer of the department is that for repairing and building such a dredge as this, and tugs and scows, we can do that cheaper than by going to the other shops. As to doing this very large and important work where we have to purchase considerable machinery, I am not prepared to say at the present time.

Mr. SPROULE. How will the minister provide for this new plant ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will advertise for tenders.

Mr. SPROULE. Every shipyard will have an opportunity to supply them?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Dredging—Quebec and Ontario, $75,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Where is this money to be spent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is taken for the maintenance of the government dredges. There is one at Kingston, and my intention is to send one to Port Hope and one to Gananoque, and to different parts of the province.

Mr. INGRAM. We should have a statement as to how many places the work will be done in.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot remember all the places now, but, if my hon. friend is agreeable, I will bring down the programme and lay it on the Table.

Mr. INGRAM. Very well.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister also bring down the information I asked for, as to the different counties in which these dredges were at work last summer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can give my hon. friend that information now. The 'Challenge' was at Kincardine, Midland, Owen Sound and Collingwood. The 'Ontario' at Port Stanley, Rondeau and Kingsville. The 'Nipissing' at Burlington Piers, Bronte, Hamilton, Port Hope

and Bowmanville. The 'Queen' at Oshawa, Bowmanville, Dunbarton and Pickering. The 'Sir Richard' at Hawkesbury, Grenville, Bath and Adolphustown.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12.25 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 8, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 169) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of James Sinclair Macdougall.—Mr. Malouin for Mr. Gallery.

Bill (No. 170) to incorporate the Nipigon Iron Range Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 171) to incorporate the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.—Mr. Stephens.

Bill (No. 172) to incorporate the City and County Bank of Canada.—Mr. Rosamond.

DISALLOWANCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA STATUTES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax) moved :

That the correspondence relating to the disallowance of the statutes of the province of British Columbia be printed forthwith, and for that purpose rule 94 be suspended.

Motion agreed to.

PACIFIC CABLE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my hon. friend the Prime Minister whether he is able to give any information to the House as to the probable liability which we will incur by the reason of the recent developments in the Commonwealth of Australia with respect to the Pacific cable. It is not necessary for me to recall the circumstances to the House. I refer to those which have been given publicity in the public press. The colony of Victoria, it appears, made certain concessions to the Eastern Telegraph Company and the government of the Commonwealth proposes apparently, in lieu of those concessions, to grant a concession extending all over that commonwealth for a limited period of years. That is, briefly speaking, the position of the matter, as I understand it, but of course my right hon. friend would be much more familiar than I with the particulars. I understand that negotiations have taken place between this government and the government of Australia with regard to the policy of the latter in this connection, and it would be desirable for us to know what has taken place. If my right hon. friend is not in a position to inform the House now, he can take this as a notice, and give the information at a later day. But we would like to know what communications have taken place and what effect this change of attitude of the Commonwealth of Australia is likely to have on the Pacific cable scheme.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Briefly stated, the position is this : Shortly before the Commonwealth of Australia was formed the government, not of Victoria, but of New South Wales, had made a contract with the Eastern Telegraph Company, which is not, we think, in accord with the undertaking assumed by the different governments which participated in the establishment of the Pacific cable. We protested at the time, but when confederation of the Australian colonies came into effect it was too late to overcome the difficulty. The arrangement was made for an indefinite time, but the government of Australia have since contemplated making an arrangement whereby the Eastern Telegraph Company would shorten the monopoly granted them to ten years, but it would be extended, not only over New South Wales, but over the whole continent of Australia. We think that this last arrangement would be more detrimental than the first. It must be evident that if, during ten years, the Eastern Telegraph Company have power to establish telegraph stations all over Australia, at the end of the time they will have a practical monopoly and retain control of the whole business, and thus come in conflict with the Pacific cable. We have protested to the Australian government, and the best information we could give to the House would be to bring down the correspondence, which I will be happy to do at an early day.

SUPPLY—MONTREAL LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the government whether they have any information to give regarding the strike at Montreal ? It may be that negotiations are in such a condition that it may be not advisable for the government to say anything, but if there is any information which they can give, the House is entitled to it. I would like to call attention to the fact that the Mayor of Montreal has said

that, from first to last, he has not had a single communication with the Minister of Labour. The language attributed to the Mayor of Montreal, referring to the hon. Minister of Labour, is as follows :—

Not a word have I heard from him, but I expect however, some news from that quarter to-night. Sir William Mulock's place is right here in Montreal at the present time. He is Minister of Labour as well as Postmaster General, and in a juncture like this should be right on the spot to do what he can to help along the trade of Canada.

I gathered from the debate in the House the other day, that some communication had been made to the government by both parties in Montreal, but it appears that the principal officer of that city has not been communicated with in any way by the members of the government, from whom we might have expected some communications with regard to the very serious condition of things existing there. However, I do not rise for the purpose of making any comments on that, but merely to ask whether the right hon. gentleman has any information which it would be proper to give to the House at the present time with regard to the condition of the strike ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think it would not be advisable until some kind of settlement has been reached, to give fully the particulars as to the action of the government with regard to the strike. At the present moment, I have only to say—and I hope it will be satisfactory to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax)—that the Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) are now in Montreal, having left yesterday, for the purpose of doing what they can to obtain a settlement.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Perhaps I may be allowed to say that I have received a telegram from one of the large shipowners to this effect :

Union men beginning to return. Expect full settlement to-day.

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

Public works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—slides and booms—St. Maurice district—improvements of boom works to facilitate the floating and storage of logs, &c. $50,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Hon. James Sutherland). This vote is to meet the requirements for improvements and additions to the works on the St. Maurice, to afford increased facilities for the descent of timber on that river. These improvements are found indispensible to meet the requirements of pulp mills and other large manufacturing establishments now engaged in developing the great resources in that district.

Mr. MORIN. Will the hon. minister please tell us what is the revenue from these slides and booms ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The revenue reported for 1901-2, the last year for which we have returns, was $13,-565.48.

Mr. WILSON. What is the amount spent for salaries and other expenses ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The vote to be asked for this year is about $47,000. I shall be glad to give information in more detail when we are discussing the vote for salaries on this work.

Mr. WILSON. Was there not a revenue to the government over and above expenses?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no.

Mr. WILSON. How much was the deficit ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) refer to the capital expenditure or the annual expenditure ?

Mr. WILSON. The annual. We want to know how much the operating expenses exceed the receipts.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total expenditure on these slides and booms on the St. Maurice ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would be better if this question were brought up in the discussion on the proper item. I may say to my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) that, as near as I can figure, the deficit for the last year would be something like $23,000. In answer to the question of the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), the total amount expended on the St. Maurice slides and booms has been $1,271,282.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the slides and booms in every other part of the country pay something over and above the expenses. Here is an expenditure of over $50,000 following an expenditure of $50,000 last year, and there is an expenditure on operating expenses of $23,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) did not understand that this vote of $50,000 is practically on capital account, for permanent improvements. The deficit is on operating expenses, for which there will be a vote later on.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand perfectly well. I understand that $23,000 is expended in wages and other operating expenses.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the deficit.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And a deficit too? A deficit on operating expenditure. That

is the most extraordinary statement I have heard for a long time. The total receipts are $13,000 a year, and on that a deficit of $23,000, and this on works that have cost on capital account over a million dollars, on which we spent $50,000 last year and for which we are asked $50,000 this year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The receipts, no doubt, will be very largely increased when the improvements are made. But, under present conditions, I do not think they will be equal to the operating expenses. My hon. friend will see that, as I have stated, over a million and a quarter of dollars has been expended on these works. The $50,000 I am now asking for is reported by the chief engineer to be necessary to put these works in a position to be useful and to keep them from being damaged. With the large amount spent during the past year or two, the work will be put in very fair permanent condition. The question asked by the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) was as to operating expenses, which are quite separate from this.

Mr. MORIN. What kind of improvements does the minister intend to make with this $50,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Point à Trudel: Construction of two mooring piers 40 feet by 40 feet by 35 feet, $7,000 ; construction of 12,000 feet of five ply booms, $11,000 ; at Ste. Flore ; reconstruction of one mooring pier 30 by 40 by 30, $5,000. At Les Hêtres : Construction of a new mooring pier 30 by 40 by 30, $7,000 ; construction of 600 feet of two ply boom, $2,500. At Pointe à Marchesault : Construction of 450 feet of five ply boom, $4,000. At Point à Bernard : Construction of a mooring pier 40 by 40 by 35, $7,000. At Ils aux Toutres : Completion of a jam pier 30 by 30 by 10, $1,200. Add for works not yet determined and contingencies, $5,300. Total grant required for 1903-4, $50,000.

Mr. WILSON. The minister finds fault with our asking for detailed information on this item. Will he kindly tell us where we can ask for it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not find fault, I merely suggested that these answers would be more appropriate under collection of revenue, item 238.

Mr. BLAIN. Did I understand the minister to say that there was a deficit of about $20,000 last year ? Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain a statement made by his predecessor on this item in the House last year when he said :

> We made out of these St. Maurice booms and slides $20,000 last year. This is one of the rare works that brings us financial results. We are earning more money than we have spent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is true that the records of the department show that in the year to which the ex-minister was then referring, the revenue was $21,322, speaking for the year 1901-2. We have not the returns for this year. No doubt the revenue this year will be pretty near twice what it was last year. We estimate it will be about $25,000.

Mr. BELL. I find on reference to the Auditor General's Report, volume 1, page B—316, last year, the total expenditure was $153,012, and the total revenue was $13,000. There was only $50,000 voted last year, or $103,000 less than was expended. There was consequently a deficit of $140,000 for that service last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is referring to the year 1901-2.

Mr. BELL. Yes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was a large amount expended in addition to the vote. I think there was a special warrant providing for the expenditure of that large amount on account of the breaking of the booms and a large number of logs being lost, in July of that year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the policy of the government with regard to the construction of these booms ? Is it the policy to build these booms all over Canada, in rivers where lumbering operations are conducted, or is it a policy that is pursued on this river for some special reasons ? Are there any conditions affecting this river which distinguish it from rivers of a similar character all over Canada in which persons interested in lumbering operations have to build their own booms ? Then there is another matter which I think we ought to know something about. We voted last year $50,000, we are spending this year $50,000 more. Are the works of such a character that we may expect to have the government, year by year, coming down with appropriations of $50,000 to $100,000 for this service upon the river in question ? When is this expenditure to end, or is it like the song of the brook, which goes on for ever, though men may come and men may go ? May we expect any finality with regard to these expenditures ? Then there is another matter I do not understand. There was a certain amount of revenue from these works last year, and a certain amount spent for operating expenses. What are they exactly, and what is the net deficit on the operations for the year ? From what the hon. gentleman said, there seems to be a deficit in the operation of these works of $23,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that is about the sum.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We ought to know what the gross revenue is, what the gross operating expenses are, and what the net cost to the country is, of operating the works upon this river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been no change of policy since confederation with regard to slides and booms. I understand that there are three systems that have been kept up in the Dominion, the Trent valley, the Ottawa and the St. Maurice. On most of the streams, I think the companies attend to these works themselves. This has certainly been a very expensive work. Since 1867 the expenditures have amounted, as I have said, to $1,271,282. I am informed by the chief engineer of the department that a year ago these works were swept away by flood and storm, and it required this large expenditure to make repairs. There has been a great development in that district during the past few years. I am informed that the improvements made last year, for which this $50,000 was voted, puts the system in fairly good shape. It would be rash for me to say that works of this magnitude, costing over a million and a quarter dollars, would not cost something each year to maintain, outside the operating expenses. However, I may give the information given to me by the chief engineer of the department as to what state he expects this vote will put the works in. He believes, that, without any unusual accident or unforseen occurrence, this amount will complete the construction that is necessary and any vote that will be asked for in future years will be for repairs.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this vote which is being asked for now for new construction, or is it for a portion of the repairs that have already been undertaken?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for new construction entirely.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is this new construction necessary?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Owing to the immense increase in the number of logs coming down to the pulp mills. The chief engineer informs me that last season over 3,000,000 logs passed down through these slides and booms. Of course, that would materially increase the revenue for the present year when the returns are made.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why does not the hon. Minister of Public Works put a duty on the logs coming down so that the government shall be put to no loss from the building of these works as they do in every other part of the Dominion? On the Madawaska, the Coulonge and every other river on which there are booms and slides provided by the government we get a handsome return from them. This river is the only one on which it would seem that there is an immense deficit. The justification, as I understand, for the issue of the Governor General's warrant was, that a portion of this work was swept away by a freshet which led to the abnormal expenditure of $153,000. Was that the actual damage done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was really more than that. This $153,000 was all expended in making these repairs.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. minister answer the first question I asked him? I made the statement that in every other part of the country, the parties who use these booms and slides pay a fair amount for them. I may be misinformed, but I understand that the amount they pay yields more to the government than that which they are called upon to expend. Why is it that a like charge is not made on the St. Maurice, so as to recoup the government for the enormous expenditure they are making in that section of the country?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information is that the dues collected are the same on the St. Maurice as on other rivers and that they are the same as are charged by the companies. The reason for the deficit is the large amount expended on these works and the apparently large amount required for operating expenses each year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is no explanation at all that the hon. minister has received from the officers of the department to say that the charges are the same as those made by the companies. You charge a man the same for the use of a boom at the mouth of the Coulonge, for instance, where the expenditure is very small, as you do for a boom on the St. Maurice, where the expenditure is large. Why should he pay the same for the small advantage that he gets from the use of a boom at the mouth of a river as he would pay where there has been an enormous expenditure on works like those in the St. Maurice? Why should you not make a larger charge on account of the larger expenditure?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend knows that these tolls were fixed by Order in Council many years ago and when he, perhaps, was a member of the government. There has been no change made since that time. The point that the hon. gentleman has raised, in view of the large operating expenses, is an important one, and I shall consider it worth my while to look into it, and see whether there cannot be some change made with regard to the tolls which are being charged, although they are now the same as they have been for many years past.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. One reason that was given, I remember, when we were in the government, for the dockage or slidage received for the passage of logs down the St. Maurice, was that it fully recouped the government for the expenditure. But, things have changed within the last five or six years. There seems to be a greatly increased expenditure. I am taking the statement of the hon. Minister of Public

Works that was made a couple of years ago, and that was read by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) to the committee that that was one of the few works on which an expenditure had been made by the government which fully recouped them for the outlay.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he could state the amount of money that has been spent on these works within the last six years ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be very pleased to have the department make up a memorandum of the amount expended during the past six years on these works.

Mr. WILSON. Is it a large amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it must have been a very large amount. There has been a deficit every year since these works have been commenced between the receipts and operating expenses.

Mr. WILSON. How long is that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These works have been carried on by the Dominion since 1867, and previous to that, I believe, they were erected by the old province of Canada in 1851.

Mr. HALE. May I ask the hon. minister if these booms and slides are used for any other purpose than the passing of timber and logs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no other use that I know of except the passing of logs through.

Mr. HALE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why it is that the government has anything to do with this matter ? It is not the custom in other parts of this Dominion to expend money simply for the use of lumbermen. They have to build their own slides, booms and piers in all other sections of the country and especially in the province that I come from. I would like to know why it is that the government is called upon to spend a dollar on these works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Hale) must know that he is mistaken, notwithstanding the fact that he has been a member of this House for a long time. It is not correct to say that no expenditure has been made by the government in other places in regard to these works. I have explained already this afternoon that ever since confederation there have been public works upon the Trent, the Ottawa and the St. Maurice. As this work was first started in 1851, I can hardly give the reason that prompted the parliament of that day in undertaking it, but certainly, it has been continued every year since then up to confederation and every year since confederation. I am not prepared at the present moment to announce any change of policy in regard to it. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is one worthy of consideration. No change in the tolls has been made for many years. I could not say offhand, nobody could expect me to, and I do not think any hon. member would take the responsibility of saying without inquiry into the subject whether these tolls should be increased or not, but it is a question well worthy of consideration. Considering the difference between the receipts and the expenditures, it may be well to consider whether a saving cannot be made.

Mr. HALE. Will the minister tell me whether there was ever a dollar of public money spent in the province of New Brunswick for booms and slides in the interests of the lumbermen of that province ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not aware of any expenditure having been made by the Dominion parliament in New Brunswick, on booms or slides.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Did I understand the minister to say that the income from these works was $13,000 a year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that. I was asked what the revenue for 1901-2 was and I answered that it was $13,565.48, but that is not the annual revenue.

Mr. BARKER. Is that gross or net ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Gross. I can give in round figures the gross revenue from 1896 to 1902. In 1896 it was $22,000; in 1897-8, $29,000; in 1898-9, $29,000; in 1899-1900, $16,000; in 1900-1901, $21,000; in 1901-1902, $13,565; and the estimate for the present year will be about $30,000.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Considering the enormous capital expenditure that has been made on these works, and considering the small revenue obtained from them it seems to me that the government should take into their serious consideration, whether they should not abandon these works altogether. I do not see why we should go on spending large sums of money annually for a work which is of no public benefit to the country, and only for the benefit of private individuals. I cannot understand how such a policy can recommend itself to the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot agree to the proposition that the development of that section of the country is not a benefit to Canada generally. I may say to my hon. friend from New Brunswick (Mr. Hale) that although, so far as I know, the government has not built or maintained the slides and booms in that province, yet they have expended a good

deal of money on improving the rivers for the floating of logs. I think it was probably in the interest of the country that that was done, and it is recognized that the removing of obstructions and the improvement of waterways for the purpose of developing our natural resources, is a wise expenditure. In the earlier days of the country these works were thought so important that many of them were started with public money.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I cannot understand what justification there can be for an expenditure which is only in the interest of the private individuals upon these rivers. Why should the public be asked to pay out money for the benefit of private individuals, when the public get no return from it. What excuse is there for it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The same excuse as for any other expenditure. When we build a canal or a railway, or even take the tariff, these are all more beneficial to some people than to others, but it is supposed to be for the general benefit of the country. The maintenance of these slides and booms are supposed to be one of the most useful works carried on by the Dominion for the benefit of the district in which they are situated. I am not prepared to say that some changes should not be made. That matter will have my consideration. We could perhaps make the operating expenses less, or as has been suggested by the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) there might be a change in the tolls which would make the annual expenditure and revenue come closer together. I am not prepared to say that something in that direction may not be done, but I do not think that at the present time the country would be prepared to endorse the abandonment of these important works altogether, unless they are taken over by companies as they have been on some of the other important streams.

Mr. McGOWAN. It seems to me that it is a provincial matter altogether. Has the minister considered the question of handing over these works in the provinces ?

Mr. HALE. While it is true that there has been a small amount of money expended on the rivers of New Brunswick for improving navigation, it is also true that no Dominion money has been expended on these rivers for the purpose of assisting the lumbermen to drive their logs.

Mr. BARKER. The gross revenue was $13,000 last fiscal year, and the minister is taking an appropriation of $47,000 this year for the actual expenses of the staff in operating these works. Therefore we only realize less than one-third our annual expenditure. In addition there has been spent on capital account for the last four years including this year, a sum of $170,000—or at least we made appropriations for that amount. We have expended all this money on a concern which is repaying us only about one-third of our annual expenditure for operating it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister has given us a statement of the gross revenue each year since 1896 ; would he be good enough to give us a statement of the annual expenditure each year since 1896. Can he also inform me whether or not in the total expenditure of $1,280,000 he includes the amount for operating expenses as well as the capital expenditure so called?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total expenditure for construction from 1867 to the 30th of June is $508,956.86, and the total expenditure for repairs, staff, and maintenance for the same period is $762,515.29, making a total expenditure of $1,271,471.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What about the other question which I asked the hon. gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I promised to bring down the information as to the expenditure both on capital and on operating expenses since 1896. That I will bring down to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the hon. gentleman for just a little more information ? I have an indefinite idea of the nature of these works, but I would like the hon. gentleman to give us as full a statement as he can as to the exact purpose they fulfil.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have never been myself on that part of the St. Maurice river ; but I understand that at a great many points there are rapids and falls. The slides are for the purpose of floating logs past those rapids and falls, and the booms of course are built for the storing of the logs, so that they should not be lost by those bringing them down from the upper country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Works of exactly the same kind in the province of Nova Scotia are undertaken by private individuals, even on more navigable rivers than I think this one is. Is this river navigable for any other purpose than the passing of logs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A very considerable portion of it is navigable. I could not say offhand how much. I may say that in the province of Quebec these are the only works of the kind which are now maintained by the government. In the province of Ontario the same conditions prevail as in the province of Nova Scotia, with two exceptions. These works are being very rapidly placed under the control of the lumber companies. I understand that on the Ottawa river the companies find that they can operate these works at much less

cost than the government tolls amount to, and I have had an application lately to hand over to the companies the balance of the works on the Ottawa river in charge of the government. This is the only instance in the province of Quebec where works of this description are operated and maintained by the government.

Mr. BLAIN. In view of the very small revenue derived from these works last year, $13,000, will the hon. gentleman tell us how many men the government have employed on them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope to be able to give the hon. gentleman that information later this afternoon.

Mr. BELL. It seems to me a distinction should be drawn between the different parts of the works for which this vote is taken. There may be a strong necessity for improving the character of the bed of the river, and there may be some necessity for a public expenditure to provide slides ; but why should the government of Canada provide the lumbermen with booms, which are generally considered a necessary part of the outfit of any company handling lumber? I would like the hon. gentleman to tell us what portion of this money is spent on slides, and what portion on booms.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must remind my hon. friend that during the years he has sat in this House he has never offered that criticism before. As I have stated already, these works were commenced in 1851, and since confederation their construction and maintenance have been carried on just as they are at present. While I am willing to admit that the operating expenses are a fair subject of criticism, I am unable to announce at the present moment any change of policy in regard to their maintenance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know numerous instances in the province of Nova Scotia in which lumbermen operating on navigable rivers are obliged not only to make the booms, but to buy land on each side of the river for this purpose. It may be that the importance of the lumbering industry on this river makes some difference. I do not know how important it is. Apparently, however, it is not important enough to make this a very profitable matter for the government. There seems to be no good reason why the government should deal with one part of the country in this way, and not with another.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not a very good argument in favour of government ownership, is it ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, it is not. Another rather curious circumstance is that in one year the revenue from the works was $29,000, whereas last year it was only $13,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Without dealing in any way with the expenditure on these works, I think it is necessary to bear in mind in whom the property in them is vested. They were created previous to confederation and were the property of the old province of Canada, and at confederation they passed into the possession of the Dominion of Canada, being part of the works referred to in the third schedule of the British North America Act as river and lake improvements. They were taken over and have been dealt with ever since as Dominion property. With regard to the question whether the time has come when we should abandon these works on which so much money has been expended, the question arises, to whom should we abandon them ? Are we going to allow them to fall into decay and become an obstacle to navigation instead of being an aid to navigation ? We cannot force the lumber company to take them over, nor can we force the province to do so. What are we going to do with them ? Perhaps I might say a word respecting the character of the improvements. The St. Maurice river is a very large river on which large lumbering operations have heretofore been carried on. It was at one time the centre of the manufacture of large quantities of pine. Of course the pine has all disappeared, and for a number of years these works were not looked upon as of very great value, and did not produce very great results, but since spruce lumber has gone up in price, these works have become of greater value, as there is a great number of spruce limits on the river. In order to drive the logs, they must pass two of the biggest falls of the Dominion, one which is the Shawenegan. It is impossible to drive down these falls, so that a slide is erected at that particular point for the purpose of avoiding the falls. That is absolutely necessary in order that the logs may reach safely the mouth of the St. Maurice, which empties into the St. Lawrence. In driving the logs, you have not only to pass the Shawenegan Falls, but also the Tuque Falls. I think that some hon. gentlemen have seen the Shawenegan Falls and would know how impossible it would be for logs to come down them. It is to enable that river to be used for the purpose of lumbering that these slides and booms were built. The booms are not the usual booms used by lumbermen, but are booms to collect the logs at the head and at the foot of the falls, where they are gathered together and driven down the next slide. I may say that there is no other river in our province, except the Saguenay, on which there are slides built by the government. The slides on the Saguenay were formerly built by the government but abandoned years ago and taken over by the firm of Price Bros., who then had a practical monopoly of the lumber industry on that river. At present

no other slides are maintained in the province of Quebec by the government except those I have mentioned.

Mr. INGRAM. Where do these logs float to ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Down to the mouth of the River St. Maurice, which empties into the St. Lawrence immediately below Three Rivers. At that point there are some of the largest lumber mills of the country. It is known as Three Rivers, because the St. Maurice has three mouths there through which it empties into the St. Lawrence. The pulp mills are above the Shawenegan Falls. The point I wanted to make is that these slides, so far as my knowledge goes, became the property of the Dominion at confederation. We assumed control over them, and I fail to see how it is possible for us to abandon them.

Mr. INGRAM. The other evening we passed an item of $100,000 for improvements at Three Rivers, and I understood that that item had something to do with the river down which these logs are floated.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That $100,000 was for wharfs on the St. Lawrence and these slides are on the St. Maurice.

Mr. INGRAM. Then none of this $100,000 is to be spent on the St. Maurice at all ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, the slides are a long way up.

Mr. MORIN. If the government were willing to sell the booms and slides, would they be allowed to do so ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Parliament could give the government authority.

Mr. MORIN. Then I would advise the government to sell them as quickly as possible or to give them away.

Mr. INGRAM. In the case of settlers coming in to take up waste lands and cut logs, do they enjoy the same privilege as lumbermen ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Every one is on equal terms. The tolls are fixed by Order in Council.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are not the booms used for these slides in the same condition as the booms on the Ottawa—specially for the benefit of lumbermen and nobody else. I cannot see why the same principle should apply now as in years gone by. In my younger days, lumber consisted of square timber.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is no square timber now on the St. Maurice.

Mr. COCHRANE. Therefore the circumstances have changed, and the same principles do not apply. The slides were built to allow square timber to come down, and it was necessary to have slides. But I venture the assertion that there is no demand for them now for square timber. The booms were built—specially for the benefit of lumbermen who were floating down logs. The logs come down altogether, and when they reach a certain place they are stopped by booms and collected by their different owners. While I would not have the slightest hesitation in supporting any expenditure for the benefit of the public as a whole, I cannot see why we should maintain booms at this enormous expense for the benefit of these lumbermen.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have much more use for them than before. But the point my hon. friend raises is one on which I have no opinion to express. In reply to my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, I beg to say that the reason why there was less revenue in the year 1901-2, as compared with the previous year, was the very low water which caused the logs to become stranded at various points, so that they could not get down. That will account to some extent for the large increase this year in the tolls collected.

Mr. MORIN. Are the tolls charged so much per log or per thousand feet board measure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So much per log. If my hon. friend from Peel would look at page 26 of part 7 of the Public Works Report, he would find a list of employees.

Slides and booms generally, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that we spent up to the 31st of December, 1902, $956.96. This was on the Ottawa slides and booms and the St. Lawrence slides and booms and the Gatineau slides and booms. This sum has been voted every year for many years, and sometimes a considerable amount is expended. The year before there were some $3,000 spent, and this year some $700. The expenditure depends on the urgent necessity of the work.

Roads and bridges—Portage du Fort—bridge over the Ottawa—works of reconstruction, provided the Quebec and Ontario governments contribute $5,000, including approaches, $16,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote of $16,000 that has been taken for several years. Negotiations have been going on between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec ; but now the money has been paid over by these provinces under agreement with the conditions on which this vote was given. The plans have been prepared and advertisements are out for tenders.

Mr. CLANCY. Has any expenditure been made by the federal government in the meantime ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No expenditure this year.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this an entirely new work, or has a bridge at any time previously been erected at this point across the Ottawa? Because, it seems to me that the policy of building such works, unless we are already committed to them, is not a very good policy. The provinces of Ontario and Quebec should build their own bridges. Of course, there may be circumstances which justify this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This bridge was built by the Dominion before. But it was washed away. The provinces of Ontario and Quebec contributed to the original structure, and the same conditions are to be carried out now. Of course, there is no rule or principle laid down for the building of these bridges. We have given assistance to interprovincial bridges in different parts of the country. From what I have heard, this is a very deserving case. There is a vote for another bridge, not on the same river, which will come up at a later stage, which also, I think, deserves assistance from this House.

Mr. BARKER. Is this the bridge, mentioned in the Auditor General's Report for 1901-2, page V—320, on which $16,000 has been spent?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was for the reconstruction of the bridge at the same place, from the main shore on the Ontario side to Portage du Fort Island.

Mr. BARKER. Is this the same bridge?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Practically the same. This is for the construction of a bridge from the island to the other shore.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to understand this clearly. In view of the statement of the hon. minister that the contribution of the two provinces have been forthcoming, and that plans have been prepared for the work, I asked the hon. minister if any expenditure had been made in the meantime, and I understand him to say none had been made. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) points out that a sum equal to that now asked for, and is described as a revote, has been expended on this same work. The hon. minister now explains, as I understand him, that this has been a revote from year to year, and that no money has been expended by the federal government, pending the settlement of the question of the contribution by the provinces.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I replied to the question as I understood it. I am strictly correct in stating that no money was expended, but that this is a revote of the total amount. My hon. friend refers to a bridge which has been built from the shore to the island. It is not the same work as this, but it is practically in the same locality. Until this portion is built, the river is not bridged from province to province. There are two bridges, one from the shore to the island, and the other from the island to the opposite shore. The bridge referred to by the hon. gentleman, that from the Ontario shore to the island, was completed during the past year.

Mr. CLANCY. What province does the island belong to?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister informs me that he believes that the island is on the Quebec side.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, this is a Quebec bridge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Ottawa river divides the provinces, so that this is an interprovincial bridge. But the river itself is divided by the island.

Mr. CLANCY. I cannot see that exactly. The river between an island that belongs to Quebec and the Quebec main shore is not a provincial boundary. The provincial boundary is on the other side, between the island belonging to Quebec and the Ontario shore. As I understand it, the bridge from the island to the Ontario side has been built, having been contributed to by Ontario, and now the bridge we are called upon to vote this money for, is wholly in the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend knows that we utilize the island to bridge the Ottawa river. I am not sure as to control of the island, but the deputy minister tells me that he is under the impression that the island is towards the centre of the stream, more on the Quebec than on the Ontario side.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not think that makes any difference. Take, for instance, an island in the St. Lawrence. An island on the American side is United States territory, and they have exclusive control of it. We may use the stream on either side for navigation purposes, but the territory is American territory. I think the same principle applies here. I am not finding fault with the expenditure of money, but if I understand it aright, the Ottawa river is the boundary line between the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec. That river is already bridged. That forms the boundary between the two provinces. The bridge that is to be built is from territory that belongs to the province of Quebec to the mainland. The river is as much a river of the province of Quebec as though it were a river in the mainland. That is the view I take of it. Has Quebec contributed to this bridge that has been built?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. When ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year.

Mr. COCHRANE. What amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Five thousand dollars. I understand the matter as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) does. But this has been considered in the past as an interprovincial bridge, and it is being treated as such now.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman tell us generally how much has been spent on the bridge during the last ten years, and how much has been contributed by the provinces ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. According to the memorandum I have here the expenditure was $43,098.27. I have not a memorandum of the amount contributed in the past by the provinces for this work.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the $16,000 the hon. gentleman is asking for now, cover the expenditure of last year ? Or did he expend $16,000 last year, that amount being supplemented by $5,000 from each of the two provinces, and is he now asking for another $16,000 to be supplemented in the same way ? And, if so, will this complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, my information is that the estimate of $16,000 is the total amount we are asked to contribute for this work.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. gentleman expended $16,000 last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But that is completed, we are not asking for anything more.

Mr. CLANCY. I confess my dullness, because I am not able to understand what the hon. gentleman means. Here is a work for constructing a portion or a whole of a bridge that is considered interprovincial. The hon. gentleman says that a sum of forty odd thousand dollars has been expended on that from the outset; that he is unable to say what proportion has been contributed by the Dominion and the respective provinces; that the $16,000 was expended on that portion of the bridge last year, and $16,000 more is being asked for this year——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was asked what amount had been expended on the old bridge in this particular place where we are now proposing to build a new one, and I said $42,098.27. But I said that bridge was practically out of existence, and that to be of any use it has to be renewed. I explained that the other portion of the bridge on the Ontario shore has been built and completed. My information from the department is that no further appropriation is required for that work, and that this $16,000, along with the contributions from the provinces, will complete the structure.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think we are gradually approaching to some understanding of this whole matter. I think it is important that we should fully comprehend the exact position that we are in. I understand from the Minister of Public Works that the bridge formerly built across the Ottawa river at Portage du Fort was swept away, the bridge has practically no existence, and that the estimate now asked for is to proceed with the construction of a new bridge, the provinces of Ontario and Quebec contributing sums towards the construction of that bridge. Now my mind is that the whole policy is wrong, that this parliament is not called upon in any shape or form to contribute towards the construction of a bridge at Portage du Fort across the Ottawa river; because if you are going to construct a bridge at Portage du Fort you might be called upon to construct a dozen other bridges along the Ottawa river, or over other rivers which form the boundary between the two provinces. To my mind no good reason can be advanced why we should build a bridge there at all. The bridge has been swept away, and I think now is the proper time for the government to consider what their policy should be in the future. This is altogether different from the public works we discussed this afternoon down at Shawénegan Falls, which we actually had on our hands, and it was necessary to carry it on or allow it to go to waste. But here the case is different. There is no bridge, the government has no asset there, has nothing to improve. They lose nothing by failing to contribute towards the erection of this bridge—unless it may be that they would lose a supporter on either side of the river. But that is not a policy we desire should be pursued. I think that it should not be looked at in that light, and that we should now, when there is no bridge there, when it has been swept away, when there is no asset for the government to protect, I think it is time the government should sit down and consider the question as to whether they should contribute one cent towards the construction of a new bridge, or whether they should leave it to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, whose duty I am satisfied it is to erect the necessary bridge for transportation from one side of the river to the other. I would feel much like moving that this item be struck out of the estimates. But instead of pursuing so radical a course as that, I would like the minister to look this matter over, to let this matter stand until the government has had time to consider it, and then if they come down to the House again and say they believe it is their duty to build the bridge, the House

can take such action as they think fit. I hope the minister will not press this vote. The vote of $16,000 was passed last year, possibly, without much discussion, and without a full understanding of the position in which we stood. I understand from the minister that no money was spent on this particular bridge, it was on another bridge that the estimate of last year was asked for. Then we have the matter much mixed; but I certainly understood the minister to say that the bridge for which he is now asking this $16,000 was entirely swept away, and that practically we have no bridge. I do not understand that any construction has yet been entered upon. The money we voted last year is asked to be revoted again. If an expenditure of $16,000 took place last year, in the estimates it would appear that the $16,000 now asked is a revote of what we voted last year. I do not understand that any money has been expended on this bridge, and I founded my argument for a reconsideration of the whole policy of the government on the ground that no expenditure was made last year, that the bridge had been swept away, that nothing has been done to restore it, and that we are now in the same position as if the bridge had never been built at that point. We have nothing to lose by striking this item out of the estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the minister tell us out of what vote the money was expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have it hunted up and hand it to my hon. friend. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) seems to expect me to be something more than human. I am to have a new policy for the old Conservative party and a new policy for the present government in all these matters. If in years gone by we voted $40,000 or $50,000 for a similar work, he seemed to think that the policy was in the interest of the country, that it was all right, when the money was expended by the government he was supporting. Last year we voted $16,000 for this very piece of work, as we did the year before, but for the other half of it. He has for several years found no fault with the policy that has been carried out. My hon. friend seemed to think that building an interprovincial bridge by the old government, costing $40,000 or $50,000, was good policy and in the public interest.

Mr. COCHRANE. May I ask the hon. minister : Did he think so ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I did, and so far as my judgment goes we may differ as to some matters, but I really think, when we look into the conditions connected with this work, we will find that it deserves to get a proper appropriation. There are other appropriations, perhaps, voted in regard to which we may have our own individual opinions, but, in this particular case, I think, taking all the circumstances into consideration, it is one that commends itself to parliament. When you have built half of this work, when parliament has twice been committed to it by making appropriations towards it, and when this is the third time that a vote is asked when the money is really required to be expended, I appeal to hon. gentlemen if it is not a vote that commends itself to our favourable consideration.

Mr. INGRAM. There is no doubt that the provinces of Quebec and Ontario have agreed to contribute towards the construction of this bridge, and there is no doubt that the Dominion government has contributed also. But, if the hon. minister will refer to page V—320 of the Auditor General's Report, he will see that the method adopted by the government for doing this work is very objectionable. In the first place, the hon. gentleman will see that the Berlin Iron Bridge Company received on the contract for the superstructure of the bridge, complete, $13,700. I would like to know whether the Berlin Iron Bridge Company in their contract agreed to put up this bridge themselves and find the labour for that price.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that that was the contract.

Mr. INGRAM. And did the bridge contractors furnish their own labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Now, there is a total expenditure of $16,497.36. The hon. gentleman will please deduct $13,700 from $16,497.36, and he will see that will leave a balance of about $2,700 or $3,000. I want to draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that we have first an inspector who received $409.95, then we have, for building approaches and foreman, $633.60, then we have a conductor who received $215.25, and then we have three general officials from Ottawa going out to do something around this bridge at $131.54. We have had the department stating all along to this House that they had a number of architects in the department ; yet, we find that there was paid to an architect, or to some person, 5 per cent of the contract price of this bridge for preparing the plans—some gentleman in the Canadian Pacific Railway office in Montreal. If this method is to be pursued in constructing a work that only costs $13,700, it is very extraordinary and some different method ought to be pursued than that. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can explain it away. That is as I understand it from the figures I have quoted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find the hon. gentleman's criticism is perfectly fair. The chief engineer informs me that the reason this 5 per cent was paid for these plans was that they would have to employ a special staff for bridges of this description, and they find it cheaper to get an outside expert to prepare these plans and specifications than to have them made in the department.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is there special about an iron bridge ? I think if you have not engineers who are capable of preparing plans for an iron bridge at this day in our history, you had better ship them and get somebody in their places who are up to date.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is probably not from lack of qualification on the part of engineers of the department that this work is not done there. There are several engineers in the department, I think, who are capable of preparing plans and specifications for this work.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the hon. minister is truly honest, was it not from the fact that somebody wanted a job that had not one ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As the hon. ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is not in his place to-day, I am hardly able to answer that question as to the motives that prompted him in regard to some of these expenditures. I suppose that all I can do is to promise to try and do a little better in the future.

Mr. INGRAM. Are we to assume that the hon. minister is not going to pursue this method of conducting public works in the future ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a very wide question. What I do say is that I will try if possible to make some reduction in regard to these incidental expenses. This is a technical question. The chief engineer informs me that he finds it cheaper to deal with a work of this kind outside than to deal with it in the department. Although I am responsible as the minister, I do not want to dispute the chief engineer in regard to that. I think that considerable saving may be made in this direction, and as far as I am personally concerned, I will endeavour to see if it cannot be done.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appears to me perfectly absurd to say that with an expenditure of $13,700, on an iron superstructure we should spend $1,900 for supervising the job. If we have a plan prepared at $600, and two or three superintendents getting $1,500, it strikes me that there is something radically wrong, and that the hon. minister should not hesitate to tell us to-day that he will not only try to do better, but that he will say that this will not happen again. I would suggest to the hon. minister that he should assume the responsibility for this expenditure. The hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) is responsible. The hon Minister of Justice is just as responsible as the hon ex-Minister of Public Works is for this expenditure. I will not allow the hon. Minister of Justice to shirk the responsibility of the ministry because the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works is not in the House. The ministers are just as much responsible for his conduct when he was Minister of Public Works in the administration as they would be if he were Minister of Public Works to-day. They should not attempt to shirk their responsibility. It would be more manly for them to justify the expenditure instead of attempting to shirk their responsibility by saying that the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works is not in the House. The hon. Minister of Justice was in office when the money was expended. The hon. Minister of Public Works was not in the cabinet at that time, but the other members of the government are just as responsible as the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Why am I brought into this thing ?

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). We want justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is not what you want.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I want my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) to be fair. I have stated before that as a member of the cabinet I do not desire to shirk the responsibility, nor do I know that the premier or any other member of the cabinet does. The question asked me was whether this had been given to an outsider for some reason or other, and I said I could not answer that. We have to take the responsibility for the expenditure, and unless a minister acted without consulting his colleagues—even then I suppose the Prime Minister is responsible for his conduct.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the money been paid by the provinces ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that the money has been paid over and is now in the hands of the Crown. The arrangement was that each province was to contribute $5,000 towards the whole cost and that money has been paid.

Mr. INGRAM. We are paying $32,000 as against $10,000 paid by both local governments. Has the minister given a contract for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract has not been let.

Mr. BLAIN. The wording of the item would indicate that there is some doubt as to the provinces paying their share.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The money has been paid.

Mr. BLAIN. Which province does the island on which the bridge will rest, belong to ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say. It might possibly be a federal island, but there is a recent decision of the Privy Council which might place it in the province of Quebec. I cannot give a judicial opinion on that.

Mr. BLAIN. Would not that be a matter for consideration before the bridge is built.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot see that that enters into it at all. Different decisions have been given by the Privy Council as to the rights of the provinces in the ownership of the foreshore and so on, but there is no doubt about this being a navigable stream, and under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. WILSON. It is not an ordinary thing for the Dominion government to build this kind of a bridge, and the minister should give us the reasons why the government was induced to build this particular bridge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have given a history of the bridge. It was the policy of the old government and it happens to be the policy of this government.

Mr. WILSON. It is no answer to say that it was the policy of the old government. The late government was defeated, I think not for the good of the country. It is no justification for a minister of the Crown to say that he is following this course because his predecessors did. The House ought to know what induced this government to undertake this work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that it was the policy of this government because it was the policy of the late government.

Mr. WILSON. You gave it as a reason.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not. I said it was a policy that was in existence for a great many years and that it was the policy of the late government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) wanted to make out that this was the first case of such a thing in the history of the country, and I told him that it was not a new thing, that it is a policy which has been in existence for a great many years, and that it was followed by the late government. The principle that governs this was to assist the people of these districts to have a bridge across a river under the control of the government, and which river divides the two provinces.

Mr. WILSON. I am just as wise now as I was before. If this river is bridged by the Dominion government because it is a navigable stream, does the same rule apply to all navigable rivers. The minister finds fault because I said that he tried to justify this because it had been the policy of the late government and the policy of all governments since confederation. That is no argument for me. The question is whether or not it is right that this should be done, and I want to know the reason why the government chose this particular river to build a bridge over. If it is done in all cases then that might be an answer, but if it is only done in special cases why was this particular stream selected ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. member tries to make out that I said we did it because the late government did it. I did not say anything of the kind. I said it has been a common practice by both governments.

Mr. WILSON. That is no reason.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say it was a reason, and I am glad my hon. friend agrees with me that it is no reason. The reason is because it is an interprovincial bridge and after consideration it was thought well to give a grant towards it.

Mr. WILSON. Is that a common practice.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been a common practice.

Mr. WILSON. I understood the minister to say in his previous explanation that this was out of the ordinary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not insinuate anything of the kind.

Mr. BARKER. The leader of the opposition asked the minister to give him the authority under which this money was spent, and the minister promised to do so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Deputy Minister misunderstood the question. This money was voted last year and the year before. But what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition wanted, was the vote the money was spent out of in the year 1901-1902. I will have that hunted up and sent across.

Ottawa city—bridges over the Ottawa river, the slides and the Rideau canal and approaches thereto—ordinary repairs, $7,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to provide for the usual necessary ordinary renewals and repairs to bridges in the city of Ottawa and the approaches thereto, the maintenance of which was assumed by the government under Order in Council of the 17th of June, 1885.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman tell us where the Minto bridge is ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think there is any bridge under the jurisdiction of the department of Public Works known as the Minto bridge.

Mr. INGRAM. I know that, but I wanted to find out where it was.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister informs me that one of the bridges on the way to Rideau Hall, under the control of the Ottawa Improvement Commission, is called Minto bridge.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood that the Ottawa Improvement Commission had no control over bridges. I understood their work was to beautify the streets of Ottawa. I would like to know whether, in building this bridge, they have not gone outside of their duties.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think one of the first works they did was to build the bridges across the Rideau river. The bridges have no connection with the department in any way.

Mr. WILSON. Is the Dominion government responsible for all the bridges over the canals ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think probably the Dominion government build and maintain all the bridges over the canals throughout the Dominion.

Dominion traffic bridges throughout Canada, including approaches, $5,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for necessary repairs to bridges built by the department in the North-west Territories, &c.

Land and cable lines, maritime provinces, $28,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The vote of $18,000 is to make provision for the construction of a telegraph line on the east coast of Cape Breton Island from St. Peter's canal to Louisburg, together with an extension from Louisburg north to Scatarie island lighthouse, and also an extension of the line from Gabarouse to North Sydney. This work is under contract, and this vote is expected to complete the work. The vote of $10,000 is for completing the construction of a telegraph line from St. Peter's to Canso and connecting Port Mulgrave with Port Hawkesbury by cable. This is under contract. Its total cost is $13,900, and the present vote is expected to complete the work.

Mr. COCHRANE. Who has the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. M. Cameron, Maple, N.S.

Mr. COCHRANE. Were tenders advertised for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The disadvantage under which the province of Prince Edward Island has been labouring for a great many years in regard to telegraphic communication is well known to this House. For the last two years, while I have had the honour to represent a portion of the province in this House, I have brought this matter to the attention of the House, and on each occasion I have been promised that the matter would receive attention at the hands of the government; but finally we have been humbugged by the government, for the matter has not received their attention, though it is one closely affecting the commercial interests of the province. As on different occasions I have with others, as the pages of 'Hansard' will verify, pointed out the grievances under which the people of Prince Edward Island suffer in this regard, both retarding their commercial growth and preventing the press despatches and news of outside world reaching them except at great cost—think it unnecessary to deal further with this phase here. The question now is as to the remedy, and I consider the government has the ready means in their hands. I understand that a delegation from the different boards of trade of Prince Edward Island have come here to interview the minister and the government on this matter, and I trust that due attention will be paid to their representations and some remedy provided for the exorbitant rates which the people of Prince Edward Island have to pay for their messages, and for the disadvantage which they are under in having no night service or night rates. I understand that the Anglo-American Telegraph Company are willing either to sell out to the government or to reduce their rates to the regular service rates paid in the maritime provinces, and to give a night service, provided the government will guarantee them against any loss. The Dominion government is under obligations to give the province an up-to-date service, and it seems to me that the difficulty could be readily overcome if the government would take it up in a businesslike way. I have here the resolutions passed by the boards of trade of Prince Edward Island, and the report brought in by their committee. It is quite a lengthy report, but it will certainly put the members of this House in possession of the facts in regard to the situation in Prince Edward Island, and I will therefore take the liberty of using a little of the time of the House to read it :

The adjourned meeting of the Board of Trade to consider the improved telegraph service was held last night. The meeting was a most representative one, among those present being Premier Peters, Hon. D. Farquharson, D. G. Cameron, Montague and other prominent men.

President Messervey occupied the chair and after stating the object called upon F. L. Hazard to read the report of the committee appointed at a previous meeting to fully investigate the question. The following is the full

REPORT.

The committee beg to report as follows :

By the Act of the legislature of Prince Edward Island, 17 Vic. cap. 4. (1853) section 2 : It was enacted that the 'New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company' may establish, construct, purchase and keep in order and work any line or lines of magnetic electric or other telegraph, or means of telegraphic communication in any part of this island, or its dependencies, or places under its jurisdiction, or between any point or points therein and any other island, province, country or place in or near the continent of America or in or near the continent of Europe ; or in the Atlantic ocean ; and during the existence of the said corporation no other person or persons, body or bodies politic or corporate, shall be permitted to extend to enter upon or touch any part of this island or the coast thereof, or of the islands or places within the jurisdiction of the government of this province with any telegraph cable, wire or other means of telegraphic communication from any other province, state, country or place whatsoever beyond the continent of America.

By the Act of 28 Vic., cap. 13, section 1. It was enacted that, so long during the term of ten years from the passing of this Act (passed April 15, 1857) as the said New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company, shall maintain a regular telegraphic communication between this island and the continent of America and Newfoundland, and shall likewise during said period at the cost and charges of the said company, build, erect and maintain telegraph offices and stations at either end of the electric cable connecting this island with the continent of America and Newfoundland, that is to say at Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine respectively, and shall likewise maintain operators at the said stations for the purpose of transmitting intelligence from and to this island and to the post office in Charlottetown at the same rate and charges as at present received by the said company for the transmission of messages, there shall be paid to the said company from the public treasury of this island yearly and every year during the said period of ten years, the sum of three hundred pounds of lawful current money of this island in equal half-yearly payments.

By the Act of 32 Vic., cap. 34, (1869), section 1. It was enacted as follows : If the New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company shall on or before the 1st day of July next, lay down in proper working order a new submarine telegraph cable, across the Strait of Northumberland so as to connect this island with the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the continent of America generally ; that is to say, at or near Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine respectively or at some convenient points on each side of the said strait and shall open offices and provide operators at Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine or some other convenient points on each side of the straits to the satisfaction and approval of the government of this island, then so long after the completion of such telegraphic communication and conection as before mentioned as the New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company shall maintain a regular telegraphic communication between this island and the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and the continent of America generally and shall likewise during the same period at the costs and charges of the said company build, erect and maintain telegraphic offices and stations at either end of the electric cable, connecting this island with the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the continent of America generally, that is to say at Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine respectively and shall likewise maintain and provide properly qualified operators at the said stations for the purpose of transmitting intelligence from and to this island and to the post offices in Charlottetown and Summerside respectively at the same rates and charges as regards the transmission of inland messages between one post office and another in Prince Edward Island as heretofore charged by the company and at a rate not exceeding fifty cents additional on former charges on messages passing out and into this island through the sub-marine cable and in the ordinary proportions for any additional number of words in each message, and also in the event of any of the people or government of this island erecting good and sufficient posts free of cost to the said company for an extension of the land-line to Cascumpec or Alberton, the said company to furnish the wires and insulators therefor and perfect telegraphic communication to Cascumpec or Alberton as the case may be and maintain said lines in proper working order and also keep up and maintain telegraph offices and stations and operators at Charlottetown, Summerside, Cascumpec or Alberton for the transmission of messages, there shall be paid to the said company from the public treasury of this island the sum of £600, of lawful current money of the said island in lieu of any former contract by half-yearly payments. . .

Section 2. Provides that all the rights, privileges, profits and monopolies with respect to extending, erecting, maintaining and building the said lines of telegraphic communication within this island in conection with it internally . . . . . and all other rights, &c., given to or conferred on the said company by the Act of the general assembly of said island, 17 Vic. cap. 4 (1853) are hereby conferred, restored and given to the said company.

Section 4. Provides that in case of failure of said company to perform, keep in order and maintain the telegraphic communication aforesaid, it shall be lawful for the lieutenant governor . . for the time being in council to contract with any person or persons willing to become bound to keep up or maintain the same or such part thereof as the said lieutenant governor . . in council shall require to be contracted for and in such case the privileges and monopolies hereby granted to the said company shall have no force or operation as against any such other person or persons who may contract to become bound as aforesaid.

Section 6. Provides that, in order to enable the government to carry out in good faith any arrangement respecting telegraphic comunication, already made or negotiated or which may be hereafter made or negotiated with the said New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company or any other company, person or persons in connection with or within this island or any point or points therein whether hereinbefore named and specified or not, it shall be lawful for the lieutenant governor with the advice of the executive council from time to time if it appears advisable, to alter, change, relax, or dispense with and again if need be to require to be performed any of the services in respect of telegraphic communication required to be performed by the first section of this Act, and also from time to time if need be, to make such further or other arrangements respecting telegraphic communication as shall

be found necessary and advisable, and to apply the sum of money hereby granted to defray the costs of such altered arrangements so far as the same can extend or provide for the same.

It is this last mentioned Act, that now so far as the committee has been able to ascertain forms the existing contract between this province and the present Anglo-American Telegraph Company—which latter company claims to have possessed itself of all the rights and privileges conferred upon the New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company by the before mentioned statutes—but, whether or not this latter contention can be fully maintained the committee express some doubt.

I may also say that the Hon. Sir Louis H. Davies, when Minister of Marine and Fisheries, gave as his opinion to this House that this company had no monopoly for cable communications to Prince Edward Island. In the 'Hansard' of 1900, page 1720, he is reported to have said :

This company was established in 1853, and it had a certain monopoly granted to it, but that monopoly does not extend to the laying of a line beween Prince Edward Island and the continent of America. It does extend to the laying of a line between Prince Edward Island, England and Europe, but not to the laying of a line between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of America, and although the company sedulously seeks to create the impression everywhere that such a monopoly does exist, I have given my attention to the whole matter very closely, and find that such a monopoly does not exist.

This Committee, in its report, came to the same conclusion, and consequently there is no excuse for the government failing to take hold of the matter. If they cannot deal directly with the Anglo-American Telegraph company, they should take the matter in their own hands and put in an entire government service, or at any rate, deal with it in some way that would remove all grounds for complaint. Under the terms of the union, when this province became part of the government in 1873, it was agreed that the Dominion government should assume and defray all the charges for various services, among which is the maintenance of telegraphic communications between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. And it stands to reason that the telegraphic communications thus stipulated should be such as is afforded the other provinces. We simply come before the government and ask that we should be put on the same plane as the province of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and that the rates for sending messages and the hours in which they may be sent shall be the same as in those provinces.

By section 92 of the British North America Act, subsection A of subsection 10, it is provided that the provincial legislatures shall have exclusive powers over local works and undertakings other than :

Lines of steamer other than ship, railways, canals, telegraph and other works and undertakings connecting the province with any other or others of the provinces or extending beyond the limits of the province.

It is evident therefore, that the Dominion government is seized with the duty of maintaining regular telegraphic communication with the provinces of Prince Edward Island and with this province. The committee reported :

That the province requires at the present time an up to date day and night service Sunday included, at the same rate per message and for additional words—this to include the privilege of sending night despatches at reduced rates—as charged in the other maritime provinces.

I pointed out last year the immense disadvantages under which the people of Prince Edward Island are labouring in this connection. I showed that the rates charged for sending messages were more than treble those charged in the other maritime provinces. The committee suggested the following measures by which the government should deal with the subject, and, as I have pointed out, the Western Union Telegraph Company are perfectly willing to deal in any reasonable way with the matter. The suggestions of the committee are as follows :

1. That the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, even if entitled to all the privileges granted to the New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company do not possess an absolute monopoly over the telegraph system of this province and that it is competent for the government to contract with any other company or persons, so long as the company or persons contracted with do not extend any telegraph cable wire or other means of telegraphic communication from any other province, state, country or place beyond the continent of America.

2. That the government under section 6 of 32, Vic. cap. 34 (provincial statutes) has the right to require that the present contract, if still a binding one, be so altered as to give the required additional telegraph service.

3. That inasmuch as the present company close their office from 8 p.m., to 8 a.m., each day and from 8 p.m., on Saturday until 8 a.m., on Mondays, it cannot be successfully contended that they have kept up regular telegraphic communication in accordance with the spirit of the Act, and consequently that a forfeiture of any rights they possessed has taken place, and it is competent for the government to contract with any other company or persons for an efficient service as provided for in section 4, of the Act of 22 Vic. cap. 34 hereinbefore mentioned.

4. That the government might acquire by purchase or expropriation the ownership of the cable across the straits and thus be in a position either to operate it or lease it subject to such terms and conditions as would prevent difficulties occurring or exorbitant tariff charges being made in future.

5. That failing any of the foregoing propositions commending themselves such terms can be made by the Dominion government by the payment of increased subsidy so as to place this island on an equal footing regarding telegraphic communication with the other provinces, and in this latter connection it appears that there are no insuperable difficulties as a pro-

position has already been made by the Anglo-American Telegraph Company by the letter of Mr. J. H. Carson, the manager of said company to Sir Louis Davies, dated 21st March, 1900, and to Attorney General Peters, dated 25th February, 1901.

These suggestions are thrown out by the committee as feasible methods by which the matter may be dealt with, but they do not commit themselves to any of them. It is for the government to carry out the terms of union, and give the island an up-to-date service. The matter, as I have said, has been before the House a number of times. When I brought it up two years ago, Sir Louis H. Davies said he had the matter in hand and that it would be attended to forthwith, and asked us not to insist upon communications being brought down at that time. Last year I brought the matter up, and the Minister of Public Works replied :

I have to assure my hon. friends that the government will give their best consideration to the important point which has been raised. It is not the first time that I have heard complaints about the Anglo-American Company.

It is like everything else that Prince Edward Island asks for it has to be brought up year after year, and even then the people's complaints are not really listened to.

The hon. gentlemen who have spoken are right in saying that we have the means of reaching them. Several members of the government will be in England in a short time, and, if circumstances permit, I expect to go there myself. I will try to have a short and interesting interview with these gentlemen of the Anglo-American Company.

And so on. Now, the matter is in the same state, practically, as it was last year. The present Minister of Public Works has, on several occasions, looked after the interests of Prince Edward Island in a praiseworthy manner. I trust he will not content himself with merely saying that he will look into this case, but that he will take it up and deal with it this session, so that an end may be put to this outrage upon the people of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HACKETT. While I have no desire to detain the committee from the important business now before it, I feel it my duty to make a few remarks on the question brought forward by the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey). This question is one of vital importance to the people of Prince Edward Island. The grievance is one under which they have laboured for nearly fifty years. A monopoly was fastened upon them about fifty years ago, and from that time until the present they have contended against it—without any result it is true. Although Sir Louis Davies, some two years ago said in this parliament that there was no monopoly, that the telegraph service of Prince Edward Island was as free as the telegraph service of any part of Canada, yet the fact remains that the monopoly is still in existence, that the people of

Prince Edward Island are charged additional rates for telegraph messages over the short cable of nine miles between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse. I would therefore urge upon the government that every means should be taken to end this grievance. The hon. member for East Prince has read the speech of the Minister of Public Works of last year. Notwithstanding what the hon. minister said, nothing has been done, and the people are still suffering under the incubus of a monopoly. What aggravates the difficulty is that our mail service in Prince Edward Island is so irregular in the winter season that our merchants, farmers and others engaged in business transactions with the outside world are debarred for weeks from receiving letters from outside the island, or sending letters to outside points. This is all the greater reason why something should be done to redress this grievance with regard to the telegraph system. If we had a fair telegraph service, our business men would be able to carry on their business under more reasonable conditions. Under the present system we are charged an extra rate for this cable when we can use it, and the telegraph offices are closed from eight o'clock in the evening until eight o'clock in the morning, no telegraph communications being received from the mainland between those hours. It does not need to be said that this question is of the most vital importance to our people. My hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) has read the resolutions passed by the boards of trade in the provinces. As I am aware that a delegation is in the city at the present time to interview the government with regard to this matter, I feel it my duty to speak a few words on behalf of the people of my province. My hon. friend from East Prince has entered very fully into the case. He has shown that the boards of trade, who thoroughly understand the situation have, by resolution, placed on record their views on this subject, representing in this matter the whole of the people in Prince Edward Island from East Point to North Cape—not a very large province, it is true, but I still claim, one of the fairest and finest provinces of the Dominion. I trust that the government will take action, and, if they cannot make an arrangement with the Anglo-American Company, will take over the service themselves. Mr. Marconi with his wireless system has sent messages from Glace Bay, Cap Breton, to Great Britain. If the Anglo-American people have a monopoly of the cable, why cannot the government enter into a contract with Mr. Marconi to establish a service between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse, and so give the people the telegraph facilities to which they are entitled. I have only one word to add to what my hon. friend from East Prince said. There are only two of us in this parliament who represent the people of Prince Edward Island, who seek to advance the interest of the people of that pro-

vince and are ready to voice their wishes. The other members from the island are as dumb as oysters. Even when they are here they have nothing to say, and generally they are not here. We are here to attend to the interest of our constituents, and I ask the government to take this matter of our telegraph system into their most serious consideration.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I understood the hon. gentleman who first spoke, he said there was a deputation here now desirous of laying this matter before the government. Personally, I have not had it brought to my attention, but I would be pleased to hear what the deputation has to say, and give their representations full attention. I am not familiar enough with the matter to make any promises at the present time.

Mr. BARKER. The minister has given me the book that the leader of the opposition asked for, and I wish now for a moment to go back to the item 137. When parliament granted the $15,000 it was on condition that the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario should contribute each $5,000, those are the words in the vote. Now we are expending another $16,000, and I presume on the same conditions, that the provinces should contribute each $5,000. But the word 'each' is not in this vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps my hon. friend misunderstood me. The total amount contributed to this whole work is $5,000 from each of the two provinces. My hon. friend thinks that each province should contribute $5,000 now. I understand from the deputy minister that the conditions were that the provinces were to contribute $5,000 each to the whole work, and that would include both branches.

Mr. BARKER. It was not so expressed when, in 1901, parliament granted $15,000 for this bridge on condition that the two provinces should each give $5,000. Now we are giving a vote corresponding with that vote of $15,000. There is no doubt that parliament, in granting that $15,000, did so on the understanding that $10,000 should be contributed by the provinces, making $25,000 for the whole work. Now we are giving $16,000 more, and I presume that the two provinces will give $10,000 again.

Mr. INGRAM. If the word 'each' was put before the word 'provinces,' that would meet the case.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this particular case, I was under the same misapprehension as my hon. friend. The deputy minister informs me that we have got the money in our hands, it has already been paid over. I have no objection to putting in the word 'each.' But it may be that if we put in the word 'each,' the Auditor General might say that was another vote, different from the one we had before.

Mr. BARKER. I have no doubt that parliament, on the previous occasion, gave the $15,000 on the understanding that $10,000 would be put along with it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can only give my hon. friend the information I have from the department. The deputy minister informs me that was the understanding.

Mr. BARKER. It was so expressed in the estimate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was under that impression myself, but I am now giving the actual facts. There is no use changing it, so far as this particular vote is concerned, because the $10,000 has recently been paid into our hands.

Mr. INGRAM. For that reason there should be no objection to putting in the word 'each.' 'The works of reconstruction provided the Ontario and Quebec governments contribute $5,000, including approaches.' That might mean $2,500 each.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The provinces of Ontario and Quebec have paid their money. I think these words should come out, because the condition has already been complied with so far as they have any intention of complying with it. If it remains as it is now, I think the Auditor General will rule that this money cannot be paid unless they make a further contribution, and the minister tells us that is not the intention. So it seems to me these words, to carry out his intention, would have to be omitted.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman say when the money was received ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would have to get the exact dates from the department. We are in this position now, that we shall have this vote of $16,000, and the $5,000 from each of the provinces, as cash on hand to carry out the work. There cannot be any dispute.

Mr. INGRAM. It would make a good deal of difference if the money had been received before this item was put in the estimates by the council. In that case the word 'each' should be put in.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since the hon. gentleman has brought it to my attention, I will refer the matter to the Department of Justice.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). I just heard the closing remarks of the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett). I do not think there was any occasion at all for such a statement, because the members from Prince Edward Island supporting the government attend very strictly to their busi-

ness. If my hon. friend wishes to make any political capital by making remarks of that kind and having them published in the island press, he is mistaken. It is really not worthy of the hon. gentleman himself. He knows as well as anybody else that we are attending to our business here. I can tell the hon. gentleman that only this afternoon we were attending to that very matter. There is a delegation here now to interview the government, and members supporting the government are working with those gentlemen. I think the matter will be advanced in that way better than by the speeches the hon. gentleman made.

Mr. COCHRANE. What have you been doing these number of years ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What were you doing for eighteen years ?

Mr. COCHRANE. I have no objection to your saying what you please. But get up on your feet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no man in this House who talks more without getting on his feet than the hon. member for Northumberland ; he is constantly interrupting. We take it good naturedly, and when anybody else makes an observation, he might as well take it good naturedly.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is no man in the House who talks more than the Finance Minister and says less. When he talks about the last eighteen years, he was not in this House, he was controlling a smaller portfolio than the one he controls now, he was discussing the propriety of a dissolution of the union, and of his province going into the republic of the United States. I will not allow the hon. Minister of Finance to criticise my action in this House. I was here before the hon. gentleman was, and I know the history of the hon. gentleman very well. Therefore, I am not going to be lectured by the hon. gentleman, although he is occupying a position that he little deserves, a position which his ability does not warrant.

Mr. HACKETT. I am pleased to hear the explanation of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes) in this connection, and I am also pleased to find that he accompanied the delegation, and is using his influence with the ministry. I trust that his influence will be successful, and that with this delegation the hon. gentleman will succeed in getting for the people of Prince Edward Island the telegraph service, which they are so much in need of.

Quebec—to repair and improve roadways and increase operating facilities generally to eastward of Godbout, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a vote of $1,000 for maintaining roadways in connection with the lines there.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.)

Belle Isle—telegraph line between extreme ends of island, $5,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister explain this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote of $5,000 to be applied to the construction of a line between the extreme ends of Belle Isle, carrying it along the ridge in the middle of the island. This amount has been revoted several times. The Department of Marine and Fisheries are undertaking considerable improvements in the lighting there. A new lighthouse is being built, and there is under consideration some arrangements in regard to the wireless system of telegraphy. Until these are completed, I cannot give any further information in regard to this work. This is a very important point in connection with shipping and some arrangement will come in a very short time.

Mr. BLAIN. Would it be in order to give some explanation in regard to the Marconi system of telegraphy ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid I am not capable of giving any information that would be of any use at the present time.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps the hon. Finance Minister would give us that information ?

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. Minister of Finance made the arrangement with the Marconi people and he will be in a position to give us some information in regard to it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) is hardly correct in saying I made the arrangement. The arrangement and the contract were made with the Prime Minister, but, however, that is not important. I really do not think there is anything to say concerning the Marconi business that has not been already given to the public through the press. When the government contributed a sum towards the erection of a station at Table Head, Glace Bay, we were assured by the Marconi people that they had every reason to believe that they would have commercial telegraphy established before the present day. They seem to have made a success of it scientifically, and several months ago there was general rejoicing at what seemed to be the complete success of the system. They had been sending some messages, not commercially, but some hitch has since occurred. We were constantly being assured by them that they were on the verge of success. Scientifically it is a success, but they do not seem to have been able to apply it to commercial purposes up to this time. The last communication we had from Mr. Marconi, some months ago, was to the effect that they expected to engage in commercial business at an early day. We felt assured that they would soon be able to engage in com-

mercial business. However, we are not in a position to add anything to what has been stated in the public press. There seems to be some hitch, the particular nature of which we do not understand. All I can say is that they have assured us that everything is going well and that within a short time they hope to make it a commercial success.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that mean as to the actual success of the working of the system, or does it mean a financial success ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it means that we will have commercial wireless telegraphy in operation in a short time. They gave us repeated assurances in a general way that that would happen. But although they seemed to have established it for a short time, something went wrong and at the present time they are not sending any messages, and they are not in a position to do a commercial business.

Mr. INGRAM. There is no doubt that the system is successful ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no doubt that the system is scientifically successful. They have sent messages, but they do not seem to be able to send them on a sufficiently large scale to warrant them in undertaking a commercial business, so that we have not had any benefit from it so far. But, they are forming a company in Canada for the purpose of making their connections. They seem to have every confidence in the success of the system, but the public seems to have been a little anxious in consequence of the fact that they have not yet been so successful as they expected in that they have not been able to undertake a commercial business.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. minister will tell us how much the Dominion government contributed up to date towards that system, and perhaps, while he is on his feet, he will make a statement as to whether the government intend to contribute any further sum, if so, on what conditions, and whether they are as hopeful now as when the government made a statement some little time ago in regard to this system.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Speaking from memory, the full sum which we agreed to pay, $80,000, has been paid. We have made no other arrangements. We do not contemplate paying any sum of money other than that originally agreed upon, which was $80,000. I think I would be justified in saying that we are as hopeful now as at any time. A couple of months ago there seemed to be a general conviction that the thing had been accomplished scientifically and commercially. In fact some messages were sent. We have had assurances from Mr. Marconi that it would be made a commercial success. From everything we have seen of Mr. Marconi we have very great faith in him. He is a great inventor, and he has assured us that he has perfect faith in the system, and we are hopeful that it will turn out all right.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister tell us whether the money was paid to Mr. Marconi himself, or to the company in which he is interested ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was paid to the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company, with which he is connected. The contract was made with the company, although the original negotiation was held with Mr. Marconi. The contract was made with a company called the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company.

Mr. BLAIN. Who compose that company ? Are they Canadian capitalists, or old country capitalists ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is an English company.

Mr. BLAIN. Altogether ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Entirely so. They have since organized a Canadian company for some department of their business, but the contract was made entirely with these English people.

The Magdalen Islands—land lines, renewal of wiring, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This amount is called for by the general superintendent of government telegraphs to make provision for renewing fifty miles of wiring of the Magdalen Island lines. These lines were built in 1879, and the system has been damaged by sleet storms. It is calculated that the work will cost $2,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. minister state what was the sum spent last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount spent last year was $1,119.50. The total estimated cost of this work is $4,000. The balance of $800 will be expended between now and the 30th June next.

Mr. COCHRANE. Has the telegraph system always been under the Minister of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. Ever since the department was formed.

Mr. INGRAM. Was there not some mention made of handing these telegraph lines over to the Port Office Department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never heard of it at all.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman say he never heard of it ? I am not saying that it has been suggested to him personally by any action that has been taken, but I assume that the hon. gentleman is a very careful newspaper reader, and upon that ground I have a shrewd suspicion that the hon. gentleman has heard of it already.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose I owe an apology to the House, but as a matter of fact I seldom read the papers, especially certain portions of them. I am not aware that such a proposal was made at any time, either in the papers or out of them.

Mr. COCHRANE. Did the minister hear it through the Marconi system ?

Mr. SCOTT. Before we leave the consideration of these telegraph items, I would like an explanation from the minister respecting the great void that appears here under the head of the North-west Territories. Last year there was a vote of $62,700 for telegraph lines in the North-west Territories, and this year that item is reduced by $62,700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That appropriation was made for work that is completed or which will be completed before the 30th of June next.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it intended to carry out some further extensions of the North-west Territories telegraph lines in the coming year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These representations will be taken into consideration, and when the supplementary estimates come down we will know.

Surveys and inspections—$50,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote provides for the surveys and inspections made during the fiscal year in connection with the hydrographic survey of the St. Lawrence on the Canadian side of the international boundary between Kingston and Pembroke.

Mr. COCHRANE. Will this be carried out by the Minister of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I was in the Department of Marine and Fisheries I advocated that the hydrographical survey should be controlled by one department, and I thought it should be transferred to the other department, because they have an organization of boats and staff which ought to do it better than to have it in the different departments, as it is at the present time. However, the word hydrographic survey is misleading. It is not a hydrographic survey, as it is generally supposed, but it is for the surveys made for dredging, and consequently is under the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BARKER. I have some inquiries to make with regard to this item, but it is now six o'clock.

Some resolutions reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ONTARIO AND QU'APPELLE LAND COMPANY.

House went into Committee on Bill (No. 62) respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.—Mr. McCarthy.

On section 2,

Mr. BARKER. I would like to call attention to the rather unusual terms of this section. It provides that from time to time the paid up capital subscribed may be refunded to the shareholders.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the last three words of that section, 'or provided for,' were struck out in the Private Bills Committee. Perhaps that may meet his objection.

Mr. BARKER. What does that mean : 'provided that all the liabilities of the company at the time of any such payment are paid' ? There may be ninety-nine cents on the dollar of the capital returned, and liabilities not yet accrued might be in existence. I do not want to interfere with the general object of this Bill, but I think the House should protect the creditors.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman will see by the first section that there must be enough land retained to answer for the paid up capital and the liabilities.

Mr. BARKER. Nobody can say that the lands are enough to pay the liabilities. My impression is that the only safety for the creditors is in requiring that the shareholders shall remain liable.

Mr. McCARTHY. The shareholders will not be relieved. If a shareholder has fully paid up his capital, his liability is relieved at once. The capital of this company is fully paid, so that there is no liability of shareholders. The directors' liability, however, is still there.

Mr. BARKER. I know that when a shareholder pays up, his liability ceases; but when a company returns to him his money, the position is reversed. I would like to ask what the Minister of Justice thinks of this kind of legislation ? The company might pay back to the shareholders ninety-nine cents on the dollar of their paid up capital, leaving one cent on the dollar to meet a large liability to the public.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the liabilities are met at the time the payment is made, then no liabilities exist. Any future liability can only be incurred in respect to the assets then in existence; and if any creditor advances money to the company, he is assumed to be astute enough to inquire what

assets are being pledged in respect of that liability. If that is so, the creditors are amply protected.

Mr. BARKER. As the Minister of Justice is here, I should like to have his opinion of this legislation. Here is a corporation ready to go into business. It may incur liabilities up to to-day; and to-night ninety-nine per cent of the capital may be returned to the incorporators, people speculating or dealing in lands, and the company may go on incurring further liabilities with only one cent on the dollar in the treasury to meet those liabilities.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As I understand, the capital is to be paid off out of the assets of the company, and will be reduced to the extent of those payments, and that reduction can only take place when the liabilities of the company have been liquidated; so that, for any future liabilities of the company, the creditors will have to be careful not to contract with the company beyond its capacity to pay. It seems to me the chief result of this Bill will be to destroy the credit of the corporation.

Mr. BARKER. I have no doubt it ought to destroy the credit of the corporation, because no man would see what his security was. But is it right to create corporations that may be in such a state ? You create a corporation that may have a capital of $1,000,000. The directors may reduce that million dollars capital to $20,000 or $5,000, but how does the general public know that that reduction has occurred ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The general public is supposed to contract with a company with a knowledge of its Act of incorporation, and when the credit of the company has been very materially impaired by the reduction of its capital, the general public will be put upon inquiry.

Mr. BARKER. They ought not to be put on inquiry, and we ought not to pass legislation which is very much like the wildcat legislation of the western states, where the public do not know what kind of corporations they are dealing with. This legislation will not only affect this particular company, but every other corporation in the country.

Mr. McCARTHY. The explanation given by the parties interested in the Bill before the Private Bills Committee was——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Who are the parties interested ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. E. B. Osler, was chairman of the committee, and Mr. H. S. Osler explained that this was similar legislation to that obtained in England by the Hudson Bay Company and the Canada company.

Mr. BARKER. Was that a good reason ?

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. member has insinuated that this is only wild-cat American legislation.

Mr. BARKER. I think it is.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then it is also wildcat British legislation.

Mr. BARKER. That may be so.

Mr. McCARTHY. It does not appeal to me in the same way as it does to the hon. gentleman. It seems to me that if anybody wants to guard against a reduction of capital by a company, the first thing he would do would be to ascertain what enactments and power that company has. He is put upon inquiry to ascertain what is its charter and to what extent its capital has been impaired before he makes any investment or enters into any contract with it. It seems to be perfectly clear and reasonable legislation.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any other companies doing business in Canada under a charter of this kind whose charter has such a clause as this ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think we have just passed a charter with the same clause in it. Before I could give a positive opinion on a question of this sort, I would have to read the Act and do not want to commit myself to any off-hand opinion. But having passed Bill (No. 61) which has a similar clause, we are committed to some extent to the principle. The clause in Bill (No. 61) is identical with the one we are considering.

Mr. BARKER. I do not wish to commit the hon. minister to any definite legal opinion, but the point is a simple one. Perhaps the hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who has charge of the Bill, can tell us if this company is asking special privileges not granted other companies.

Mr. COWAN. We have just passed a Bill with a similar clause. The matter was discussed very fully in the Private Bills Committee, and Bill (No. 61) and this one are of exactly the same character.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not just the point. The hon. member for Simcoe has gone outside of Canada for an example of legislation similar to this, and I ask whether, in any charter already granted to a company, there is the same kind of clause.

Mr. McCARTHY. The legislation respecting land companies is limited in this country, and this is not a new departure. The business of a land company is of necessity a winding up business from the time it begins to sell its lands. Our company's Act says that the capital of a company should not be impaired, and there was doubt in the minds of the directors whether they could distribute among companies, the shareholders, the proceeds of the land sold, because the lands are the capital of

the country. This clause was therefore inserted, following the precedent set in the case of the two oldest land companies doing business in Canada, the Hudson Bay Company and the Canada Land Company, whose charters were obtained in England. This was the explanation given the committee, and after full consideration the committee passed the Bill, but struck out the last three words of this clause 'or provided for,' making it thus absolutely necessary that the liabilities of the company should be absolutely paid before the proceeds of the land sales could be divided among the shareholders. It is not sufficient that the company should provide for the payment of the liabilities, but the liabilities must actually have been paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the idea is that the only profits of the company are the proceeds of lands sold and paid for, and the directors could not divide, from time to time, these proceeds without this provision. Otherwise they would have to retain all the assets of the company and would not be able to declare any dividend until it was finally wound up.

Mr. BARKER. My objection is this. Any man who subscribes to stock in an incorporated company is liable for its debts up to the amount of his unpaid subscription. If he should get that stock refunded, he ought to still remain liable for the amount of his subscription just as if he had never paid it. Otherwise the creditors would not know where they are. This Bill does not say anything about the real liabilities of the company, but authorizes to pay over its assets to the shareholders, provided it has settled all its apparent liabilities up to the time of such payment. There is a great deal of danger in this. A man might get his stock refunded, while possibly the liabilities of that company remained unpaid, and he would not be liable to pay for his stock in full.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What provision will there be to ascertain that all the liabilities of the company have been paid before the assets are distributed? One answer no doubt would be that the burden is imposed on the directors of seeing that the liabilities are paid up, as otherwise they would be personally liable, but possibly their financial ability might not be equal to meet certain liabilities outstanding.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no doubt about the present directors.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know anything about the present directors, but they may be changed next year or the year after.

Mr. McCARTHY. This is really a process of winding up and it is the same legislation as was granted the Hudson Bay Company and the Canada Company. It seems to be the only way in which these companies can be wound up.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The assets of the company are being devoured gradually by the sales of lands.

Mr. McCARTHY. There are no liabilities really.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The duty is certainly imposed upon the directors of seeing that the liabilities are paid before making this distribution.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There would be personal liability on default, I imagine.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I believe there would be.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the New Canadian Company, Limited.—Mr. Lemieux.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Winnipeg Western Land Corporation, Limited.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Canada, Northwest Land Company, Limited.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Great Northwest Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 144) respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 146) respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—Mr. Vrooman.

Bill (No. 148) respecting certain Trust Funds of the Diocese of Moosonee.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 151) to incorporate the St. Joseph Transportation Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 153) to incorporate the Mount Royal Savings Bank.—Mr. Bickerdike.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Surveys and inspections, $50,000.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has already made some explanations about this item, but I would like to ask about the nature and place of these inspections.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When application is made for a work it

is necessary, first, to have a survey and inspection made so as to be able to form an idea of the cost of the work. In fact, no progress can be made until a careful survey and inspection of the location have first been made. This applies particularly to the building of wharfs, piers and that sort of thing, where an examination of the depth of water, the kind of soil, and so forth, has to be carefully made, before plans and specifications can be prepared. The list of places is a very long one. A number of surveys were made last year in the various provinces.

Mr. BARKER. In the Auditor General's reports this item has been divided under eight or ten heads. It is very desirable that the minister should tell us now what he proposes to expend under the various heads. The items run from $1,000 to $6,000. I do not like this blanket system of $50,000 for general surveys and inspection. If the hon. gentleman would just tell us the various items of the expenditure, and what he wants for each place, we would then know hereafter, when we come to inspect the accounts, exactly what has been done under each head.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not aware that there has been any consolidation of votes. I think the same amount was voted last year, but of late years there has been an increase in the expenditure for this purpose, on account of the increased number of public works to be attended to. I may say that so far as my personal experience goes, this vote is properly used, and is of great advantage to the country. Many votes have been given in the past before sufficient data have been obtained in the way of a survey and inspection, and in some cases the work would not have been undertaken had there been previously an inspection and survey. I find that during the year 1901-2 over a hundred surveys and examinations were made in the various provinces. These of course are made by men competent to do that kind of work, and their travelling expenses, being included in the item, make it considerable. But that is one of the items that, if properly controlled by the department and expended by proper officers, will be a great saving to the country, and will enable this House to obtain as full information as possible with regard to all these matters.

Mr. BARKER. I did not expect the hon. minister to tell us the travelling expenses or any thing of that kind, I do not ask anything that is unreasonable. But take the last report of the Auditor General under this head, and we find items such as these: Hydrographic survey, Kingston to Prescott, $4,653. Hydrographic survey, Kingston to Prescott, steamer 'Jessie Bell,' $5,244. That is the kind of division I would like to see made of this general item. I want to know, for example, how much of this money he is going to spend on any particular survey, not the details of that survey. When we come to the expenditure, it is all divided up in sums of from two to four and five thousand dollars. Surely the hon. gentleman can tell us what work his officers have advised him to do for which he wants this $50,000. Then when the accounts are investigated later on, we will see how far the hon. gentleman's work during the year has been in accordance with what parliament has authorized.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I explained before six o'clock, the words hydrographic survey' as used in this vote are a little misleading. It is not the intention of the department to carry on a hydrographic survey in the sense in which that word is generally used, for the purpose of preparing charts for navigation purposes. These surveys and inspections are made for work that the department is called upon to do, and it would be impossible for me to say at the present time just what applications may come in or what work may be undertaken. The work for the past year of course is shown. Some important surveys will have to be made, for instance, owing to the development of the country in the Lake Superior region, at Fort William, Port Arthur, and these places. I find that in the department we have not sufficient data to work upon in order to award a contract for dredging, for instance. Every application that comes in is considered by the department. I may say that the people of almost any district are entitled, when an application is made for certain improvements in the locality, at least to have an examination and report by the department as to the nature and the cost of the work, so that the government and parliament may know what is required to be done. Without that information we, as representatives here, are quite unable to say whether or not the work should be undertaken. In regard to dredging that is to be done, or works which are to be let by contract, it is impossible to proceed with any degree of discretion unless we first know the conditions as they are revealed by a survey and inspection. My hon. friend will know that there are many applications for dredging in various harbours, and a survey has to be made so as to enable us to know what the depth of water is, and what amount and kind of material has to be removed. When building wharfs, piers, &c., a survey has to be made. While I could give my hon. friend a list of the places where surveys were made for the past fiscal year, I think it would be impossible to give a full list of the places at which it is expected that we shall make surveys during the year 1903-4, except that I might mention some of the larger works that we are engaging in throughout the province of Ontario, for instance, on Lake Superior;

then there are many of the smaller places on the St. Lawrence, in fact, almost the whole distance where work is being demanded, on the Saguenay, at points in the lower provinces and at the various ports on the Atlantic as well as on the Pacific ocean. So that, my hon. friend will see that these surveys and inspections are made and reports received from all points wherever applications are made, and that it is necessary to make a survey so as to enable us to decide upon the desirability of going on with the work or otherwise.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman is asking now $15,000 more than was expended in 1901-2 for this purpose. The last vote was $35,000 and he is now asking $50,000. When we look at the accounts of the expenditure under this $35,000 vote we see that there are various surveys that must have been contemplated in advance. The hon. gentleman must know of a great deal of the work that he contemplates surveying and inspecting during the year. All we ask is that he should give us certain particulars and then if he wants a general sum for contingencies let him add an item for that purpose. The hon. gentleman does that in other matters. He takes an appropriation for repairs here and there, and then a general appropriation for general repairs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) that in 1901-2, to which he refers, there was a vote of $25,000 and a supplementary vote of $10,000 which makes $35,000. That was found insufficient for the work that had to be done. Last year there was a vote of $50,000 which it was found will be fully expended before the 30th of June. It is so reported to me by the chief engineer of the department. Owing to the great increase in the number and importance of works to be undertaken I find it will be necessary for that same amount to be voted for 1903-4. I might give my hon. friend an illustration to show how this work has increased. During the fiscal year 1896-7 the number of works examined and reported upon was 244. During the year 1901-2 the number was 463, and we have a great many more than that for the coming year. My hon. friend will see that the expenditure has about doubled the amount expended on public works in 1896-7 was $695,438, while in 1901-2 the amount expended was $3,785,000, or five times as much; yet we are not asking double the amount formerly voted for surveys and inspections. In these matters, of course, a minister has to be guided, especially one with the limited experience that I have had, by the advice of the chief engineer of the department.

Mr. BARKER. I quite admit all that the hon. minister says, but the hon. minister certainly does not put this item in his estimates without asking his deputy precisely what he wants the money for. All I claim is that in this committee we are entitled to ask the hon. minister what he asks his deputy and to get as much information from the hon. minister as he gets from his deputy.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have given the very fullest information so far as I have been able to obtain it from the officers of the department. I suppose it would only weary the hon. gentleman to read over the long list of places where these inspections were made last year. I have given him the information furnished me by the chief engineer as to his estimate of what would be required for 1903-4. The expenditures on these surveys are all accounted for in the report for the following year and then would be the time for the House, if it thought that there had been surveys and inspections that were not warranted, or that had been extravagantly made, to discuss the question. When we look at the works which have to be undertaken I do not think that we can do otherwise than accept the advice of the chief officials of the department in regard to the appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How was this work done ? It is not done by officers of the department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When, from time to time, officers of the department have not time to do this work we engage technical officers to do it. The great majority of the technical officers are what are called temporary officers and would not be on the permanent staff, but as soon as they are appointed to undertake this work they become officers of the department and are paid out of this vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that $50,000 should accomplish a good deal of surveying ? The inspections of buildings under construction, are, I understand, usually made out of the vote for particular buildings, so that this would not include any inspection of that kind.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I do not think so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What inspections would it include ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Only harbours and rivers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For example, does the Department of Public Works make any inspection of Halifax harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If an application was made for work to be done there the department would have to make a survey and inspection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If a work was proposed there which would interfere with

navigation, would that be under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Department?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then that is one class of work that would require a survey and inspection?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We would have to make a more careful survey and inspection so as to know what it would cost to remove the obstruction to navigation if an application were made.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not mean where there is an obstruction of navigation, but, suppose it were proposed to build a wharf that might interfere with navigation, or to erect a bridge, is it part of the work of the hon. gentleman's department to have a survey made and a report presented for the purpose of determining whether or not a certain consent which is required by statute should be given?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Exactly, that is what a part of this vote is for. Applications are made for corporations or private individuals to erect works on harbours and rivers and an inspection and report have to be made by a technical officer of the department before the consent of the department can be given to the erection of a work.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps I could point to an apt illustration of what the minister means. Application has been made to his department for some improvements in the river Sydenham at or near the town of Dresden, and I suppose the minister will send one of his technical officers up there, out of this vote, to report with regard to that application.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a fair illustration of how this money is expended. Instructions have already been given to an officer to visit the place and to report on the work that is requested to be done on the Sydenham river. I am not sure but that the officer may have gone; if not he will be there within the next few days.

Mr. CLANCY. I feel very much relieved because I was afraid the officer would not start until after the session.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I promised to send him and I have done so.

National Art Gallery, $7,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What works of art have been added during the past year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only work of art purchased during the past year is a painting by Tencate called 'The Pedlar.'

Mr. INGRAM. Who are the committee on selection?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Brownell and Mr. Taylor. I think this is a very good picture. There was a large price asked for it and we bought it very reasonably.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there any intention to improve the Art Gallery building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope we will have a better building before long.

Chief engineer's office—salaries of engineers, draughtsmen and clerks, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $59,200.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work of this branch of the department is five times as great now as it was a few years ago. Last year I find that the full amount was required. I have not had an opportunity of looking into the matter carefully, but if this amount is not found to be sufficient, I will have to ask for a supplementary estimate.

Mr. CLANCY. There appears to have been an over expenditure last year of about $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes; the amount was over-expended the year before, and a supplementary vote was taken.

Mr. CLANCY. Where did the minister get the money in the meantime. Was it by Governor General's warrant?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was voted in the supplementary estimates for that year.

Mr. BARKER. It does not so appear from your estimate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount was over-expended and that will have to be provided for in the supplementary estimates for the current year.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the minister what is covered by the expression in this item 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I understand the Act aright—I do not know whether I shall ever understand the Civil Service Act—none of these men could be employed at over $400 a year unless these words were inserted in the vote. They are all technical officers and their salaries are very much over $400 a year.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to make a few remarks about the administration of the Civil Service Act. We discussed it early in the session, and there seems to be a great difference of opinion with respect to it, not only as between ministers but as between gentlemen on both sides of this House. At that time the chief question was as to carrying out the provisions of the Civil Service Act with regard to section 15, and the Minister of Finance stated, as appears by 'Hansard,' what he thought was the prac-

tice of the departments under that section. I have since discovered that the Minister of Finance was absolutely wrong in his view of what was being done under these mystical words we see so often in the estimates, 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' The Minister of Finance told us with regard to section 15, that it was merely a question of the order in which certain routine proceedings took place. We were then discussing a chief clerkship; and although the question may not be strictly within this item, I may as well refer to the matter here as elsewhere.

The procedure provided by the Act is: First, that the deputy head of the department shall report that the officer is necessary for the proper performance of the public business in the department, stating his reasons for arriving at that conclusion; next, the concurrence of the head of the department in that report; and, third, the salary being voted by parliament. There was a great deal of discussion at that time as to the order of these three events. The Finance Minister laid it down that the order was exactly as stated in the Act, in which I entirely concur with him. If that order were carried out, and it were represented to this House that it was being carried out, we would have nothing to complain of. Everybody knows that the deputy head of the department occupies not only a very responsible position; but one in which he is protected by the state. He can only be removed in a particular way, and he is an officer on whom we can rely, owing to the independence of his position. Therefore, under the Civil Service Act he must initiate expenditure of this kind by recommending the creation of the chief clerkship and the several other officers mentioned. Now, I wish to refer to some matters bearing on this subject which appear in the Auditor General's report, and I do so for the purpose of showing that, although the Finance Minister was quite right in his view of the statute, the statute is being utterly ignored by the department. At page 49, Vol. 1, of his report the Auditor General sends to the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals this request:

I have the honour to request to be furnished with a copy of the report, referred to in section 15 of the Civil Service Act, recommending the creation of an additional chief clerkship in your department.

Such recommendation, as the Finance Minister agrees, was the first step towards the creation of that clerkship. Some time afterwards the Auditor General writes again, because he got no answer. The next step is that the Secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals, Mr. Jones, writes to the Deputy Minister of Justice:

By direction I beg to hand you two letters from the Auditor General, dated respectively the 3rd and 12th instant, and also a memorandum from the office of the law clerk of this department, all bearing upon the promotion of Mr. F. A. Dixon of this department to the office of chief clerk and the requirements of the Civil Service Act in that connection.

I am to request that you will be pleased to advise whether it is necessary in this instance to comply with the provision of section 15 of the Civil Service Act as requested by the Auditor General.

Attached to that is the following memorandum signed 'R':

Memo re attached.—Section 15 of the Civil Service Act reads as follows:—

15. A chief clerkship in any department shall only be created by Order in Council, passed after—

(a) The deputy head has reported that such an officer is necesary for the proper performance of the public business of the department, stating the reasons on which he has arrived at that conclusion.

(b) The concurrence of the head of the department in such report; and—

(c) The salary has been voted by parliament.

In schedule B of the estimates for the year ending June 30, 1903, there is an item:—

'For the promotion of F. A. Dixon to the rank of chief clerk, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,800.'

Parliament has thus voted the salary as required by paragraph (c) above, and it has done more, it has waived all the provisions of the Civil Service Act which affect the promotion.

Therefore, according to the contention of the department, when we pass an item in these estimates, with the words 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' we waive the whole provisions of the Civil Service Act, notwithstanding what the Finance Minister says. Then the matter goes to the Justice Department and there is a reply by Mr. Power, acting Deputy Minister of Justice:

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of this day's date with respect to the promotion of Mr. F. A. Dixon, of your department, to the rank of chief clerk.

I understand that the Auditor General contends that the promotion of Mr. Dixon cannot lawfully be made unless a chief clerkship has been created in the manner provided by section 15 of the Civil Service Act, and that an opinion is desired from this department as to whether or not the position of the Auditor General in this respect is correct.

In reply, I beg to state that by the Appropriation Act of last session the sum of $1,800 was granted to His Majesty for the financial year ending June 30, 1903, 'for the promotion of F. A. Dixon to the rank of chief clerk, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' I am of opinion that the effect of this provision in the Appropriation Act is, not only to provide the salary for the current year, but also to waive any and every provision of the Civil Service Act which stands in the way of Mr. Dixon's promotion, the provisions of section 15, as well as those relating to promotion examinations, and I think that the Governor in Council may promote Mr. Dixon to the rank of chief clerk, notwithstanding that a chief clerkship has not been created for the purpose in the manner provided by section 15 of the Civil Service Act.

In other words, we have been passing item after item in the estimates, with these words

attached, 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' and the Law Department treats that as waiving every provision in the Civil Service Act. The Minister of Finance told us otherwise. He represented to us—and I have no doubt he said just what he believed was the truth—that the regular order was being proceeded with; but the Railway Department certainly did not act in accordance with that view. The moment it got the estimates passed, it used these words as a waiver of everything contained in the Civil Service Act. Then, there is a further letter from the Secretary of the Railway Department to the Deputy Minister of Justice :

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 14th instant, by which you report in respect of the promotion of Mr. F. A. Dixon, of this department, to the rank of chief clerk.

In reply, I am directed to say that under date May 20 last, an Order in Council was passed whereby Mr. Dixon was promoted to such clerkship, and it is presumed by the department that that is all that is necessary in the matter.

Be pleased to advise if that is the case.

So that although there is an Act of parliament saying that this thing shall not be done until the first step is taken by the deputy head of the department recommending the chief clerkship, yet, by passing these estimates with these few words attached, we have been waiving the whole Civil Service Act without knowing that we were doing so. For that reason I think parliament is bound to be a little careful about the wording of the estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that we ought to give careful attention to these words, and see what they mean in each case. Every Act of parliament is capable of being amended, and when we introduce into the Supply Bill the words, 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' undoubtedly to the extent of these words, and in the case to which they refer, we amend the Civil Service Act, and we must be prepared in every case to give a good reason for doing so. I think that the statement I made in the former discussion as to the general practice and policy was correct, but there may be exceptional cases, such as the one referred to, in which the Act must be departed from. As to the particular item, it is for the 'salaries of engineers, draughtsmen and clerks, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' These officials do not come under the provisions of the Civil Service Act as to classification. There is no question in their case of promotion to any particular grade in the civil service. They are technical officers, they have no special rank in the service, and they have to be treated as technical clerks. If you were to apply to them the provisions of the Civil Service Act, they could only be paid $400 per year. This does not make any change in their classification, but solely deals with the question of their salaries. They are not civil service men called upon to pass any special examination ; they are technical officers, and the only object of the words is to enable the government to pay them more than $400 per year. Officers of that character cannot be obtained at that rate, so that the question in their case is not precisely the same as in the case of Mr. Dixon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The case of Mr. Dixon referred to by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is a most outrageous one. What possible reason was there for repealing the provisions of the Civil Service Act in his case ? Why should not the deputy minister consulted in that case, have first reported that that officer was necessary for the performance of the public service ? How does the hon. Minister of Finance justify the repeal of that provision of the Act in his case ? There are so many of these amendments in the Civil Service Act that we are getting tired of seeing them in the estimates. I have counted up twenty or thirty cases on a single page of the estimates last session, in which that provision of the Civil Service Act was repealed. We cannot possibly follow up every one of them, and the result is that you have an outrageous abuse of the powers of parliament in that regard. There is no possible reason why the provisions of the civil service should not have been carried out in the case brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from Hamilton. Yet we have the Department of Railways setting the law at defiance and smuggling this item through the House without any explanation. I say that it was a most disgraceful piece of business. I do not know anything about Mr. Dixon. It may be desirable indeed that he should be a chief clerk, he may be a very deserving officer, and no doubt he is, but what I am objecting to is the means taken to violate the provisions of the Civil Service Act without the slightest shadow of excuse. At least I have heard none from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to-night. I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works before this item passes, for a statement as to every one of these gentlemen to whom these words may apply, in order that we may fully understand what we are doing. We have made mistakes of this kind in the past, which are now brought to our attention by the Auditor General, and it is high time that this House should see that an end is put to this abuse.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There have not been any mistakes. I have differed from my hon, friend in the past in his criticisms of these items, and I do so again. It is true that items of this character appear occasionally in the estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Occasionally ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I use the word advisedly, for in proportion to the total number of officials in the service, the exceptions made by these items are very small indeed. A year ago I took the trouble to have the figures prepared of the number of officers affected in this way, by the votes; and in proportion to the total number, it was by no means large. It is not conceivable that in a service where there are hundreds of officials, there will not be some special circumstances to justify a departure from the ordinary rules, and it must remain for the minister responsible in each case to explain the departure. I have no recollection of the case of Mr. Dixon mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, and I cannot recall the particular reasons which my colleague the hon. Minister of Railways gave for the promotion of this gentleman. But I have no doubt that the Deputy Minister of Railways was thoroughly conversant with the transaction and a party to it. I have never heard of the deputy minister refusing to give the certificate. As appears by the wording of the vote, that certificate was not necessary and was not obtained, and in the absence of any information to the contrary, we are bound to believe that my hon. colleague had some good reasons for the step he took. We have not this item before us now except incidentally, but I would not like the committee to think that these exceptions are made without special cause. A man may be of exceptional merit, we may be in danger of losing his services, and may find it necessary to give him a larger salary than is assigned to his rank under the Civil Service Act. Would it not be quite proper for the minister, in such a case, to say that he was entitled to a larger salary than the Civil Service Act allows and to ask parliament to vote that salary, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act ? It is in such cases that most of these exceptions are made. There are not many cases where exceptions are made to avoid examinations. With such cases I have not much sympathy, but I have warm sympathy with the case of a man, in whose favour an exception has to be made on account of his personal qualifications. I have no sympathy however for that class of item when it is only designed to exempt him from undergoing the examinations provided for in the Civil Service Act. I think that we should insist on examinations, but these exceptions are not more numerous than formerly.

Mr. INGRAM. How many temporary clerks are there in the chief engineer's department now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are all temporary clerks.

Mr. INGRAM. There are permanent clerks, according to the Auditor General's report, but I would like to know how many temporary clerks there are.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are fifty-one.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year there were forty-two, and they have increased to fifty-two. It seems strange that there should be so many temporary clerks in the chief engineer's office. Surely, it is possible to have some of these men made permanent and enjoy all the rights under the Civil Service Act, and thus avoid the necessity of having to come down every session and provide for an expenditure of this kind. Hon. gentlemen say that they cannot obtain the services of a certain class of men without paying them more than the minimum amount of $400, and they therefore ask this additional expenditure every year, but would it not be better to make as many as possible of these clerks permanent ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The term 'temporary clerk' is apt to be somewhat misleading. We have temporary clerks who have been in office twenty years. They are practically permanent, but are ranked as temporary. The particular branch of the service referred to is a technical service which does not necessarily require the clerks to pass the civil service examination, so that there is no reason why these people should come under the operation of the Civil Service Act. Take architects, engineers and professional men of any class, they would not be any the better because they passed the civil service examination, which is imposed on ordinary clerks. These are, for the most part, practically permanent officers, but they have the rank of temporary clerks and are treated accordingly. Though I have not looked up the estimates, I am satisfied that this item has appeared for many years in the same way.

Mr. INGRAM. Of course, it has, and that is exactly what we are trying to get rid of. I have in mind now the case of a gentleman who was employed in the department of the Interior for about twenty-five years, all the time as a temporary clerk. For ten years or more he was in the outside service and for another ten years in the inside service. He did everything he could to have his name placed on the permanent list. But this was objected to. Being only in the temporary service was a source of annoyance to him. He did not see why he should not be on the permanent list, and, when I was referred to, neither did I. I investigated the matter and wrote to the department and tried every way to induce the minister to have the man's name transferred to the permanent list. After a great deal of persuasion this was done. It is rank injustice to an officer not to have his name on the permanent list, if he is really a permanent officer. After he has been in the service ten or twelve years, why

should he be still considered a temporary employee ? The position is a most unpleasant one for him. Should anything occur in a certain direction, he would be beholden to those who came into power to retain him in his position. A man who has rendered faithful and efficient service should not be treated in such a manner.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know of the particular case to which the hon. gentleman refers, and it may be that his reasoning, as applied to that case, is quite right. But, as a matter of fact, we may have a person in the position of a temporary clerk whom it would not be expedient to have in the regular service.

Mr. INGRAM. Why not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, there are people doing a class of work which does not demand a larger salary than that they are receiving. I know of such cases in the temporary service, persons who are doing a given class of work, doing it well and faithfully; but the work is of such a character that there is no reason for adding these officers to the permanent staff, where they will advance to higher rates of salary than would be fairly proportioned to the work they are doing. I am not sure that we may not find it necessary to have a further classification so as to provide for some employees who are now classed as temporary.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister forgets that when officers have been refused their annual increase the reason given by himself and others was that the officers did not merit it. As a matter of fact, in many cases the government did not give the annual increases, notwithstanding the objections raised by the opposition. Well, if the government have control of the annual increases of these officers and can refuse those increases as they please, there is no force in the argument of the Minister of Finance, for it would not be necessary that these officers, even if put on the permanent list, should receive increases of salary.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is quite correct in a sense. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) is aware that, while we still contend that the annual increase is not a legal liability, there is moral force in the argument that people expect these increases; and we have taken that view and have granted the increases almost without exception. Once a man gets into the permanent service, he looks for these increases, and, as a rule, the officers are getting them. But it may be that an officer is doing a certain line of work, and doing it satisfactorily and getting fair pay for it, and yet there may be no reason why he should be in the line of promotion and have an increasing salary.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not find that similar cases are treated alike. Perhaps, the hon. minister can point out why a clerk living in Ottawa who is an assistant draughtsman, who must pass the civil service examination and is appointed to the inside service, is in a different position from that of the man doing similar work residing in New Westminster or elsewhere. The same is true of a paymaster. Whether in the inside service or in the outside service, they perform practically the same duty and, if they have been employed for years there is practically no difference except that one is on the permanent list and receives statutory increases unless he does something to disentitle himself to them, and the other does not. What my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has pointed out is perfectly true. Yet, as the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has shown, by the simple words 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' in the estimates, the government take to themselves power to treat these officers differently from others and in a way never contemplated by the law. This came up in another form not many days ago, when I called attention to the anomaly of a large class in the civil service who practically had no status in the service—clerks doing the work of permanent clerks yet not on the permanent list. I can understand exceptional cases, as, for instance, engineers, who do not require to pass the civil service examination, and who are in a class by themselves. But I have pointed out that there are cases in which men are provided for in that way and do not come within the class. I think we ought to have such anomalies corrected, because, as the hon. member for Hamilton pointed out, they involve possibilities of grave abuses.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of late, we have been considering the question whether we may not be obliged to create another class in which many of these temporary clerks who are practically permanent may be placed. I am not saying definitely that this will be done, but I am only pointing out that the matter has not been overlooked. There are some who are practically permanent officers, although called temporary, who have the same positions as permanent officers except with regard to the name. I confess that I rather sympathize with the idea that they should be put on the permanent list. Still, there are cases where the service can be had at the present rate of salary, and there is no reason why the officers should be transferred to the permanent list.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not heard in the remarks of the Minister of Finance the slightest justification for promoting this gentleman, whom I mentioned, without going through the procedure provided in the statute. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is familiar with the facts, and so he cannot justify the action of the government. But I propose to ask the Minister of Railways to jus-

tify this action at the proper time. I will say no more about it except that I regard it, in the absence of an explanation, as an outrageous abuse of this method which has been employed so often to dispense with the provisions of the Civil Service Act. I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) under what statutory authority these gentlemen are employed. I would like to understand this before we get through with this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Application is made by the head of the branch to the deputy minister and he recommends the appointment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman's department is the creature of the statute, and I do not understand that he has authority to employ any one except so far as there is provision in the statute enabling him to do so. I suppose this authority must be found under some general provision of the Civil Service Act. I would like him or the Minister of Finance to tell us what clause it is. I thought I had found the clause, but I am not sure of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Irrespective of the Civil Service Act, this vote is authority passed by parliament to employ persons within the limits of the vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then this means the abolition of the Civil Service Act so far as the hon. gentleman's department is concerned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Civil Service Act has never applied to these officers, so far as my recollection goes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought there was a provision in the Civil Service Act for the employment of temporary officers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is—employment at $400 a year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it not under the provisions of that clause that you really get these gentlemen into the department, and then waive the Civil Service Act and give them higher salaries? You get them in as temporary employees at $400 a year, then waive the provisions of the Act, give them higher salaries and keep them on as temporary employees for twenty-five years or more. That is the way the law is carried out at present. At least, that is the way it seems—I do not profess to understand it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Supposing it is as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) what is wrong about that?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is just this much—that the law says you may employ temporary assistants at $400 a year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But you come in and amend the law by this vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then in order to carry that out thoroughly, you propose passing an item 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' and you follow the provisions of that Act as closely as you can by giving them any salary that you see fit, and keeping them on as temporary employees for any number of years.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There must be a provision in the estimates each year, and parliament has full control of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Justice will not regard that as a desirable scheme of legislation.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It has continued on ever since 1885, this very item.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not care. If it is wrong, the fact that it has continued a long time is all the more reason for curing it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not say it is wrong.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it is continued on a wrong basis since 1885, we need not continue it for ever on that ground. I have asked the Minister of Finance for two or three years to consider whether it would not be better to make some amendment in the Civil Service Act by which we may avoid the appearance of this item. It is unnecessary to go over the old ground which I have urged so often, namely, that one branch of the legislature is repealing in this way a provision which has been enacted by both branches. The other branch of the legislature cannot deal with appropriation Bills except as a whole, and we in this House are repealing the provisions of the Civil Service Act in a hundred different ways every session, in a most sweeping way, as announced by the hon. minister tonight, and the other branch of the legislature has nothing to say about it. The Minister of Finance will say that we have worked along very well, and found it a practicable way of dealing with these matters. How many of these men are included under this sweeping repeal? Are the whole fifty-two?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are all these gentlemen in effect permanent employees?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the majority are old employees who have been many years in the service. Some hon. gentleman opposite said there was an increase of ten or eleven. The deputy minister informs me there is a decrease of two.

Mr. INGRAM. It was the hon. gentleman himself who told me there were fifty-two, and I showed there were forty-two last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My deputy informs me differently. There is no desire to cover up anything. I was

going to give an illustration of what has been the custom with regard to this branch ever since it was established. We will take the chief engineer of the department, Mr. Lafleur, who I understand has been twenty-two or twenty-three years in the service. He has always drawn his pay out of this vote, under this plan. None of these, I understand, are permanent officers except two, very few of these are at Ottawa. Twenty-four are at the head office, and there are men doing work all over the Dominion. In Nova Scotia, for instance, there is the chief engineer at $2,000, the assistant at $1,825, the assistant draughtsman at $547. We could not get men of this class unless we gave them salaries commensurate with their duties. My own opinion is that it would be better if we paid these technical officers a little higher salary. At Halifax there are the late resident engineer, the two assistant engineers and the draughtsman, all from $800 to $2,400. Prince Edward Island has a resident engineer. I understand most all these men have been there for many years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought there was some provision in the Civil Service Act which would help out the hon. gentleman's position. I thought there was a provision about men possessing technical qualifications.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They would be subject to the limitations of salary then.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then that is a most absurd provision.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. To get over the examination.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. An engineer, for example, could not come in at a higher salary than $2,400, and that will not get the service of a high class engineer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it not be better to amend the Civil Service Act so far as the salary is concerned, so as to get rid of this difficulty of violating it all the time? We know that in this country you cannot get men of high technical qualifications for small salaries such as have been named. Why should we every year be passing these items 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Servce Act' when we know perfectly well that we must pay men higher wages than that which the statute provides.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not believe we could make any amendment to the Civil Service Act which would render it unnecessary at times to have these exceptions. We cannot make a Civil Service Act which will reach out its arms and take in all the public service throughout the Dominion; it never has been possible and never will be possible. There are always special cases to be dealt with. My hon. friend is wrong in assuming that these are exceptional estimates. We can show from past experience that many cases have occurred in former estimates. I do not wish to shelter myself behind any moss grown practice, but I am persuaded that no change you can make in the direction the hon. gentleman has suggested will prevent the necessity of coming here session after session with some exceptional case which we cannot deal with in the general terms of the Act.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman should see in the vote we are dealing with now that out of some thirty-two persons employed, ten are persons who are not doing technical service. The hon. gentleman said that they called themselves technical; I think it is the hon. gentleman who has called them so. We ought to cure that anomaly, first, because it would put the service on a better footing, and next, because it is so easy to class these persons. I agree with the Minister of Finance that there are certain persons that must be employed in the department for which an exception must be made, for example, such as resident engineers in the various provinces. Now there is another class of persons employed in the service to which I have referred, and I have pointed out to the hon. gentleman that there are nearly one-third of the number of persons—I am not saying one-third of the aggregate salaries—but persons employed at lower salaries who ought to be put on the same footing as civil servants in the inside service. Then they would be entitled to their statutory increases if they were entitled to them by reason of good service. That is the point I am endeavouring to make. If they are good men, they are entitled to get paid for such services as they render, and they should be put on the same status as a member of the civil service. I think the very fact that one-third of the persons employed do not properly come within the vote we are taking now is a sufficient reason why the hon. gentleman should take this matter up.

Mr. INGRAM. Every year the different departments come down and ask for additional sums under this head. I would like to have that point made plainer. If parliament grants a vote under this head does that take away any rights or give any rights to the persons for whom the money is being voted? Can they come in under the Civil Service Act?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They can not.

Mr. INGRAM. That is what I would like the hon. Minister of Justice to explain.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No doubt the intention of the head of the department who introduces an item of that kind is to evade the Civil Service Act by adding these words to the item.

Mr. BARKER. Why did the hon. minister not tell us that he was trying to do it?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think we are trying to do it. Parliament is doing it and doing it very effectively. That is what I would like to point out in connection with the Dixon case, as to which the hon. gentleman declaimed in a manner which is not usual to him. The Dixon case is not one for which the head of the department is responsible. The Dixon case is one in which parliament is responsible.

Mr. BARKER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The Dixon case is not one of those cases where the words were added 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' The Dixon case is one in which it is said by parliament that he is to be permitted to become a chief clerk. Parliament adopted the item and parliament said that he should be a chief clerk. The government did not do it. Parliament did it, and a discussion now as to the reason why parliament did it seems entirely beside the question. Parliament discussed that item. That item was submitted to parliament, it was discussed, the reasons in support of it were given then, and it seems to me that it is out of the question to discuss it now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What page?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The words in the Auditor General's Report are quoted from the estimates of last year.

Mr. INGRAM. The explanation of the hon. Minister of Justice is very good so far as it goes, but we want it to go a little farther. In the item that we are now voting, are these words:

Chief engineer's office—salaries of engineers, draughtsmen and clerks, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

I want to point out to the hon. Minister of Justice that by reason of these words—

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Would my hon. friend permit me? In connection with the Dixon matter, I find in the estimates of last year, under the heading of Department of Railways and Canals:

For the promotion of F. A. Dixon to the rank of chief clerk.

Parliament was notified. Parliament concurred, and the matter was disposed of.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that; but what I thought the hon. gentleman was going to give was the explanation submitted to parliament by the responsible minister at that time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Surely my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is not serious when he asks me to do that now? That item was submitted to the House last year by the responsible minister, the House discussed it, and why should we give the reason now when parliament adopted it last year?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought the hon. gentleman had it in his hand.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, the hon. gentleman was not serious.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was perfectly serious. I am speaking of the action of one of the hon. gentleman's colleagues. I thought he was coming to the assistance of his colleague.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did that last year probably.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He may have to do it again.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is disposed of.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, the hon. gentleman is mistaken if he thinks it is disposed of, because I can tell him that it is not, and that it will be heard of again this session.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not say it would not be heard of, but the question is legally disposed of.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not disposed of.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Parliament has disposed of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Parliament will have to dispose of it again, or discuss it, at least.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, yes, you will discuss it; there is no question about that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I simply wanted to make that plain to the hon. gentleman, because he was under a misapprehension about it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend can discuss it if he chooses. I state my opinion, and he states his.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have given my opinion, but you have no opinion, as far as I can see.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is absolutely delightful.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad the hon. gentleman is pleased.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Perfectly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad he is in such good humour to-night.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I generally am.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not very often we have such a delightful exhibition

of the hon. gentleman's humour as that which he has afforded just now. When I submitted to the committee that it was rather a remarkable thing that a vote should have been brought before the House last year by which a provision of the Civil Service Act was unnecessarily dispensed with, in my opinion, I think I was bringing to the attention of the committee a rather peculiar action on the part of the hon. gentleman's colleagues, and the hon. gentleman makes answer by saying: Oh, that is disposed of. I suppose it is disposed of in just the same way that we found a certain item last year voted for a particular purpose, and applied to another purpose. Perhaps that will be heard of again also. These are things for which the members of the government are responsible, and the fact that parliament, under a misapprehension, or without sufficient explanation, has passed an item of that kind, does not preclude a discussion of it in the following parliament, as I think the hon. Minister of Justice will understand. If he does not understand that now, perhaps he will understand it later on. That is all.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am quite willing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is very kind indeed and we are very much obliged to him for his willingness. Otherwise we should not venture to mention the matter. As far as this particular item is concerned, does not the hon. Minister of Public Works think that this part of the work of the department might be carried out under some better scheme of observing the law? The hon. Minister of Public Works is a business man, a practical man, and does he not think it would be well to deal with the engineer's department in such a way to give effect to the Civil Service Act. Notwithstanding the doubts cast upon this matter by the hon. Minister of Finance, I think as far as the engineer's department is concerned, that a better provision might be made. I am not attempting to cast the slightest reflection upon the work of the officers of the department. Knowing Mr. Dodwell and other members of the staff at Halifax, who are very capable officers, and who have been in the service a long time, I cast no reflection upon them, but I should like to see them put upon a better basis than by excepting them from the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot discover any difference between the estimates of last year and the estimates of this year, and that is what makes me a little foggy on the question. I find several items here, but I do not find the name of Mr. Dixon and that is what makes it foggy to me. Do these words in an item give the person who receives a salary under that item, any rights that he would not have under the Civil Service Act. I understood the Minister of Justice to say they did.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It seems to me that it is clear and simple and there is no necessity for my hon. friend being befogged.

Mr. INGRAM. All right.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Under the Civil Service Act it is provided that a chief clerkship can only be created by Order in Council. That Order in Council has to be passed on the report of the deputy head and in that report of the deputy head the head of the department must concur. That is the procedure that in the ordinary course under the Civil Service Act ought to have been followed. Now, the Civil Service Act is an Act of parliament and the Subsidy Act is an Act of parliament also. The Civil Service Act can be amended by parliament at any time, and it is amended by the Subsidy Act if there is anything in the Subsidy Act contrary to the provisions of the Civil Service Act. In the case of Dixon, he could not have been created a chief clerk under the Civil Service Act except after compliance with formalities I have mentioned; but parliament, by the Subsidy Act of last year comes in, and creates him a chief clerk and to that extent it amends the Civil Service Act, so that thereafter he is a civil servant entitled to the rank of chief clerk. He is dealt with as chief clerk thereafter as a result of that amendment contained in the Subsidy Act. That is very simple.

Mr. INGRAM. That is, by putting his name in the item and submitting it to parliament.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. But I do not find his name submitted to parliament.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If the hon. gentleman will look at the statute of last session he will find 'for the promotion of F. A. Dixon to the rank of chief clerk.' There is the name and he is promoted to the rank of chief clerk. In this particular case before us, you say that a certain number of temporary clerks are to be employed notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, but that is a different thing altogether from the promotion of a particular individual to a particular class in the service.

Mr. BARKER. We ought to be indebted to the Minister of Justice for warning us that when passing estimates in future we must be very careful indeed about words, lest we are amending Acts of parliament.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) to say whether or not in his opinion—for after all, if he will permit me to say it, there are few men

whose opinion I have a higher regard for—in his opinion is not the Subsidy Act an Act of parliament which amends any previous Act so far as the previous Act is effected by it.

Mr. BARKER. I understood the minister to say that when these words are put in the estimates, we do away with the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. That is practically amending it. My object in citing the case of Mr. Dixon was to show how the departments were using the estimates in cases of that kind. Let us take the case upon which all the discussion arose. Mr. Pugsley was appointed at $1,800 notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, and the Minister of Railways and Canals explained why Mr. Pugsley should get $1,800. He said :

He has been performing duties in the accountant's branch previously done by the assistant accountant. He is a faithful and industrious officer and we have promoted him to the first-class.

The Minister of Railways and Canals therefore spoke as if the Civil Service Act had been complied with and we were simply voting the money ; and further on the minister said :

We are only asking for the amount of money we require.

Surely the minister, in using these words, intended the members of this House to understand that the law was being complied with. There was further discussion, and the hon. member for East Grey said :

Therefore the Civil Service Act is being entirely ignored by the government.

Now, I want to point out what the Minister of Finance said in reply to that, and the Minister of Justice will see that hon. members would infer that the Civil Service Act was being complied with in its strictest terms. The Minister of Finance says :

I think my hon. friend's remarks are based upon a misconception. His argument is that you must first create a clerkship before you come to the House for a vote. My hon. friend is mistaken. The Civil Service Act distinctly declares the reverse. Section 15 provides that the chief clerkship in any department shall only be created by Order in Council passed after the report of the deputy, and after the concurrence of the head of the department in such report, and after the salary has been voted by parliament. These various conditions must be first complied with before the Governor in Council creates an additional clerkship.

The Minister of Finance in using these words intended this House to understand that every provision of that Act which he said must be complied with was being complied with, and having regard to what the Minister of Railways and Canals had said a minute before, that we were simply voting the money. The Minister of Justice may now say what he pleases and so may the Minister of Finance, but I say that there is not a member of this House on either side who ever supposed that in voting these estimates he was doing more than voting the money that was asked for, and he never for a moment believed that he was dispensing with the Civil Service Act except in regard to the amount voted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have a recollection of the circumstances. In the first place, I was not explaining the railway estimates; but the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) opened up a general discussion upon the question whether we could appoint a first-class clerk without having a report of the deputy and the Order in Council creating the office before the vote of parliament; and my observation was to show that the voting of the money was one of the first conditions. The discussion attending that particular vote had to be looked after by the Minister of Railways and not by me, for I had no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister told us the three things that had to be done, and he said that these various conditions must first be complied with before council creates the office. Yet the Minister of Justice advises the Minister of Railways that these various conditions need not be complied with, because we voted the money with these words attached.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because we voted the money, we complied with the first condition.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then you were evidently deceiving the committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has no right to make that remark. It is not correct.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the suggestion made by the hon. leader of the opposition could be carried out, it would be a great relief to the minister. When a vote is brought in, with the words referred to attached to it, there is a suspicion that the department is doing something not in accordance with the law. In this particular case it has, I think, been made plain to the committee that the services of the department could not be carried on unless such an arrangement were made. I have not myself given much consideration to the Civil Service Act. There are some provisions in it which are intended to do good; but I am not sure that it is on the whole of much advantage to the country. But under this item there has been no abuse of the powers given by these words.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have been looking up the Dixon case in 'Hansard' of last year. His salary was voted in the

first place just as a salary to a first-class clerk. Then, in the closing days of the session, the Minister of Railways brought in the item without making the slightest explanation to the House that it was intended to do away with the intervention of the head of the department ; but he said simply this :

There is no difference in this gentleman's salary. The salary is voted in the main estimates, but on the basis of his being a first-class clerk. He is now made a chief clerk, his salary as chief clerk being the same as the highest salary attained by a first-class clerk.

Would anybody suppose, with that explanation of the Minister of Railways before him, that the provisions of this statute which I have referred to, were intended to be deliberately violated ?—the provisions which require that the deputy head has reported that such an officer is necessary for the proper performance of the public business in the department, stating the reasons on which he has arrived at that conclusion, and, secondly, that the concurrence of the head of the department has been obtained. If the Minister of Justice supposed that I did not understand that the voting of the item was amending the Civil Service Act, he exhibited less keenness of intellect than he usually does.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not assume that my hon. friend did not understand it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The point I was making was that it was an improper thing for the Minister of Railways and Canals to bring the item to the House without informing the House at the same time that he intended departing from two such important conditions of the Civil Service Act as those which I have just read, an omission which has not yet been explained to the House by the Minister of Finance; and I understand that this not being his department, he is not in a position to explain it. The Minister of Railways and Canals may have a good explanation, but in the absence of an explanation, it looks as if the provisions of the Act had been deliberately violated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would it not be reasonable to wait for an explanation from the Minister of Railways and Canals, instead of assuming that there is not an explanation ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not going to that extent. I am going to assume that the Minister of Railways and Canals has a good explanation, but I shall in the meantime wonder what it can possibly be.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The point I took was that when the item was introduced into the Appropriation Act, in the terms in which it was introduced, those who read it must be presumed to understand that it amended the Civil Service Act, because in law it did amend it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Although the Minister of Railways and Canals said simply, 'he is now made a chief clerk.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. His words could not affect the terms of the vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know they could not, but we would expect a certain amount of frankness in the minister in dealing with a matter of that kind.

Mr. CLANCY. There seems to be no doubt about what has been done, but there is some difficulty in getting at the reason why it was done. With regard to the case of Mr. Dixon, I am in no way quarrelling with his being made a chief clerk. He may be a very worthy gentleman; I know nothing about him; but the formalities required by the law in making him a chief clerk were utterly ignored. Then, why should the minister come down without any explanation, and satisfy himself simply by putting these words in the estimates ? Perhaps it is not convenient at this moment to give the explanation as regards Mr. Dixon's case. But here is an evil which may lead to serious results. The deputy head must refuse to give the recommendation, and the minister could override his refusal by putting these words in his estimates : 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' and repeal the Act to that extent. The practice is certainly open to very grave objection. I think, unless some very extraordinary reason can be given, the minister has no right to ignore all these healthy formalities, and to promote a clerk in the department simply by inserting these words in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, I am not in a position to say anything about any other department; but there is no question in regard to this particular vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the discussion to-night ought to lead us to one conclusion, that is, that the exception introduced is altogether too sweeping. We are told by the Minister of Justice, in a somewhat cynical way, that everything in the Civil Service Act is repealed by the insertion of these words, and that parliament has nothing to do with the matter afterwards. It seems to me that that should be a warning to us to deal only with particular sections of the Act. It cannot be necessary to repeal the entire Act with regard to these men, and I submit that it would be far better to indicate the particular sections sought to be repealed. If that had been done last year, the attention of parliament would have been drawn to the Dixon item at once, and we would have asked for an explanation. But it was passed, as many of these were passed, with the impression that it was only a technical provision which was repealed. Is it necessary to ask that the whole Act be re-

pealed, so far as these men are concerned? Cannot my hon. friend indicate what particular section he requires to be repealed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that my hon. friend magnifies the evil. I am informed by one of the officials that in the case of a number of the clerks of his department referred to, they actually do possess the qualifying certificates, and it would not make any difference to them whether the Act were amended or not, but the bulk of these people are technical officers, in whose case the civil service examination is not required. In the case of professional men, it would be an extreme thing to demand that they should pass an examination. We will not do great harm in following the usual practice during many years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has done service in pointing out how far this provision goes. That never occurred to us until this discussion came up. It is a very sweeping dispensation indeed and may have the effect of going further than the hon. Minister of Justice indicated to-night. I see no reason why we should repeal the entire Civil Service Act simply because one of its provisions stands in the way of a political appointment. Where it is necessary to depart from any one or more of the provisions of the Act, the government should indicate definitely and explicitly what provisions they intend to dispense with, and should dispense with these alone. My hon. friend the hon. Minister of Finance told us the other day that a man should never say anything more than is necessary. I admit that that is a good rule, and my hon. friend usually follows it, but he has not done so in these cases. He is saying more than is necessary, because he is sweeping away the whole Act, when he only wants to dispense with one or two of its provisions. I shall not insist any further to-night, so far as this item is concerned, but will probably on future items leave to my hon. friend to consider whether that cannot be done.

Chief architect's office—salaries of architects, draughtsmen and clerks, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $32,200.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will consider the discussion which has just taken place as having been repeated on this item, and put it in 'Hansard' to save time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it exactly the same thing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. This is practically the same. These are men who are not on the temporary staff. There has been one addition to this, of a district engineer.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance said a moment ago that the chief architect's office was precisely in the same case as the chief engineer's. But looking at the Auditor General's Report, I see that they are all employed in Ottawa, or nearly all. Why should they be treated differently from ordinary civil servants ? A great deal of this work is not technical, and I do not see any reason why these men should not be brought under the Civil Service Act.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The majority of them have been in the service a long time. None of them probably, at the beginning, could have been engaged under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and if any of them have to be replaced, you could not get others to fill their places, if they had to come under the Act. Even a typewriter in this branch could not be got for $200 per year.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is filling up the service, under that heading, with a class of men who are doing the same kind of work as is now done in other offices by men who have passed the required examination, and he should not make any distinction between them. Let the hon. gentleman look at the list and see the work they are doing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have said that I did look over the list in the chief architect's office, and I did not see that these officers could be employed at all at any thing like $400 per annum.

Mr. CLANCY. There are persons who have passed the examination and who are employed in his department as temporary clerks.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Why should they be treated differently from other civil servants? It simply amounts to this, that by avoiding the provisions of the Civil Service Act, these persons may be kept on as temporary clerks during their whole lives, when they are performing precisely the same services as are done by permanent clerks. Take the assistant clerk of works, Mr. Boulanger, who is paid $912 per year, why should he not be put on the permanent staff and be given his class, whether first, second, or third, or chief clerk, and be thus given the means of promotion to the highest position in the service ? There is such an anomaly in this whole procedure that we should put an end to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite accept the criticism of my hon. friend in the spirit in which he has made it. I should be very glad if some amendment were made to the Act which would place those men in a different position, but at present we could not put them on the permanent staff, nor do I see any disadvantage or advantage to them or to the government

in either case, since we have done away with the Superannuation Act. The only advantage to them would be that if put on the permanent staff, they would have to be appointed by order in council, and it would be more difficult to dismiss them than it is at present, in case they did not give satisfaction. The only difference that I can find out is that according to the Act they are appointed under order in council, and if they will not do their work it is somewhat difficult to dismiss them. I have been inquiring as to the difference between one staff and the other——

Mr. CLANCY. Is the difference not clearer since hon. gentlemen opposite have reluctantly recognized their duty to keep their contract with the civil service and give them their statutory increases ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I think that under this the minister is responsible for the salaries paid. He could give a statutory increase or more if he wanted to.

Mr. CLANCY. But should that depend on the mere smile or frown of the minister ? Should not the clerks in the service of the country be in a better position than that ? It seems to me that if an officer in the public service is doing good work, he earns the salary he receives. And, if we say the civil servants are entitled to statutory increases, that ought to be made so plain that they would not be indebted to the minister for receiving those increases.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that is a proper way of putting it. I have pointed out that there is very little difference between these two classes. The real reason for the position of this class must be the one I have suggested. For instance, you want a draughtsman. Say the salary earned by a draughtsman in the ordinary way of business is $1,000. You cannot hope to engage a draughtsman to work for the department for $400 a year. He does not give a rap for your permanent staff or anything of that kind. If he cannot get the salary that his qualifications enable him to earn outside, he will leave the employment of the government for the position where he can earn more—as they can often do. The intention of the Civil Service Act, no doubt, is good, and on the whole it may result in good. But I know there are many deficiencies in it, and that some departments of the public service are very much injured by it. We have employees who were appointed by Order in Council and who are under the superannuation law who ought to be dismissed, but nobody has the heart to take away their superannuation. What I am pointing out is that the only object in taking the appropriation in the form proposed is that in these branches it is necessary, in order to engage qualified men, to pay the salaries that are generally paid throughout the country.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is giving the theory of the case rather than what really happens. Is he prepared to say that young men would not be glad to come in at these low salaries and get their training with a view to rising in the service and receiving the higher remuneration which their improved abilities would entitle them to ? If we have a Civil Service Act at all, it should be fairly well adhered to, and I see no reason for an exception in this case. Whatever the hon. gentleman's theory may be, the practice of the department seems to be the common sense and business practice. Take the case of a young man commencing as a draughtsman at $400 a year. It is a small sum, but many a young man would be glad to commence at that if assured that he would have the chance to rise. But he is hampered, for the attitude that the government takes toward him virtually to say : We can dismiss you when we like. He naturally feels that he is liable to be dismissed after he has given his best years to the service. Of course, in every service you will find drones, and in a service the size of ours there will be drones whether they are appointed under the Civil Service Act or are engaged as temporary clerks.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not particularly referring to this item, I think I was right in saying that the Civil Service Act is not altogether a good thing for the service, not altogether a good thing for Canada. I say that in the various branches we are driving young Canadians out of the country, young men who have developed and shown by their course in college or in other way that they have brains—these men are driven out of the country by the picayune salaries paid under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman should have realized that long ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have always thought that, and the more experience I have the more strongly I believe it. We have not the class of men in the service that we should have. We talk of a matter of $40 or $50 on a man's salary, but a good man will save a hundred times that, yes, he may save hundreds of thousands of dollars in the conduct of the works of the department. A young man who has shown himself possessed of ability seeks a position in the engineer's office. He is offered $400 a year, with the prospect of rising in twelve years to $1,400 a year. These men are able to earn from $1,000 to $5,000 a year as soon as they leave college.

Mr. CLANCY. Has not the hon. minister the means of overcoming that ? If he finds a young man in his department who shows

ability, is it not possible by the recommendation of the deputy head, confirmed by the minister and the passing of an Order in Council to advance such a man ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At $1,400 a year—you can't keep them at that.

Mr. CLANCY. You could promote him to be chief clerk.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is only $2,400 as a maximum.

Mr. CLANCY. I can say this—that while hon. gentlemen on this side have been in opposition, something over six years, the civil service has never been made a mark of attack as it was in former years. I believe very heartily that Canada ought to have a good service and that that service ought to be adequately paid for. There is no reason why a man who is employed in the service of Canada should be made a subject of discussion. There always may be the question whether he is needed or not, but every good man in the public service should be well paid. Speaking for myself, I am prepared to give hon. gentlemen opposite support in appointing good men to the service and paying them reasonably well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What can you do under the established rate of salaries ? They are altogether too low. If I were to take the responsibility of appointing some bright young Canadian at a salary of a few hundred more it would be considered a case of favouritism or something of that kind. I can name young men from my own county who have left college and in a few years were earning from $4,000 to $18,000 a year. Many of them would be a great credit to the public service.

Mr. CLANCY. These are the exceptions.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are getting pretty nearly to be the rule. If the hon. member will look over the various departments he will find that our bright young men will not accept positions under the Civil Service Act, and that in order to get good men we have to give them something like a reasonable salary to start with.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I am glad to hear the admission that the civil servant is underpaid. We live in a happy time when there is a large surplus.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is deceiving himself. He has not counted the money right.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I have confidence enough in the Minister of Finance to believe that his statement is correct, and if the hon. gentleman has not, I am sorry for him. Now I think there should be a commission appointed to inquire into the condition of the civil service from top to bottom. I do not think that any part of the surplus could be better applied than in putting the civil service in that position, that would enable men to live as they should in this country. Now, in Halifax we had this misfortune, that when we came into the confederation the salaries were low, and they never got up to that standard that they reached in other provinces. In the province of New Brunswick, Sir Leonard Tilley had foresight enough, when his province entered the confederation, to increase the salaries of the civil servants in the city of St. John, and perhaps all over that province. I know from the condition of the Post Office Department and the railway service in Halifax and neighbourhood, that those people are all underpaid, and it is time that something was done to bring them to such a standard that they can live with some comfort. There are young men with growing families who are receiving salaries so inadequate as to be unworthy of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he thinks of his leaders when they refused the civil service the statutory increases, knowing that the cost of living was increasing, and that their salaries were far below what they ought to be. Has the hon. gentleman changed his mind, or why has he been so silent on this subject for so long a time ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. This is the second time I have brought this matter to the notice of the committee.

Mr. CLANCY. But I should like to hear from the hon. gentleman more than a mild protest. I have never heard him say once in this House that he disapproved of the conduct of the ministers in refusing the statutory increases.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I do not want the ministers to confine themselves to a few cases, I want them to deal with the whole subject from top to bottom, beginning with the deputy ministers and even with the ministers themselves. I do not think that they are overpaid, because I do not think, in view of the anxiety and turmoil of political life, that they will live long in this service. I think it desirable that our prominent men should continue a long time in public life. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I am not afraid at any time to give an expression of my opinion, and to disapprove of the government when I think they are wrong.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has suggested that the ministers are wearing out their lives. I agree with him, and we have some solicitude as to how long they are going to stand it. But the hon. gentleman can give practical effect to his sympathy for the weary ministers by supporting

a want of confidence motion and giving them relief.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He has no confidence that he would be able to get as good a government to replace them.

Temporary clerical and other assistance, inclusive of services of all persons required who were first employed after July, 1882, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $36,000.

Mr. CLANCY. I see there is an increase of $2,000 on the item for telegraph service, salaries of staff. Why is that increase?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was one additional divisional superintendent, and there has been a great increase in the telegraph system. There are five superintendents altogether on the list. I have explained that the Department of Railways and Canals pay the other half of the salaries.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, May 11, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE NEW CANADIAN COMPANY, LIMITED.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved that the Order for third reading of Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the New Canadian Company, Limited (Mr. Lemieux), be discharged and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for reconsideration. He said: This Bill was sent to the wrong committee, and there are one or two things in it which require to be amended. The undertaking is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, but in the preamble it is declared to be an English company incorporated by the British parliament. In order that it may be amended in such a way as to be able to accomplish its objects, it should be referred back to the Railway Committee.

Motion agreed to.

THE NORTH-WEST BANK OF CANADA.

House went into Committee on Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the North-west Bank of Canada.—Mr. McCreary.

On section 1,

Mr. HENDERSON. When this Bill was before the Banking and Commerce Committee, its name was changed to 'The Northern Bank.' I was under the impression that the committee were of opinion that a better name would be 'The North-west Bank,' and I have been informed that such was the feeling of the committee had that name been submitted. It is a name that will better meet with the wishes of the people, and one to which I do not think the promoters would object. I therefore move that the name of the bank be changed to that of 'The North-west Bank' instead of 'The Northern Bank,' as in the amended Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This matter was referred to in the committee, and the promoter was content to accept the name 'Northern Bank,' and I do not see why we should depart from the usual custom and change a name which has been accepted by the promoter of the Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. The parties interested were perhaps not all there, and if I mistake not the name 'Northern Bank' was accepted as a compromise. My own impression is that they would prefer the name 'North-west Bank' to the 'Northern Bank.' If my impression be correct, I think we ought to change the name. I think they were only suggesting the name 'Northern Bank,' because they thought they were not to be allowed the name 'North-west Bank'; and I offer the House the opportunity to change the name to 'North-west Bank' instead of the other, which I do not think at all meets the wishes of the people out there. To my mind, it is not nearly so good a designation for business purposes as the name 'North-west Bank.'

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). I think I was the one who seriously objected to the name 'North-west Bank.' The head office of the Western Bank of Canada is in the riding I have the honour to represent. The Western Bank of Canada thought that this was rather an infringement of their name, and I think so too, and so did the committee. The promoters of the Bill were willing to accept the change of name to the 'Northern Bank' instead of the 'North-west Bank.' I am still of the same opinion as before, and if the promoters were satisfied and the committee reported in favour of the change of name I do not see why there should be any objection. I think there are sufficient geographical and other names in the language to give the bank a new name entirely. I remember that when, two years ago, a bank applied to this House to be chartered under the name of 'The Empire Bank' it was objected to by the representatives of The Imperial Bank and the name was changed to 'The Sovereign Bank.' If it has been the policy of the department, the government and parliament to protect the names of banks, why not make a change in this case

in order to protect the name of a bank that has already been in business for twenty years, that has served well the section in which it works, and that is now proposing to enlarge its capital and extend its operations into the North-west Territory ? Under the circumstances, I think the name can well remain as it now stands in the Bill.

Mr. McCREARY. When the matter first came up in the Committee on Banking and Commerce an objection was raised to the name 'North-west Bank of Canada.' I at once asked for two weeks' enlargement, and wrote to the solicitor of the provisional directors in Winnipeg on the subject. He wired me if the change in the name was to be made, to ask that it be changed to 'Northern Bank,' omitting the words 'of Canada.' I suggested that to the committee, and that was adopted, I presume that the solicitor consulted the provisional directors before he suggested this new name. In regard to the name 'North-west Bank,' when the territories are given autonomy, as, no doubt, they will be before very long, the name would not have so much significance as at present. I think the name 'Northern Bank' would be suitable. We have on the other side of the line very large institutions with similar titles, such, for instance, the Northern Securities Company. I think the name 'Northern Bank' would be quite sufficient without the words 'of Canada'—just as suitable as 'North-west Bank.'

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

EMPIRE ACCIDENT AND SURETY COMPANY.

House went into Committee on Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Empire Accident and Surety Company.—Mr. Calvert.

On section 11,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick). I would draw the attention of the promoter to this clause. My hon. friend (Mr. Calvert) will remark that the name of the company does not contain the word 'limited,' and, under this section, section thirty-nine of the Companies Clauses Act is not applicable. That section, No. 39, reads as follows :—

> The directors of the company shall be jointly and severally liable upon every written contract or undertaking of the company, on the face whereof the words 'limited' or the words 'limited liability' are not distinctly written or printed after the name of the company where it first occurs in such contract or undertaking.

So, my hon. friend will see what the incorporators are exposed to if this goes through in the present form. It would be better to have the committee rise and report progress, so that there may be an opportunity to look at this clause.

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario).

Mr. CALVERT. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) to extend the power of Loan Companies.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 129) respecting the Crown Bank of Canada.—Mr. Guthrie.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 135) to incorporate the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Railway Company.—Mr. Logan.

Bill (No. 145) respecting the Quebec Bridge Company ; and to change its name to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—Mr. Power.

Bill (No. 147) respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 149) to incorporate the Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 150) to incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 152) to incorporate the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Riley.

Bill (No. 154) to incorporate the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Railway Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 157) to incorporate the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 159)) to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 160) to incorporate the Stewart River Development Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 161) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Woolf Valve Gear Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 162) respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, and to change its name to the 'Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company.'—Mr. German.

QUESTIONS.

MEDICAL INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria)—asked :

1. Has the government appointed any medical officers ; and if so, how many, for the purpose of inspecting immigrants entering Canada ?
2. When were such officers apointed, and where are they stationed ?
3. Do such officers inspect immigrants whose destination is the United States ?

4. How many immigrants have been rejected and refused admission to land in Canada by such medical officers ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. Yes ; one chief medical officer and two local medical officers.

2. First November, 1902. Fifteenth January, 1903, and 25th April, 1903 ; the chief medical officer at St. John, N.B., with general supervision, and the two local officers at Halifax and Quebec, respectively.

3. Yes, when necessary.

4. Two hundred and ten.

CANE BROTHERS, NEWMARKET, ONT.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria) —asked :

1. Have Cane Brothers, of Newmarket, Ontario, at any time had license to cut timber on any islands in the Georgian bay, under the authority of the Indian Department ? If so, what was the date of same and what islands were so under license ?

2. Did Cane Brothers, if not licensed to cut by the Indian Department, at any time cut timber on any island or islands in the Georgian bay under the control of the Indian Department. If so, when and what quantity of timber was cut by them ; and on how many islands was the same cut ; and if any cut by the said Cane Brothers, what disposition was made of the same ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. The Messrs. Cane Brothers, of Newmarket, Ontario, have not at any time had license to cut timber on any islands in Georgian bay, under the authority of the Indian Department.

2. The Department of Indian Affairs understand that many years ago, namely about 1886, the Ontario government granted a timber license to the Georgian bay Lumber Company to cut timber on certain lands on the Georgian bay, and that Messrs. Cane became transferees of this license. Subsequently a dispute arose between the Ontario and Dominion governments as to whether these lands belonged to the Ontario or Dominion governments, and this dispute is still unsettled. The Ontario government continues to assert ownership over these lands, their licensees accounting to them. In 1894 the Dominion government endeavoured to take possession of some 940 logs cut on what is known as Baxter Island, claimed by Messrs. Cane as covered by their license and which logs they claimed were their property ; but subsequently, namely in 1894-5, the Dominion government discontinued such efforts. Since then the question of the ownership of the islands has remained in dispute and it is presumed that the transferees of the license account to the Ontario government in respect of any timber cut on the lands in question.

There are a number of other disputes between the two governments as to the ownership of other lands claimed as Indian lands, and matters arising therefrom, and negotiations are pending for the reference of all such disputes to arbitration.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. What amount was paid for drawing the agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Prince Edward Island, with regard to the building of the Hillsborough bridge ?

2. To whom was the money paid ; what were the names of the parties, and amounts paid each, respectively ?

3. Was the cost for drawing this agreement to be paid exclusively by the Dominion government, or partly by them and partly by the local government ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). No amount has been paid by the Dominion government for drawing the agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Prince Edward Island for the building of Hillsborough bridge.

LEASE OF FALSE CREEK, B.C.

Mr. WILSON—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria) asked :

1. Has any portion of False Creek, Vancouver, been leased to Messrs. Burnett & Kelly ? If so, what is the area so leased ?

2. What is the duration of the lease ?

3. What is the rental per annum ?

4. Have any protests been received from any public bodies in Vancouver against the granting of the said lease ? If so, from whom ?

5. Upon whose recommendation was the lease granted ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). If this question has no reference to the foreshore the answer will be as follows : No portion of False Creek reserve, Vancouver, has been leased to Messrs. Burnett & Kelly. If it belongs to the foreshore the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) will be the proper person to answer for that part of it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I suppose the question will then stand until the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) is in the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. MORIN—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Before accepting the Ross rifle, did the Department of Militia and Defence submit the said rifle for examination and approval to experts ?

2. If so, what are the names of those exports ?

3. What report did they make to the department ?

4. Is the department, or the Minister of Militia and Defence, aware if the rifle in ques-

tion has been offered to the imperial government or to that of the United States, and with what result ?

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

1. Yes, to a board of officers.

2. Colonel W. D. Otter, president. Members : Colonel J. M. Gibson, Lieutenant Colonel W. P. Anderson, Lieutenant Colonel Sam Hughes. M.P., Major F. M. Gaudet.

3. The report is that the rifle has features which are a positive advantage over the Lee-Enfield.

4. No.

TRANS-CANADA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WILMOT—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

Has the government entered into any contract with the Trans-Canada Railway Company for the construction of any portion of its line, and have the plans and profiles of the same been deposited with the government ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). No contract has been entered into by the government with the Trans-Canada Railway Company, but the company have sent to the department plans of two short sections of the line, one ten miles from Nelson river westward, and the other twenty miles from same point eastward.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENT WITH GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. KEMP—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. At what point, or points, does the interchange of freight traffic between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway take place ?

2. Is there an agreement in existence in respect to the apportionment of earnings ; and what is the nature of such agreement, and the date of same ?

3. What are the proportions earned by each company for freight transferred from the Grand Trunk to the Intercolonial, and vice versa, in all cases ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. At Montreal, St. Hyacinthe and Chaudiere Junction.

2. There is an understanding as to the apportionment of rates. But further information to reply to this question is being asked for from Moncton.

VALLEYFIELD STRIKE, 1900.

Mr. MORIN—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Was there a strike of the employees in the cotton mills at Valleyfield in the fall of 1900, just previous to the election in that constituency ?

2. By whom was it provoked ?

3. Was Mr. King, the Deputy Minister of Labour, sent to Valleyfield to try to settle the strike ? If so, by whose order was he sent ?

4. What did he accomplish ?

5. Did the employees of the cotton mills secure higher wages ?

6. Were the militia ordered out there ?

7. If so, what was the cost of the troops ?

8. By whom was the said cost paid ?

9. Has the town of Valleyfield paid the costs ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. Yes.

2. On October 22nd some 200 labourers engaged on excavation work for the Montreal Cotton Company at Valleyfield went on strike for higher wages, and the strike of the employees in the cotton mills followed on the evening of the 26th, being of the nature of a protest against the bringing in of two companies of infantry from Montreal at the request of the company for protection against certain acts of the striking labourers.

3. Mr. King, deputy minister of Labour, was sent to Valleyfield by order of the Minister of Labour on receipt of a request dated October 26th, from the secretary of the 'Union Ouvriere,' that the government send a representative to Valleyfield in connection with the strike. On receipt of the communication from the secretary, the Minister of Labour immediately telegraphed to the solicitor of the company, the secretary of the union and the Mayor of Valleyfield, offering the friendly intervention of the Department of Labour, and the deputy minister proceeded at once to Valleyfield.

4. A full account of the negotiations conducted by the deputy minister while at Valleyfield, and their results will be found at page 102 of the issue of the 'Labour Gazette' for November, 1900.

5. No.

6. As above stated, the Mayor of Valleyfield made a requisition for the services of the militia on October 25th, at the request of the company, and two companies of infantry arrived in Valleyfield from Montreal that night.

7, 8 and 9. The Department of Labour has no information on the subjects referred to in these questions.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax) moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council, and all correspondence between the imperial government, or any departmental officer thereof, and the government of Canada, or any department, or officer thereof ; and all reports respecting the purchase in Canada, by or through the government of Canada, or any department, or officer thereof, of any horses, hay, oats, material, supplies, animals, or merchandise, for the imperial government, or any department, or officer thereof, during the years 1900, 1901, and 1902.

He said : Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) informed me that he had no objection to make to the passing of this motion, provided it was amended so as to read as follows :

Copies of all Orders in Council, and all correspondence in connection therewith, respecting

the purchase in Canada, by or through the government of Canada, or any department, or officer thereof, of any horses, hay, oats, material, supplies, animals, or merchandise, for the imperial government, or any department, or officer thereof, during the years 1900, 1901, and 1902.

I am perfectly willing, for the present, to put the motion in that way, provided it may not be held as an estoppel in case I wish to move for any papers that may be covered by the words which are struck out. I do not exactly appreciate the difference between the motion as proposed by me and the motion as amended at the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Finance, but with that understanding, I have no objection to let it go in this form at present, and when the papers are brought down, I will understand better what is proposed to be covered by the motion as amended.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) reading the motion as I gave it to him ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, exactly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will be satisfactory. On a previous occasion on this question, I was asked across the floor of the House if the government had managed this business for the imperial government, and I replied that while we were aware that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) was lending his friendly assistance to the imperial government in this matter, practically it was not dealt with as a Canadian government matter at all. I want to qualify that statement now to a certain extent. I found afterwards, on looking over the papers, that at the first stage an Order in Council was passed which virtually assisted with the credit of the government of Canada in the first steps that were taken. After a short time operations took a different form, the imperial government provided the funds, and the whole transaction from that time forward was conducted as an imperial government transaction. I find it is necessary to make this qualification, because, at the first stage, an Order in Council was passed authorizing advances to be made by the bank. Of course, we had no power to authorize advances, but the assurance that the Canadian government was behind the transaction undoubtedly had its effect with the bank at the beginning, but at a later stage, and as respects probably four-fifths of the whole transaction, that would not apply. I think in view of the answer which I gave to the question put by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) I should make this explanation, because the statement I then made was not exactly correct.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the motion carries I would like to know, if under this motion as it now reads, we will have all the operations that took place between the imperial government and the Department of Agriculture here ; all the purchases of oats, hay, provisions, &c.; or, are four-fifths of these operations going to be kept from our knowledge ? As I understand the statement made by the Minister of Finance, the transactions began by an advance on credit given by the Canadian government, and under which a part of these supplies were purchased. These, as I understand the Minister of Finance, we are entitled to under this motion as altered. But, four-fifths of the transactions having taken place under advances made by the imperial government—perhaps direct to the Minister of Agriculture or to somebody employed in the Agriculture Department—four-fifths of these transactions will not be taken cognizance of under the present amended motion. I do not think that is right ; I think we should have the whole of them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The motion as amended in the suggestion I made to the leader of the opposition, and which he for the moment has accepted, is designed to cover the Orders in Council and papers of the character which are referred to, and anything which relates to the transaction on the part of the Canadian government. But it is not contemplated at present that we shall bring down accounts of the expenditures, because practically no expenditures were made by the Canadian government. An Order in Council was passed in the beginning on which the banks were assured that the government of Canada would see them through this transaction. Of course, we had no legal authority to advance moneys to the imperial government. That Order in Council was given and there was a moral assurance—there could be no legal assurance—but there was a moral assurance given by the Canadian government at that first stage. It was then expected the accounts would have to be dealt with as Canadian accounts, and I think, speaking from memory, it was provided that the accounts should be submitted to the Auditor General. Subsequently, however, that was not carried out. The whole transaction was managed as an imperial transaction. In the form in which the motion will pass, it will call for the Orders in Council which have been passed on the subject, and the papers in connection therewith, but it is not contemplated to include in that order the accounts for the purchases that were made.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

TOWNSHIPS OF MARA, RAMA AND MORRISON—FLOODING OF LANDS.

Mr. GEO. D. GRANT (North Ontario) moved for :

Copies of all reports, corespondence, petitions and papers, filed in the Department of

Public Works, or other department, in the matter of the lowering or regulating of the water of Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching ; and the relieving of lands in the townships of Mara, Rama and Morrison, from floods occasioned by the overflow of said lakes.

He said : I desire to direct the attention of the ministry to a grievance of long standing affecting the three townships mentioned in the motion and which are situated in the north riding of the county of Ontario. These three townships of Mara, Rama and Morrison, are every spring more or less flooded by the overflow of Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching. Those townships are adjacent to and lying east of the lakes; they are low-lying lands and difficult to drain. In these three townships the grievance has been felt severely for years, in as much as the community is depending more and more on agriculture, the pine and wood being practically cut out. Many years ago when the lumber industry was still thriving in that section the inconvenience and loss was not so manifest. The township of Mara has spent several thousand dollars for drainage in the last ten years; the provincial government has also lent its aid, and large drains across the township have been dug to Lake Simcoe; these have proved ineffectual. The difficulty is this, that in the late winter and early spring the lakes overflow the lowlands and on their receding, leave a considerable depth of water on these lowlands towards the interior of the township. Drainage is difficult, and this water lies on the surface often until the month of June, and, in a wet season, all summer. During some seasons in the past it has been utterly impossible for a number of the farmers to get in their crop, because of this.

As to the filling up or narrowing of the outlet from Lake Couchiching into the Severn river, an artificial obstruction has been put in on the west branch of the Severn river and contributes to the trouble. On the centre branch of the river, is a dam which also is a factor. These outlets can be so improved or enlarged to regulate the water of the lakes, particularly in the spring of the year.

It is represented by persons affected, that if the surplus water was let off in the early spring, before the spring freshets, the overflow would not take place, in fact the agitation is for the regulation rather than the lowering of the lakes. In the past when this matter has been discussed, some opposition was offered by the lumbermen who operated on these waters and also by vessel owners. There can now be no objection from these sources for lumber operations have ceased, nor are there any mills depending for their power on the depth of water at the immediate outlets. As regards navigation, the objection is not well taken, because by a proper system, the freshets can be let off and artificial barriers placed at the outlet and the water kept up to the mark where navigation would be safe and easy. Besides that, considerable dredging has of late been done in the channel or narrows between the two lakes, and in other shallow places, insuring greater safety and ease for vessels.

The county of Ontario has suffered for many years severely, from this matter; the annual loss is hard to determine, but it is undoubtedly true that lands worth in the neighbourhood of $100,000 are, in many years, rendered wholly unremunerative to their owners. The land itself is excellent and if relieved of the floods, would add greatly to the wealth of the townships.

As long as these annual floods occur, the thorough drainage of the township is practically impossible, inasmuch as a great part of the area affected is either below or on an equal level with Lake Simcoe.

The township of Rama is also a heavy sufferer, more particularly through the flooding of the Black river and some of the smaller lakes which drain into the Severn; the cause is practically the same; in fact the one remedy in the enlarging of the outlet and regulating the outflow, would be an enormous benefit to the three townships mentioned. The residents themselves have done a great deal and have been at great expense towards rectifying the evil and are very much in earnest in pressing the matter on the government's attention. I feel quite sure that a competent engineer can solve the difficulty and with small expenditure comparatively, when the amount of benefit to accrue is considered.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). I would have thought that the works referred to might come more properly under the jurisdiction of the province. However, there is no objection at all to the resolution, and the matter seems to be so important that I will have a careful investigation and a report made upon it by the engineer of the department.

Mr. S. HUGHES (North Victoria). I may say that this matter was before the House some years ago. It is entirely under the jurisdiction of the federal authorities, inasmuch as it forms a part of the route of the Trent canal. I can assure the minister and the hon. gentleman who has made the motion that there is very little land flooded, and no damage has been done, and that much opposition will come from the municipalities along the southern shores of the lakes, especially those in the counties of York and Simcoe, against lowering the waters of these lakes below their normal level. The obstructions in the river Severn were removed some years ago, as will be found on reference to the department, and, so far as can be ascertained, there is no cause of complaint at the present time. If any attempt is made, such as was made

some years ago, to have these waters lowered, below their normal level, very serious opposition will be offered by the vast majority of the people all around the lakes, and those who would be benefited can be numbered on the fingers of one hand.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND WINTER COMMUNICATION.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (East Prince, P.E.I.) moved for :

Copies of petitions, engineers' reports, estimates and correspondence, in reference to the building of a pier at or near Carlton Point, Prince county, Prince Edward Island, in connection with promoting the efficiency of winter communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

He said : I understand that two petitions have been forwarded to the Governor General for the construction of a pier at or near Carlton Point on the Prince Edward Island side of the Northumberland Straits, for the better carrying out of the winter service between the island and the mainland. These petitions, I understand, have been numerously signed by prominent people all over the island, and I shall take the liberty of reading to the House the resolutions on which they are based. The following resolutions were passed at a mass meeting held at Emerald, on February 5th, 1903.

To His Excellency, the Governor General in Council :—

May it please Your Excellency :

The memorial of the undersigned inhabitants of Prince Edward Island hereby showeth :

That the life and prosperity of a province is largely dependent upon its system of communication with the outside world ;

That ' continuous communication ' was a principal condition of Prince Edward Island entering into the Canadian confederation at all ;

That great loss and inconvenience have resulted to us as a province because of such communication not having been kept up, as a consequence of our not having united long ago on the shortest, easiest and most continuous way of such communication ;

That distance in the matter of a winter route is, other things equal, a prime factor in its adoption to the public service ; and that the route between the capes—Tormentine and Traverse—offers immeasurably the shortest, and we believe all things considered, the most regular and expeditious way as that which we are forced to have recourse to in extremity for mails and passengers, even with open boats ;

Therefore, consonantly to a resolution passed at a mass meeting held at Emerald on the 5th day of February last, which reads as follows :—

' Resolved that this mass meeting of islanders do hereby urge upon the government as of absolute and pressing necessity the immediate construction of a pier at or near Carlton Head, on this side of the strait, and further

' Resolved that the department in charge be requested to push to its completion at once the necessary dredging at the Tormentine pier for the safe docking of steamers and also to proceed with the construction of such other work as may be essential to the safe, speedy and efficient navigation of the strait between the —capes—its natural ferry—winter and summer.'

We respectfully ask that a sufficient sum be placed in the estimates at the next session of parliament to secure to us these necessary works and give Prince Edward Island that communication it has a right to under the terms of confederation.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

The other petition was circulated in Summerside and throughout the west and I will take the liberty of reading it also :

To His Excellency the Governor General in Council :

May it please Your Excellency :

The memorial of the undersigned humbly showeth :

That a petition emanating from a public meeting held at Emerald, Prince Edward Island, on the 5th February, has been extensively signed, requesting that a pier be constructed at or near Carlton Head on the island side of the Strait of Northumberland, and that such dredging and other works as may be essential to the safe, speedy and efficient navigation of the strait between the said capes—' its natural ferry summer and winter'—be constructed forthwith ;

That your memorialists respectfully desire to dissent from that portion of said petition which refers to the summer service, knowing as we do that the present Summerside-Point du Chêne route, with its safe, natural harbours is more direct, has better connections, occupies less time, and in regard to distance is shorter as a summer route than that from any station on the Prince Edward Island Railway to Painsec or any point west on the Intercolonial Railway than the capes route ;

That in other respects your memorialists fully concur in the prayer of the said petition.

Your memorialists therefor respectfully ask that a sum sufficient be placed in the estimates at the next session of parliament to secure such necessary works as may be required for said winter service to be operated in conjunction with Summerside harbour when the latter is navigable.

The causes which have led up to these petitions are well known to this House. You know the difficulties under which we have suffered for years, culminating in the disaster of last winter, and it is to avoid a repetition of such mistakes that the petitions are presented to this House. This is not a new scheme. A petition was presented last year, signed by some 800 names, and the Minister of Public Works then promised that the matter would receive attention. He said :

I am very thankful for the information given me, and will give more attention than ever to this important question. If it be true, as I hope it is, the communication between the island and the mainland can be shortened to eight miles, there is no government which can refuse to undertake that work, but there must be some obstacle in the way or it would have been done long ago. However, we are in a century of progress, and I will give my best attention to the statements just made. I will have my officers go again into that important question, and if it can be done, I will pledge myself to do it.

Unfortunately, we have not got the then Minister of Public Works with us. We are changing ministers around so fast that the promises of one will not hold apparently for the next one. However, the matter now comes before you, supported by these two petitions and the experience of last winter, and I hope something will be done. Before dealing directly with the subject matter of these petitions, I want to go back over recent history in connection with the terms of union, by which we were to have efficient steam service between the island and the mainland, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway, and the railway system of the Dominion. Only a year or two ago a claim was made for the nonfulfilment of these terms, and a part payment for nonfulfilment of $30,000 annually was granted to the island.

I may say, judging by the experience of last year and the failures of business people on the island owing to that experience and the general set back thereby caused our commercial interests, that $50,000 per year, if this thing continues, will fall very far short of in any way compensating for the damage which will be caused each year to our people commercially. One would have expected that, after admitting its failure to carry out the terms of confederation, the government would have used every means possible to give us the continuous communication we require, but instead they have been getting further away from that desired end. It is not very agreeable to us to have to press this matter on the attention of the House year after year, but we are only demanding our rights. I for one do not like to be getting up here session after session and calling the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this important question, but at the same time I feel that I would be derelict in my duty to the people I represent and to this Dominion if I did not do so. Last year was the worst in the history of the island as regards winter communication since confederation, all circumstances considered, and if the government persist in neglecting to carry out its obligations, the results will be still more disastrous to the interests of Prince Edward Island and the people of the mainland who are depending on the island's products. There are two winter boats, the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto,' which perform the winter service. As far back as the time of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, when the Pictou route was packed with ice during certain seasons, we advocated the Summerside and Cape Tormentine route, but there was always a pull in the eastern end of the island against the western. The objection was raised that there was not sufficient water in Summerside harbour, and that the 'Stanley' when performing her summer service would lie in the offing. When the Hon. Sir Louis Davies was Minister of Marine this same objection was pressed, and it was not until the fall of 1900 that the 'Stanley' finally came to Summerside. It was then found that there was just as much water, and even more, in Summerside harbour than on Pictou Bar. In 1900 the service was impeded in an unusual way. The scare of small pox at the Cape was raised, and the boat was taken away to Charlottetown, so that on account of these interruptions, the service did not receive a fair test. In the fall of 1901, we again had the 'Stanley' put on the route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, and she made more round trips during the same time she was on that route than did the 'Minto' on the other route, and that despite the fact that no preparations were made for her coming either at the Cape or Summerside. There was no loading preparation made either at the Cape or Summerside harbour, and no information as to when the boat would run or how she would run, or whether she might not be taken off the route at any time, as was done in the previous year. There was continual bungling of the service, and yet she gave better service than was performed by the 'Minto' between Charlottetown and the mainland, and the test was acknowledged as satisfactory. I have no doubt that the hon. Minister of Marine of last year (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) will testify to the fact that the trial service between Summerside and Cape Tormentine was in all respects successful. I now come to last winter's operations. One would naturally suppose that when the government had found out that this route was feasible and gave satisfaction, one of the government steamers would have been commissioned for that service before the harbour froze up. But instead of the 'Stanley' being sent to Summerside when the summer service was over, it was not until some time later that she put in an appearance there. It is but natural to suppose that trade will flow along the line of the service which the people expect to be kept up. The time when the summer service ceases is the most important of the year. It is just then that the people are getting in their fall importations and exporting most of their produce, and that was the time that the government should have had that boat in Summerside ready to take up the winter service, and the shippers should have had every facility for using that route as would have been afforded them had any private company undertaken the work. But instead there was no information given the public. The Northumberland steamer of the summer service made her last trip on December the 10th, and the 'Stanley' did not put in an appearance until December the 18th, so that the shippers were ignorant as to which way to send their shipments. A great deal of freight had been sent to Cape Tormentine, and, contrary to the shippers' instructions,

this freight was carried all the way round by Georgetown, thus costing the shippers an undue amount of freight. Nor were any proper arrangements made with the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railways, and there was a lot of shuffling for more than a month before any decided freight arrangements were made in this regard. The hour of departure of the boat was ill-advised. It left at eleven a.m., when there was only a half day to load and unload and get back in day time, when instead the boat should have been away by seven o'clock in the morning and have a chance to discharge freight and get back by daylight. Neither was any information given to the travelling public that the 'Stanley' was in commission on this service. The Boston and Maine Railway Company had to send down a man to find out whether the service was really being carried on at all. The excuse was given for the boat not being ready to take up the service on time that there was no coal, and that the government were waiting for coal in Pictou. But is it not absurd that the department should urge the excuse that they had no coal for their steamers at a time when the harbour was freezing up? Why, they could have got plenty coal at Summerside or could have brought it by train to Cape Tormentine and have had a continuous supply there, and the coal would not have cost them more than a dollar a ton extra. But for the sake of one dollar a ton, the service was broken, the shippers did not know which way to ship, and things were all in confusion. The freight to be carried on that route would have amply repaid the one dollar per ton extra in coal. Again, up to the time the boat was put on the service the agent of the Marine Department in Charlottetown could not give any information as to whether the boat was going to run on this route at all. Remarks have been made in this House about the service having proved a failure this year. To refute this criticism, let me just give the House a record of the work done by the 'Stanley' each day until she was unfortunately caught in the ice off of Summerside harbour:

The ss. 'Northumberland' made last trip from this port December 10, 1902.

December 18, 1902. The ss. 'Stanley' arrived about 10 a.m., from Pictou. At 1 p.m., left for Tormentine in a snowstorm laid outside Summerside light all night. Next morning, 19th, proceeded to Tormentine (without returning to Summerside to take passengers that arrived on evening train, who had to stay in Summerside till the 20th), returning about 4.20 p.m.

" 20. Left for Tormentine with local mail, returning 21st without any mail.

" 22. Made round trip, returned about 1.15 p.m. No mail coming.

" 23. Made round trip, returned about 1.15 p.m. No mail coming.

December 24. Made round trip, returned about 3.15 p.m. No mail coming.

" 25. Made round trip, returned about 3.15 p.m. Mail both ways.

" 26. Did not cross. Went outside harbour and returned.

" 27. Made round trip, returned about 4 p.m., with mails.

" 28. Sunday at wharf.

" 29. Made round trip, returned about 5 p.m., with mails.

" 30. Made round trip, returned about 3 p.m., with mails.

" 31. Made round trip, returned about 4.30 p.m., with mails.

January 1, 1903. Made round trip (change of time), leaving, returned 4.30 p.m. Mails.

" 2. Made round trip (change of time), leaving, returned 3 p.m. Mails.

" 3. Made round trip (change of time), leaving, returned 3 p.m. Mails.

" 4. Sunday at wharf.

" 5. Made round trip, returned about 2.25 p.m. Mails.

" 6. Made round trip, returned about 3.30. Mails.

" 7. Did not cross.

" 8. Snowstorm went outside harbour and returned at 11 a.m.

" 9. Left at 9.30 a.m., returned to Tormentine over night. Returned on the 10th about 11.15.

" 11. Sunday at wharf.

" 12. Left about 7 a.m., in a gale of wind from west and very cold. Should have laid at wharf.

She should have laid at the wharf all this day, which was one of the worst days of the year, with the barometer showing that we were going to have very heavy weather. The captain went out contrary to the advice of his pilot and mate. He was caught outside in the gale that was threatening and that was on him even before he went out. He was caught in the running ice and was carried down against the board ice. We will let this pass as possibly an error of judgment. No one will deny that the service up to this time could be a better vindication of this route as regards the number of crossings, and if the department had used judgment and had boats at proper season and freight arrangements and time of leaving arranged, it would be hard to improve. Now, take the history of the boat from that time. It will show to this House still further the neglect of the government in failing to provide for this service. I have already shown how they failed to have the boat on the route, and now I am going to point out that the whole blame for breaking up the winter service is with the department and the government. She was caught there on the twelfth, and lay there ten days, and during that time not a single effort was made by the government to move her. About the tenth day, as representative of East Prince—she was lying outside of Summerside harbour where I live—in company with the official port-warden who is the representative of the fourth district in the

local legislature, the mayor of the town, and the stipendiary magistrate, I drove out to the vessel. We ordered about a dozen men with implements to find out the condition the vessel was in and what means should be taken for her release. The official port-warden said to the captain: Your ship is in a dangerous condition, the ice will break up inside of you, and you will be carried out; but, as things are, she can be cut into the harbour. The captain replied: I will not spend a dollar on getting her in. We asked the captain to call for assistance from the shore, but he would not do so. He said: My vessel is safe. We set the men to work to find out the best means to release the steamer and the thickness of the ice jam in which she was locked—leading into Summerside harbour—I wish to give the House the measurements of the ice on that day. The first seven yards there was thirteen feet of lully and raft ice at the bow; the next thirty-four yards there were three feet of ice; the next fifty yards, one and one-quarter feet of ice; the next sixty yards, two feet-six inches of ice; the next eight yards, five feet of ice; the next one hundred yards, three feet of ice, the next one hundred yards, one and one-half feet of ice; and for the next three hundred yards, ice hardly safe to drive a horse upon—not one foot thick. Yet the report has been made and members will rise here and state, and even the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has represented that she was in board ice fourteen feet thick. The condition of the ice was such as I have stated. Yet that boat remained with freight and passengers aboard, with freight piling up on both ends, for ten days and not an effort made by the government to get her out. We reported the condition of the ice, and yet the captain would do nothing. We held a meeting of the board of trade and decided that we would put our hands in our own pockets and send men out next day to commence cutting her out. We sent thirty men out the next day. They did not make much headway, because they were late in getting ready. That very same night, there was a gale of wind off shore, and the steamship went adrift in the raft ice where she had been lying for ten days without an effort being made to move her. I believe that throughout all that time the agent of the marine department did not even go to investigate her condition. It was left to private parties to do what was done, and private parties had to pay the bill. On the fifth of February a mass meeting was held at Emerald and a petition was prepared as before set out; we also immediately wired the department to ask that something should be done to release the 'Stanley.' With the red tape and humbugging of the department, it was two or three days before anything was done to try to get her clear. On the twelfth of February the 'Minto' was sent to her relief. The 'Minto,' meantime, as I shall point out, could not perform her service on the eastern route on account of ice in Pictou harbour; so, she was sent to the relief of the 'Stanley.' On February 28th, the 'Minto' broke her propeller blade. Captain Brown, about that time reported that the boat could not be released from the ice until about the end of April. That was reported to the department. I claim that she could have been released from the ice when she was outside Summerside harbour, and people competent to give an opinion, who were there and saw the position of the vessel and the condition of the ice, said she could have been released within three days if the proper means at hand had been set to work to cut her into the harbour. Had this been done there was hardly a day from that time until the spring of the year, when the boat could not have performed the service on that route. On March 12th, the government having failed to do anything, the board of trade of Charlottetown took hold of the case. By this time the vessel had drifted over fifty miles and was frozen in near Pictou Island. These parties took hold of her, and the 17th the boat was liberated at a cost of $1,200. The expenditure necessary to release her, had it been made at the proper time, would have saved many failures in Prince Edward Island, and the service to and from the Island could have been carried on. There need have been no such blocking of the service as there was but for the neglect, the culpable neglect of the department and the government. It was not, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says, not as the hon. member for Pictou would have you believe, because the boat was in the ice, or because the 'Minto' broke her propeller in trying to relieve the 'Stanley,' nor, indeed, as the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes), would represent, from both boats not being on the eastern end, but because the government failed to perform the duty of having the 'Stanley' released when that might have been done, when she lay for ten days off Summerside harbour.

Now, what all this means to the people of Prince Edward Island, perhaps the members of this House cannot readily realize. Farming operations have changed in the island during the past fifteen years, and the people have gone into the raising of dairy products, butter, eggs and prepared meats, and working up a trade in the hope that they would be able to depend upon a winter service. Our winter business was being carried out at Sydney, and Halifax and on the mainland generally, while a great many of our shippers had prepared to carry on an extensive business with the old country. But this set-back of last winter has paralyzed the whole trade of the island, and as I said before, has resulted in the failure of not a few of our merchants. There were thousands of dollars worth of fish waiting for shipment at Georgetown that had to be

thrown into the fields. I understand that these same gentlemen who had a right to depend upon this service being fulfilled, when the 'Minto' had several times failed to take their produce across to Pictou, are looking for some remuneration from the government on account of their products being spoiled at the port of Georgetown while waiting shipment. I sincerely hope that the government will take their claims in hand and give them some relief in this matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the way in which the service was performed in giving us 'continuous communication between the island and the mainland' last winter. I want to point out to this House that the necessity devolves upon this government of providing at once another winter boat to carry on that service. The Canadian trade returns show that the winter trade of the Dominion of Canada is very nearly as large as the summer trade. For the months of July, August and September, 1901-02, the imports were $48,782,832 ; and for January, February and March, $45,743,796. The exports for the three summer months I have named, were $55,948,525, and for the three winter months, $31,554,434. It will be seen, therefore, that the winter trade of the Dominion is nearly as large as the summer trade. We have no means of telling just what proportion the island contributed to this trade, but it stands to reason that if facilities were provided for the island during the winter season, her winter trade would be almost as much as her summer trade. In fact, this can be readily shown from the position of the island in respect of transportation facilities in summer. We have two steamers of the Steam Navigation Company making daily trips with full cargoes ; we have the Plant line making two trips a week ; we have two steamers of the Black Diamond Line, two of the Dobell Line, and one of the Quebec Steamship Company ; we have the City of Ghent between Halifax and Sydney ports, and we have sometimes a direct steamer to Great Britain to carry away our products during the summer, besides numerous other small craft that are continually in operation. Now it stands to reason, that it requires all these boats to do our service in the summer time, we want increased facilities for our winter service. At the time the 'Stanley' commenced running with the 'Minto' they got along fairly well, but since the trade has been growing, the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' are not able to perform the service satisfactorily, and it will require another boat of much larger carrying capacity and better suited to cope with the ice conditions, in order to do the trade of the island.

Now, I have placed before you the demands of the people of the island for relief. I think the Department of Marine and Fisheries understands very well that the 'Stanley,' which is now fifteen years old, when she went last year to perform that service between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, was not in a condition to be put on the route. It was easy to see that the plates of that vessel were indented in many places, and when she got into a jam of ice, it was almost impossible for her to back out. The attention of the department was called to her condition last year, and they were asked to make repairs to the boat, but now she is in a much worse condition than before. It behooves the present government at once to set about acquiring a new boat, because the 'Stanley' is practically unfit for the service.

Now, there were some special features in regard to the performance of this service ; for instance, the matter of special trains to meet the winter boats and transfer the passengers and mails to their destinations. Time and again, as the boats arrived at Summerside or Georgetown with perhaps two or three days' mail and thirty or forty passengers, we could not get a special train to carry these mails and passengers to Charlottetown. And time and again private individuals had to put their hands in their pockets to pay for these trains. I know myself of one occasion when the vessel came over with thirty or forty passengers and the mails we had to wire to Charlottetown to the board of trade, and one of the hon. members for Charlottetown had to take the money out of his own pocket to pay for a special train. We not only had to put up the money to get a special train for passengers, but our special train had to carry His Majesty's mails free. More than that there has been wrangling going on between the Post Office Department and the Railway Department, and the Minister of Railways and Canals got up in his seat when this question was up some weeks ago, and said this was the first time he had heard of it. I can take up 'Hansard' of last year or the year before and point out where he acknowledged that our complaints were justified, and he promised to remedy them. There is no excuse the department can offer for inflicting this inconvenience upon the people, and there is no excuse for this wrangling between the Department of Railways and Canals and the Post Office Department as to which is responsible for carrying the mails, or to which department the expense should be charged.

Then there is the Capes route. At the time when two boats were locked in the ice, the Capes service was not ready. I have in my hand a paper stating a case where $150 was paid by two travellers to carry baggage from the island to the mainland :

Mr. J. A. Thompson, of P. Garneau fils & Co., of Quebec, and W. F. Macoun, of Hodgson, Sumner & Co., Montreal, who have been delayed for some time on account of the tie-up of the winter steamers, came to the city from Georgetown this morning and leave to-day for the Capes, where they have made arrangements by telegram with Captain Allan to transport their trunks across to-morrow morning. It

will require six boats and the cost of each traveller will be upwards of $75. These gentlemen have now been delayed upwards of two weeks waiting for winter steamers.

I know for a fact myself, having had to cross by the Cape when the boats were tied up, that there were not enough boats in the government service to carry the baggage and passengers offering. I do not know whether the member for King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes), is prejudiced against this route from local feelings and is actuated with a desire to try and throw cold water upon it, but we are advocating it in the belief that it is the best possible place for communication between the island and the mainland. The hon. gentleman points out that if you put two boats on the Georgetown route satisfactory communication will be ensured. The principal reasons why the Summerside-Cape Tormentine route has been advocated and tested were because it has been found that for the last thirty years there were times in each year when the steamers were locked out of either Georgetown or Pictou for days at a time. The board of trade in Charlottetown in 1898 sent a resolution to the government with the following complaint:

During each winter it invariably happens that for several weeks, owing to the ss. 'Stanley' being unable to make regular crossings in the severest weather on account of heavy ice, the mails have been transferred to the capes routes.

That is why we advocate the Cape route and that is why the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Farquharson) advocated the Cape route and the building of a pier at Carlton point last year. That is why the representative people put their names to this petition. It has been known for thirty years that there are times when you cannot get into or get out of Pictou harbour. There are certain times of the year when under certain conditions Pictou harbour is inaccessible. It is impossible either to get in or out of that harbour. If you will glance at the map you will see that Pictou harbour is not very well situated geographically for a winter port. The harbour opens to the north-east. Due north of the harbour and distant seven or eight miles from Pictou, lies Pictou Island, extending four or five miles in an east and west direction, and forming a bay within, which is open to the full force of the north-west and especially to the north-east winds. During a winter like the present, the prevailing winds are north-west, north and north-easterly, and these have packed the bay with hard ice, only take this year's experience of Pictou and it will be seen the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not understand or has been misinformed when he states that the trouble resulted from the 'Minto' going to the relief of the 'Stanley,' and that had both boats been on eastern routes, continuous communication would have been assured. Look at the facts and the records, which show that on February 2, the 'Minto' became frozen in at Pictou. She made no attempt to get out until the 7th, when she succeeded in working her way to a point three miles beyond the lighthouse, and was obliged to return. The captain reported that, 'it will be impossible to move until there is a strong southwest wind and high tide.' On the 8th, 9th and 10th she was unable to move. On the 11th she reached Georgetown. On the 12th she got back to Pictou. On the 13th she could not get out. On the 14th she left Pictou. On the 15th, 16th, 17th and 18th she fought her way from Pictou harbour to a point five miles east of Pictou Island, a little east of her regular course. At this time the 'Stanley' was off Arisag. The two steamers retained these positions until the 25th, when the 'Minto' succeeded in coaling the 'Stanley.' During all this time it is admitted by those in a position to know, that Pictou harbour was inaccessible and it is a well known fact that when the 'Stanley' towed the 'Minto' to Pictou on Tuesday, March 17, she encountered a belt of ice at the entrance to the harbour which had to be blown up with dynamite before she succeeded in forcing her way through. So that Pictou harbour at all times of the year cannot be counted upon to give us regular communication, while, if we use the two routes we can generally count upon a fairly good service. I do not intend to go into the merits of the Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine route. I pointed out the advantages of these routes two years ago as regards distance, and as regards the condition of the ice. There is hardly a time that they could not cross at that place and I am assured by experienced men who are familiar with the conditions there, that if proper landing facilities were provided, a service could be carried on much more regularly there than at present.

There is no doubt in my mind that a tunnel would be a feasible scheme, that it would put an end to this bickering over the winter service for all time to come. While the funds of this Dominion are rolling in so plenteously and we are spending millions in improving the west, building railways and giving subsidies, I cannot see why the government does not take this matter seriously in hand and have an investigation made. It could only be a matter of $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 and surely the east is entitled to some consideration while so much attention is being given to the west. We have no complaint to make about the development of the west, or about the money which is being expended to improve the west, but we certainly must look after the interests of the east. Only last year, the government paid $1,000,000 as a part payment, not as full satisfaction, for the non-fulfilment of the terms of union in respect to crossing the straits in winter. It may not be very long before our people

will be asking for another $1,000,000 and if the financial and commercial disaster resulting from the failure to maintain the service last year are to be repeated in the future, $1,000,000 will not give satisfaction to the people of Prince Edward Island. This is a serious matter, and the government should take into consideration whether it would not be well to consult engineers and competent persons as to the construction of the tunnel between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse. But, in the meantime we must have a pier. We must have facilities. The tunnel cannot be built in a year, nor in four or five years, and in the meantime we want facilities to carry on our winter service. We want a pier at Carlton point and we must have a new steamer. The steamer 'Stanley' will soon be no good and the steamer 'Minto' has certainly not sufficient capacity to carry the traffic between the mainland and the island. The people of Prince Edward Island have certainly been long suffering. They have been putting up year after year with a great deal of humbug and mismanagement—absolute mismanagement—on the part of the government. I can call it by no other name; there is no excuse for it, as it has been repeated year after year and we have observed it very closely this year. We can get no satisfaction. It probably may be that the captains want to carry out the service satisfactorily. A representative in the local house made the charge that he knew that one of the captains was following instructions in not carrying out the service and that he could prove it. It is a general idea prevailing in Prince Edward Island that they are trying to give a black eye to the Summerside-Cape Tormentine route. The department at Ottawa may be trying to carry out the service, but they apparently do not understand the situation, they do not understand the changes in conditions that are liable to take place within a day in regard to ice and unless you have a local board of control or an agent of the department who has backbone enough to go ahead and perform the service without being hampered with a lot of red tape from Ottawa we will never have a satisfactory service. We ought to have some person on the spot who is in a position to dictate how these steamers shall be run. We must either have an agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries down there who is capable of doing the work or a board of local control such as is advocated by a great many representative men on the island. I do not wish to take up any more time of the House upon this question except to say that while the people of Prince Edward Island realize, it is time the government realized, that this matter has to be dealt with in a business-like way, they have the experiences to show that improvements are needed without delay. They are in a position to know that the two boats we have are not sufficient to perform the service and that we want landing facilities at Carleton point. I beg leave to move the motion which stands in my name.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all reports, correspondence, petitions and papers that are to be found in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or in any other department, concerning the construction and placing of fish-ladders in the Rivière du Nord, crossing the county of Two Mountains, from its confluence with the Ottawa river, at St. André, in the county of Argenteuil, to St. Jérôme, in the county of Terrebonne, for the purpose of preventing the destruction of fish in the Rivière du Nord.—Mr. Ethier.

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, and other documents, in anywise relating to improvements or work done by the government of the United States: 1st. In the Detroit river and Lake Erie; 2nd. In other international waters.—Mr. Cowan.

Copies of all Orders in Council, memorials, letters, telegrams, and other correspondence, and all other documents and communications in writing, between the first day of January, 1897, and the first day of May, 1903, relating to, or concerning, or in any way having reference to the granting of provincial autonomy to the North-west Territories, or the creation of the said Territories into a province, or provinces.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

KLONDIKE MINES RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. C. F. McISAAC (Antigonish) moved:

That the petition of the Klondike Mines Railway Company, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for presenting petitions for private Bills, be now read and received and referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. McIsaac) would state what is the reason for asking to extend the time in this particular case. I have no doubt that there may be good reasons, but if we extend the time in this case we will be obliged to extend it in all cases, unless the present application is based on exceptional grounds.

Mr. McISAAC. The charter which it is sought to extend will not expire for a couple of months yet. The promoters of this railway have recently come out from the Klondike, and on reaching Ottawa they found that they would be required to furnish certain information to the Railway Department which they were not able to get before the expiration of the time. The full information has not yet been placed in my hands, but they will be able to give this information to the Standing Orders Committee and all they ask at the present time is to have this matter referred to the Standing Orders Committee, to which the reasons will be submitted.

The PRIME MINISTER. I told my hon. friend that we would reserve judgment as to the merits of the case, but this motion is simply to allow the matter to go to the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it is understood to be merely formal I shall raise no objection, but I should think that in a case of this kind some special reasons should be given to the House, because we are departing from our rule in acceding to the request of the hon. gentleman. However, as the Prime Minister is satisfied to let it go, I shall raise no further objection.

Motion agreed to.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 39) to make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—Mr. Brock.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think it is somewhat objectionable for my hon. friend to attempt to define the word animal in the way attempted here. Under it, if there were a canary bird, for instance, in a car, it would be incumbent on the railway company to make provision for its comfort and convenience.

Mr. BROCK. My desire in bringing in this Bill has been to avoid anything which might reduce it to an absurdity. I am very anxious to have it passed, and would be willing to strike out the word bird, if the hon. gentleman desires to do so. I may say that one of the objects of the Bill is to prevent cows being crowded together when being taken to market, and to prevent small animals and birds being crowded together in coops. I do not suppose many canary birds are carried in freight cars.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Would my hon. friend allow me to offer this suggestion ? Certain amendments to the criminal code are now being considered in the department by a gentleman who has had large experience in the drafting of Bills of this kind ; and if my hon. friend will do me the favour of calling on Mr. Fraser in the department, he might be able to meet some of the objections which my hon. friend has in view, and make the Bill more workable than it is in its present shape.

Mr. BROCK. Would it be possible, under these circumstances, to get it passed during the present session ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, yes.

Progress reported.

Mr. McISAAC.

FIRES CAUSED BY RAILWAYS.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville) moved second reading of Bill (No. 23) to indemnify those who suffer damages in consequence of fires caused by railways.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Explain.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the Bill which is now before the House to be read a second time, is the exact copy of a Bill introduced last year in the British House of Commons, and the second reading of which was carried by 307 against 80. In spite of that vote, the Bill, presumably through the adverse influence of the leader of the House, did not become law.

According to the jurisprudence which now prevails in England and in Canada, railway companies are not responsible for the fires they may start in running their trains, provided they show that their engines were at the time in perfect order. Such enactments, as I shall show, are contrary to common law. Railway companies, here and in England, enjoy privileges which are granted to them by their charters. Were they in the English-speaking provinces, as in the province of Quebec, left under the operation of the English common law, they would be held responsible for all losses inflicted by them. The whole question is dealt with at length in volume 7 of the reports of the Ontario Court of Appeal, at page 166 of which the following statement of principle is made :

> The general rule of common law is correctly given in Fletcher vs. Rylands, that when a man brings or uses a thing of a dangerous nature on his own land he must keep it in at his own peril, and is liable for the consequences if it escapes and does injury to his neighbours.

The judges of the Privy Council, in the now famous case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company vs. Roy, make a similar statement (see page 231 of the reports, Appeal cases, 1902). The judges of the Privy Council admit that, should the English common law obtain, the railway companies might be held responsible. They are exempt from responsibility solely on the ground that the authority of parliament is supreme; and that parliament having authorized the railway companies to do the very things that are complained of, namely, to use engines for the carrying on of their business, they are not to be held responsible for losses inflicted. Herewith is what the judgment of the Privy Council sets forth, among other things :

> Much was argued by the learned counsel for the respondent as to the peculiar jurisprudence of Quebec ; but in truth there is no such difference between the law of England and the law of Quebec in this respect as he seemed to suppose. The law in England, equally with the law of the province in question, affirms the

maxim 'sic utere tuo ut alienum non lædas,' but the previous state of the law, whether in Quebec, or France, or England, cannot render inoperative the positive enactment of a statute, and the whole case turns, not upon what was the common law of either country, but what is the true construction of plain words authorizing the doing of the very thing complained of.

The legislature is supreme and if it has enacted that a thing is lawful, such a thing cannot be a fault or an actionable wrong. The thing to be done is a privilege as well as a right and duty, and it seems to their Lordships, it come within the express language of the code (article 356).

As may be seen, the admission is fairly made that it is a privilege pure and simple which parliament has granted to a railway company ; so that if we were to go by the common law, whether English or French, the company would be responsible for the fires it may start on neighbouring properties.

Then again, it seems to me the principle of this Bill cannot be controverted. A railway company should have the right to use its own property, but not the right to use that of its neighbour as well ; and if sparks from its engines set that property on fire and cause losses, the company is actually using that neighbour's property, and not only using it, but misusing it. For these reasons, I trust the principle of this Bill will be agreed to by this House.

Across the line, the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and North Carolina, among others, have enacted laws which provide that railway companies will be responsible for the fires started by their engines. At the last session of parliament, I introduced a Bill on the same lines as this one. The hon. the Prime Minister at the time spoke favourably of the object I had in view. As a measure introduced by a private member has not, as a rule, much chance of passing, I think the best thing I can possibly do will be to hand over this Bill to the government requesting them to have it passed this year. It may be objected that this Bill is not worded as it should be, and that a matter of that kind does not fall within our purview. I am not of that opinion, for if railway companies enjoy privileges granted by this parliament, that same parliament has the right to enact that such companies will be responsible for the losses they cause, and that those who suffer such losses shall be entitled to claim damages. Besides, the matter of the wording of the Bill is a secondary one. It enacts that in case of a fire brought about by a railway company those who are made to suffer from such fires, will be entitled to recover compensation from the company. It does not matter much whether we say that the company shall be responsible for the losses, or that it shall be dealt with in conformity with the common law, notwithstanding any privileges granted by this parliament. The common law is the same in all the provinces ; and it is only by virtue of a special enactment of this parliament that railway companies were declared exempt from any responsibility for losses brought about by the running of their trains.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) I approve of the principle which the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Demers) has for its object to sanction. In consequence, I shall have much pleasure in voting for the Bill, which, to my mind, lays down an equitable rule in connection with the matter. However, I have some doubts as to whether such a law would wholly meet the purpose which my hon. friend has in view. We are dealing with a question which has been very much discussed by jurists, especially in the province of Quebec, and several have given it as their opinion that the passing of a direct Bill such as this one would be an infringement on the legislative powers of the provinces. After listening to the argument just made by my hon. friend, I admit there may be some doubt on this point. As I am in favour of some such measure being passed, I hope the Bill will be agreed to in consideration of the principle it involves.

In the course of this session, I prepared a Bill dealing with the same matter ; but I was content with laying down in a general way, the principle of the railway companies' responsibility, in the shape of an amendment to the Interpretation Act of the laws of this parliament. This could not have been looked upon as an infringement on provincial rights in the matter of legislation.

As regards the province of Quebec, the principle is already embodied in our laws, and has been recognized by our courts in the case of Roy. That point is quite clear to my mind, in spite of the contention of the hon. the Minister of Justice to the contrary. In an interesting work, the hon. gentleman has endeavoured to show the difference that exists between the legislative power in France and the legislative power in Canada, and has pointed out how much greater it is in our case. But, notwithstanding the force of his argument, I still believe that the question of losses arising from the running of railway trains is one that falls within the purview of provincial legislatures.

In the province of Quebec, if I understand matters rightly, there is an action against any railway company for losses arising from fires set by sparks from its engines. But in the other provinces the law is different. In those provinces, I understand the principle of the English common law is strictly adhered to, and a company incorporated by parliament and enjoying its privileges with the necessary caution, is not to be held responsible for losses inflicted.

Should this Bill become law—and I hope it will—its effect will be to extend to the whole Dominion the very wise principle which obtains in the province of Quebec. If such an enactment be *intra vires*, it will

bring about a change in the common law of the other provinces, and place the railway companies incorporated here on the same footing as those incorporated in the province of Quebec. Farmers will be benefited by the passing of such a law; but should it be *ultra vires*, I think the railway companies will take that ground for having it set aside. At all events, I am in favour of the Bill.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I cheerfully give my support to this Bill, the object of which my hon. friend, the member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) has so clearly explained. For a long time past the need of such a law has been felt. It is repugnant to reason that railway companies should enjoy privileges such as the new jurisprudence of His Majesty's Privy Council seems to allow them to enjoy. You will remember, no doubt, that this jurisprudence was very forcibly laid down in a judgment rendered by the Privy Council in a case wherein the powerful Canadian Pacific Railway Company and a poor farmer of the province of Quebec, named Adrien Roy, were the interested parties. On a previous occasion, I recounted the various stages through which this now celebrated case was made to pass. About 1901, a Canadian Pacific Railway train, having crossed the property of this settler, a fire started by cinders from the engine destroyed his wood lot and farm buildings. He entered an action for damages against the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the case came up before Mr. Justice Langelier, of whom our bench and bar are justly proud. The judgment of the court awarded the plaintiff damages to the extent of $400 and costs. The case was taken to appeal and the judgment of the Superior Court unanimously maintained. The judgment rendered by the Court of Appeal is a very elaborate document and gives a complete review of the jurisprudence heretofore followed in the province of Quebec. It is a judgment indeed, and it was to be hoped that it would be upheld by the Lords of the Privy Council. However, the Canadian Pacific Railway wished to exhaust all resorts and by means of the appeal of favour, took their case before the Privy Council. Well, notwithstanding the rational construction put by our courts on article 1053 of our civil code, notwithstanding a long list of judgments rendered by the Superior Court and the Court of Appeal, the Privy Council reversed the judgment referred to and established a new jurisprudence, new, at any rate, as regards the province of Quebec. That decision caused a great commotion in our judiciary circles, and was the object of much adverse criticism. I, myself, called the attention of the Minister of Justice last year to this new interpretation of our law. It has always appeared to me that, even under the Railway Act, companies causing losses to properties, situated along their lines, could not escape the responsibility laid down by articles 1053 and 1054 of the civil code. That is also the opinion of the judges of the Superior Court and of the Court of Appeal. In spite of all that, whether we like it or not, we are bound henceforth to go by the new jurisprudence laid down by the Privy Council. The way out of the difficulty is clearly shown in the provisions of the Bill now before us. If we are unwilling to grant special privileges in behalf of railway companies, if we wish them to be on an equal footing with individuals, it goes without saying that the Bill of my hon. friend the member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) should be voted by parliament. This is an opportune time for doing so. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is moving just now for the consolidation of our railway laws. Why should not the principle so clearly laid down in this Bill be embodied in the general law? Such an amendment is imperative if we wish to uphold the principle enacted by our code, and render the railway companies responsible for the losses inflicted by the running of their trains. I shall give my support to the Bill with the hope that the Minister of Railways will find in it the way out of the difficulty created by that unfortunate judgment of the Privy Council.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Yale and Cariboo). I think the Bill is far-reaching in its effects, and it is desirable that it should have its second reading and be referred to the Railway Committee, where the different interests concerned may be heard. I have no objection to its second reading, but am of opinion that it should be referred to the Railway Committee, where we will have every opportunity of hearing every objection that may be raised by those interested.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I agree with my hon. friend who has just spoken that this Bill should be referred to the Railway Committee. It is intended to give compensation for damages in the case of fires caused by sparks from railway locomotives. A Bill of a similar character was introduced in the English House of Commons but not proceeded with when first introduced. It was again reintroduced in the month of February, 1901, and its second reading was carried by a majority of 370 to 80. This shows what the feeling is in England with respect to legislation of this kind. I myself think that the discussion which has taken place in this House regarding the judgment rendered by the Privy Council in the case of Roy and the Canadian Pacific Railway went further than was quite justified by the circumstances. There was no encroachment by the judgment of the Privy Council on the civil laws of the province of Quebec or any

of the privileges enjoyed by that province. The principle laid down was this: that when a legislature—the parliament of Canada, for instance—creates a corporation, which it has power to create, so long as that corporation exercises the powers granted it in the manner provided by parliament, there can be no fault on its part for which it may be held responsible in damages. The principle on which the law in the province of Quebec governing damages is based, is that every man is responsible for the damage caused by his fault or that of his agent. But how can there be fault on the part of a corporation, if it is merely carrying out the powers conferred upon it by the legislature which brought it into existence and in the manner provided by that legislature? That is the only question the Privy Council determined. It did not attempt to interfere with the laws of the province of Quebec. The principle laid down was this—and the judgment is based on the doctrine well established everywhere—that there can be no liability for acts done under statutory authority when there is no negligence.

Take the case of Roy and the Canadian Pacific Railway. It would appear—and I am not satisfied that the fact is absolutely true—that sparks from one of the locomotives of the Canadian Pacific Railway, set fire to a building owned by the plaintiff. The point decided by the court was that, so long as the locomotive was equipped with all modern appliances, as required by statute, the company was not in fault and there could be no recourse in damages against it. The statute which authorizes the company to operate its railway determines also the conditions under which the railway may be operated and the locomotives constructed, and one of these is that the locomotives must be equipped with all modern appliances. So long as you comply with the statutes, where can fault come in? That is all the Privy Council held. It is a necessary incident to the exercise of our parliamentary authority and the full enjoyment of our parliamentary institutions, that if this parliament has power to legislate with respect to corporations, it must have the power to vest these corporations with everything required to give effect to that legislation. It would be an impossible condition if a large railway corporation, incorporated by this parliament, would be subject to the local laws of every province regarding the powers conferred upon it. For instance, if the Canadian Pacific Railway should be made subject, as it passes from one province to another, to every local law in respect of the appliances it must use, the operation of that railway would be rendered impossible. It is absolutely necessary that when we give to a corporation powers within our authority, that corporation should have the right to exercise those powers uninterfered with by the laws of any particular province. That certainly is necessary if our institutions are to have full operation and our legislation to have proper effect. This Bill, at first sight, seems to me entirely within our authority, if we think proper to pass it. If we, by our legislation here, can interfere with the civil or common law of any particular province—the civil law of Quebec or the common law of any other province—we can of our own notion restrict our legislation so as to say that it shall not operate in such a manner so as to amend the civil law or the common law of any other province. Whether that would be right and proper is another question. But, while I have not considered the matter very carefully, it seems to me that we have the power to pass such legislation. The matter should go before the Railway Committee in order that all parties may be heard. This is very far-reaching legislation. It is going to undo the legislation we have had heretofore with respect to damages caused by fires arising from the sparks of locomotives.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it will be proper to send the Bill to the Railway Committee, because, so far as the majority of the provinces are concerned, it will alter the law to a very considerable extent, governing the liability of railway corporations. In my own, and I think in all the maritime provinces, the law is that railway companies, authorized by Act of parliament to operate railways, are not liable for damages of this kind, unless occasioned by their negligence. It is entirely a question of negligence. I have not any doubt, speaking without much consideration, as to our power to pass the Bill, because, while this parliament can create a corporation and give it power to operate a railway, it can attach to that power any conditions it sees fit. If a railway company acts in accordance with its charter, it is not liable, except in case of negligence. But it is perfectly competent, as pointed out by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, for us to give that power subject to the condition, if necessary, that certain civil liabilities shall attach to the operation of the railway, even although no negligence can be proved. I would therefore concur, so far as I am concerned, in the proposal of the hon. Minister of Justice to send this Bill to the Railway Committee.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time and referred to the Select Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that Bill (No. 48) to amend the General Inspection Act be read the second time and referred to a special committee, composed of Messieurs McCarthy, Thompson (Haldimand), Parmelee, Henderson, Wilson, Sherritt and Cowan.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have no objection, provided this be not regarded as an affirmation of the principle of the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

INSOLVENCY ACT.

On the Order being called for :

Resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Monk for the second reading of Bill (No. 53) respecting insolvency.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Stand.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this matter has been pretty fully explained, and I would like to take the sense of the House upon the Bill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) prefers it. But I had the misfortune to be absent when he explained the Bill to the House, and I am sorry to say that I have not had an opportunity to read what he said. I meant to do so before the Bill should come before us again. Probably I shall have an opportunity to read his explanation within the next few days, and shall be better able to discuss the Bill if it is postponed now and brought up again.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) has overlooked the fact that this is the last opportunity we shall have during the present session.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Not the last.

Mr. MONK. Only one more day.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is right. But my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will admit that, with the House so thin as at present, he could not have the sense of the House upon the question this afternoon.

Mr. MONK. I should be satisfied to have the sense of the House as it is now composed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONK. If it is impossible, of course, I submit. But I very much fear there will be no other opportunity to take the sense of the House upon this Bill, and I would like to take it now.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend will have the opportunity of taking the sense of the House next Monday. And I certainly would prefer it.

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to insist unduly ; but I shall insist upon a division if I am in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. There can be no question that the hon. member (Mr. Monk) has the right to move the second reading of the Bill now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the government will say that there will be an opportunity.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly. I have said so to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) and I say so again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not later than next Monday ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not later than next Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

Order allowed to stand.

FRUIT MARKS ACT.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (South Wentworth) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 86) to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901. He said : My proposal is to add to the Fruit Marks Act, 1901, the following, immediately after section 9 :

9a. Whenever any person having at least a carload of fruit packed in close packages ready for shipment desires it, the Department of Agriculture shall send a qualified inspector as expeditiously as possible to examine the same and brand upon the packages the grade of the fruit therein.

The Fruit Marks Act was passed two years ago and amended a year ago. So in its amended form, it was in operation last season. There was a very heavy crop of apples of poor quality, so that there was an opportunity to test the Act to the fullest extent. It worked remarkably well in many ways. There was one difficulty, however. The inspector was empowered to examine apples anywhere, and, if he found them wrongly branded to mark them. But the Act did not provide that a man, having apples to sell, could have them branded according to their quality by some authority —in this case the authority of the government. To have this done would be an enormous advantage to the growers and shippers of apples. The man who already has a good brand established or is able to establish a brand does not need such a law as this. Perhaps it would be no advantage to him. But it would be an enormous advantage to the ordinary grower who has a carload of apples—or it might be made to apply to less than a car. When this Act was first proposed in the Fruit Growers' Association, this feature of it was discussed. But it was agreed by all that it would be desirable not to have the powers of the inspector extended so far ; the promoters of the Bill had the idea that it would be advisable not to load it up with too many clauses at once, but that it should be tried for a year or two as finally proposed to the House, that all might see how it would work. It has been in operation for these two years, and all those engaged in the business find this fault with it. Any one who is at all conversant with the trade in

apples will readily understand what an advantage it would be to a man to have his apples branded with a mark to show that they were of the grade he thought they were. Every one almost, has a different idea of what a No. 1 grade of apples is. But, if a farmer had a carload of apples ready for sale, packed, as he thought, in accordance with the requirements of the Act, and could have them branded No. 1 by a government inspector, he would not have to establish a brand, but it would be already established, and he would have a marketable commodity ready to place on the market either in this country or in England. The market would be prepared for him, and he would have no difficulty in selling. My idea is that the cost of inspection would be defrayed by fees. I hope the House will consider the Bill favourably, and allow it to take its second reading now. It can be further discussed when it comes up in committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I regret that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) who takes a very deep interest in this question, and who introduced the Bill which my hon. friend (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) proposes to amend, is not present. I would prefer, if possible, that the motion should be delayed. The hon. Minister of Agriculture is expected to be here in about ten days. Still, if the hon. gentleman feels that he is ready to go on and wishes to proceed, we have no right to ask him for further delay. But if it is as convenient to him, I would suggest that it stand until the arrival of the minister, and I move that the debate be adjourned. Meanwhile, I will say that from the advice I have received I think this Bill goes very much beyond what was the intention of the minister in proposing the Act in question. It was not designed that there should be an inspection of fruit by government inspectors except in a secondary degree. The design is that the inspection should be made by the fruit grower or the fruit packer who is in a position to have personal knowledge of the contents of the package, and that government inspection only comes in at a later stage where the inspector has a right to mark a barrel or package of fruit which is found to have been falsely marked. I am inclined to think that the passage of this Bill would involve the employment of a much larger number of inspectors than we have, and that the thing could hardly be worked out successfully. Government inspection in this case cannot be so intelligent as the inspection by the fruit grower or producer himself. My hon. friend proposes that where a carload of fruit is ready the government inspector shall examine it. But how can a government inspector examine that whole carload unless he opens up each package? That, I think, will be found manifestly inconvenient. Surely it would be better in the interest of the fruit grower that he should have the responsibility of marking his fruit himself; the responsibility is upon him, if he is a man of good reputation, and establishes a brand for his fruit, and he desires to preserve that reputation. If on the other hand, his brand turns out to be unreliable, he must suffer the consequence. But I am inclined to think from information I have received—it is not a subject upon which I am as well informed as the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith)—but from the advice and information I have received from officers of the department, I am inclined to believe that the object he has in view cannot be carried out, that the scheme is unmanageable, that the inspection and marking of fruit can best be done by the grower or packer who has a personal knowledge of the contents of the package. Any attempt to have a government inspection without an examination of each package would, I am afraid, be found to be unworkable. There are some things from which you can take a sample, and you can brand a number of packages, possibly by testing a sample, because you have a guarantee that comes from their common origin. I am afraid that is not possible with fruit, where the fruit is gathered from different growers and packers. At all events, I would suggest that my hon. friend, who is an experienced fruit grower, and attaches importance to his Bill, would let it stand over until a later stage, because in a few days the minister will be here, and from such information as I have at present, I should be obliged to ask my hon. friend not to press his Bill.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I will consent not to press the Bill in the absence of the minister, but I would like to have an opportunity of bringing it up again. It might pass its second reading now, and be discussed in committee later on.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will promise my hon. friend that there will be an opportunity to discuss it at a later stage, so he will lose nothing by delay. I would make the same observation to my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) who has a Bill on the same subject coming on a few minutes later.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CONCILIATION ACT.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 95) to amend the Conciliation Act, 1900. He said: This Bill is exactly similar to the one that was presented by myself last year, and I presume that during that time it has received some consideration at the hands of the Minister of Labour. In dealing with this matter I might express the wish that the Minister of Labour would give us his own opin-

ion, and some account of the actual operations of the Conciliation Act during the three years it has been in force. There are at the present time, as was shown by the debate in this House last week, a large number of industrial disturbances in the Dominion. In nearly every province attention is being drawn to disagreements between capital and labour; therefore I think, Mr. Speaker, the House will be inclined to give some attention to a proposition which aims to improve the Conciliation Act as much as possible. I notice that the Minister of Labour has gone definitely upon record as altogether in favour of the principle of compulsory investigation rather than compulsory arbitration. I would like to be able to think that these attempts and these experiments that he is making would be effective. But I cannot persuade myself that they will be really effective, not that they will not affect any disputes, but that they will not practically affect any considerable number of the disputes that we are having and that we are likely to have in the future. I submit that we have no warrant whatever to expect in the near future any cessation in the number of labour disputes in this country.

We have seen during the last five years, and more than ever during the last three years, an increase in the number of these disputes. The reason probably has been the general wave of prosperity that has advanced over the country. Everything has been advancing in price, in cost, and labour seems always to be the last to advance and to obtain a share of the prosperity. In this respect prosperity has been practically a curse to the wage earner. The wage earner, whose wages have a tendency to remain at the same figure, cannot get them advanced in many instances without going in to industrial trouble, and he has often had to sacrifice weeks and weeks of his salary in an attempt to get his wage scaled up to meet the requirements called for by the increased cost of everything on which he has to spend his wages. Speaking especially for the city I know best, prosperity has been a most serious drawback to the men who work for wages. Of course, I claim that we have no right, at all events, to condemn the principle of compulsory arbitration so far as we know what its record has been. It has only been in operation seven or eight years, I think, under a British form of government, that is in New Zealand. They have experience there as well as we have in rising markets, and there is no doubt that the Act has been successful in abolishing strikes. There is some difference of opinion at whose cost success has been gained. It is very generally supposed that the worker has gained the largest number of awards made. On the other hand, I think we can find in New Zealand itself that the workers, although they agree to the principle are no more enthusiastically in favour of it than are the employers themselves. The employers claim this one thing for the Act, at all events, that it has abolished suicidal and industrial disputes in the matter of strikes and lockouts.

It is taken into the court; it is separate altogether from the local court, but, at the same time into the court where the dispute is considered and adjusted while the men are at work, while the wages are being paid, while industry is continued, and whatever the result is you have the award loyally accepted by both sides. At the present time I believe there is a probability of one award finally being put to test. For myself, I shall watch with some concern the outcome of this matter, although I am not prepared at all to agree in advance that any objection to an award, either on the part of an employer, if the award may be against him, or on the part of the employee, if the award be against him, or if one or two objections are to be taken, it shall be considered as a condemnation of the principle of compulsory arbitration. If it were possible, and I believe most things are possible in this country, if we attempt them in the right way, even by means of legislation in this House, I favour this principle because I believe it makes for industrial peace. In view of the enormous distance that there is in this country between the present condition and industrial peace, I believe it is something to be looked for and to be worked for. The Bill that I have introduced simply attempts, or seeks to amend the Conciliation Act of 1900. I am ready to believe that there is some merit in the suggestions that have been put into these clauses because I find the idea exactly carried out in the Bill that this House was discussing the other evening, called an Act to aid in the settlement of railway labour disputes. That Bill seeks practically to apply the same principle that is involved in Bill No. 95, but it applies it only to railways. There seems to be no doubt that the promoter of the Bill expects good to result from it, but the question that is raised and the question that must be raised in everybody's mind is: Why not extend the principle of that Bill to other industries that we can affect, to the mines especially and to large manufacturing industries? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if the principle is good in connection with railways, it would be equally good in connection with the general industries of the country, and I do submit that the probabilities are that it would be a great deal more useful and that it would certainly be a good deal more availed of. At the present time, as was shown in the debate the other evening, the larger organizations in connection with railways have got beyond that period in the life of labour organizations when strikes are necessary. They no longer strike. The principal railway organi-

zations of this country and of this continent no longer have to resort to strikes. Their differences are settled by conciliation, by conferences, by appeals, first to one official then to another official, right up to the vice-presidents and presidents of the road, and if there is no agreement then come to with the representatives of the railway system, the chief officers of other systems are called in both by the railway corporations and by the labour organizations. This practice for the last eight or ten years, has resulted in practically abolishing strikes on Canadian railways in so far as the old established brotherhoods are concerned. Strikes by the newer organizations which are brought about by the desire of the railway companies not to have to deal with any other bodies of employees as bodies, are continually arising, they will arise in future and this railway Conciliation Bill will be brought into operation to that extent, but I believe not in the same degree as it would be if applied to the general business of the country. Although the Conciliation Act is something to the credit of the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), I believe he could tell us that it does not, as a matter of fact, affect many of the disputes that arise, and that under this Act they are settled neither satisfactorily nor unsatisfactorily, because they simply wear themselves out in the course of time, and the reason for this is not because the parties to the dispute are necessarily opposed to conciliation. In any serious dispute, I take it, and it is a fact, that either party would welcome conciliation if it could be brought about by a third party without either of the disputants appearing to solicit it, because, in the matter of a labour dispute, as in a larger dispute, the party who is calling for an armistice, the party who is calling for cessation of hostilities or for intervention, is practically admitting that he is beaten, and employers will not ask for conciliation because they are afraid it will give heart to the men on strike, and labour organizations which have a strong fund to support their members, are reluctant to ask for conciliation because they are afraid it will be taken as an admission that they have lost the day, and that finally in the award it will be used against them. It was this important consideration, I believe, in connection with the big strike in New Zealand, in 1890 or 1892, that first led the statesmen of that country to formulate their Compulsory Arbitration Act, which Act practically operates altogether independently of the expressed wish of either of the parties. I believe that if our Conciliation Act could be so amended that it could be put into operation, at all events, as far as conciliation is concerned, and if the minister had the power and also the duty in connection with the labour dispute of making an investigation and attempting conciliation, the probability is that it would be found easy to bring the parties together and would result in the ending of many industrial disputes.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Puttee) has not concluded his remarks ?

Mr. PUTTEE. No, I have not quite concluded.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, out of respect to the memory of the late Mr. Justice Mills, for a long time a prominent and very much respected member of this House, and so as to permit hon. members to attend his funeral, which will take place this evening, I now have the honour to move that the House do adjourn.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I esteem it my duty, Sir, under the circumstances and out of the respect that we owe to the gentleman who was so long a prominent figure in the public life of Canada, and who at the time of his death occupied a very high position on a judicial bench of this country, to second the motion.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 12, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

TRANS-CANADA RAILWAY—CORRECTION.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I would like to correct an error in an answer given by me to a question yesterday. I was asked if there had been any contract entered into with the Trans-Canada Railway Company for any portion of the line. The other portions of the answer were all right, but in the first part I overlooked the fact that a contract had been entered into last January for sixty miles of a railway which is really a portion of the Trans-Canada Railway.

TO CHANGE THE NAME OF HUDSON'S BAY.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 173) to change the name of Hudson's Bay.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. MACLEAN. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen will hear me. I think there is good political reason and good national reason for the introduction of this Bill. It is an assertion of our supremacy

over the waters of Hudson's Bay and the adjoining territory. We have not been very successful in maintaining our supremacy and control over the northern half of this continent in the past. We lost the great valley of the Mississippi through inattention; we lost Louisiana; we lost Texas; we lost Oregon and the Pacific coast——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). And the state of Maine.

Mr. MACLEAN. We lost Alaska——

Mr. LEMIEUX. And you lost North Ontario.

Mr. MACLEAN. And hon. gentlemen opposite may lose something else later on—they may lose their present seats. Our right and title to a portion of the Yukon is now disputed. And, as has been said, we lost the state of Maine. And nearly all these losses occurred because Canadians themselves failed to assert their rights and to assert their supremacy over their own country. The Hudson's Bay country is coming to be a valuable country. I believe there is a great future for us in that respect, and I say we ought to begin now to assert our supremacy in regard to that territory, we ought to give it a distinctively Canadian name, and I do not know any better name to apply to those waters than to call them the Canadian sea. There are but two seas larger than Hudson's Bay, the Mediterranean and the Carribean sea.

Mr. CLARKE. What about the Caspian sea?

Mr. MACLEAN. The Caspian sea is much smaller than Hudson's Bay, and we ought to be patriotic enough and Canadian enough——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman intend to include all these three seas in his Bill?

Mr. MACLEAN. Does the hon. gentleman think I do? I am comparing these seas to Hudson's Bay, though it is not a bay, it is a great sea with an area of over half a million square miles. The area of Hudson's Bay is larger than that of all our lakes combined. The great lakes of Canada only include 100,000 square miles, but Hudson Bay includes half a million square miles, and has a name that is not properly applied to it. It may be said that I propose to remove an old historical landmark and to change the name. But, Sir, the discoverer of Hudson's Bay, or rather the man by whose name it is known, has a monument in the Hudson river in New York state, and he would still have a monument, if this Bill goes through, in Hudson Straits, and he is embalmed in Rip Van Winkle in a way that will last for ever. The motion I make has been suggested to me by men who have been studying the facts in connection with Hudson's Bay, by men who have been studying the geography of that country, by men who have been reading the history of the country, and the way in which we have lost territory. I think a very good opportunity is now presented to us for asserting our supremacy in that country. I hope it is true that the government in some way are already asserting supremacy in that country, that they are at the present time collecting customs duties there and planting the flag. If we do not plant the flag in Hudson's Bay, there are enterprising men and rivals of ours who will soon do it, and who have been setting up pretensions there, as they have set up pretensions in the Yukon. These things ought to cause us to reflect, and while hon. gentlemen opposite who have not been very anxious about protecting Canadian territory, and who have been anxious to see the old flag removed from the northern half of it—some of them may jeer and laugh at it——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh.

Mr. MACLEAN. Now the sore point comes. Now I touch on the raw. Now is the time to turn the other way. In the light of all our past experience, of this loss of territory, of this abandonment of territory, I say it is in the public interest that such a Bill as this should be introduced. It is the duty of the government to show that they take an interest in a question like this, that they are interested in the maintenance of Canadian supremacy on this half of the continent, and that they are doing something now to hold that country for Canada. I hope they intend to give some encouragement to our friend Capt. Bernier in his efforts to plant the flag on the North Pole. I am quite willing so far as I am concerned, to support that scheme. I say this Bill is of the greatest national importance, it is important to the empire, and although it may be modified in the way it is drafted, I hope it will meet with the unanimous support of this House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—THE TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. T. C. CASGRAIN (Montmorency). I beg to bring before the notice of this House the question of which I gave notice some time ago, concerning the Treadgold concessions, in the Yukon. At the last session of this House a debate arose upon these concessions, but it was in the dying hours of the session, and not as much attention was given to it as would otherwise have been given. I find on referring to the

'Hansard' that the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), in replying to some remarks made by the leader of the opposition, spoke as follows:

Perhaps it would have been more satisfactory to the House if, at an earlier period of the session, when we were not in a hurry with the proceedings necessarily pressing upon our minds at the close of parliament, a fuller discusion of this whole matter could have taken place. I have only to say that I should welcome the subject if it is brought up by my hon. friend or by any other member of the House, at some future time, because the whole subject is one in regard to which I will welcome full and complete discussion.

Now, Sir, we are only complying with the invitation given to us last session by the hon. gentleman, in bringing this matter to the notice of the House. As hon. gentlemen will see, it is an important matter, these are very important concessions, and we think it is advisable that the House should know the conditions under which these concessions were made, their importance, and the extent of the grants which are given to Mr. Treadgold and his associates. There were two sets of Orders in Council. The first set is composed of three orders which were passed on the 12th of June, the 29th of June and the 7th of December, 1901. Then on the 21st of April, 1902, as I will show later on, after some representations had been made to the government, the Orders in Council passed in 1901 were cancelled, and the Order in Council dated the 21st of April, 1902, was passed, making almost the same grants to Mr. Treadgold and his associates. It is necessary for me first of all to point out to the House the importance of the water supply in the Yukon, and of some system by which miners in the Yukon district may be supplied with water. I can find no better authority upon this subject than the remarks which were made on the occasion I have alluded to by the Minister of the Interior. Speaking on the 13th of May last, he said:

The whole subject has given the government a great deal of consideration, and anxious consideration, in order to bring about the best results. A question which has not yet been realized in regard to the development of the mining ground of the Yukon Territory as completely as it will be realized, is the question of the water supply. So long as the rich pockets upon the creeks now well known continue to be worked, the effects of the lack of a proper water supply are not likely to be seriously felt. But as soon as these beds begin to be exhausted—and we are getting pretty near to that now—the difficulty about the water supply will press for attention. There is an enormous quantity of gravel of a much lower grade than the miners have been heretofore operating upon, which it will be necessary to work if that portion of the country which is producing the largest quantity of gold is to be kept up to its present position. It was the desire of the government to secure the inauguration of some scheme whereby water would be brought in on a large scale, and, to do that we felt that it would be justifiable and proper in the interest of the country that pretty liberal privileges and concessions should be given.

In order to further show the importance of the water supply in the Yukon. I beg leave to quote from a letter which was addressed on the 11th of November, 1901, by an engineer of repute in the Yukon, to the then Minister of Justice, he said:

The cutting of the timber and opening up of the country has changed the conditions so that as soon as our spring opens up the snow melts much faster than in past years when we had more timber. The majority of miners who are situated on small streams, gulches and hillsides find that their water supply dries up so early in the summer that they had not even time to wash out their winter dumps, so that the water supply is a very serious one, and the lack of it has retarded the mining interests in the past year very much. . . . . It would require, at least 10,000 inches of water distributed through the district—the district referred to is at least sixty-three miles—to supply the different miners within this district, water to wash their gold from their different claims that are now known to be good properties, to say nothing of other ground that may prove good on being developed.

Water must take the place of wood; most of the creeks have had all the wood cut from them. The miners have had to go some distance, so that the cost now runs up to $25 per cord in some places, and will cost more as it becomes more scarce. In using water, all of the higher banks can be washed from top to bottom, instead of working only a few feet, of the drifted ground three feet more or less where it is found the richest. All of the creek beds that have been partially worked by the ordinary method can be worked over again and be made to pay by the use of water.

This is a very important statement in view of what has taken place in granting the concessions of which I have spoken.

So you see it is important that some means must be taken whereby a supply of water can be placed at the disposal of the Yukon miner or the gold will not be removed for hundreds of years.

In 1900 a petition was signed by the inhabitants of the Yukon territory to the Governor General. I see that a committee had been entrusted by their fellow citizens in the Yukon with the duty of making representations to the government in regard to what was going on in the Yukon at that time. These gentlemen, in the first paragraph of this petition say:

That on the 13th day of February, 1900, the undersigned were duly appointed a committee of the citizens of the Yukon Territory, to petition for and secure representation of the said citizens on the Yukon council and in the House of Commons of Canada.

Then, they go on to say, amongst other things, speaking of the concessions which have been made in the Yukon:

On the 25th day of November, 1897, the then gold commissioner, contrary to the mining regulations then in force and in direct breach of faith with the miners who were then exploring

and prospecting Dominion creek, closed the said creek against locations, and in 1898, the gold commissioner, together with the then commissioner of the Yukon territory, closed the hillsides and benches along said Dominion creek, against locations by the free miners of the Yukon Territory, and this closure was enforced by the recognized authorities until the 11th day of July, A.D. 1898.

On the 13th day of March, 1899, contrary to the regulations made by Order in Council, all benches and hillsides on Bonanza and Eldorado creeks——

I understand that these two creeks are amongst the most valuable in the Yukon district.

—were closed against locations by free miners and said action, was, on the 5th day of September, 1899, confirmed by the Privy Council of Canada, and said districts have never been reopened to the locations of placer mining claims.

During the time when these closures were being made and enforced on the various creeks, hillside and bench claims, in the gold mining region of the Yukon Territory, large parts of the said closed portions and other parts of the Yukon Teritory were granted by the government of Ottawa to certain persons many of whom never at any time were in the Yukon Territory, as hydraulic concessions, and certain fractions have been granted in compensation for alleged grievances, which alleged grievances ought never to have been in existence.

Thus while the creeks were closed to the ordinary and necessary prospector as above set forth, in the autumn of 1899, the relocation of abandoned claims were entirely done away with in the Yukon Territory. Population was driven from the Yukon Territory by what was a practical prohibition of development, large tracts of richest placer mining ground of the Yukon Territory have been handed over in concessions and the said concessions include and take in valuable fractions which have been denied to the prospector and have been handed over to the concessionaires for the small sum of one hundred and fifty dollars per mile, so that at the present time prospection and new discoveries have practically ceased.

They then pray to the Governor General in Council as follows :

Wherefore your petitioners pray that :

Third, the necessity of opening for location to free miners all parts of the Yukon Territory owned by the government which are fit for placer mining.

Fifth, the necessity for altering the hydraulic mining regulations so as to secure for the free miner the right to locate, record and work any ground which is fit for placer mining whether covered by a concession or not.

Sixth, the adoption and enforcement of such mining regulations as will encourage to the utmost the prospector, first, the miner, second, and the investor, third, and throw open the country for the fullest and free development.

Now, Sir, while these locations were closed, as was represented by this petition to the Governor General this was going on in Ottawa here : In March, 1898, the Minister of the Interior directed that Bonanza, Eldorado and their tributaries and benches should be closed against location. This was followed on October 7, 1899, by a regulation closing all lapsed claims in the territory against re-location. In the year and a half which followed, without the knowledge of the Yukon people the greater part of our richest placer ground was included in so-called hydraulic concessions. On Hunker creek were granted—the Williams (2½ square miles) ; the Milne (2 square miles) ; the Anderson (2½ square miles). On the Klondike, including Bear and Lindow creeks, was granted,—the Boyle (50 square miles). On Bonanza—the Philip (5 square miles) ; the Bronson & Ray (15 square miles), and the Matson-Doyle (3 square miles) were granted. On Quartz creek another concession (about 4 square miles) was granted to the same Boyle, while the other creeks heretofore mentioned were almost similarly blanketed by concessions which were obtained by fraud in most cases.

Then came the Order in Council of June 12, 1901, to which I now wish to direct the attention of the House. The Order in Council consists of the preamble and the tender made by Treadgold and his associates was included in the Order in Council, as appears to me, without any amendment whatever; that is to say that these gentlemen made a proposal to the government, they wrote the government a letter in which they said : We want a concession in the Yukon on such and such terms, and the government simply took the letter and incorporated it in the Order in Council without, as it appears, as far as I can see, changing any part of it. The preamble of the Order in Council says :

Whereas the mining now carried on in the Klondike district is, because of the inadequate supply of water necessarily confined to the washing of the richest gravel only comparatively small in area, thus leaving large tracts of gold-bearing gravels unworked ; and from the information obtained from the gold commissioner of the Yukon Territory and others it is believed that the riches of the Klondike district can only be properly utilized by such a water supply as that which the before mentioned applicants are prepared to establish.

Then the Order in Council goes on to say that :

Therefore, the Governor General in Council is pleased to order and doth hereby order, that the said application by the said Malcom H. Orr-Ewing, A. N. C. Treadgold and Walter Barwick, bearing date the 31st May, 1901, a copy of which is hereto annexed, and which is hereby made a part of this Order in Council, shall be and the same is hereby accepted.

This Order in Council is the most extraordinary document, perhaps, to which the attention of this House has ever been called. A proper value can only be put upon the concessions made by this Order in Council when the Order in Council is properly dissected and properly reflected upon. First of all the Order in Council gives the concessionaires, or the grantees :

The sole right to divert and take water from the Klondike river at any point or points be-

tween its entry into the Yukon river and Flat creek for the purpose of generating power with which to pump water to work the auriferous deposits in the district hereinafter termed 'The District') comprising the beds, banks, valleys, slopes and hills of the Klondike river, of Bonanza, Bear and Hunter creeks and their tributaries.

I will show afterwards by quoting from some authorities who live in the Yukon Territory the extent of the district and I think I will be able to show that the district comprises probably the richest part of the Klondike. These people have a prior right to divert the water and establish their pumping stations so as to create this power over an extent of forty miles of country from the Yukon to Flat creek. Then, having given them the sole right to thus divert the water of the Klondike river, the Order in Council goes on to give them :

The prior right . . . to divert and take water from the Klondike river for distribution and use in the district especially upon the hills and benches.

The right on any creek or tributary within the district to divert, take, impound and store for mining purposes any water not used by any free miner for the working of his claim on such creek or tributary under the regulations now in force for placer mining, or respecting the diversion of water for mining purposes in the Yukon Territory.

Afterwards, by an Order in Council of the 7th December, 1901, this right on Rock creek which is the principle creek in that district, was limited to 2,500 miners' inches. I presume that many gentlemen in this House are as ignorant of what is a 'miner's inch,' as I was before I began the study of this question, and it will probably be well to define the term here. When you say a 'miner's inch' one would think that this was a small quantity of water, but I find in the official 'Gazette' of 1902 page 82 that a miner's inch has been defined by the Department of the Interior as follows :

A miner's inch shall mean the passage of one and a half cubic feet of water per minute.

And if we consult the dictionaries, we find that a miner's inch is defined to be :

The amount of water that will pass in twenty-four hours through an opening one inch square under a pressure of 6 inches.

I have also heard from a competent authority, that a miner's inch is equal to a volume of water twelve feet square.

The Order in Council goes on to give the right :

The right at any point or points in the bed, banks, valley, slopes and hills of the Klondike river between its mouth and Flat creek to construct and maintain dams, cribs, intakes, flumes and any other works necessary for the generation of power and the right of entry upon and way through any lands and any mining ground for the purpose of such construction and maintenance.

The right to purchase any Crown lands required by the grantees for the purposes of their works at a price not exceeding ten dollars per acre, saving and reserving all the timber, mines and minerals upon or under such lands.

The right at any point or points in the district to build, maintain and operate pumping stations, electrical works and reservoirs.

The right of entry upon and way through any lands and any mining ground for the purpose of constructing, laying and maintaining flumes, ditches and pipe lines for conveying the grantees' water supply to any point within the district.

The right of entry upon and way through any lands and any mining ground within the district and within the Indian river district for the purpose of constructing and maintaining overhead or underground wires and any other structures for the transmission of electricity for any purpose whatsoever throughout the said districts, and the right to levy and collect such tolls as may be approved by the Governor General in Council for the use of electricity in the said districts.

Then it gives the right

To use, distribute and dispose of the water delivered by the grantees within the district.

Therefore these grantees got first of all, the sole right to divert and take water from the Klondike river in this large district ; they got the prior right under this Order in Council to take all the water which is necessary and which they wanted to take, and then they got the right to use, dispose of, and to distribute this water within the district. They got this right subject to no payment except the royalty :

The right, subject to no payment except the royalty prescribed upon output, to enter upon, make entry for any work all mining locations now or hereafter abandoned on Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks and their tributaries.

It would seem at first glance that this power is not very important, because as the House wil notice it only gives the right of entry over the abandoned claims, but anybody who knows anything about this question ; anybody who has studied it at all, will see that this right is of paramount importance. Abandoned claims are not at all claims which have been abandoned because they are not good claims. For instance, when a miner has staked out a claim and he has not sufficient means to work it, or has not sufficient appliances, he will work it for a short time, and then abandon it, but here are a great many claims, there are thousands of claims in the Klondike as in all other gold-bearing regions, which have been abandoned and which have been worked over again at enormous profit. The House will, therefore, see the importance of the statement which was made in the petition to the Governor General in Council that I have just read. The House will also note the importance of the closing up of this rich district to the prospector and to the free miner ; the prohibition which was imposed upon them against retaking or reclaiming the abandoned claims. The House will remember that at a certain period in 1898 and 1899 these districts were closed

against the free miner by regulations emanating from the department at Ottawa. These very same claims, the abandonment of which had been ordered by regulation of the Department of the Interior, were handed over by this regulation to the grantees, the only obligation imposed upon them being the payment of royalty. There was no stipulation for any other payment whatever. Therefore, at once, these grantees came into competition with the free miner, and with such competition the free miner was not in a position to compete, and so these gentlemen got the abandoned claims that were to be found in this very rich district. I call the attention of the House particularly to this, because it is one of the parts of the Order in Council which was not repealed or changed in any manner, shape or form, by the subsequent Order in Council which was passed on the 21st of April, 1902.

Then they have the prior right :

The prior right, if mineral-bearing lodes or deposits of any kind whatever be discovered through the operations of the grantees upon Crown lands, or upon lands or locations owned or leased by the grantees within the district, to enter upon and purchase locations embracing the discoveries in the manner prescribed by the regulations governing mining in the Yukon Territory.

Then they have the right to take timber from Crown lands subject to the payment of dues, and they have also :

The exclusive right, subject to the regulations hereinafter contained, to construct, lay, maintain, supply with water and operate bedrock flumes, and any other flumes for supplying water in the district ; provided that every free miner shall have the right of constructing flumes for the purpose of conveying to his claim the lawful amount of water to which he is entitled under the regulations now in force for placer mining in the Yukon Territory, and any water that he shall purchase from the grantees ; and he shall also have the right of constructing flumes for the purpose of draining his claim.

Therefore, under this Order in Council, they have the right to dispose of and sell the water which they had the prior right to take out of the Klondike, and they were the only people who could lay pipes or flumes so as to distribute this water throughout this district. Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be in order to discover what is the area of the territory which was handed over to these concessionaries. I quote from 'Hansard' a question which was put to the ministry during last session of parliament. It is as follows :

What area of the Klondike is by this concession given over to such syndicate, and closed to the general public ?

The answer to that question was given in the following words by the Minister of the Interior :

Claims on Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks and their tributaries, which have been staked out by miners and thereafter abandoned and allowed to lapse.

Mr. CASGRAIN.

Now, Sir, this will not probably give the House a true conception of the extent and the value of this immense concession. I beg leave to quote from a newspaper which no doubt my hon. friends on the Treasury benches know very well. It is the Dawson 'Morning Sun.' This paper, I may tell the House, is the government organ in the Yukon ; or it is the most friendly paper in the Yukon to the ministers, and the fact of the matter is that the Saturday edition of the Dawson 'Morning Sun' is the official 'Gazette' for the district. I find this among the papers in a return which was brought down by the government in reply to a motion made in the House. The 'Morning Sun' of February 14th, 1902, came out with some startling headlines. I must say that it seemed to take a long time for the people of the Yukon to correctly seize the importance of the concessions which had been handed over to Mr. Treadgold and his associates, but they apparently woke up one fine morning, and the Dawson 'Morning Sun' came out with an article which I shall quote, and which was preceded by very large headlines. Some one asked me a moment ago what this district comprised, and in answer to that I shall quote this newspaper, which I suppose is well informed, and which would certainly not give information to the public wantonly, nor would it be likely to give any information which would be false, especially if that information were to injure the government which this newspaper then supported. It says :

WHAT IT MEANS.

Three hundred and fifty square miles of territory.
Two hundred and twenty-five thousand square acres.
Twenty thousand dollars a day earned now.
Five hundred and twenty thousand dollars a month earned now.
Three million one hundred and twenty thousand dollars earned in six months.
Ten million dollars earned in three years.
Three thousand eight hundred relocations last year.
Three thousand seven hundred renewals last year.
Loss of revenue to the government.
Loss of business to merchants.
Shrinkage in securities.
Values reduced.
Miners deserting territory.
Confidence gone.

The 'Sun' then goes on to say :

Public opinion was quickly aroused when the 'News' appeared on the streets last night with the first exposure of the gigantic mining grab attempted by Treadgold & Co. A mass meeting was quickly arranged for and the A. B. Hall promptly engaged for Monday evening at 8 o'clock. Every man who has anything at stake in the country should be present and support the resolution which will be presented for the endorsement of the people present.

The map published in the Daily 'News' yesterday, showing the dimensions of the enormous wet blanket upon future development which is cast upon the Dawson mining division by the

Treadgold concession, was an object lesson that probably did more to arouse a deep public interest in the subject than any arguments against the creation of this iniquitous monopoly that have been or can be made.

The map shows a territory covered by this concession of about 350 square miles, or over 225,000 acres. It shows also that this is the richest portion of Yukon territory in its number of gold-bearing streams and its mining development. It shows about eighty streams that have been located and in addition many others that have not as yet been named. With this area there are thousands of claims—creek, bench and hillside—that would in a short time be staked and developed were it not for the fact that the individual miner has been robbed of this mining territory so near to his base of supplies, in order that a wealthy syndicate might be made a present of it; to have and to hold until 1905, whether they do any development on it before that year or not.

That some of the claims embraced have been abandoned is no argument. In every placer mining camp claims are abandoned as worthless and afterwards relocated and worked at a profit. Many of the Klondike pioneers, for instance, abandoned their claims on Eldorado, and even during last year only 3,800 miners relocated claims that other miners had abandoned. Here follows a list of the principal creeks and gulches that are closed to development by the concession.

The paper goes on to give an enumeration of the creeks and their tributaries which were conceded to these people, or over which they had a monopoly; and it gives this result: the Upper Bonanza, with fourteen tributaries; Last Chance, with three tributaries; Hunker Creek, with sixteen tributaries; Eldorado, with eleven tributaries; Lower Bonanza, with twenty-six tributaries; Bear Creek, with one tributary; and Gold Bottom, with three tributaries. The paper adds:

> In addition to the above are innumerable creeks and gulches which have no names that appear on any map, but upon each and all of them there are claims a number of which lapse each year.

The House will see the value of the concession which was given to these people, not by any comment I am making on the Order in Council, but by the explanation given by this organ of the government, and, I take it, a paper which must be well informed as to the state of affairs in the Yukon territory.

Now, what were the conditions imposed on these people by the Order in Council?—Because the House will say, surely these great privileges and monopolies were not given to the grantees unless some conditions were imposed on them, or unless an equivalent was given, if not to the government, at least to the unhappy miners who had been, I may say, defrauded by the concessions which were given by the government. By the Order in Council which was passed on the 12th of June, 1901, it was provided:

> The grantees shall before December 31, 1902, have expended upon the objects of their enterprise at least the sum of $250,000.

It was also stipulated that before the end of December, 1902, they were to deliver within the district during the summer season of 1905, not later than July 1, 1905, at least 1,000 miners' inches of water. I may say that by the Order in Council of the 7th of December, 1901, this was altered. They were still obliged to expend $250,000 in work so as to bring this concession into operation, and to supply the miners in the district with at least 2,000 inches of water. There were other important particulars in this first Order in Council which were not changed by the second, and this very important concession was given to them:

> The grantees shall not be required to pay to the Crown or to the district or local authorities any rentals, occupation rents, assessments, or other dues in respect of any lands except timber lands, or in respect of any flumes, drains, properties or profits other than import customs duties, school taxes and a royalty on the gold mined in the mines owned by them, or any tax or assessment which may be substituted for such royalty.
>
> The properties of the grantees shall be exempt from representation.

To the ordinary mind the word representation here does not mean much; but when I tell the House what it means, the House will see the enormous value of the concession given to these gentlemen. Under the regulations, which I have here, the ordinary free miner is obliged first of all to pay $15 to become a free miner; he is obliged to get a certificate, which costs $10 or $15, and he has to pay every year a renewal fee of $15. That is not all: he has either to work his claim to the extent of $200 or pay $200 to the government every year. That is what is called representation. These gentlemen, for some reason, were exempt from representation. They were put on a footing much better than that of the ordinary free miner. They had not to pay anything for their certificate; they had not to do any work whatever on their claims; and if they did not, they were not obliged, like the ordinary free miner, to pay this sum of $200 to the government. The House will see at a glance what an enormous loss of revenue this is to the treasury of the country. Why was this concession given to the grantees? I would like some explanation on that point. Then, under the regulation which was passed in accordance with this Order in Council, they have the greatest rights of expropriation.

> The rights conferred upon the grantees shall extend for the period of thirty years, at the expiration of which period all exclusive and prior rights granted to them shall cease and be determined, but the works and structures built by the grantees together with the lands, rights and easements which they shall have purchased and acquired shall remain the grantees' private property.

The grantees shall have the right to assign the rights conferred upon them to any company or companies or to any persons associated together for the purpose of carrying into effect the objects of the grant or any part of them.

Now, I call the attention of the House to this part of the Order in Council :

The charge which the grantees shall be entitled to make for the use of such water on each claim shall not exceed one dollar per miner's inch per hour.

So that the miners were obliged to take water from these people. They could not build a flume for themselves or take any water from the Klondike to work the richest parts of the Klondike, but they were obliged to pay these people one dollar for every miner's inch of water per hour. By the Order in Council of 7th December, 1901, this charge for water was reduced from one dollar to twenty-five cents per miner's inch per hour. The implication is that there must have been something wrong in this concession at the outset—that the enormous price put upon this water was put upon it either in absolute ignorance of the position of affairs in the Yukon or from some other motive, which I will not characterize at this moment. As I have said, it took some time before the citizens of the Yukon realized the extent and the importance of the monopoly which had been given to Mr. Treadgold and his associates. I find in the return brought down, a communication from the late Senator Wood, to the Department of the Interior, inclosing a letter from the firm of Holme Miller & Company, of Dawson. This letter is addressed to the firm of the late Senator Wood, in Hamilton, and is dated February the 13th, 1902, some time after the passing of the Order in Council, which was passed on the 7th of December, 1901. From that moment therefore the government were made aware of the appalling state of affairs created by this concession. They were then put upon their guard and notified to have this condition of things put an end to immediately. The letter is as follows :—

We are sending you a marked copy of a Dawson paper, which marked article we wish to call your attention to.

If this is allowed to stand, it means that two-thirds of our gold-bearing area is closed to the prospector and miner, and absolutely tied up for a period of three years and possibly longer. It will mean a falling off in trade in all lines from 25 per cent to 50 per cent. Surely you cannot be so disinterested in the development and the advancement of this section as to sit quietly by and to allow such an outrage to common decency in matters of government to be committed.

Every manufacturer, every wholesaler in Canada is indirectly interested in this matter, and should not rest until this order of affairs is reversed.

Just such administration of affairs in the Yukon has driven over 8,000 honest, law-abiding English, Canadian, Australian, and American prospectors from this section, and if this condition of affairs continues to exist, there will be nothing left but a skeleton of a once prosperous and wealthy community.

If you could come with us to a visit to the creeks we would show you miles of ground held under concession lying idle, while adjoining ground resembles a human beehive, alive with men delving for the golden treasure.

We do not over-estimate this matter. We have been silent heretofore, but the time is now arrived when every man, every woman and every child in the Yukon Territory should enter a protest against a measure aimed against their prosperity and their homes.

Believing you will consider this matter carefully and act accordingly.

We remain, yours truly,
HOLME, MILLER & CO.

In a subsequent letter of February the 17th, the same gentleman writes :

We are sending you to-day marked copies of the Dawson 'Daily News' and the 'Morning Sun.' The latter paper is the government's organ here. We wish to call your attention to the articles referring to the 'Treadgold grants.'

We wish to enlist your services in an endeavour to have this grant repealed. This means the success or failure of many a business enterprise in Dawson. To us it means a loss in trade of 25 to 50 per cent. Neither the 'Daily News,' which is an independent paper, or the 'Sun,' the government's organ, over-estimate the damage this grant will do to the commercial interests here.

If there is anything you can do in this matter, any influences you can bring to bear, we trust you can see your way clear to do so.

This firm must have been a reputable concern or the late Senator Wood, who was a very estimable gentleman and a very good friend of the government, would not have thought it worth while to transmit this communication to the department with the extracts from the newspapers referred to. I am not making any comments on the concession, because no comments of mine could convey such an idea of the iniquity of the grant as those passed by the people themselves in the Yukon district. The 'Daily Sun' of the 15th February said—and I am taking this again from the return laid on the Table :

People are just commencing to realize the enormity of the steal attempted by the Treadgold concession holders. No other term will correctly indicate the nature of the transaction. Rights which belong to the public are being taken without compensation or shadow of authority. What can this be called other than a theft ?

There was also a meeting held at Dawson city, a full report of which is given in the 'Morning Sun' of the 16th February. This was not a meeting of citizens, prepared in any event to condemn the government unheard, it was not a meeting of opponents of the government, but a meeting of the Liberal club of Dawson city.

The 'Sun' said describing this meeting :

An earnest and enthusiastic meeting of the Liberal club was held last evening at Pioneer Hall for the purpose of discussing the recent Order in Council concerning the Treadgold concession.

That meeting was presided over by the Crown Prosecutor, who was then held in great esteem in government circles, and who is now the governor or commissioner of Yukon. The 'Sun' report goes on to say :

One hundred and fifty members were present, and vice-president F. T. Congdon, called the meeting to order. He stated that, while the meeting had been called at the instance of the Liberal club, the subject under discussion was of such vital interests to the country that anyone who felt interested would be privileged to speak.

Mr. Congdon spoke of the aroused feeling of the people—aroused justly on account of the injustice of such a grant, and that it was the duty of the Liberal club to point out the wrong that had been made. He declared it to be a violation of all the principles of government, and that it had evidently been gained by the grossest misrepresentations. They should not go to extremes in the matter as was being done at present but calmly discuss its great mistake. The government should not give such grants, for it was but the trustees of the people and it was the purpose of the people to see that they were considered in such affairs. He read some extracts of law on contracts and closed his remarks by saying that with a united effort of the Liberal club they should get good results from the commissioner's visit to Ottawa.

I believe that Mr. Ross, the present member for the Yukon district, was then the commissioner and was on his way to Ottawa. The 'Sun' report continues :

The next speaker called on was orator Charles Macdonald, who said :

I have not the slightest reluctance in improving this oportunity to state my feelings concerning the Treadgold concessions. I only wish that men more conversant than myself—and there are many here—had been called upon. But we would be false friends to the Liberal government if we did not point out the mistakes of the party. (Hear, hear.)

As we all know a mighty concession has been given, yet the government has no right to make such a gift, for it is merely the trustee of the people. This matter of the Treadgold concession must and cannot be carried into effect. It is our duty to act promptly (hear, hear) and point out the wrong. There can be no two opinions. It should not become law. (Hear, hear.)

It is rather strange that these gentlemen up there, friends of the government, should have felt called upon to read this lesson to the government. It is rather strange that they should have felt under the necessity of impressing on the government what is an undoubted principle of constitutional law, namely, that such a concession as this should not be given by Order in Council. Again I quote from the 'Sun':

Mr. A. F. George, another newspaper man in the Yukon, likened the Klondike to a great reservoir upon which the country drew for a supply. He made a pretty illustration of how a claim being abandoned to-day in one district would be made up by the discovery of another. He had worked out two claims himself, and yet there was ground still untouched and awaiting the hands of the miner.

'Now,' he said, ' if this opportunity is taken away from three or four thousand men, the work in this district, as individuals, we will only have in its place in a few years five hundred men and our boss, Mr. Treadgold.'

Mr. George thought there should be a rattling of dry bones and made that remark apply to his belief, that not only this, but other concessions should be looked into.

Mr. F. G. Stackpole said :

I have been a Liberal all my life, but I would not stay with any party that has acted like the present government. My interests are in the Yukon and that's the part I am wanting protected.

Alexander I. McFarlane did not hesitate to say that if the government was in ignorance of this country, it was about time to quit sending delegations to Ottawa, and have them send delegations here. He suggested that Mr. Sifton be asked to take a trip in over the ice.

Now, it is strange that the government had not more information about this country. This was in 1902, and work has been going on in the Yukon since 1896 or 1897. The government had their officials there, and I believe some of the ministers had visited that country. At all events it was their bounden duty to know the state of that country, to know the condition of affairs there; and if they passed Orders in Council, giving concessions and grants deserving of this denunciation by their friends, what should be the opinion of members of this House before whom are being placed all the facts of the case ?

The resolutions were moved by Mr. J. H. Davison and seconded by J. C. Noel.

I know Mr. Noel, and I know that a better Liberal or a more devoted admirer of my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does not exist in the country. The resolutions passed were as follows :

That a committee be appointed to collect statistics and other information regarding the concessions and the probable consequences of its operation, with a view of providing the commissioner with the same.

It is further resolved that telegrams be sent to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and to the other members of his cabinet protesting against the Treadgold Order in Council and praying that its operation be suspended pending the arrival at Ottawa of the commissioner of the Yukon Territory.

Whereas, the Liberal association of Dawson has summoned this meeting of the association to discuss the Treadgold concession and to make such representations in respect thereto to the government as might be deemed necessary, and has invited all Liberals, whether members of the association or not, to attend this meeting ; and

Whereas, this meeting has the greatest confidence in the judgment and ability of the commissioner of the Yukon Territory and in his desire and determination to guard the interests of the people of this territory ; and

Whereas, in the opinion of this meeting their confidence in the commissioner is shared by the people of the territory at large ; therefore be it

Resolved, that the meeting requests the commissioner to undertake the presentation to the

government of the representations which it is desired to make in regard to such concession, and that the meeting urges the commissioner to use all his great influence to secure a cancellation of the obnoxious features of the recent Order in Council, and the other Order in Council relating to such concession, and to relieve this territory from the disastrous consequences certain to ensue if such Order in Council is allowed to stand in full ; and be it further

Resolved, that the commissioner's attention be called to the fact that he be requested to represent to the government that, in the opinion of this meeting, the insertion of such features in the Order in Council could only have been procured by the grossest misrepresentations and fraudulent concealment ; that it never could have been represented to the minister who proposed said orders, or to the Governor in Council that the orders were an interference with the abrogation of vested rights ; that it was retroactive in operation and most far-reaching and uncertain in effect ; that it was certain to produce distrust and lack of confidence among the mining communities of this territory, and prove fatal to the progress of the territory ; nor could it have been presented and made apparent that the only consideration promised for the enormous interest granted was a monopoly to supply water at an exorbitant and prohibitive price.

Then the 'Sun' goes on with its comments as follows :

The whole populace of Dawson and the creeks is in a furore of excitement bordering on consternation over the far-reaching effects of the amended Treadgold concession . . . Hunker, Bear and Bonanza and all of their tributaries and ground contiguous thereto are within the reach and grasp of the great concessionaire syndicate. That means every paying creek in the country flowing into the Klondike river. Those which empty into the Indian river and the Yukon are the only ones omitted and every miner in the country knows how few those are. . . . . Only a few days remain to the people here who hope to retain what they consider their most sacred rights before it is possible that the giant octopus will have fastened its tenacles upon the country that the poor prospectors have conquered and placed in the list of proud territories of the Dominion of Canada and which with the process of strangulation once in effect, will divest the country of its population and cheat the government of its income from this source. . . . It was the talk all round and there is no use trying to deny or conceal it—that the Treadgold concession will sap the life of the country. . . . Not for the mining industry alone do the people object but on account of the life of the city of Dawson itself. They are firmly of the belief that the place will be little more than a memory with the Treadgold people in power, and that where now palatial public buildings and costly banks and big stores and warehouses all stand, will be no more than a reminder of once when there was a prosperous country somewhere in the far north.

Mr. CLARKE. What is that from ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. This is from the Dawson 'Sun,' the government organ in the Yukon. It says also :

It is apparent that there must have been a vast combination of misrepresentations regarding the Yukon formed to assail the authorities at Ottawa to induce them to come to the conclusion that this territory cannot get along without Treadgold, and that it is a very insignificant matter to hand over to him all the abandoned claims on certain creeks. It is certain that nobody outside knows much about the Yukon, and the editor confesses that he has been here for so short a time, that for a while, and until he was enlightened, he could not see any great value in abandoned claims. He said, and, no doubt the authorities at Ottawa said : What good would the claims be if the present owners valued them so little as to lose them rather than pay the small renewal fee ? Why not give them to some one like Treadgold, who will appreciate them and work them ?

One only needs, however, to examine the matter for a little on the spot to understand fully how erroneous such an idea is, and to appreciate how great must have been the imposition practiced to obtain such an order. Treadgold and his associates are horribly anxious to develop this country. They are grieved to think our people are suffering for water. It will be observed, however, that their efforts to develop are confined to districts where other men have found and opened the richest mines on earth. They do not care to strike out into new regions for themselves. They cannot be induced to leave the Klondike. Their excuse for confining themselves to this region is that Bonanza, Hunker, Eldorado, &c., are in distress for water, and they desire to relieve this distress at the small cost of twenty-five cents per miner's inch.

I have read these copious extracts to show what the real nature of these grants is. I think it is most interesting to know that these comments should have been made upon the first Orders in Council, because it seems to me, as I shall endeavour to show (with good result, I think), that there is no material difference between the Order in Council now in existence and the Orders in Council against which these denunciations were launched not only by adversaries of the government, not only by people indifferent in politics, but by the Liberal club and by some of the strongest partisans of the government in the Yukon district. I have already said that the new Order in Council was passed on the 21st of April, 1902. Now, Sir, I will not read all the new Order in Council, but I will simply indicate to the House some of the salient points of that order. Some of its clauses were exactly the same as those of the former Order in Council. Let me say at the outset that the sole right to divert and take water from the Klondike river at any point or points between its entry into the Yukon river and Flat creek was preserved to the grantees by the new Order in Council. So they have the sole right to take the water from the Klondike river for a distance of forty miles between Yukon river and Flat creek, to erect pumping stations so as to pump water to work the auriferous beds, banks, valleys, slopes and hills of the Klondike river, or Bononza, Bear and Hunker creeks, exactly as granted to these gentlemen by the first Order in Council to which I have

referred. In the second clause there is a difference—a limitation. It will be remembered by the House that, at first, a right was given to the grantees to take water from the Klondike river for distribution from the Klondike without any limitation. By the second Order in Council they have not the right to take all the water they chose from the Klondike river for the purpose of operating their own works, but they have a prior right to take water from the Klondike up to 5,000 miners' inches.

Now, I submit to the House that, having this prior right to take from the river the water for distribution and use in the district up to 5,000 miners' inches, nobody else could come into that district and take water. It stands to reason that these gentlemen have still, under the second Order in Council, the right to build dams across the river, the sole right is given to them to expropriate property for the object of their concession. They have the right to erect pumping stations, they alone have this right, they have the sole right to divert water from the Klondike river according to this first clause. So I say this is a monopoly ; and nobody else, even if he had authority, even if he got a subsequent grant from the government, would be so foolhardy as to go up there and establish competing pumping works, or works of any kind so long as this concession is given to the present owners. Then they have the same rights to purchase any Crown lands, and build and operate pumping stations, and enter upon any lands or mining grounds, to construct and maintain overhead and underground wires for the purpose of supplying this district with electricity and electrical power. They have the right,—

Subject to the regulations hereinafter contained, to establish, distribute and dispose of by sale or otherwise, the water delivered by the grantees within the district.

Now, a notable omission of this Order in Council is that these people have the sole and exclusive right to divert the waters of the Klondike, the prior right to take the 5,000 miners' inches. They have the sole right to use, and the sole right to distribute this water, and no price is imposed upon them by this Order in Council. The first Order in Council said that the price to be paid by the miners was $1, this was subsequently changed to 25 cents per miners' inch per hour. This Order in Council does not say what price these people are to pay. Therefore, to anybody reading this last Order in Council it will be evident that these people have there a monopoly to distribute and to sell water, that nobody else can distribute and sell it, and that they can sell it at any price they deem fit. They can sell it at one dollar, or two dollars, or fifty cents for a miners' inch per hour, there is nothing to restrict them. Therefore, I say this Order in Council is at least as bad as the former Orders in Council which were repealed by the Order in Council of the 21st of April, 1902.

The grantees have the prior right if mineral-bearing lodes or deposits of any kind whatever be discovered through the operations of the grantees upon Crown lands, or upon lands or locations owned or leased by the grantees within the district, to enter upon and purchase locations embracing the discoveries in the manner prescribed by the regulations governing mining in the Yukon Territory; the right, subject to no payment except the royalty prescribed upon output, to obtain entry for and work all mining locations now or hereafter abandoned on Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks and their tributaries.

The House will remember that one of the features which was most denounced by friends of the government in the first Order in Council was the right these gentlemen had of making entry for and working abandoned mining claims in this rich district. The very same right is given to them by the subsequent Order in Council. Then again :

The grantees shall not be required to pay to the Crown or to the district or local authorities any rentals, occupation rents, assessments or other dues in respect of any lands except timber lands or in respect of any flumes, drains, properties or profits other than import customs duties, school taxes and a royalty on the gold mined in the mines owned by them, or any tax or assessment which may be substituted for such royalty.

Here again one of the objectionable features which was to be found in the first Order in Council is reproduced in the second Order in Council. The only material difference between this Order in Council and the others, so far as I have gone, is that by the first Order in Council a prior right was given to these gentlemen to divert the waters of the Klondike without any limitation whatever ; whilst in this Order in Council they still have the prior right to divert that water to the extent of 5,000 miners' inches per hour. But, I say that when these people have this prior right, after having been given the sole right to divert the waters on this extent of territory, nobody would dare to go up there and establish any hydraulic or other system for supplying water to the miners in face of the monopoly created by this second Order in Council. The rights conferred upon the parties by this Order in Council extend also for the period of thirty years, and they also have the right, as they had under the first Order in Council, to assign their rights to any person or corporate bodies.

The House will remember that one of the conditions imposed upon these people was that they were to do work within the short space of a few months to the extent of $250,000. They were to give evidence of their bona fides, and of their ability to carry out this concession, by spending in that district for the benefit of the miners the sum of $250,000. They were also obliged to bring in at least 2,000 miners into this dis-

trict before ; they could make entry for and work upon these claims in the rich creeks I have already mentioned. Singularly enough, by the Order in Council, no such conditions are imposed upon these gentlemen. They are not obliged to expend this $250,000, and they are not obliged, either to construct or to make those works within the time specified by the first Order in Council. The question presents itself. Where has this $250,000 gone ? That question would strike anybody. These people came up with the evident intention of establishing these works and of putting up a large sum of money to show their ability to construct these works, to show their bona fides, and all at once, by this Order in Council, they are relieved of this obligation of spending $250,000, and even for the space of six years to do any work whatever in this district. So under the Order in Council which gives them the right to assign these powers given to them, they may, during six years, hold up this country as it were, while they are floating their company in England, while they are trying to get somebody in England to put money into this scheme, while they are trying to float a company which will take hold of this valuable concession. If this Order in Council is maintained by this government, I have no doubt a company will be formed to reap the rich benefits which have been sown by Mr. Treadgold and his associates.

Now, Sir, a short time after this second Order in Council had been passed, as we know, an election was held in the Yukon district, and the electors sent here my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) who now represents this district, but who, I am sorry to say, is not in the House. It would have been well if he had been here, and I have no doubt that the reasons of his absence are valid and good reasons, and that he would not be absent unless it was absolutely impossible for him to be here. I regret it, because I have no doubt that he could have given to this House his experience and a great many explanations which this House needs in order to grapple with this most intricate question. As I said before, an election was held. Now what was the first plank laid down by the convention which selected this gentleman who now represents that district, the convention which gave him written instructions as to what he was to do when he came into this House. I hold in my hand now the Liberal platform which was adopted by the Liberal convention at the election in question. Among other things, here is what was laid down as one of the planks of that platform :

> Whereas, the supply of water and power to the mines on the creeks is one of the most serious questions of the day in the Yukon territory, and whereas, in the opinion of the convention the matter of such supply on fair and reasonable terms could best be dealt with by the government itself and should not be left to private individuals ;
>
> Therefore, be it resolved, that the government be requested immediately to make careful examination and obtain reports upon the subject with the view of cancelling forthwith the Treadgold concessions, and undertaking such supply as may be needed.

Now, Sir, this is not the concession which was given to these people in the first Order in Council, this is not the concession condemned by the Liberal convention, which was given by the first set of Orders in Council to Mr. Treadgold and his associates; but this is the Order in Council which was passed during the last session while we were sitting here in the House on the 21st of April, 1902. One of the very first planks which was laid down in the Liberal convention called before the election in the Yukon district is that representations should be made by the member who is to be elected for the district so that the government shall forthwith cancel this Treadgold concession.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that the one that is in force to-day ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is the one that is in force to-day—the Order in Council which was passed on the 21st April, 1902, and which is still in force. The platform goes on to say :

> Resolved, that in the opinion of this convention many of the concessions now held were obtained by fraud or imposition.

The House will remember that I read over a list of the concessions—the Boyle concession and others which were given by this government, and against which the citizens of the Yukon district protested in a petition addressed by them to the Governor General in 1900. It is alleged that these concessions were obtained by fraud, that they were obtained by misrepresentation, that they were obtained by concealment. The convention went on to complain that the government had given these concessions to some of its own favourites. It says that :

> It is in the interests of this territory that such concessions should be annulled and to that end that an inquiry should be set on foot to ascertain the circumstances of such fraud and imposition, and action taken by the Attorney General of Canada in the premises.

I would ask my hon. and learned friend if he has instituted the inquiries in regard to these concessions which are called here by the friends of the government fraudulent concessions ? Then it goes on to say :

> Resolved, that a policy should be adopted which would prevent the obtaining of concessions for hydraulicking except in places where the dirt is of such low grade that it could not profitably be worked by other methods; and that before any hydraulic lease should issue, notice should be given by the applicant by publication in the newspapers of his intention of applying for such lease, so as to enable protests to be entered against the granting of the

same; and that the owners of hydraulic concessions already granted should be compelled to carry out the strict terms of their leases, and that in default of their so doing, their leases should be cancelled.

While these leases continue in existence nobody can work the mines for which hydraulic leases are given. This vast mining territory is there idle and, as is stated in the papers from which I have read, the men are leaving the Yukon because they cannot work these claims. That is the platform adopted at the Liberal convention which chose the hon. member who now represents the Yukon territory (Mr. Ross), and his answer is contained in a letter which I also hold in my hand :

I have received—

Mr. Ross says—

—a copy of the platform adopted by the convention which honoured me by its nomination as a candidate for the House of Commons for Canada. I freely subscribe to every measure suggested therein.

That hon. gentleman comes to this House pledged to have this concession repealed and to have it cancelled forthwith. Why is it not cancelled to-day, because it was obtained by fraud and misrepresentation ? The Order in Council still exists to-day, and such a monopoly exists as will drive people away from the Yukon and prevent them from coming in to work the mines. He gives them solemnly a pledge to see that this Order in Council granting this and other concessions, which it is alleged were obtained by fraud, should be immediately cancelled, and that this country should be relieved from what the 'Daily Sun' describes as a giant octopus. He goes on to say :

I recognize that the whole business life of the Yukon depends upon the success of the prospector and miner, and they above all others must be encouraged. With this in view I shall advocate the reduction of fees, which, I think, may now be safely done without impairing the revenue; the thorough investigation of the charges of fraud made in respect to the manner in which certain concessions are alleged to have been obtained, and if such fraud is established, the immediate commencement of such proceedings as may be required to vacate the grants, and the enforcement of strict compliance with the conditions embodied in all Crown grants in the Yukon.

I am sorry that it is impossible for the hon. gentleman to be here, because I have no doubt he would give some good reasons for his silence so long in this House after having received this command from his constituents to see that these concessions were forthwith repealed. At the same time some questions were put to him by a gentleman in the Yukon representing a certain section of the electors of that district, and here are some of the questions :

1. Will you pledge yourself to advocate for and insist upon the immediate cancellation of the Matson, Doyle, Bronson and Ray, Boyle, Slavon-Gates and Miller creek concessions ?

2. Will you agree to advocate for and insist upon the cancellation of the Treadgold concession ?

3. Will you pledge yourself to advocate for and insist upon the punishment and exposure of officials both in Dawson and Ottawa by whose fraud or culpable negligence or inefficiency those concessions were granted in the first instance, or are now continued in force after the same by their terms should be cancelled ?

I again call the attention of the House to the fact that the Order in Council of the 21st April, 1902, is still in existence in the Yukon.

6. Will you support the appointment of a commission of five persons, of whom two shall be nominated by the premier, two by the leader of the opposition, and one by yourself, to inquire into the administration of the Yukon country, both local and federal, in all departments, and report ?

The hon. gentleman was not himself able to give an answer to these questions, but it was answered by his right bower, the gentleman who is now Governor of the Yukon territory, Mr. F. T. Congdon, who wrote as follows :—

Dawson, November 4, 1902.

C. M. Woodworth, Esq.,
Dawson, Y.T.

Sir,—I beg to say that your questions were received and forwarded to Mr. Ross at too late a date for it to be possible for him to have answered them by this time. I know the views of Mr. Ross as well as any one can and have no doubt he will advocate the course of action you suggest in your questions.

So that this hon. gentleman was elected on the distinct pledge that he would come to Ottawa and have these concessions cancelled forthwith. This Order in Council should be cancelled now if everything I have read from these documents is true. It should never have been passed in the first place. After all the condemnation which has been brought down upon the heads of the government by the passing of the first Order in Council, this second Order in Council, which does not materially differ from the first Order in Council, should never have been passed, and I say that the government should be condemned by this House for passing the second Order in Council after having been warned by its own friends of the detrimental effects which this concession would have upon the Yukon district. I have evidence of this in a question which was put to the administration not long ago. The Dawson board of trade telegraphed to certain gentlemen in this House, and amongst others to the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in the following terms :

Oppose any attempt to pass Order in Council or Act in parliament that will in any way confirm Treadgold concession. Are having monster petition signed and reliable data prepared to

forward to Ottawa, asking government to aid in furnishing water for mining purposes. People are a unit in making demands and will insist on government protection from monopoly of Treadgold octopus.

To which the right hon. leader of the government replied :

You are altogether mininformed as to what you call the Treadgold concession.

No such action contemplated either by legislation or government order.

The people of the Yukon should have had a satisfactory answer from the right hon. leader of the government, but this was a rather ambiguous answer. I do not quite understand the reply which the right hon. leader of the government made to the very distinct telegram which was sent to him by the president of the Dawson board of trade. The right hon. leader of the government says :

No such action contemplated either by legislation or government order.

What does the right hon. gentleman mean? Does he mean that this Order in Council required no confirmation at the hands of this parliament ? Does he mean that the Order in Council is a valid concession of the franchise which the government purpose to give these people ? Is that the meaning of the telegram; or does my right hon. friend by this telegram mean, that he will not do anything at all; that he will let this concession stand or fall on its own merits, but he will not ask his government or ask this House to confirm it in any manner whatever. I really do not know what the right hon. gentleman meant by this. However, this fact remains; that the Order in Council has not been repealed; that it is still in existence, and that although it is as obnoxious and as illegal and as unconstitutional as the first Order in Council, no steps have been taken yet by the government to repeal it and to give satisfaction to these people in the Yukon who have been crying out against this shameful state of things. The Dawson Board of Trade, after having seen this telegram also sent a petition which is on file here, and which is signed by a large number of the people of the Yukon. The Dawson Board of Trade addressed a letter to the newspapers in which the Treadgold concession which is now in force is commented upon in the following terms :

The Treadgold concession and water grant as granted by an Order in Council and which when ratified by the parliament at its next session will become law is, in the opinion of this board, one of the most iniquitous measures that was ever inflicted upon a people, and (in the consideration of the Dawson Board of Trade) will work a great hardship upon the people of this territory since it will mean the virtual bankruptcy of all the property owners of Dawson and surrounding territory, and instead of the Klondike becoming the prosperous country we expect, it will virtually become the property of Mr. Treadgold and those who are associated with him in his scheme.

In this community the Treadgold concession is called 'the infamous Treadgold grant,' and is alluded to as an 'iniquitous concession,' and in the petition which was sent to the House of Commons this language is used. After reciting part of the Order in Council, it says :

2. That the benefits conferred upon the grantees are of incalculable value and involve an enormous exploitation of the public resources of this territory for the benefit of a few favoured concessionaires.

3. That in the opinion of your petitioners the accumulation of extraordinary powers in the hands of a single corporation such as is affected by the above Order in Council, will lead to the paralysis of the independent, commercial and industrial life of the community and will prove in the highest degree oppressive and injurious to the public welfare, since the grantees are thereby enabled to crush out competition and to reduce to a position of practical servitude the individual miners in the extensive district affected, which includes the richest portion of the Klondike.

4. That the need of this territory is not the creation of monopolies, but their prevention, and the encouragement of the individual miners by securing equal privileges and opportunities to all as far as the law and the administration can provide them.

5. That for the promotion and development of the mining industry of the Yukon, a cheap, abundant and effective water supply, furnished at a minimum of cost by the government at the earliest possible moment, is absolutely essential.

Your petitioners therefore pray :

1. That the Order in Council of April 21, 1902, may be cancelled completely, and that no special privileges shall hereafter be granted within this territory with respect to wood, mining, water or any other class of rights affecting the general public; but that all persons shall be restricted in such matters to the rights conferred upon every member of the community by the mining regulations.

Now, Sir, the House will see that the very same condemnation which was brought down upon the government for passing the first Order in Council is brought down upon their heads to-day for passing the second Order in Council. I take it that the Dawson Board of Trade, in the very nature of things, is not composed entirely of opponents of the government, and in the estimation of that board of trade this huge monopoly conferred by the second Order in Council should be cancelled immediately. They state that if it is not cancelled it will do a great injustice to the miners of the Yukon district, and that it is calculated to injuriously affect the interests not only of the Klondike but to injure the commercial interests of Canada as a whole.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The Dawson city council passed exactly the same resolution and sent a petition to the House of Commons, and these resolutions being couched precisely in

the same terms as those passed by the Board of Trade which I have just read, it will be unnecessary for me to repeat them. And here I am again face to face with my friends of the Liberal club of Dawson. You will remember, that although they are friends of the present administration, they thought it was their bounden duty to condemn that first concession which was given to Mr. Treadgold and his associates. Apparently they do not find a very great difference between the first concession and the concession which is in existence to-day. They do not find the great changes which the Minister of the Interior tried to persuade this House last session had been made in the second Order in Council. On the contrary, they go on with their agitation against the second Order in Council and they have petitioned the government and this parliament to withdraw or to cancel the second concession as being just as bad as the first one, against which they protested in the month of February, 1902. The petition of the Liberal Association of Dawson and of the Yukon Territory, goes on to say :

That the development of the resources of the Yukon has been seriously impeded by the appropriation of extensive areas of rich placer ground by hydraulic concessions believed in some instances to have been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation.

This alludes not only to the Treadgold concession, but it relates also to the other concessions which are mentioned in the petition to the Governor General in Council in 1900, and which were referred to in the platform of the Liberal convention when the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) was elected, and also in the questions which were put to the hon. member (Mr. Ross) and which he answered by his friend Mr. Congdon, before he was elected. These concessions not only include the Treadgold concession, but also the concessions which I enumerated to the House. We find the Liberal club stating that these concessions were obtained by fraud and misrepresentation. Now, Sir, if the government has been the victim of fraud or misrepresentation, it is its bounden duty to immediately cancel not only the Treadgold concession, but the other hydraulic mining concessions which were given to the other parties I have named. This demand is made on the government by their own friends in the district and by people who seem to know what they are talking about. The petition of the Liberal club says :

Your petitioners therefore pray :

That the Order in Council of April 21, 1902, granting certain rights and privileges to Malcom Orr Ewing, A. N. C. Treadgold and Walter Barwick, may be rescinded absolutely.

That the government institute forthwith a careful investigation by competent engineers and obtain reports upon the subject with a view to undertaking the construction of a public water supply as a national enterprise.

That the water of Rock creek be retained by the government for public purposes and that no special privileges either in such creek or with respect to wood, water or mining rights within this territory, be granted to any individual or private corporation, but that all persons be restricted in such matters to the rights accorded the general public under the mining regulations.

That all hydraulic concessions whose owners have not observed the conditions of their leases and the provisions of the mining regulations may be rescinded.

That an inquiry may be set on foot to ascertain the circumstances under which the leading hydraulic concessions were obtained in order that action may be taken by the Attorney General of Canada in the premises.

That the Attorney General of Canada do issue a fiat authorizing prceedings to be taken in his name in every case where action is begun against an hydraulic concession in which fraud or misrepresentation is charged, including all such actions as are now pending.

Therefore, I repeat, that in view of these petitions signed by the great majority of the people in the Klondike district, and the great majority of the Liberals at that, it is the bounden duty of the government to see that these concessions are cancelled. It seems to me that if the inquiries which have been asked for in these petitions are not granted, it is either because the government wants to favour those to whom these concessions have been made by fraud and misrepresentation, or, that the government itself is guilty of fraud in giving these concessions to these individuals.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not see how the government can escape from that dilemma. Now, Sir, a delegation has been appointed, not only from Dawson City, but from the different points at which gold is mined in the Yukon district. That delegation is composed of Mr. Clarke and Mr. Pringle. Mr. Pringle, I am told, is an excellent Liberal, and he is coming to Ottawa or has arrived here, to insist on the cancellation of this Treadgold concession. At a meeting which was held at Bonanza, Mr. Pringle spoke as follows :

The assay office is the most pressing demand. I say it now and I said it then. The Treadgold concession is in fact the paramount question, after all. Because, if Treadgold owns the country, there will be no gold to assay and no need for banks. But the miners want the assay office first, and they want the Treadgold concession cancelled next.

I am a Liberal and have always been a Liberal. But it seems to me the Liberal government in its administration in the Yukon has driven a coach and four through everything I ever knew that was Liberal.

We can live in this country if you stop graft. I stand against graft.

The appointed members of the Yukon council refused to sign our telegram to Ottawa against the Treadgold concessions because they said it would be a slap in the face of the government. They will vote against us for the same reason when the council meets.

The telegram which was proposed to be sent by the council of the Yukon to the government is in the following terms—it was signed by Messrs. Clarke, Pringle, Thompson and Landreville, the elective members of the council :

We, the elected members of the Yukon council ask the government to recind the Treadgold concession in toto.

We represent a people who are absolutely united in their demand for the cancellation of the present Order in Council. Its continued existence means the ruin of business and of the placer mining industry in the Yukon Territory.

That telegram was sent to the government.

Now, Sir, not only were these grants made improvidently, not only were they most detrimental to the best interests of the Yukon and of the country at large, but it seems to me that they are absolutely illegal—that the Governor in Council had no right to make them. There is no doubt—and on this proposition I think I shall be borne out by my learned friend the Minister of Justice—that public lands or the public domain belonging to the Crown cannot be granted by Order in Council, except in those particular instances in which the Governor in Council is by statute given power or authority to make such grants. I think that is a sound proposition in constitutional law ; for, after all, the government are only a committee of this House, and they have no other powers than those which this House specifically delegates to them. They have power to administer, but they have not power to grant or even sell any part of the domain of the Crown. Take, for instance, the Dominion Lands Act. By section 29 of that Act, specific power is given to the Minister of the Interior and his agents under certain conditions to grant public lands to settlers ; but this provision goes to show that in other circumstances the Crown domain is sacred, and can only be conceded or sold by the authority of parliament, and not by the authority of the ministers, who are only a committee of this House. The Crown domain consists not only of the public lands of this country, but also of the rivers and streams which flow through it. Of course, the navigable streams all belong to the public domain and cannot be given away, granted or sold by Order in Council. But in a territory like the Yukon, where the government is the proprietor, the owner, on both sides of streams which are not navigable, I take it that the Crown is equally the proprietor and owner of the streams. These concessions which were granted by the Order in Council were concessions to private individuals of certain parts of the Crown domain. The very franchise itself by which these gentlemen were permitted to build dams across rivers and streams, to build pumping stations anywhere they saw fit, to maintain electric works for the purpose of transmitting electric power all through that district, to expropriate private lands and lands belonging to the government, is a franchise that belongs to the Crown. Every day before the Private Bills Committee and the Railway Committee, persons appear for the purpose of obtaining franchises belonging to the Crown for the purpose of expropriating the lands of private individuals or lands belonging to the Crown ; and if it were only a franchise in the water that was given to these people, it would be a grant of a certain portion of the property vested in the Crown, of which the Governor in Council had no right to divest the Crown. The authority under which the second Order in Council was passed is stated in the preamble of the Order in Council itself. The following statutes are quoted : Clause 47 of the Dominion Lands Act as amended by section 5, of chapter 15, of 55-56 Victoria ; section 8, of the Yukon Territories Act, as amended by chapter 11 of 62-63 Victoria. The minister has taken the precaution of giving us the quotation from the statutes under which he proposes to Act, and he says in the preamble of this Order in Council that it is in virtue of these two statutes. No doubt, if he could find any other statutes which would give the Governor General in Council power and authority to make these concessions, he would have quoted them also. Now, let us take the first statute which he quotes, the 47th section of the Dominion Lands Act, as amended by section 5, of chapter 15, of 55-56 Victoria, which reads thus :

Lands containing coal or other minerals, including lands in the Rocky Mountains park, shall not be subject to the provisions of this Act respecting sale or homestead entry, but the Governor General in Council may, from time to time, make regulations for the working and development of mines on such lands, and for the sale, leasing, licensing or other disposal thereof.

The effect of this statute is this : First, it takes away from the minister and the Governor General in Council the right to do with these lands what the minister does with the ordinary Dominion lands which he concedes or grants to settlers. The legislature says by this section, that he shall not treat mineral lands in that way, but that he can make regulations for the working and development of mines on such lands, and for the sale, leasing, licensing or other disposal thereof. So that what should have been done would have been to pass regulations for so dealing with this part of the public domain. The regulation takes the place of the law. For instance, under the Dominion Lands Act the settler applies for a part of the public domain as a homestead. Therefore, if regulations were passed for the sale or lease of mineral lands, anybody could come in and say to the government : I have complied with the regulations and am entitled to a grant of mineral lands.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are these all mineral lands ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes. This is the very section which is quoted, and I do not see how the minister can take any relief from it. He is doing exactly what the law forbids. The law says that he can only lease or grant lands under the general regulations which govern all the subjects of Her Majesty, so that any man who complies with these regulations and conditions is entitled to the benefit of them. But until he does comply with them, the Governor General in Council is powerless to grant, concede or sell any part of these mineral lands. Let me however refer to the second statute quoted in the preamble of the Order in Council and see whether the hon. gentleman can take any relief from it. This statute is section eight of the Yukon Territory Act, as amended by 62-63 Victoria. I call attention to this section because I cannot see how the Minister of the Interior could have gone before his colleagues and quoted to them this law as authorizing him to make this concession. I cannot come to any other conclusion than that this grant was put through council hastily and carelessly, and that none of the hon. gentleman's colleagues could have looked at the statutes or realized the enormity of the concessions which they were asked to give. Section eight of the Yukon Territory Act, as amended, says :—

> Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Governor in Council can make ordinances for the peace, order and good government of the territory, and of Her Majesty's subjects and others therein ; but no ordinances made by the Governor in Council or the commissioner in council, shall——
>
> (c) Appropriate any public land or other property of Canada without authority of parliament, or impose any duty of customs or any excise.

So that the very statute which the hon. gentleman quotes in the Order in Council says that the Governor in Council shall have no right to appropriate any public land or other property of Canada without the authority of parliament. The very authority which the hon. gentleman quotes is against him. It is an authority which says that he cannot do what he proposes to carry out. I await the explanation of the government on this point with a great deal of interest. Of course I know that we can sometimes drive a coach and four through any law, but it will certainly require great skill to overcome these two statutes cited in the Order in Council. It seems to me that these concessions should be immediately repealed. They are certainly against the interests of the miners and other citizens of the Yukon. They will certainly prove prejudicial to the interests of Canada as a whole, and I beg therefore to move :—

> That all the words after 'that' in the proposed motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor :—
>
> This House regrets that by an Order in Council of date the 21st day of April, 1902, the government for the ostensible purpose of establishing hydraulic works to supply water for the efficient working of auriferous deposits have granted to one A. N. C. Treadgold, of London, England, and his associates, vast powers, franchises, and concessions in and upon the beds, banks, valleys, slopes and hills of the Klondike river, Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks, and in and upon the waters of Rock creek, in the Yukon Territory, with the right to establish for the benefit and advantage of the concessionaires in and through the region and district through which these rivers and creeks run, hydraulic, electrical and other systems, and to enter and to take up and operate mining and other lands :
>
> This House is of opinion that the said powers, franchises and concessions constitute in favour of the said Treadgold and his associates a gigantic monopoly, which, while depriving the treasury of enormous revenues, is most detrimental to the mining industry of the Yukon :
>
> And that in so making the said grants and concessions by Order in Council, the government have exceeded their authority and have committed a gross breach of the duty entrusted to them under the constitution.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The subject, Mr. Speaker, which the hon. gentleman has brought to the attention of the House is one of considerable importance, largely involving legal questions, but at the same time not free from questions of public policy. The hon. gentleman quoted some interesting extracts from newspaper reports and other anonymous communications and utterances of various kinds.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Not one anonymous.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would the hon. gentleman give the names of the gentlemen who wrote the various documents, editorials and so on, which he quoted ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I said that it was the editor of the Dawson 'Sun' who wrote the articles, and that these were sent to the government by the late Senator Wood.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend has taken the proceeding—unusual in courts of justice though not always in popular tribunals—of quoting newspaper reports and articles, and other uncorroborated utterances and building thereon an elaborate argument, which may appeal with some force to people who are not familiar with the facts. It appears to me that the address and the argument of the hon. gentleman on this occasion would have been much more fittingly made in the Yukon district itself, at the time, shortly before this session opened, when the people there were given the opportunity of pronouncing a verdict on the administration of this government. This is not the first time that hon.

gentlemen opposite have taken advantage of their position as members of this House, to rise in their seats and attempt to vilify the administration of the Yukon, and spread broadcast throughout the country the most unfounded aspersions on the policy and the conduct of the government. While I am not taking any exception to the ventilating of this matter again in this House, I think that I have the right to point out that there was a most appropriate occasion, not long ago, when the hon. gentleman could have addressed to a tribunal composed of the people directly interested, the arguments he has just made here. I refer to the electors of the Yukon. Why the present session should have been selected rather than that occasion, it is for the hon. gentleman to explain. During many sessions another hon. gentleman in this House took the interests of the Yukon district under his special care. He was the self-constituted guardian in this House of everything dear to those people. I refer to the hon. and senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). But neither did that hon. gentleman venture beyond these precincts. Neither did he go to the Yukon and there make his charges before the people who are most familiar with the facts and best able to pass judgment on them. But he preferred making them at this convenient distance. Now, there was abundant opportunity given at the late election for hon. gentlemen opposite to have denounced before the electors of the Yukon the administration of that district in their most vigorous fashion. They were given ample notice. They had six months notice. We passed an Act a year ago giving representation to the people of the Yukon; and we challenged these hon. gentlemen on the floor of this House to meet us during the recess before the people of the Yukon and fight out these charges, so properly determinable by the people, before the electors themselves. Sir, they did not appear on that occasion; they abandoned the issue. They had not the courage to make the charges before the electors of the Yukon. We put a candidate in the field and the electors of the Yukon returned him as a supporter of this government by an overwhelming majority. Unfortunately that hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross, Yukon) for reasons which we all regret, is absent from the House to-day. He is absent from Ottawa. Otherwise, perhaps, he would be heard upon this matter. It is also to be regretted—and by none more than by myself—that the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) who is so familiar with the details of these transactions, is also absent from the House, attending to public business of a high character in London, England. I can only speak from such information as comes readily to my hand through reviewing the papers in the department. To that extent, therefore, I will address myself to the particular subject in question.

The hon. gentleman took many exceptions to the Order in Council. Let me first, so far as I know it, describe the situation and the outlook for the government. When the Yukon was discovered and it was learned to be rich in placer mines, everything was prosperous. But the time came when the placer mining began to give out. Still, every one felt that there must be a future for that district, and it was the duty of the government to endeavour in all possible ways to aid in furthering mining operations. There are many kinds of gold mining. There is placer mining, hydraulic mining, quartz mining, as well as the recovery of gold from water. These are various methods for utilizing the rich gifts of Providence to the Yukon. When the lower claims near the water level became exhausted, it was necessary to consider by what means the government could succeed in delivering water on the elevations, that it might be available there for washing out the gravel upon the benches and hills. Manifestly, that is a task not to be carried on by each individual for himself. Business suggests at once that a large scheme for the development of power and the pumping of water is the proper way of supplying the individual with the necessary water. It is just as it is in cities to-day. Municipalities deem it wiser to establish water-works and operate public service, rather than leave it to each individual as in primitive times, to supply his own conveniences. And so, for the purpose of working these claims above the creek and a little distance away from the water, it, manifestly, is the more businesslike and economical and profitable method to carry on that business by having a company or some wholesale system, whereby each person can purchase just such water as he requires without each having to duplicate the capital expenditure necessary for the establishment of works to supply himself with water. And so, the Department of the Interior endeavoured to obtain offers in order to provide water for the upper mining district. Many schemes had been suggested. But the Department of the Interior was extremely desirous of placing this franchise, if possible, in the hands of men of reputation, men of financial strength. My hon. friend has read from the newspapers charging fraud all round, he has charged concealment, misrepresentation and fraud. I do not know whether he alludes to the gentlemen to whom these grants were made. But, if he does, I think they have good ground to complain. One of these gentlemen is well known to every hon. gentleman in this House. He is well known in this country; and highly as I respect the reputation of my colleagues on both sides in this House, I think I am not going beyond the facts when I say, that there is no man who enjoys more the respect of the people of Canada as an upright man than one of the grantees whom my hon. friend charges with having been guilty of fraud of

many kinds towards this country. I refer to Mr. Walter Barwick. I would also say to my hon. friend who tells us that he is so desirous of investigation that I am sure he must well know that it has been long the fixed intention of the government to hold such an investigation. The hon. gentleman must remember that, when the election was held, promises were given to the people of the Yukon that there would be a commission to inquire into the whole administration of that territory. There has been no opportunity since that date until the present to send in commissioners. I doubt if navigation is more than open, even if it is yet open. When the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) returns to Ottawa, —he is at present in British Columbia, I understand—and we can have the benefit of his advice, it is our intention to fully carry out the representations made to the citizens of the Yukon to have a full investigation into all charges or suspicions that hon. gentlemen may be good enough to mention or entertain in regard to any matters connected with the Yukon administration. I give that public notice to my hon. friend, so that, in addition to the advantage he has had of ventilating his views on the floor of this House, he will have an opportunity to make good, if he can, any of his charges or suspicions before a tribunal where newspaper extracts and letters will not be the only evidence, but where gentlemen will have the privilege of pledging their oaths to the truth of all they say. I would point out that, in his zeal to magnify, he has entirely misapprehended the scope of the Order in Council. He reads from newspapers to show that we abandoned 350 square miles of territory comprising all these rich creeks and gulches and rivers. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and he proposed to make a legal speech and to give the legal effect of documents; yet there is not even a layman in this House but, I am sure, will see that he has entirely misrepresented—I speak without meaning anything offensive—he has given to the House an entirely erroneous impression of the scope of the concessions spoken of. Though there is a grant of power to erect a dam upon the river, to take water and generate power, and because that gives these concessionaires the right to sell that power throughout that district, by what process of reasoning does he say that the whole district with all its wealth is handed over as a grant to these concessionaires ? Why, Sir, when you grant a privilege to erect dams and generate electricity on a river and give the grantees the right to sell that power to the public, unless you restrict the deed, the grantees have the right to sell power throughout the whole of Canada. And if it should happen that such a grant were given, my hon. friend, according to his present reasoning, would argue that such a grant carried the exclusive possession and ownership of Canada. That is the necessary result of his reasoning—because they are given the privilege of selling electricity over a certain area, that carries with it all other possible rights. Now, what does the Order in Council grant? The Order in Council of June, 1901, differs materially from the Order in Council of 1902. My hon. friend says there is no material difference. Let us see. He is a lawyer, and has carefully studied these questions, he has had these papers in his hands since last session and knows all about them. I have the two copies here, my hon. friend has the two copies also. Let us see if he will adhere to his statement that there is no material difference between the one and the other Order in Council. Under the first Order in Council a considerable term of years was granted. Under the first Order in Council it was necessary for certain works to be done within a certain time. There has been a modification, my hon. friend will say for the worse, by having substituted six years for a shorter period. I merely remark that in one sense the work required under the second Order has not to be completed as quickly as under the first. But I pass to the new section, and I commend it to the hon. gentleman's attention :

> Provided, that if any power is developed and rendered available by the grantees under this section which they do not make use of, then the same should be offered for sale to the public, and the rates to be charged therefor shall be subject to the control of the Governor General in Council.

Now, I would say that is an entirely new clause. When the first Order in Council was a subject of criticism in the Yukon, a meeting of the miners was held, and they appointed two delegates to come to Ottawa and ask for modifications, not for a repeal of this Order in Council. The majority of the miners of the Yukon, so far as we know, do not desire the repeal of all the Orders in Council, they do not ask for a repeal of the old Orders in Council, but they ask for modifications, and the modifications they asked for were of the following character : They objected, for example, to the exclusive right given by the first Order in Council to erect bedrock flumes. That was regarded as a very objectionable feature of the first order. That objectionable feature is removed, and does not appear in the second Order in Council. Not only does it not appear, but privileges are given to every person, reserved to every person to erect bedrock flumes. One of the great questions in the Yukon in regard to the first Order in Council was the exclusive right granted to construct, maintain and use bedrock flumes. People were excited upon that point, and they sent two delegates, Mr. Williams and Mr. Sugrue, to consult with the government and ask that all objectionable features might be removed from the first Order in Council. That was the first point that the people proposed, and that point was arranged. That former objection disappeared, and yet my hon. friend

says there is no material difference in the two Orders in Council.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says that the majority of the miners did not want that concession repealed. I would like to ask how the majority of the miners voiced their opinion ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The two representatives of the miners who came to Ottawa, purporting to represent the opinions and wishes of the miners, did not ask for repeal, but for modifications, and those modifications were granted. I think it is reasonable to assume, when they came down on a mission of that kind and presented their arguments, that they were voicing the sentiments of those they were representing here. Again, my hon. friend says there is no difference between these two Orders in Council. The first Order in Council allowed the grantees to develop power and use it all for themselves. There was no duty cast upon them under the first order to sell power to anybody. How is it under the new Order in Council ? Will my hon. friend tell me this is not a material change ?

> Provided that if any power is developed and rendered available by the grantees under this section which they do not make use of, then this same shall be offered for sale to the public.

Is that not a material change ? My hon. friend does not see that under the new order the public are the beneficiaries to the extent that they have a right to purchase the power that may be generated under this concession.

Mr. POPE. At what price ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will proceed to read. Hon. gentlemen should restrain themselves, they will get all this information in due time. They would have been much wiser if they had known the Orders in Council before making these inflammatory speeches.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We know them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope) asks at what price.

> The rates to be charged therefor shall be subject to the control of the Governor General in Council.

That is the way the rates are fixed in this country in many other cases. The Governor in Council fixes the railway rates and many other kinds of rates ; and here the Governor in Council, responsible to parliament and to the public, are the parties who stand as an independent tribunal between the buyers and sellers of power, so that under the amended Order in Council the general public have vested rights entitling them to power and entitling them to protection against unfair prices.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the power mean water ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. There the hon. gentlemen show a limited knowledge of this scheme. Power means the electrical power that is going to be developed by the use of water. There is going to be a dam, or a backing up of water. Hon. gentlemen smile ; let me read the clause :

> The sole right to divert and take water from the Klondike river at any point or points between its entry into the Yukon river and the Flat creek for the purpose of generating power with which to pump water to work the auriferous deposits in the district.

This is an entirely different proposition from the right to take water from the bed of the river and to raise it up, whether it may or may not return to the river.

Mr. CLARKE. Have these concessionaires no right to sell power under the first Order in Council ? Had the public no right to compel them to sell power ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will see about that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is there anything in the Order in Council about it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When they have the power generated then they have to sell it, if there is any one to buy it, and if there is any to spare. I turn to section 2. Under the first Order in Council it has been correctly stated that the grantees had the right to divert and take water from the Klondike for distribution in the district generally, for the use of benches and other claims. Under the new order, the amount that they may take exclusively is 5,000 miners' inches.

Mr. CLARKE. How much does that amount to ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wonder if the hon. gentleman has any idea how much water is available in that district.

Mr. CLARKE. We are asking for information. What volume of water does that 5,000 inches mean ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will explain that in a moment. Let me first explain that under the second Order in Council there is a prior right given to license holders :

> Provided that licensed holders of mining locations situated on the Klondike river should be entitled as against the grantees to the use of a flow of water sufficient for working their claims but not exceed in all 3,500 miners' inches, equal to 5,250 cubic feet per minute.

A miners' inch, therefore, is equal to a cubic foot and a-half per minute. First of all, license holders take their 5,250 cubic feet per minute, then these grantees are entitled to take 5,000 miners' inches per minute. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) desires to know what proportion that bears to the capacity of the river. I have here a memorandum from Professor Haanel in these words :

On the authority of Professor Herdt, of Montreal, the velocity of the Klondike is seven miles an hour, the average width 275 feet and the average depth 3½ feet. This will correspond to a delivery of 395,266 miners' inches.

The miners' inch was defined by Order in Council of the 19th of May, 1902, to be a discharge of 1½ cubic feet per minute.

Thus the hon. gentleman will see that these 395,266 miners' inches representing nearly 1½ cubic feet per minute of a flow would certainly leave what is called a margin for the general public even if some one was to get 5,200 cubic feet per minute.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought the miners were to have 3,500 miners' inches and that all the rest was to go to these concessionaires. The Order in Council says :

Provided the licensed holders of mining locations situated on the Klondike river shall be entitled as against the grantees to the use of a flow of water sufficient for working their claims but not exceeding in all three thousand five hundred (3,500) miners' inches, equal to five thousand two hundred and fifty (5,250) cubic feet per minute.

After the miners get their 5,250 cubic feet all the rest will belong to these concessionaires.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That may be the hon. gentleman's opinion as a member of this House, but I do not think it is his opinion as a member of the bar.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will tell the hon. gentleman what my opinion is as a member of the bar if he wants it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sure he would not say that it would lead to any such conclusion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is your conclusion ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My conclusion is that the license holders on the Klondike river have a prior right to 3,500 miners' inches. The grant made to the grantees is named. If the whole of the rest of the water was to be given to the grantees what would be the sense of saying that they should have the right to the use of the water up to 5,250 cubic feet. I am sure my hon. friend will not press that point any further.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is evidently right and you are evidently wrong.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not so very long ago that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were evidently right on a legal question—the construction of the British North America Act. One after another got up in this House and presented an elaborate and learned argument to show that the representation of the various provinces should go in a certain way. It was found a few days afterwards by the Supreme Court that every one of these hon. gentlemen was wrong in his opinion of the law. They are bold to give their opinion again on the law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are you paying a compliment to the Supreme Court now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not paying any compliment, but I am just paying what is justly due to the Supreme Court.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman would just give his own construction as he says we are wrong as to sections 1 and 2.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does my hon. friend refer to the first or second Order in Council ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To the second Order in Council—that of April 21, 1902. I want to understand it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is fair. Under section one, the concessionaires are given power to erect dams on the Klondike and take water from the Klondike for the purpose of generating power with which to pump the water for use in a certain district named. Power is not given to them to take water for hydraulic or mining purposes, but to take water to generate electric power which will in turn set their machinery to work which will pump the water. That is the power which is given to them.

Mr. CLARKE. Have they the sole power to do that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) has the clause before him.

Mr. PRINGLE. As I read section one of the last Order in Council it says :

The sole right to divert and take water from the Klondike river at any point or points between its entry into the Yukon river and Flat creek.

Then it says :

Provided that if the right given by this section is not exercised within six years from the date hereof, it may be revoked by order of the Governor General in Council.

Is that right to be tied up for a period of six years to these concessionaires ? Could not these concessionaires by injunction restrain any other company or individual from taking water from the Klondike river between these points.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not appear to know that this Order in Council as yet has no legal validity. It gives no legal right. There are other things that have to be done with Orders in Council before they can have the force of law, but this Order in Council is an evidence of faith towards the concessionaires in the hope that they may be enabled to induce capital to come to Canada and erect these works.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. Postmaster General admit that the Order in Council is not valid ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I mean to say that an additional step has to be taken to confer legal rights under the Order in Council.

Mr. PRINGLE. What additional step ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Orders in Council such as these dealing with mining rights do not give powers to the grantees to exercise these rights until these Orders in Council are gazetted. Then, they become law. They are not gazetted at the present time. They are reserved, but if the concessionaires should show that they are able to raise the funds to erect these valuable public works, then it will be for the government to consider whether or not they would confirm the concession, but at the present time they simply have these Orders in Council indicating what they think it would be proper to do provided they could see that they are able to proceed satisfactorily.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What about the telegram from the board of trade ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I now come to section 10. The hon. member for Montmorency said that there was no material difference between the two Orders in Council. The meeting of miners asked that in addition to relief from the monopoly in respect to bed rock flumes there should also be a change in the regulations in regard to abandoned claims. They contended that in a former Order in Council the grantees secured rights to abandoned claims and were not therefore obliged to do any work in the way of providing hydraulic power. But, the abandoned claims would not have had any value without the addition of the water. When the representatives of the Yukon miners appeared before the government, this point was thoroughly discussed and a new clause was framed and this has taken the place of the old one in the new Order in Council. I would refer my hon. friend to section 10. Section 10 reads as follows :

> The right subject to no payment except the royalty prescribed upon output to make entry for and work any abandoned mining claim or claims on Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks, such right to be exercisable only when the grantees by the construction of works in pursuance of this franchise are in a position to deliver water upon such claim or claims for the working thereof.

Under the former order, it was argued that they might appropriate the abandoned claims and never expend a dollar in the erection of these works, but under the present order that is entirely changed, and they have no right whatever to an abandoned claim until they have laid water to it, and then they have only the chance of the general public who may step in and stake a claim and prevent the concessionaries getting it. So far as staking abandoned claims is concerned, they are only given the same rights as are given to any other person who may go to the Yukon. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) takes exception to the clause in this agreement which exempts the grantees from representation or the payment of fees. It is correct that the grantees are so exempt, but there are reasons for that. It is the effort of the government to induce these grantees to proceed and if possible to successfully carry out this undertaking. This is not a very attractive proposition to the grantees. Up to this moment they have not been able to find capitalists to see anything in it. They got the first concession in January, 1901. Over two years have elapsed since then, and if this were such a valuable franchise ; if there were such fortunes in it, don't you think that the shrewd business world of London, where those people are men of influence, would have long since contributed to the capital to provide for the carrying out of this alleged improvident transaction ? But as yet they have not been able to convince any person that there is any money in this enterprise. When the second Order in Council was passed, consideration had to be had to expenditures already made. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) says that under the new arrangement we abandon the clause requiring the expenditure of $250,000. That is correct. The first Order in Council called for the expenditure of money, and the grantees proceeded to expend money. They engaged some of the most able hydraulic engineers of England ; they sent out to the Klondike Sir Thomas Tancred, a very high authority, and they expended a large sum of money in investigation and research.

Mr. CLARKE. How much ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am told by Mr. Barwick, that up to the time of the cancellation of the order the grantees had expended over $50,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was there any work done on the ground ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not on the ground. They had to pay very large fees to the engineers, and other expenses, which Mr. Barwick informs me amounted to over $50,000. They had that amount of money at stake when the first Order in Council was cancelled, and therefore, they had the material interest of following their money in prosecuting the work. They have already, therefore, $50,000 in jeopardy, all of which will be lost unless they can turn the grant to practical use.

Mr. CLARKE. Was there anybody else invited to go and examine the ground and see what the proposition had in it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think there were various parties making other proposals.

Mr. CLARKE. Will these proposals be laid on the Table ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I only know that from general hearsay.

Mr. CLARKE. Newspaper reports ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am told that all the papers have been brought down. Then I come to another provision in this agreement, and I think hon. gentlemen will see that it is a clause which does a great service to the community. The scheme, whilst giving to the grantees the right to erect works, to generate power, and the right to make use of the water the same as others ; does not give them the exclusive right, but entitles the general public to water just the same as the general public are entitled to water from the city of Ottawa. The public of the Yukon have the same right to water and power as any private citizen in this city, and therefore, this is a public enterprise in which the whole community, on payment of a proper toll, will be entitled to share. Under the regulations it is left to the Gold Commissioner to fix all compensation arising under this grant. If the private user desires to have the price fixed, and if he cannot agree with the company, the Gold Commissioner fixes the price subject to an appeal to a higher tribunal.

Mr. CLARKE. How does the Gold Commissioner or the government know whether the price fixed is a reasonable one or not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Gold Commissioner lives in the Yukon, and the people of the Yukon will know. There will be some way of ascertaining what is reasonable ; that is a question of opinion. At all events it is left to the Gold Commissioner and the Territorial Court of the district to settle a question of that kind. I do not know of a fairer tribunal ; perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) does. However, that may be, in trusting the rights of the people in an important matter of this kind to the Gold Commissioner, with the right of appeal to the Territorial Court, it does not, at least to my mind, indicate carelessness, improvidence, or fraud when we are trying to bring water within the reach of the people in order to develop that country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir William Mulock) is relying on the words : ' Any question of compensation.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, certainly, under the grant. The three differences which I have pointed out to the House are the three variations that the representations of the miners' have asked to be made. These three variations were made, and I would mention this circumstance : that when the Minister of the Interior contemplated considering the change in this Order in Council, he found no hesitation whatever on the part of the grantees to the change being made. On the contrary, so little importance did they attach to their rights under the circumstances, they being so unprofitable up to that moment, that they readily consented to the cancellation of the Order in Council. There are a number of provisions in the Order in Council of 1901 which have been omitted from the new Order in Council. For example, section 3, of the old Order in Council has been omitted, and it reads as follows :

> The right on the creek or tributary within the district to divert, take, impound and store for mining purposes any water not used by any free miner for the working of his claim on such creek or tributary under the regulations now in force for placer mining or respecting the diversion of water for mining purposes in the Yukon Territory.

That section has been left out of the new Order in Council. Again under the old Order in Council, it was provided that the grantees should have an extension of time for the completion of their works in the event of delay caused by various things, such as floods, war, civil commotions, accidents to machinery or works, and other inevitable causes. That is omitted from the new Order in Council, and they are held more firmly to the time than before. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have pointed out a number of very material variations between the old order and the new ; and yet my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) said he saw no difference whatever between the old and the new. With reference to that part of my hon. friend's speech wherein he first of all stated that there had been large tracts of country withdrawn from entry, I think he was under the impression that they were withdrawn from entry before the granting of the first Order in Council. I take the liberty of correcting him. He read from the Dawson ' Sun ' a statement showing, as he supposed, a large area which that paper said was granted to these concessionaries. My hon. friend seems to suggest that entry had been closed in respect to a number of these creeks in order to enlarge the area to be granted to these concessionaries. He tells us it will have that effect. On that point he was not just.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is not my contention. Do not put words in my mouth which I did not use.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not intend to do so. I have given the hon. gentleman credit for a desire not to mislead, but I want to correct him. It is true, at one time, Dominion creek and Bonanza creek and their tributaries were closed against entry; but it is not correct to say that they were closed against entry at the time of the granting of the first Order in

Council. They had been re-opened prior to that time.

Mr. CASGRAIN. When ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot give the exact date.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have it here.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then the hon. gentleman can give it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The 11th of April, 1902, by a telegram from the Minister of the Interior.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, that is wrong.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Then the return to the motion is wrong, because that is where I got it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I can give the hon. gentleman the text of it if he wishes :

Office of the Gold Commissioner
of the Yukon Territory,
Dawson, Y.T., April 11, 1902.

The Secretary,
Department of the Interior,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of the following telegram from the Hon. Clifford Sifton to the Gold Commissioner : 'Throw open for entry at once all the lapsed and abandoned claims withheld from entry by reason of Treadgold Order in Council.'

The minister's instructions in this matter have been carried out, and upon the receipt of the telegram the following notice was posted by the Gold Commissioner :

Dawson, Y.T., April 17, 1902,
4.30 p.m.

Notice is hereby given that from the above period all the lapsed and abandoned claims withheld from entry by reason of the Treadgold Order in Council are open to locations by free miners under the Placer Mining Regulations.

(Sgd) D. PATULLO,
Assistant Gold Commissioner.

Might I ask my hon. friend, while I am on my feet, to state which of these Orders in Council were cancelled and which were not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will try to answer that question; but I will say to my hon. friend first that the telegram which he has read does not touch the point to which I am referring. I will read a memorandum from Mr. Ryley, of the Department of the Interior :

The claims which were reserved from entry on Dominion, Bonanza, and tributaries, were open for entry some time before the Order in Council of June, 1901.

This memorandum was sent to me from the gallery. I suppose that if the officer had been in the department, he would have given the exact date. So that it will be seen that the grant is not so large as my hon. friend thinks.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If that had anything to do with this, why was it not brought down with the return ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose there are many things which might have to do with the debate here which would not form part of the return. It would depend on the wording of the order. I do not know what the order called for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to summarize the effect of this order. The order in a nutshell is that if the grantees should succeed in raising capital, it will be their privilege to erect works upon the Klondike for the purpose of generating electric power. It will be their privilege to use, subject to certain restrictions, water for hydraulic purposes. It will be the right of the public to take such power as the concessionaires do not use, and to pay therefor such price as may be fixed by the Governor in Council. It will be the right of the public to compel the company to sell to them whatever water is available at such price as may be fixed by the Gold Commissioner, or, in case of appeal, by the Territorial Court of the district. These material rights are secured to the public, and all they have to pay for these rights is what may be fixed by the Governor in Council or by the Territorial Court. The public are not excluded from an inch of the country. They have an equal right with these grantees to enter on any of the abandoned claims. The only exclusive grants conveyed to the grantees are in respect to the water privileges for generating power, and, sub motu, to use a certain portion of the water themselves. You cannot find in these documents anything giving the grantees any exclusive privilege except as the people's representatives fix. These are some of the reasons, and the chief reasons doubtless, why capitalists have failed to find in this scheme any such attractions as to induce them to embark capital in it.

Mr. CLARKE. Have these people not six years to raise that capital, and is not that privilege tied up for that time ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not tied up one day if we choose to repeal it. These gentlemen, we hope, will succeed in raising the money necessary to build these works. If they do not, hon. gentlemen opposite will have the credit of preventing them. They have already paralyzed the enterprise.

Mr. CLARKE. Have any petitions been received from the Yukon in favour of this concession being continued ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have received the most complete communication from the Yukon in regard to this matter, and the general policy of the government that could be desired. We heard the voice of the people a few months ago. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the candidate of hon. gentlemen opposite lost his deposit. So you see there is some money left in the treasury there yet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Because the other candidate was pledged to repeal this concession.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Sent here on purpose to repeal the concession.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know that he was. He was pledged to promote the best interests of the Yukon, and he is doing it, and we are doing it. I wish hon. gentlemen opposite were doing the same thing. I may not have dealt with this matter to the satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite; but I think I have dealt with it at least in such a way as to show the House and the country that this measure is one in the interest of the Yukon. Unless it is prevented from coming to fruition by obstacles thrown in its way, the time is not far distant when the people who make these charges will wonder at the attitude they have assumed; and among those who will be repentant for their mistakes will be some hon. gentlemen opposite, who will have ample opportunity to do so in the shades of opposition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman did not give the information I asked for. I asked him to state which of these Orders in Council had not been gazetted, I understood him to say that the Orders in Council did not come into force until they were gazetted. It is perfectly obvious that the first Order in Council must have been gazetted because it was acted upon.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By the closing of the abandoned claims to public entries, as the correspondence amply shows.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that the closing of the claims proves that the Order in Council was acted upon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman state whether or not the Order in Council was gazetted ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am pleased to give the hon. gentleman any information necessary, and there is no occasion for him to show any temper or heat, though I suppose we should make some allowance. The second Order in Council was never gazetted. I did not make any inquiry, but if I can see any of the officials before eight o'clock, I shall do so.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Under what law was it passed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman knows all the law.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is why I want you to state it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the Dominion Lands Act, section 51.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Which does not apply at all.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROBERT A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with every attention to the remarks of the Postmaster General and Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I only wish that the task of replying to the hon. gentleman had fallen on worthier shoulders. It is probably for me rather a difficult task to stand up here and advocate the claims of those whom we may term the gum-boot miners, the men whose enterprise, labour and endurance of hardships have made for Canada all that is worth while in the Klondike to-day. I was surprised to find the hon. Minister of Labour standing up here and, instead of advocating the cause of the miners, advocating the cause of the concessionaires of the monopolists, of the men who have obtained as I shall show an iniquitous concession from this government. And, Sir, what is the answer of the hon. Minister of Labour to the very able arraignment made by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) ? His one answer to the accusation is : Why, Sir, in the election of December 2, the Hon. Mr. Ross was returned as a member of the House of Commons; he was returned as a supporter of this government. But let us for a moment pause and see on what platform the hon. gentleman was returned. Was he returned as a supporter of this concession which we are now attacking ? Or was he returned as opposed to that concession ? Let us look for a moment at the platform of the Liberal party, in that election and see what it advocated. Let us examine the address of the hon. gentleman who was returned as a supporter of this government. I think this examination will convince you that he was returned pledged to oppose this concession, pledged to see that this concession was abolished. This is the platform adopted by the Liberal convention, and in every clause it is an arraignment of the present government. It begins :

Whereas, in the opinion of this convention the continued prosperity of the Yukon Territory depends chiefly on the efforts of individual miners and prospectors whose work is conducted under most difficult conditions, and the stability of the business of the country will be insured by furnishing regular employment to workmen ; therefore, be it

Resolved, that every effort should be made by the government to secure, and have such changes adopted as would secure, the ends desired ; that this convention most strongly recommends :—

1. Reduction of fees for miners' licenses and for recording and renewing claims.

2. The abolition of payment of commutation for assessment work, and compelling the per-

formance of assessment work upon the claim itself or upon the claims as grouped.

Then follow seven or eight clauses, and the platform continues :

Whereas, in the opinion of the convention the matter of such supply——

That is dealing with the supply of water——

——on fair and reasonable terms should best be dealt with by the government itself, and should not be left to private individuals ; therefore, be it

Resolved, that the government be requested immediately to make careful examination and obtain reports upon the subject with a view to cancelling forthwith the Treadgold concession and undertaking such supply as a national enterprise.

Then, Sir, the hon. Minister of Labour said that the government were accused of granting these concessions by misrepresentation and fraud. Who accused them of it ? Was it not the Liberal convention who accused them ? At a meeting of Liberals held in the Yukon, the resolutions were passed stating that these concessions were granted by misrepresentation and fraud, and asking the government to cancel these concessions or, at least, to have an investigation in regard to it. Now, the platform goes on to say :

Resolved, that in the opinion of this convention many of the concessions now held were obtained by fraud and impositions ; that it is in the interest of this territory that such concessions should be annulled, and to that end that inquiry should be set on foot to ascertain the circumstances of such fraud and imposition and action taken by the Attorney General of Canada in the premises.

I repeat that these accusations of fraud and imposition come from the Liberals in the Yukon. I will not read all the platform adopted by the Liberal convention. But I will read the last clause :

And that the owners of hydraulic concessions already granted should be compelled to carry out the strict terms of their leases, and that in default of their so doing, their leases should be cancelled.

What was the answer of the Hon. James Ross to the platform of the convention as laid down ? In his address to the electors of the Yukon, he said :

I freely subscribe to every measure suggested therein. In respect to most of the planks, they are in perfect accord with the policy I have sought to have adopted in the Yukon. I recognize that the whole business life of the Yukon depends upon the success of the prospector and miner and they above all others should be encouraged.

Then in regard to the charges of fraud and misrepresentation, what does the hon. gentleman say ? He says :

The thorough investigation of the charges of fraud made in respect to the manner in which certain concessions are alleged to have been obtained, and if such fraud is established, the immediate commencement of such proceedings as may be required to vacate the grant and the enforcement of strict compliance with the conditions embodied in all crown grants in the Yukon.

And let me read one other little paragraph :

I believe that the Yukon is only in its infancy and that so far from its resources being exhausted, they have scarcely been touched, and the prosperity of the future will dwarf into insignificance all the success of the past. I was engaged in an endeavour to revise and codify not merely the mining laws but all the laws specially applicable to the Yukon when my illness interrupted the work. I think this work most essential in order that the laws may be fixed, clear and certain. With respect to the mining laws I propose to have them codified and then submitted to representative miners for criticism, alteration and approval in order that they may as far as possible meet with the approval of the mining community.

So, there is the platform upon which the Hon. James Hamilton Ross was elected as a representative of the people of the Yukon and as a government supporter in this House. Now, the hon. Minister of Labour dwelt a great deal upon the election of Mr. Ross as a government supporter. Let me say a word further in regard to that election. I find from the returns that, at that election, there were 5,160 votes cast, of which Mr. Ross received 2,971, and Mr. Clarke, 2,079, there were 100 spoiled ballots. But I find, from examination of the papers, that there was a great deal of dissatisfaction with regard to that election. I know that in the election which followed, on the 17th of January, the three leaders of the poll aggregated only 1,618 votes, though circumstances were such as to favour a larger vote than that of the 2nd of December, and the element beaten on the 2nd of December was triumphant on the 15th of January all along the line. At Miller's creek, where the whole population does not exceed forty, there were 161 votes cast for the hon. member for the Yukon. At Cariboo crossing where the population is less than twenty, 109 votes were cast for the hon. member for the Yukon. So I do not think that the Postmaster General should take such great credit for the election of the Hon. James Ross.

Now, Sir, while I am pleased with the statements made by the Postmaster General in regard to the charges of misrepresentation and fraud, let me for a moment refer to a very large meeting that was held by the Liberal party in the Yukon, where resolutions were passed in reference to this matter. This was a meeting of the Liberal Association :

The Liberal Association of Dawson met at the Pioneer Hall on Saturday night, and condemned in no uncertain tones the Order in Council of December 7, making Treadgold & Co. heirs to all the Klondike on this side of the Dome. A resolution was passed unanimously calling on the ministers of the Crown to secure its cancellation, and also to Mr. Commissioner Ross urging him to use all the powers at his disposal to prevent the law ever being enforced. A resolution was also passed unanimously that the

first resolution be telegraphed at once to each of the ministers and to Mr. Ross.

This meeting was held in March, 1902.

The vice-president, F. T. Congdon, called the meeting to order and stated its objects. Mr. Congdon's remarks were to the point at once. He pointed out that public feeling had in a few days been aroused as it had not been aroused in a long while, yet he thought that notwithstanding the seriousness of the occasion and the enormity of the mistake that had been made, it was not an occasion warranting extreme action; indeed, he thought that the best results would be obtained by calm discussion, and the proper advising of the ministers in whose hands lay the remedy. Above all he thought no political capital was to be made of the ill-advised action of the government. The grant or Order in Council of December 7th had clearly been secured by the grossest misrepresentation and in violation of all the principles of right. Canadian soil was not the property of the government. The government only held it in trust for the people at large.

Who is it that makes this statement? The man who is the present Governor of the Yukon, the man who is a supporter of the present government. He goes on to say:

The facts so familiar to each and every one of his hearers, he believed it had not been called to the attention of the government, and he thought the government had been grossly imposed on. The Order in Council has already been passed and the law of contracts stood in the way of the cancellation of the contract at the will of one of the makers; but there is another provision of the law just as powerful and binding where a contract can be shown to have been made by misrepresentation and fraud, its provisions could be set aside, and he believed there would be no difficulty in this case in showing such misrepresentations to have been made and many important facts withheld.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were resolutions passed at that large gathering of Liberals in the Yukon, and this is one of the resolutions:

Resolved, that the commissioner's attention be called to the fact, and that he be requested to represent to the government that in the opinion of this meeting, the insertion of any such features in the Orders in Council could only have been procured by the grossest misrepresentation and fraudulent concealment; that it never could have been represented to the minister who proposed said Orders or to the Governor in Council that the Orders were an interference with and abrogation of vested rights; that it was retroactive in operation and most far reaching and uncertain in effect; that it was certain to produce distrust and lack of confidence among the mining communities of this territory and prove fatal to the progress of the territory; nor could it have been presented and made apparent that the only consideration promised for the enormous interests granted was a monopoly to supply water at an exorbitant and prohibitive price.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I regret sincerely the absence of the hon. the Minister of the Interior. If we are to believe report, he sailed from England on the same ship that Mr. Treadgold sailed on, and they are now, no doubt, in the city of London. I regret his absence, because I would like to have heard his explanations in regard to all these different concessions, and especially in regard to this Treadgold concession. I regret also the absence of the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross). I find, Sir, that he is paraded in the official organ of the Liberal party as having reached parliament and as having obtained great and important results for the miners of that section of the country. Let me just refer to the reception of Governor Congdon upon his arrival in the Yukon, and to his statements in regard to this Treadgold concession. I will refer to the Yukon 'Sun,' the official organ, as I understand, of the Liberal party. There is also an interview with Governor Congdon in the 'Dawson Daily News.' What does the Governor say in regard to this concession:

As to the Treadgold concession, I may say I favour its cancellation.

This was on Thursday April, 9, 1903, months after the election of the hon. member for the Yukon.

I am in the same position regarding the subject as I always have been. I am satisfied that he should have no more privileges than any one else. I will not say that I favour the total cancellation——

He has changed his mind since being appointed Governor. Prior to his appointment as Governor he was in favour of the total and absolute cancellation of the Treadgold concession. He now says:

I will not say that I favour the total cancellation of the Treadgold concession, that is, I shall not put it in that way, but say I believe he should have no privileges that others do not have. As to what parliament is likely to do with the matter I cannot say. I feel that if the government will install a supply of water for the camp it will be a great enterprise and give an impetus to the mining industry. Mr. Ross is working on the scheme, and will urge parliament to send a corps of experts here to investigate the feasibility and desirability of such a system. It is the intention of Mr. Ross to get the government to send the most competent engineers that can be found in the world. Parliament doubtless will deal with this matter deliberately, and it is not to be expected an appropriation will be made for the installation of such a gigantic plant now in the short time the session will last. Heavy projects progress slowly, and if Mr. Ross succeeds in getting an appropriation this season for the expenses of a corps of experts to investigate the field and desirability of the scheme, he will be doing well. If after all a government supply of water is not to be obtained we should have water from some source. But the government does not know our needs and will first have to satisfy itself as to the prospects for permanency of the placers and the need of water over the camp as a whole. The needs of a few would not justify such a great expenditure as is contemplated.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the date of that paper?

Mr. PRINGLE. April 9, 1903, the 'Dawson Daily News.' Now, Sir, let me quote from the 'Yukon Sun.' One cannot read any of the editorials of the 'Yukon Sun' without coming to the conclusion that it is the organ of the Liberal party in that territory. In the first place, I will quote from the 'Yukon Weekly Sun' of Saturday, April 4:

The Treadgold concession stands a poor show. Must be ratified by the present parliament or it falls to the ground. Mr. Ross will oppose its ratification.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is he not here?

Mr. PRINGLE (reading):

If the Treadgold concession comes up in the House for ratification, Yukon's member will oppose it. Section 5 of 'An Act to amend the Yukon Act,' passed last session, provided that all regulations passed applying or relating to Yukon Territory, will remain in force only until approved by resolution of both Houses of parliament. From the records received here from Dawson, it appears that people there are under a misapprehension in regard to this provision. All the regulations to be operative must be approved by parliament to keep them in force beyond the date of prorogation of the present session. The Treadgold Order in Council must therefore be approved at the present session or it will fall to the ground. As already said, if it comes up in the House, Mr. Ross will oppose it.

I have been in this House since the opening almost every day, and up to the present time I have not heard any great opposition coming from the hon. member from the Yukon. That hon. gentleman has been doing great things, but, I challenge any hon. gentleman here to tell us what he has done in the House. Here is an editorial in the official organ of the Liberal party at Dawson, the Yukon 'Sun' of March 28th. It says:

JIM ROSS, M.P.

Is he a lightning striker? We should remark that he is. Saturday afternoon he arrived at Ottawa. Sunday he received the members of the House and Senate and made friends for Yukon. Monday he was introduced in the House, upon which occasion he was cheered to the echo. The premier of Canada introduced him. Immediately after the introduction he secured the passage of a Bill granting extended powers to the Yukon council. Tuesday he spent the forenoon in the Department of the Interior looking after matters pertaining to the Yukon. Wednesday he had the price of free miners certificate reduced to $7.50.

I can give him or somebody credit for having these fees reduced. I find that it was managed within a very short time, and the fee is now reduced to $7.50. Then it says:

The record fees from $15 to $10, renewal fees from $15 to $10, and payment of money in lieu of assessment work abolished. What he did yesterday is not known at the time this is written, but the telegraphic advices pointed on the first page of this issue will tell. If Jim Ross keeps up his present gait it will only take him a week to perform all the seeming impossibilities of the platform prepared here for him, bound him to.

Why, the platform provided for him bound him to abolish this Treadgold concession, and according to this editorial of the official organ of the Liberal party in the Yukon, if he kept up his gait, in a week he was going to have this Treadgold concession abolished. He seemed to have slackened his gait, because we have not heard anything of the Treadgold concession since the hon. member arrived in Ottawa. It says further:

The judgment of the voters of the Yukon in electing Mr. Ross is apparent. No man would have the assurance to even insinuate that Mr. Clarke could have done the good work for the Yukon that Mr. Ross has already done. Mr. Ross goes to Ottawa as a friend of the party in power. He was received with distinguished honours and is able to win some consideration for us each day. Mr. Clarke would have gone as an avowed enemy of the party in power, would have talked anarchy to every reporter who would listen to him along the route, and we would have received about as little consideration in parliament as he might with reason expect. The judgment of the people of the Territory of Yukon can be depended upon. And that judgment was never better demonstrated than in their selecting 'Jim' Ross to represent them in parliament.

But, in the same edition of this paper, Mr. Jim Ross is going to abolish the Treadgold concession, and he is going to establish a national work to supply water for the miners of that country. Now, it is not very hard to understand, after the explanations I have given in regard to this election, how the hon. member was elected for the Yukon. I find, at any rate it is alleged in certain documents, that in the Yukon Territory, there is one official for every fifteen miners in the district, and I have no doubt that these officials did not neglect to vote for the hon. gentleman. I desire to approach this matter in a fair, impartial and calm spirit. The hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) accused the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) of making an inflammatory speech. In that he accused him improperly. I think, we in this House, should agree, and that the hon. the Postmaster General, who is also Minister of Labour, should agree with the proposition that the policy should be to give every advantage to the practical miner over the mere speculator, and that is the policy that I desire to advocate.

I know that it is very often difficult to advocate the policy of the miner against the hon. Postmaster General, who is advocating the policy of the monopolists, and who is advocating the policy of these concessionaires. I would have expected that the hon. Postmaster General would have advocated the cause of the miner, the cause of the labourer, the cause of the men who have done so much to bring to the knowledge of the people of the world Dawson and the

Klondike. We have only to look back a few years, to the time when these names were unknown throughout the civilized world, but to-day, Dawson and the Klondike are known from one end of the world to the other, and if they are known they are known through the efforts of the hardy men who went into that country as prospectors and who developed the mines of that region. These are the men we should protect, and these are the men who are entitled to the protection of the members of this House. Let me quote briefly from a little work that was published by a man who was in Dawson City and who went into that country to see the conditions existing there. What did he find? Did he find that the affairs of the country were administered properly? No Sir, he found that the condition of the miners there under the regulations adopted by the government was worse than the condition of the Uitlanders in South Africa. The work is entitled 'The Klondike Stampede' and it is edited by Mr. Tappan Abney, special correspondent of 'Harper's Weekly' in the Klondike. He says:

In the Klondike, those who best knew the country's needs had no voice whatever in its government; all laws were made at Ottawa, and those sent out to enforce them were responsible only to the home government, or to the officials to whom they owed their appointment. Dawson was an 'alien' camp, where, if the position of the majority of the residents was different from the 'Uitlander' at Johannesburg, it was only that the laws were in intent more liberal. Distant, weeks and months from the seat of responsibility, it is not difficult to understand how, even if government intended well, the condition of the miner might be scarcely better than that of his unfortunate confrere in the Boer republic. In fact, conditions which actually prevailed at Dawson were likened by British citizens direct from the Transvaal as even worse than what they left.

The natural difficulties that stood in the way of putting into immediate operation an effective government were so great that one should not judge the Klondikers too harshly. On the other hand, if there were not serious disorders it was due less to the quality of government than to the orderly character of the population, and to the fact that men were there enduring the privations of an Arctic climate to make their fortunes and get away, not to help set in order the political households of their Canadian friends.

Now, Sir, he goes on to say

While the law required the 'gum-boot' miner to stake in person, so-called 'dredging permits,' in five-mile blocks, were granted over fifteen hundred miles of Klondike and Yukon streams to men who, for the most part, had never seen, nor intended to see, the Yukon. Such, in brief, are the regulations now in force which further provide for the sale of timberberths to private parties, whereby miners are virtually prevented from cutting wood, even for their own use, except on such terms as the monopolists concede. The tendency of the new legislation is against the 'gum-boot' miner, the man whose enterprise, labours, and hardships have made for Canada all that is worth while in the Klondike to-day. This is always the inevitable trend, but never in any camp has so much been done in so short a time in that direction as in the Canadian camp.

He goes on to deal with the public officials in the Yukon, and he says:

Afterwards, emboldened by the impotency of the commissioner to correct these abuses, favoured ones began to be admitted during office hours, upon passes, and recorded claims ahead of men who had been waiting often for days in line outside. It became recognized by everyone who was obliged to deal with the office that the only way of getting even what belonged to him was to bribe an official. Appeal to the Gold Commissioner was as likely as not met with dismissal in an arbitrary, unjust, or illegal manner. During the greater part of the rush there was no one to verify measurements of claims (only survey by Dominion land surveyors being recognized officially). The commissioner was in ignorance of the location and identity of creeks; he would give two different names to the same creek, not knowing them to be the same; he would grant the same claim to different men, and yet refuse, when the fact was proven, to refund the record fee to one of them; he allowed two discoveries on one creek, and claims became so mixed, in consequence of overlapping between discoveries, that he was obliged to close the creek, to the great loss of miners, who were not allowed to record (pending arrival of official surveyors), and who were holding the claims in person, in compliance with the mining law. Thus, between the incompetency of the commissioner and the corruption of his clerks, legitimate business came almost to a standstill. The general law of Canada, providing that no person should suffer from the incompetency of an official, was of no effect to the poor miner, who had neither money nor time to obtain the remedy.

The author of this work is an entirely independent man who went into that country, and he tells here of the way in which he found the public business administered. It is my opinion, Sir, that the evils were not so great at the time that work was written as they are at present. Since the publication of that work we find that large concessions have been granted in that territory to what are called concessionaires, and that the miners have been practically driven out of certain sections of the country. We find that as early as 1898 the government began to close the placer ground of this territory against location by the placer miners. In that year a large tract of Dominion creek was from time to time closed. In the same year also, fractional claims were closed against location. In February, 1898, the Minister of the Interior directed that Bonanza and Eldorado, and their tributaries and benches should be closed against location, and I may say that so far as I can ascertain these were amongst the richest creeks in that section of the country. This was followed in October, 1899, by a regulation closing all lapsed claims in the territory against relocation. In the year and a half that followed, silently at Ottawa and without the knowledge of the Yukon people, and on the flimsiest pretexts, the greater part of the richest placer ground was included in what

was called hydraulic concessions. On Hunker creek were granted to Williams two and a half square miles; to Milne, two square miles; to Anderson, two and half square miles. On the Klondike, including Bear and Lindow creeks, to Boyle, fifty square miles. While the miner could only take up so many feet as a claim, the government were granting here concessions of from ten to fifty miles. On Bonanza there was given to Philip, five square miles; to Bronson & Ray, fifteen square miles; to Matson & Doyle, three square miles, and on Quartz creek, four square miles were granted to the same Boyle. I may say that this man Boyle seems to be a very favoured individual of the government of this country. He seemed to have no trouble in getting concession after concession in the richest and best portion of the Yukon Territory. I find Mr. Boyle sold these concessions later on to other parties at enormous figures. As I say, on Poors creek another concession of about four square miles was granted to the same Boyle, while the other creeks were almost similarly blanketed by concessions which were obtained—in the words of the Liberal convention; in the words of the Liberals present at that meeting—I am only repeating their language when I say that these concessions were obtained largely by fraud.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PRINGLE. Now Sir, the miners of the Yukon take this ground, and it seems to be a proper ground to take—the Liberal party in the Yukon take this ground, and they evidently consider it a proper ground, namely : that these concessions which were granted on misrepresentation and fraud should be annulled. I believe, Sir, that every one of them can be cancelled because of the breach of the conditions stipulated in their leases.

Now, Sir, we come to Mr. Treadgold, and I want to say here that I have not a word to say personally in regard to Mr. Treadgold, in regard to Walter Barwick, K.C., in regard to Mr. Ewing or any of the men who have obtained concessions from this government. I have nothing whatever to say with regard to these men. I don't think they are philanthropists; I don't think they were getting this concession for the benefit of the miners, but I do think and I have no doubt that they were getting this concession for the benefit of themselves, and a very valuable concession it was. If the report of the Dawson Board of Trade, and if the report of the engineers of that company be correct, it was a concession which would make these men millionaires in very short order. Mr. Treadgold appeared on the scene in 1898, and I am informed that he was welcomed to the Yukon as being a representative of British capital. He began at once to acquire placer claims of value. In 1899 and 1900 he purchased interests in the Boyle concession, and other of the infamous concessions which I have already referred to. On the 31st of May, 1900, on the pretense of bringing water to work low grade gravels, he, with Walter Barwick, K.C., and O. N. Ewing, asked for a controlling interest in the rest of the Klondike basin. It is interesting to turn to the request of these concessionaires. On the 31st of May these gentlemen put in their requisition to the hon. Minister of the Interior and in that requisition they state :

> The applicants are prepared to undertake the establishment of hydraulic works which will supply water to the auriferous deposits now without water, &c.

In that request of theirs they asked for concessions which the people of the Yukon contend should never have been granted; and, Sir, was there any change made when the government passed the Order in Council ? The Order in Council was passed in the identical language in which these gentlemen asked for the Order. There does not appear to have ever been any discussion by the minister as to whether the request of these gentlemen was reasonable or unreasonable. The Minister of the Interior evidently advised his colleagues that they must grant to these applicants everything they asked for, and the Order in Council was passed on the 12th of June, 1901; and what were they to get under that Order ? They were to get one dollar per miners' inch per hour for water supply. It was a most iniquitous concession, on their own showing, because they came down very shortly afterwards and said : 'We will be very glad to take twenty-five cents per miners' inch.' The Order was amended shortly afterwards, I think on the 29th of June, 1901, as follows :

> The charge which the grantees shall be entitled to make for the use of such water on each placer claim shall not exceed 25 cents per miners' inch per hour.

These gentlemen came down very quickly from a dollar to twenty-five cents.

Now, the hon. Minister of Labour has accused the hon. member from Montmorency of speaking from unofficial documents, from newspapers and from anonymous communications, and he has spoken disparagingly of every source from which the hon. member from Montmorency spoke. Why should he condemn the Yukon Board of Trade, a body composed of both Conservatives and Liberals ? I was surprised, Sir, to hear him condemn that body and term them irresponsible parties. Here is what the board of trade says in regard to this matter :

> The Treadgold concession and water grant, as granted by an Order in Council which, when ratified by the parliament at its next session, will become law, is, in the opinion of this board, one of the most iniquitous measures that was ever inflicted upon a people.

The Dawson Board of Trade may be irresponsible, but they are the best represen-

tative body we can find in the Yukon Territory, and they say that in their opinion this concession—

Will work a great hardship upon the people of this territory, since it will mean the virtual bankruptcy of all the property holders of Dawson and surrounding territory, and instead of the Klondike becoming the prosperous country we expect, it will virtually become the property of Mr. Treadgold and those who are associated with him in his scheme.

Why is this concession granted? Is it granted for the benefit of the miners of the Yukon or for the benefit of these individuals? We know that everybody in that country is opposed to it. The hon. gentleman said that he had petitions from some sources favouring the concession. I would ask the hon. gentleman to lay those petitions on the Table of this House; we want to see them, because we are advised that the people of the Yukon are a unit against this concession, and we are advised that when the hon. member for the Yukon takes his seat in this House, he will give us active and vigorous assistance in doing away with it.

Let me read a little from the petition of the board of trade:

The petition of the undersigned residents of the Yukon Territory humbly showeth:

1. That by Order in Council of April the 21st, 1902, certain privileges are granted to Malcolm Orr Ewing, A. N. C. Treadgold and Walter Barwick, in connection with the proposed establishment by them of a system of water supply for washing out gold-bearing gravel in the district therein described, including the Klondike river, Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks and their tributaries.

2. That the benefits conferred upon the grantees are of incalculable value and involve an enormous exploitation of the public resources of this territory for the benefit of a few favoured concessionaires.

3. That in the opinion of your petitioners the accumulation of extraordinary powers in the hands of a single corporation such as is effected by the above Order in Council, will lead to the paralysis of the independent commercial and industrial life of the community and will prove in the highest degree oppressive and injurious to the public welfare, since the grantees are thereby enabled to crush out competition and to reduce to a position of practical servitude the individual miners in the extensive district affected which includes the richest portion of the Klondike.

4. That the need of this territory is not the creation of monopolies but their prevention, and the encouragement of the individual miners by securing equal privileges and opportunities to all as far as the law and the administration can provide them.

We have a computation made by a very competent gentleman as to the revenues that would be derived by these concessionaires from the concession which is being granted to them by this government. If this computation is at all correct, the amount of money which these people would derive in a very short time is simply fabulous. Let me refer for a moment to the statement made:

Now in order to convey to you some idea of the magnitude of the grant which Mr. Treadgold and his associates are looking for and which it appears likely they will receive, if the intention of the Minister of the Interior is allowed to be carried out, it having been recommended by him, we believe that the said Treadgold and his associates receive the sole and prior right to divert and take water from the Klondike river up to 5,000 miners' inches for distribution and use in the district, said district comprising the beds, banks, valleys, slopes and hills of the Klondike river, of Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks, and their tributaries, also the right to divert and use the water of Rock creek, which water we are informed by Mr. Joseph McGillivray, a mining engineer of long experience, amounts to 8,000 inches, natural flow, and which would give Mr. Treadgold and associates the sole right to divert and sell 13,000 inches of water. Now, a miner requires with which to sluice his dirt 50 inches of water, which is the amount considered necessary to make a sluice-head, and should the Treadgold Company at the rate which, we understand, is the contemplated charge (25 per cent miners' inch per hour) it would cost the miner $12.50 per hour or $300 per day of 24 hours, which is the length of the working day here during the summer season. Now this grant of 5,000 inches from the Klondike river and the natural flow of Rock creek, amounting to 8,000 inches, making a total of water at Treadgold's command of 13,000 inches, or 260 sluice-heads of 50 inches per sluice-head, costing the miner in this country $78,000 per day, or $10,140,000 per year of 130 sluicing days, which is the length of the sluicing season here, would mean this: that the holder of the same would practically own the country, all the hill claim owners would have to come to him for water, or allow their claim to remain unoperated for lack of same, and Mr. Treadgold and his associates would be receiving all the profits that would accrue from the thousands of hill claims, situate on the immense and huge gravel deposits with which this country abounds.

I do not see why these gentlemen should get a concession of such tremendous advantage to them. The hon. the Postmaster General has predicted that the opposition will repent the attack on this scheme. It was equally predicted that he would repeat the attack made on the Yukon Railway deal of some years ago. Let me just refer for a moment to the language of the right hon. the Prime Minister, when the little item of $328,508 which this country had to pay to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, was before this House. Here is the item:

To pay amount of judgment of Exchequer Court in favour of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann to recoup them for their outlay in connection with proposed contract for a railway from Stickeen river to Teslin lake.	$327,678 10
Costs for evidence, &c..	830 20
	$328,508 30

In the discussion on this item the right hon. gentleman said:

Of course I am bound to say at once that there is no legal recourse against the Canadian government which can be enforced in a court of law, but we admit that Mackenzie & Mann have

a moral claim against the honour of the Canadian people against the honour of the Canadian government and against the honour of the Canadian parliament for the money which they have expended in an enterprise which was national in its character, &c., &c. For these reasons we submit to the Canadian parliament that these men should not be subjected to the heavy loss which would be entailed on them, but as this is a loss which must be borne by somebody, it should be borne by the country and not by the contractors, &c., &c. Of course, if it had not been for the charter which parliament had granted—I will not say improvidently or imprudently, granted, but granted in ignorance of the conditions existing in that country, there would not have been any necessity for such haste.

I have no doubt that my hon. friend the Postmaster General will come down later on in the day and seek to get some compensation for these gentlemen's interests in the Treadgold concessions, because he has told us that they have expended over $50,000 in that concession. Though I am satisfied that this government will never in the face of the opposition from their own friends in the Yukon, in face of the opposition of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) who was elected to represent the Yukon district in this House, permit this iniquitous concession to become law, they will no doubt ask for a vote to recoup these people for the expenditure they have made in connection with this concession, just as was done in the MacKenzie & Mann affair. I am not reflecting in any way on Messrs Mackenzie & Mann or anybody else in connection with their scheme, but I say that when the government rushed into it, the conditions of the country were not known or the government would never have committed such a piece of folly. Let me quote again from the work of Tappan Abney on 'The Klondike Stampede.' Referring to the Mackenzie & Mann deal, Mr. Tappan said :

> The Canadian Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Clifford Sifton, granted to a firm of contractors, Mesrs Mackenzie & Mann, provisional right to construct a railway from the Stikeen river to the Teslin lake, in return for immense grants of gold-bearing land in the Klondike. Surveys were made and material delivered at the terminus of the proposed road, and tickets were sold in the principal cities of Europe and the United States for through passage to Dawson.

But, he added :

> Before the agreement with Mackenzie & Mann was ratified by parliament, however, a committee of miners sent out from Dawson in the fall of 1897 to protest against the royalty tax, discovered and pointed out to parliament the true inwardness of the proposed franchise, the profits on which had been already figured out as $34,000,000, and, as a result of the flood of light they let in upon parliament concerning the Yukon, the Bill was killed.

Then he proceeded :

> 3,750,000 acres of mineral land in Klondike were to be granted to the contractors, whereas the whole area about Dawson that had been prospected contained only 864,000 acres. They were to be allowed to run their lines along 960 miles of creeks, whereas Bonanza and Eldorado are only thirty-one miles long ; the land was to be held in fee simple, instead of by annual lease ; and royalties on gold were to be only one per cent instead of ten per cent, which were required of all others. In return for which they were to build a narrow-gauge railroad, from a terminus only twenty-six miles nearer Dawson than Skagway—150 miles of tracks, useless for seven months of the year—with right to charge exorbitant tolls, and with a monopoly of railway ingress to the Yukon for five years. It was a grab of nearly everything worth having in the Yukon district.

If that Yukon agreement was a grab of nearly everything worth having in that district, this Treadgold concession, if we are to believe the Liberals of the Yukon, the board of trade and the miners of that district, is a grab of nearly everything worth having in that territory.

I would like to refer for a moment to something that certainly is not ancient history. I should like to read a telegram sent on March the 6th, 1903, by the board of trade, and to comment on the reply which was sent by the right hon. Prime Minister. I may be very obtuse, but I cannot comprehend exactly the meaning of that answer. This is the message which the board of trade sent :

> Dawson opposes any attempt to pass Order in Council or Act of parliament that will in any way confirm the Treadgold concession, are having monster petitions signed, and reliable data prepared to forward to Ottawa asking the government to aid in furnishing water for mining purposes. The people are a unity in making demands and will insist on government cancelling monopoly of Treadgold's octopus.

The reply to that telegram is dated, Ottawa, March the 9th, 1903, sent to H. C. McCullough, president of the board of trade. Evidently the right hon. the First Minister did not share in the opinion of his hon. colleague, the Postmaster General, that this is an irresponsible body.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me ? On several occasions he has charged me with saying that the board of trade of Dawson is an irresponsible body. I said nothing of the kind. I did not allude to them ; I did not say anything to embrace them, I alluded to the quotations from the press and scrap information of that kind.

Mr. PRINGLE. Well, I should sincerely regret to misquote the hon. Postmaster General. What I understood him to say—and I took a note of it at the time—was that the hon. member for Montmorency quoted from irresponsible parties.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say that all his quotations were from irresponsible parties. I pointed out that there were quotations of the kind I said.

Mr. PRINGLE. Would the hon. minister tell me which of these quotations were from

irresponsible parties Were they the quotations from the convention of the Liberal party ? Were they the quotations from the platform of the Hon. James Ross ? Were they the quotations from the platform of the Liberal party as laid down in their convention ? Were they the quotations from the board of trade ? Or what quotations were from irresponsible parties ? If the hon. gentleman will tell me, I will be in a position to take that up.

Now, Sir, failing to get an answer from the Postmaster General, I will proceed with a discussion of these telegrams. To my mind they are ambiguous, I will not say they are deceptive, though that is the term used by some of the parties in the Yukon. What does it mean ? Does it mean that no confirmation is needed ? Does it mean that the Treadgold concession is dead, and that there is no action contemplated by legislation or government order ? Here is the telegram which is signed by the right hon. the Prime Minister :

You are altogether misinformed with regard to what is called the Treadgold concession. No such action contemplated either by legislation or by government order.

Now, what is the action referred to by the telegram sent to the Dawson Board of Trade ? The only construction that we could place on it is that there is no action contemplated either by legislation or by government order to confirm and make legal and valid this Order in Council that the Postmaster General has told us is not binding as yet, and cannot be binding until such time as it is published in the official 'Gazette.' I do not wish to weary the House, but I wish to refer to one or two other points in connection with this matter, which seems to me a very important one so far as the miners of this country are concerned. And it is worth noting that, while we have labour representatives in this House, I do not know that they will get up to advocate the cause of the labouring men in the country if it interferes with a concession granted by the government. We have a statement made by the Postmaster General that the deputation waited upon the government last year, but that they never asked for the abolition of this concession, but only for certain changes to be made in it. I have here the report of these gentlemen on their return to the Yukon. Let us see what they said :

Gentlemen, as there seems in some quarters to be a desire for a report as to the results of our mission with regard to the Treadgold concession, I wish to lay before the committee a synopsis of our doings at Ottawa.

According to instructions, we met and conferred with the Hon. Jas. H. Ross on our arrival, and found him disposed to assist us in every way possible.

An interview was arranged with the premier and the hon. Minister of the Interior, at which were present Hon. James H. Ross, Ralph Smith, Arthur Wilson, and myself. The matter was laid before the premier and Mr. Sifton in its entirety, and the total abolition of the concession was demanded.

It is not for me to say who was right or who was wrong. But when the Minister of Labour gets up in this House and says that this deputation never asked for the abolition of the Treadgold concession, it is only right that I should refer to the report of these gentlemen when they returned to the Yukon. Now, what did they find out ?——

We found out that the concession had been already granted and that the only method by which we could secure redress was by working with the government, which showed every disposition to rectify the mistakes which had been made.

But, Sir, what did the government do ? They rescinded the Order in Council, rescinded it in toto, and then issued another order which gave to these people greater concessions than they had in the first order. We find, subsequent to the time when this deputation arrived in the city, and subsequent to the interview with the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior, the order was passed rescinding the Order in Council of the 12th June, and subsequent order. It says :

Extract from a Report of the Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, Approved by His Excellency April 21, 1902.

On a memorandum, dated April 17, 1902, from the Minister of the Interior, stating that he has been in consultation with the Hon. James H. Ross, Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, with regard to certain objections which have been raised to the Orders in Council of June 12, 1902, June 29, 1901, and December 7, 1901, granting Messrs. Malcolm H. Orr-Ewing, of Malvern, England; A. N. C. Treadgold, of London, England, and Walter Barwick, of Toronto, Ontario, certain rights, powers and privileges, as set out in the above-mentioned Orders in Council, and such objections have also been the subject of consultations with the grantees.

The minister recommends as the result of the said consultations, with the assent of the said grantees, that the Orders in Council cited above, be rescinded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these Orders in Council were rescinded. If the government had made mistakes in regard to these Orders in Council they had the consent of the grantees to rescind them, and they were rescinded on the 17th April. At that time the government was possessed of the knowledge that the people of the Yukon were utterly and totally opposed to these concessions. Yet, three days afterwards, on the 20th April, they grant to these very same people concessions which gave to them greater rights than they previously had. I shall take that subject up a little later on, and shall show that by the last concessions granted to these people they had greater rights than under the previous concession. Now, let me refer also, while I am on the subject, to the statement made by the Minister of the Interior with regard to this de-

putation. In 'Hansard' of last year, 1902, volume 2, pages 4951 and 4952, you will find a discussion that took place last session in regard to this deputation. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) asked the Minister of the Interior the following :

I would like to know whether the concession in its amended form has met with any opposition in the Yukon at the present time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think so. Mr. Ross informed me that the delegates who had been sent from Dawson had seen the amended Order in Council and agreed that it would be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With regard to the abandoned claims, the information I have would show that in many cases those claims afterwards proved to be very valuable. Another objection that was brought to my attention was that a scheme of this kind was not required in the Yukon at the present time, because it could not be properly carried out until the lower levels had been more thoroughly worked. As I understand it, the operations of a scheme of this kind would prevent the working of the lower levels. Am I correct in that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is one other circumstance I would like to mention. There was a memorial of some kind presented to the minister by a number of miners. I saw a copy of that printed in the public press. I would like to know whether the amended Order in Council meets the objections either wholly or partially which were made by the miners in this memorial ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. To all intents and purposes, I think I can say that it does. I went over the memorial with the delegates, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Sugrue. Mr. Wilson was one of the elected members of the Yukon council and Mr. Sugrue was a newspaper man. I went over the memorial with them, and they agreed that the Order in Council in its amended form substantially met their objections. Possibly some of the abandoned claims may turn out to be very valuable.

Now, Sir, does that agree with the report of the delegates upon their return to the Yukon ? In their report they state an entirely different set of affairs. They say :

We found that the concession had already been granted and that the only method by which we could secure redress was by working with the government.

Now, Sir, it has been stated here by the Minister of Labour that the hon. member for the Yukon was returned to this House as a government supporter. No doubt he was returned as a government supporter. But I want to remark that he was pledged from the start to the finish of his campaign to oppose this Treadgold concession. I have read you the platform of the Liberal party, I have read you his endorsation and his acceptance of that platform. Let me also read you the statements made by Mr. Congdon on Mr. Ross's behalf during the campaign. Mr. Congdon was an active supporter of the Hon. James Ross, now the Governor, and in his speech at South Dawson during the campaign, on October 14, 1902, he said :

The government had entered into a contract with Treadgold and only the parliament of Canada could abrogate that agreement. Mr. Ross had asked for the cancellation of the Treadgold concession, but the government found itself tied in such a manner that it could only secure a modification of the grant.

Now, Sir, that shows that Mr. Ross was advocating the cancellation of that concession. Then there was another statement made by Mr. Congdon, but as that was referred to by my hon. friend from Montmorency, I will not now refer to it. I say that throughout that territory there has been a constant agitation against that concession, an agitation by all parties irrespective of politics. Let me refer you to one or two resolutions that were passed at a mass meeting of citizens held April 2, 1902. There were statements made there which I think would be unfair probably to make in this House. Men standing high in the politics of this country were connected with some of these concessions in statements made at that meeting. I think, Sir, it would be entirely unfair for me to repeat those statements, as I have no proof and nothing to show that these men were in any way connected with these concessions. This is a report of the meeting at which certain statements were made by Mr. Woodworth and other gentlemen. I will simply read the resolutions, and not the statements which were made by these men. The resolutions passed at this meeting held in Dawson are reported in the press of April 22, 1902. The first resolution is this :

We request the government of the Dominion of Canada to immediately inquire into the means by which the Anderson, Milne, Boyle, Bronson and Ray, Doyle Matson, Slavin and Gates and Miller creek concessions were obtained, as to whether said concessions were obtained by fraud and misrepresentation and granted in error and improvidence, and as to whether the regulations have been complied with in the grant or continuance of said leases.

Whereas, the Anderson, Milne, Boyle, Bronson and Ray, Matson, Doyle, Slavin and Gates and Miller creek concessions comprise much of the richest known placer mining ground in the Yukon Territory and ought never to have been leased to the pretended lessees.

Therefore, resolved, that all ground within the limits of said concessions be open to location by the placer miner whether held by concession or not.

Whereas, by express agreement of the holders of the Matson and Doyle concessions are entitled to the mining claims forfeited within the bounds of their concessions, providing they file a plan and apply for the same within one year from date of lapse of said claims, and whereas, under express or implied agreement the Slavin and Gates, Bronson and Ray, Boyle, Milne and Miller creek concessions in a similar manner are claims lapsing within their boundaries, and whereas all said concessions were obtained by fraud and misrepresentation and comprise within their boundaries some of the richest placer mining ground in the Yukon Territory, therefore resolved, that the government of the Dominion of Canada be requested to take steps to prevent said lapsed ground becoming a part of said concessions.

The leases and agreements by which the Anderson, Milne, Boyle Bronson and Ray, Doyle, Matson, Slavin and Gates and Miller creek concessions be cancelled and revoked upon such terms as may be just.

Now, Sir, I will deal for a few moments with the Order in Council granted on the 21st of April, 1902. The Minister of Labour has gone over these concessions clause by clause, and he has endeavoured to point out to this House that the concessionaires did not obtain so much by the final Orders in Council as they obtained by the previous orders. I cannot agree with him in that contention. Now, Sir, in clause 1 of the Order in Council, 21st April, 1902, the first paragraph of that Order in Council is identically the same as the first paragraph of the Orders in Council previously granted, and which had been rescinded. Under that first paragraph these parties are given—

The sole right to divert and take water from the Klondike river at any point or points between its entry into the Yukon river and Flat creek for the purpose of generating power with which to pump water to work the auriferous deposits in the district (hereinafter termed 'The District') comprising the beds, banks, valleys, slopes and hills of the Klondike river, of Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks, and of their tributaries.

Now, I say that they are given the sole and absolute right and by the section that follows they are given six years to exercise that right. They tie up for a period of six years the development of the water power in that locality. Mr. Speaker, I take the ground that if any man went in and attempted to develop the power in that district these gentlemen could at once apply for an injunction and restrain him from doing any work in that connection. It has been my pleasure to read several of the best works in regard to placer mining in the State of California. I recognize that in a new country such as the Yukon there are difficulties in the way of government, in the way of making orders and regulations incidental to meeting the requirements of the people, but I venture to say, Sir, that you cannot find in the history of any mining country where a concession was given such as the Treadgold concession. I find in the history of California that in the placer mining districts of that state, during the boom in placer mining, there were 6,000 miles of sluices built. There was no monopoly given to any one company, and there was no concession such as this tying up the whole country. Companies were formed and there was competition between these companies and that competition gave to the miners a reasonable rate for the water which they required. There was no such concession as this monopoly which has been granted in favour of the concessionaires. Now, the hon. Minister of Labour also referred to a little change that was made in regard to section 3. He says that :

The right to divert and use the water of Rock creek subject to any grants lawfully subsisting and subject to the rights of free miners' bona fide working claims.

And so on is a change. I would like to just point out to the hon. Minister of Labour in regard to the water of Rock creek that there are no claims worked on Rock creek so that the reservation in this case amounts to nothing. Rock creek was a source of water for distribution to the Klondike river. There are a number of clauses in this Order in Council and it would take me a very long time to point out all the iniquities of them. The hon. minister has pointed to section 10 of this Order in Council. I do not know why he did. It is a most sweeping clause. Clause 10 reads as follows :

The right, subject to no payment except the royalty prescribed upon output to make entry for and work any abandoned mining claim or claims on Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks.

Up to that point it is absolutely the same as the previous Order in Council, but this language has been added :

Such right to be exercisable only when the grantees by the construction of works in pursuance of this franchise are in a position to deliver water upon such claim or claims for the working therof.

I fail to find in this final Order in Council where the grantees are bound to do anything. They are not bound to expend one dollar, while, in the former Order in Council, they are bound to expend $250,000. By this Order in Council, I repeat, they are not bound to expend one dollar.

Now, I am not going to take up the legal aspect of the case, because there are those who will follow me who will deal more particularly with that subject. My mind is in a very hazy condition in regard to the legal aspect of the case as construed by the hon. Minister of Labour. He tells us in one breath that this Order in Council is no good, that it does not become any good until such time as it is officially published in the 'Canada Gazette.' In another breath he tells us that the Order is good. From my reading of the statutes I am satisfied that the Order is not good. We have to speak of the Order in Council just as we find it, and we find that in the preamble of the Order in Council these hon. gentlemen quote as their authority for the passing of that order certain statutes being section 5, Chap. 15, of the Act 55-56 Vic., and section 8 of the Yukon Territory Act as that section was enacted by section 2 of chapter 11 of 62-63 Vic. Let us look at 62-63 Vic. for one moment :

Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Governor in Council may make ordinances for the peace, order and good government of the territory, and of Her Majesty's subjects and others therein ; but no ordinance made by the Governor in Council, or the commissioner in council, shall—

(c.) appropriate any public land or other property of Canada without authority of parliament, or impose any duty of customs or any excise ; nor shall any tax be imposed except as in this Act provided.

I say that this statute is the authority against the contention of the hon. minister, and that they have no authority to give away or to grant the public domain of this country without coming to the parliament of Canada. Now, I must apologize for taking up so much time, but I feel that while these men are far distant from us, some members of this House have to advocate their cause. There is no doubt a great grievance existing in that country. There is no doubt that concessions have been granted since 1898, which have been to the detriment of the miners of that country. There is no doubt that this concession which we are now discussing is a concession which will destroy that country, which will have the effect of injuring not only the trade of that country but of injuring the trade of Canada, and I say that my only excuse for taking up some much time is that I felt that it was a pleasure to advocate the cause of the miners of the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Mr. Speaker, there are two or three phases of this question that I would like to offer a remark or two upon, and which have been mentioned by my hon. friend who has just spoken. There is no member of this House, I may say, if the hon. member will permit me, for whom I have a greater respect, or of whose courtesy and ordinary fairness I have a higher opinion than I have for that of the hon. gentleman. I must confess that he presented to me, as I think my hon. friend presented to the House, a striking example of how prejudiced and unreasonable a frame of mind an hon. member of this House can get into when he honestly and sincerely thinks that he is as fair and impartial as a man can be. The hon. gentleman has approached this question, as he assured us, in a spirit of the utmost fairness; yet, I think the first adjective that he applied to the transaction was that it was a transaction of a most iniquitous character. How calm and how impartial my hon. friend must be, when, in discussing a plain, and it seems to me a very reasonably clear business transaction, he has no more moderate or reasonable a criticism to pass upon it than to declare that it is an iniquitous transaction. Now, Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) asked this House to express its opinion with regard to this transaction. And what are the terms of his amendment ? It says :

That this House is of opinion that the said powers, franchises and concessions constitute in favour of the said Treadgold a gigantic monopoly, which while depriving the treasury of enormous revenues is most detrimental to the mining industries of the Yukon. And that in so making the said grants and concessions by Order in Council, the government have exceeded their authority and have committed a gross breach of the duty entrusted to them under the constitution.

I presume that my hon. friends opposite, will at least admit that they are under some obligation to furnish to this House evidence to justify it in expressing the opinion set out in the motion. I shall take the liberty of examining somewhat closely the terms of the resolution, to ascertain if I can, what evidence has been furnished—dignify it if you will by the name of evidence—to justify the House in putting itself upon record in such a form. Is it because there is a monopoly in the terms of the Order in Council, that my hon. friend has objection to it ? Is it the monopolistic character of this grant that he makes the most complaint of ? Well, I am at a loss to understand how it would be possible, under the conditions which must exist in the Yukon, to have a privilege of this kind exercised except it would be in a monopolistic form. To go back to the original conditions that existed in the Yukon ; we know that for two or three years after the placer mining qualities of the territory were discovered the richest yield in these placer diggings was capable of being taken out with ease, and a trifling outlay then brought large financial results. As the years went on, the conditions changed and year after year it becomes less possible to take out placer gold except by the exercise of greater labour and the introduction of machinery. Unless you can resort to mechanical appliances ; unless you can get the hydraulic system in operation in that country, you cannot under present conditions turn to profitable account the admittedly large deposits of placer gold which are to be obtained in that territory. You have got to have mechanical means to assist you, and these mechanical appliances have been found necessary in other countries where placer gold digging has been followed with any success. It is therefore conceded that in order to work these placer diggings expensive hydraulic machinery must be employed. Now, Sir, it goes without saying that such appliances can only be obtained by a very large outlay of money, and by persons or companies having considerable capital at their command. In the very nature of things it requires a monopoly to carry on such work. The hon. gentleman told us that in certain placer districts of the United States it had been possible to allow two or three companies to operate on one of these rivers. How are you going to put in these creeks in the Klondike three or four different systems, with three or four different mechanical plants, to compete one with another. In the first place it is necessary to have the head water dammed and there cannot be four different dams across one river at the same point. To accumulate the water so that it may be

obtained to sluice down the river, it cannot be done by more than one concern. Unless I totally misapprehend the conditions which exist there can only be one company in operation and if that be the case then that company must of necessity have a monopoly. I do not believe therefore that this House will be justified in condemning that transaction because it is a monopoly, when in the very nature of things, if you require that this hydraulic process should be employed to maintain that industrial enterprise in this country, it has to be done in form of monopoly, and cannot be done in any other form. Therefore, to condemn the monopoly, in the words of this resolution is to condemn a thing that is imperatively necessary, unless you are to abandon this country altogether and allow these deposits to go unproductive. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) goes on to say in his motion :

While depriving the treasury of enormous revenue.

What evidence is there that under the operation of this system—which as I have said is a necessary and proper system—what evidence is there that it is going to deprive the country of an enormous amount of revenue. Every dollar's worth of gold that is taken out by this process is taken out subject to the royalties which are imposed upon the production of gold taken out in any other part of that district. There is no difference between the royalty upon this and the royalty upon any other gold.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What about representation ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can very well understand that there are reasons, very strong and proper reasons, why, in order to induce men of capital to put in $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 and perhaps more to construct this machinery, there would have to be very attractive and valuable inducements held out to them, and concessions would have to be made in the way of the removal of restrictions which would generally be applicable, and might very properly be applicable in the earlier history of the country when placer mining was conducted under very different circumstances. You must bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that in adopting this system the government had the idea in mind of insuring the continuance of the development of that country, so that all the placer mining should be made as profitable as possible. In order that that should be done a large expenditure must necessarily be made, and in order that the money for this expenditure could be obtained you had to offer to capitalists an attractive proposition. We happen to know that when the question of the hydraulic development of that section of the country was first mooted a number of people visited Ottawa from the United States and elsewhere. When some people heard that we were going to impose conditions upon this system of mining they turned away their faces and went away from the country, because they said : The conditions that you are talking about imposing are such that it would not be profitable for us to embark in this enterprise and to risk a large amount of money contingent upon the possibility that the country might not prove as rich in its gold-bearing properties as was represented. There were persons who came to Ottawa at that time, and who, as I am credibly informed, were satisfied that they could not embark in the enterprise under any condition which the government would entertain favourably. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) does not appear to consider that you ought to present an attractive programme to people whom you invite to go into operations of this character. The hon. gentleman thinks that every body should see at a glance that it was certain to be an enormously profitable undertaking.

My hon. friend from Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle) said that the amount of money the Treadgold syndicate would make was simply fabulous. He figured out that they would make ten million dollars a year profit. Well, if any one who had command of the means would believe that my hon. friend's statement was to be relied on, he and everybody who had the same belief would be tumbling over one another in order to secure this concession on any terms, and would not care how drastic or severe they might be. The negotiations were not conducted by the Minister of the Interior alone. It is only fair and just to him to say that all through this transaction he was acting in conference with his colleagues and with a sub-committee of Council. Realizing that we were dealing with new problems to us, we were doing the best we could to reach a conclusion and to arrange a bargain which would be advantageous to the country and just to all concerned. Reflections are being cast on the Minister of the Interior, and this is spoken of by hon. gentlemen opposite as a fraudulent transaction, as a transaction which is based on fraud. What is the evidence to justify any such statement as that? The present Judge Davies, of the Supreme Court, I am reminded, was one of the committee, and was aiding and assisting us in these negotiations.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What does that prove ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend from Cornwall and Stormont refers to the fact that the formal application made by the Messrs. Treadgold was received one day and was immediately and instantly accepted and replied to by the government the next day ; the idea intended to be conveyed being that these gentlemen swooped down on the government, gobbled them up, and carried away in an instant the contract for these con-

cessions. If my hon. friend had been here for the months during which these negotiations took place, he would have known very much better. He would have known that the reason the letter came to be dated so short a time before the Order in Council was passed, was because the negotiations which had taken place from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month, were finally concluded, and when they were concluded, the terms that were acceded to by the government were put into the form of that application.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him how much deliberation was expended on the question of allowing them to charge a dollar an inch for the water ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A very great deal. I confess that the question was absolutely new ; and, as regards a reasonable price, we had to confer with others ; but upon the best opinion we could get, the amount was put in, because it was believed it was a fair price. We found afterwards that we were entirely mistaken ; I frankly acknowledge that ; as people are likely to be mistaken when dealing with entirely new matters, as to a new country, far away from the scene where the decisions are arrived at and where the administrative acts take place.

Now, our hon. friends have no evidence to prove that this arrangement, in addition to being a monopoly, is going to deprive the treasury of enormous revenues. If it is a successful adventure, that is to say, if these people are able to raise the necessary money to carry out the undertaking, it may prove to be a very great money saver to the country ; and the country may secure the development of that section of the Yukon, which might not, under any other conditions, be susceptible of development. It may in that way bring enormous revenues to the country which we would not otherwise have. But there is no testimony that it might involve a loss to the treasury of any large sum.

Our hon. friends ask the House to say that this arrangement would be most detrimental to the mining industry of the Yukon. What evidence have they adduced in support of this proposition ? How is the mining industry of the Yukon going to be harmed if we succeed in having this great hydraulic system in operation in that country ? Where does the power reside to say what is the proper compensation to be paid to these people for the privileges which they are able to lease or sell to the owners or licensees of mines in that district ? Does not the Governor in Council hold in his hand all the necessary power to prevent any wrong being done to the miners ? What do the licensees throughout the district want ? They want water. And what may they properly give for it ? What is a fair price for it ? My hon. friend says they are going to be asked 25 cents per miners' inch, and that it is going to cost $300 a day to every one who has a sluice. Well, does anybody imagine for a moment that the government would permit, having power to prevent it, the continuance of a system which would compel the miners to pay an exorbitant sum away beyond what would yield a fair return of profit to these people on their undertaking ? Nobody believes that the government could for a moment tolerate the continuance of such a condition of things.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will my hon. friend permit a question ? I would like to know where there is any specification whatever in the Order in Council as to what price the miners are to pay for the water.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will show my hon. friend where it is. We have named no price in the order for the use of water. It does not at all follow that it was necessary to name any price. On the contrary, we think it is quite unnecessary to name it. If the miners are called on to pay for the use of the water which is brought down to them or let out to them, and which they are using upon their locations, then the amount they shall be compelled to pay would be under the control and direction of the Governor in Council, and I will show my hon. friend where that is to be found.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where is that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If I succeed, Mr. Speaker, in pointing out to this House that the power is reserved, in sufficiently clear and explicit terms, in this Order in Council or grant to protect the people from being imposed upon by excessive rates, where in all conscience are you to find any injury that is being done to the mining interests in that country ? What the mining men want is to have the government spend out there, some $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 in order to construct hydraulic works. They know that they cannot perpetuate the Yukon as a gold bearing country unless works of this kind are established, and they want the government to construct them out of the exchequer of the country, because they think, no doubt, that they would then enjoy greater advantages than if these works were done by a company. That is why we are hearing complaints to-day. My hon. friend asks me to point out where there is anything in this Order in Council showing control by the government of the rates for the use of the water.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Section nine reads :

That these grantees shall have the right, subject to the regulations hereinafter contained, to use, distribute and dispose of the water delivered by the grantees within the district.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Where are the regulations ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has a copy of this. I refer to regulation C.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to read A and B first ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am happy to oblige my hon. friend :—

(a) The grantees shall allow all free miners within the district to tail their sluices, hydraulics, ground sluices and drains, free of charge into the flumes and drains of the grantees, yet not in such a way as to damage or obstruct the free working of the flumes and drains of the grantees by rocks, stones, boulders or otherwise.

That throws no light on that branch of the question.

(b) The grantees shall compensate the owner of any mining claims or lands for any damage which any such owner may sustain by reason of any of the grantees works breaking or being imperfect.

That does not bear on the question.

(c) Any question of compensation arising under this grant.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend, of course, with his astute legal mind, would make out that the compensation must have relation simply to the compensation implied or referred to in the preceding regulation 'B.'

Mr. CASGRAIN. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If that were the intention, instead of saying 'any question of compensation arising under this grant' the words used would be 'any question of compensation arising under these regulations.' My hon. friend laughs.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend cannot dispose of a legal argument simply by a laugh.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put him a question ? How is it that in the first Order in Council, when anything is said about what is to be paid for the water, it is not the word 'compensation' which is used but the word 'charge.' In the regulations, which accompany the first Order in Council, is the following clause :—

The charge which the grantee shall be entitled to make for the use of such water on each claim shall not exceed $1 per miners' inch per hour.

How is it that the word 'charge' has been changed to that word 'compensation,' when in the clause immediately preceding, the regulations speak of compensation for damages to the owner of any mining claim.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say, as I read and interpret this clause, that if there were to be a limitation, such as the hon. gentleman puts upon the general language of sub-clause C of the regulations, that sub-clause would refer specially to the previous regulation B, and thus be clearly restricted to it. Subclause says : 'Any question of compensation arising under this grant shall be determined'—by whom—by the Gold Commissioner subject to appeal to the Territorial Court of the district, and the said court may, upon special circumstances being shown, make an order for the taking of further evidence.' Take these two clauses together, and they seem to remove the question beyond doubt—clause nine :—

The right, subject to the regulations hereinafter contained, to use, distribute and dispose of the water delivered by the grantees within the district.

And sub-clause C of the regulations which I have just read. That being the interpretation of clause C, there does not seem to be any solid basis upon which the miners in the Yukon can say that their individual interests are likely to be prejudiced by this grant or that the general mining interests in the country are in the slightest degree prejudicially affected. There is no foundation for this argument, nor is there anything in the Order in Council itself which in any way militates against the most complete right of any miner in the country, once these works are completed, making application for and obtaining a license to mine in that country anywhere so long as the privilege he asks for has not already been taken by another. Only when these works are actually completed does it become a right in the grantees to claim that wherever there are any licenses or any ground abandoned, because the parties did not think it worth while, although water was available, to hold and continue the work alone, they are entitled to take this abandoned ground. It does seem to me there can be very little justification for criticism of any kind upon an Order in Council, restricted and surrounded by such safeguards as these regulations, and it affords almost conclusive evidence of the inability of our hon. friends opposite to take any reasonable view of any transaction by their political opponents, when they denounce, as they are doing, so well considered and well prepared a proposition. The concluding portion of the resolution says :—

And that in so making the said grants and concessions by Order in Council, the government have exceeded their authority and committed a gross breach of the duty entrusted to them under the constitution.

I think my hon. friend rather failed to make clear the proposition that there has been any act on the part of the goverment in this transaction which is at all in

excess of the powers properly belonging to it. It is quite true that this Yukon country belongs to the Crown. It is quite true that it is not in the power of the Governor in Council or any minister of the Crown to dispose of or sell, any property of the Crown except and until there has been a statutory enactment conferring that authority. No man would argue for a moment that, because a Minister of the Interior has become minister, he is invested with powers, by reason of that, which are not derivable and are not founded upon some Act of parliament. But there is such an Act of parliament going the full length and justifying all that has been done in connection with this grant and all the powers to which have been, on the face of it exercised by the government. Section 47 of the Dominion Lands Act has been referred to. That section has not only been re-enacted and affirmed, but has been somewhat enlarged by subsequent legislation. This is to be found in the revised statute of 1886, chapter 54. Section 47 declares :

> Lands containing coal or other minerals, whether in surveyed or unsurveyed territory, shall not be subject to the provisions of this Act respecting sale or homestead entries, but shall be disposed of in such manner and on such terms and conditions as are, from time to time, fixed by the Governor in Council, by regulation made in that behalf.

Now, if any wider language is necessary than that——

Mr. CASGRAIN. That has been repealed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has been repealed and another section has been substituted, and I say that section is even more explicit and clear. For, if you will turn to that Act, chapter 15, of 55-56 Victoria, you will see the enactment is as follows :

> Clause 47 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor :—
> Lands containing coal or other minerals, including lands in the Rocky Mountains Park——
>
> —shall not be subject to the provisions of this Act respecting sale of homestead entry, but the Governor in Council may from time to time make regulations for the working and development of mines on such lands, and for the

Let hon. gentlemen note this—

> —for the sale, leasing, licensing or other disposal thereof.

Can there be broader language than that ? The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make regulations for the development of the miners, for the selling of such lands, for the leasing of such lands, for the licensing of such lands, any one or all which would be within the scope of what has been done under the present Order in Council.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this a regulation for the sale ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are general regulations which authorize the sale.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where are they ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are general regulations. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) has them and he will refer to them if occasion arises. If there were no other regulations, this would be a regulation as respects this transaction as fully and completely as it would be necessary to have one made. But I do not make the argument that it is necessary to regard this as a regulation, though I could very well do so. I would be correct in doing so. Regulations have, however, been made and have been promulgated, and under the regulations that have been promulgated all that has been done under the Order in Council was in the fullest degree authorized. So, my hon. friend has not taken substantial ground. He is following a delusion; he is deceiving himself, when he supposes that an Act of parliament which says that the Governor in Council has power to sell or lease these lands in any such manner and under such regulations as he choses, is not sufficient to cover this case. I think there can be no ground for the belief that a constitutional doubt arises as to what has been done. Yet my hon. friend will subscribe to this resolution which says that the government has exceeded its powers. We are the government and they are the opposition, and it is not necessary to use any argument to convince them that we never do anything right, while they are unimpeachable, their opinion is the standard of correctness and propriety, and so they can vote for this resolution without the slightest hesitation or reluctance. I intended to refer earlier to the statement of the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle), when he took occasion to drag in the question of the Mackenzie & Mann contract and to say that this is a similar contract and one in which the government has been guilty of improvidently and unreasonably committing itself to a bargain such as never should have been sanctioned or approved. He may well remember in that connection the fabulous calculations that were made as to the untold millions that were going to be made out of the Mackenzie & Mann contract if it became law. I remember hon. gentlemen opposite, one after another, rising in their places, with eyes glittering at the prospect pointing out the hundreds of millions of dollars, and the hundreds of thousands of acres of land which were being given away, lands which were simply a land of gold—all you had to do was to go out and dig it up. Why, it was so vast in extent, so enormous in its richness that we were simply throwing away wealth that would have made the whole country rich, and probably would

have sufficed without the imposition of other taxes to maintain the government institutions of the country for a century. And, notwithstanding all this, and though these lands have lain there open to any man who choses to make application for them, teeming as they told us with this incalculable and inexhaustible wealth, yet not a single individual has been found who has discovered enough to make it worth his while to apply for a square mile or for even a hundred square feet of that whole territory for mining purposes—not a single solitary one. I recall to my hon. friends, therefore, the wild folly of their statements when this subject was under discussion, and I ask them to beware that they are not putting themselves in that same untenable and indefensible position that they put themselves in when they opposed the proposition that we then laid before them. They talk about the enormous amount of money to be made out of this Treadgold venture. They are talking in the same strain as before. They are asking parliament to forget that there is a public opinion in the country which would not tolerate the imposition by this syndicate of any more than reasonable, just and proper rates. They ask parliament to forget that these people would always exercise the privilege given under their charter in the full light of day and under the full control of the government of the country.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I was prepared, when the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) stood up to discuss this question and, when I heard him find fault with the remarks that have been made by hon. gentlemen on this side who preceded him, to hear this question discussed without any exhibition of prejudice or feeling. But if the hon. member who preceded the Minister of Railways and Canals in discussing this question to-night, showed any spirit of prejudice, I venture the assertion that he has been entirely outdone by the Minister of Railways and Canals himself. Looking at this question from a general standpoint, it appears to me that the same rule applies to this Act as should be applied to other legislation or legislative acts. The general principle should be that any legislation or legislative Acts which tend or pretend to confer upon any individual, or any corporation or body of people, rights that are different from the rights that are enjoyed by the public in general, should be such as will bear the very closest scrutiny by the opposition and by the country. But I do not think, in viewing the Orders in Council that have been under discussion here to-day that they come within that category, for they strike me as being in direct violation of that very wholesome principle. That Order in Council bears upon its face its own condemnation. It is perfectly apparent from the terms of that Order in Council and the offer that was made by Mr. Treadgold and his associates, that the Treadgold company did not forget, when they were presenting their memorial to the government, to ask for almost everything that was in sight. And, Sir, notwithstanding the greed, if I may use the term, displayed by the Treadgold Company in asking for these concessions, it appeared that the government was perfectly willing to go them one better. They have signified their willingness to go them one better in the language that they used in the Orders in Council. After reciting the offer that had been made by these people, the government say :—

> And that the said parties shall be and are hereby granted all and every the powers, privileges, rights and franchises asked for.

Well, Sir, it is wonderful to my mind that the Treadgold Company did not ask for a fence around it, and if they had, I do not doubt the government would have given them a fence, and also given them a gatekeeper, judging from the way they have treated this company. Now, it has been said, and said correctly, that while the government were so generous in granting to the Treadgold Company these rights and privileges, they were yet careful enough only to grant these rights subject to certain conditions. Well, one is apt to understand the use of that term 'condition' as implying that some onus or some duty is placed upon the person against whom that condition is established, or that some duty is cast upon that person in regard to the granting of the right. But I call the attention of the House for a moment to one or two of these conditions, and the manner in which the Treadgold Company were tied up by the government's action. I would point out that the government said to these people when they came and asked for these rights, yes, take all you want, all you ask for you may have; but you must take those rights subject to these conditions. The first of these conditions is, yes, take all you want but you must not pay any taxes upon it. That is the first condition, certainly a very onerous one, and the Treadgold people must have struggled and argued strenuously with the government to prevent them from imposing such an onerous condition as that. But perhaps they thought that was the only condition of an onerous nature that would be imposed upon them, and so no doubt they waited for the next clause of this Order in Council. The next clause goes them one better, and says: Yes, you may have all these rights that you are asking for in this memorial you have presented to the government, and in addition to your not paying any taxes, we go you one better and we say that you should not pay any rent, nor should you pay any occupation rent. No doubt the Treadgold people felt themselves very greatly aggrieved by that condition, but that is the language of the condition that

is imposed upon them. Let me point out something more. After granting to these people all they asked, and saying they should pay no taxes, no rent, and no occupation rent, that they should only pay the royalty upon the output equal to the very lowest royalty that was imposed upon gold and silver, then they added another clause as if to make the matter doubly binding and doubly pleasing to the Treadgold people, for they say: Yes, and even if you don't work the mine, we will put the further condition upon you that you won't have to pay the $200 to the government. Why, Sir, you may go through the whole list of these conditions and with very few exceptions they are of the nature I have described.

Now one word with regard to some of these matters where I think it is perfectly apparent to any careful reader that the government have wrought an injustice and injury to the free miners of the Yukon territory. You will notice that in the regulations of council which have been referred to here to-night, in the first clause, subsection one, which has been read more than once, it says:—

Provided that license holders of mining locations situated on the Klondike river should be entitled,

And so on, as against the grantee. Now what does that mean? Could language make more plain the meaning and intention of the concessionaires and of the government? It says: License holders who may hereafter procure licenses, but it confines the benefits which are there pretended to be granted, to these miners who are already holding licenses, and it does not extend to any future miner who may go in there in opposition to this corporation. It seems to me to be an extraordinary block to free miners going into that country. Yet the Minister of Railways and Canals will ask this House and gentlemen who have discussed this question,, where or in what way is this going to effect prejudicially the miners of the Yukon Territory? Sir, is it not perfectly plain that such a clause as that in these regulations, absolutely shuts out future competition over a large portion of that country to free miners? But that clause has a still more sweeping effect, taken in connection with the other clause of this regulation which provides that upon a claim being abandoned these people may enter upon that claim and work it. Now take that clause in connection with the regulation in regard to the supply of water. If there is a shortage of water, if there is not water enough to work all these mines efficiently, then the water is to be divided proportionately between them. Yet, I say, taking these two Orders in Council and taking these regulations I have referred to, the result will be almost inevitable, it seems to me, it is impossible to work it out in any other way, that these miners who are already in there and who alone are protected by that first subsection, will, a large portion of them, be shut out by the operation of this Order in Council. That is another way in which, I say, it appears clear to me that the Order in Council is going to work prejudicially to the interests of that country. Now, I want to call attention to just one other clause in regard to this matter and that is to clause thirteen. I shall not take occasion to refer to those clauses which have been spoken of particularly, but this feature of section thirteen has not, I think, been mentioned in this discussion. Section thirteen provides that:—

The right, subject to the regulations hereinafter contained, to construct, lay, maintain, supply with water and operate bed-rock flumes, and any other flumes for supplying water in the district.

What does that really mean? It means that Mr. Treadgold and his associates are granted this right and this exclusive right for the purpose of prospecting that country. When they build their bed-rock flumes in these rivers and creeks they cannot do it without discovering where the best mining locations are all along that line, and when they discover a mining location this Order in Council provides that they have the right to grab it up the same as they grab all the others. That in itself is sufficient to condemn that Order in Council and to show conclusively that the concessions that are granted, as far as the interests of that great country are concerned, were disadvantageous to the Yukon Territory and to the miners there. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals took occasion to ask opposition members who are discussing this question to furnish some evidence that the concessions granted to these people, were operating, or were going to operate disadvantageously to the people of that country. I am surprised that the hon. minister should ask such a question in the face of such an array of testimony as has been offered from this side of the House during the discussion. When he asks that question he actually discredits his own party, and he actually discredits the best people in the Yukon Territory. In addition to what has been already quoted in regard to the action of the Liberal party, of the Liberal club, of the board of trade and other bodies who, we have a right to assume, are familiar, from their contact with that subject and from their living in the country, with the conditions and needs of the territory, I am going to present to the House an expression of opinion from the citizens of Dawson. I hold in my hand a paper printed in Dawson, which, in its issue of February 20, last, contains the report of a meeting of citizens of Dawson held for the purpose of discussing the railway policy of the government and amongst other things the Treadgold concession. A number of resolu-

tions were passed by that meeting. These resolutions were to be forwarded to the government and the government were urged to take action upon them. The sixth resolution demanded :

The cancellation of all hydraulic concession leases fraudulently obtained, also hydraulic concession leases, the terms of which have not been complied with that are now liable to cancellation.

Seventh. The strict enforcement of the terms of all hydraulic concession leases, so that the holders of same will be obliged to operate and mine the ground held by them.

There is another way in which this Order in Council operates to the disadvantage of the people of that country, as has already been pointed out. It ties it up for six years. Those living upon the spot and being familiar with the subject say : compel these people to operate and mine the ground held by them.

Eighth——

And this is a sweeping one——

The cancellation in every instance of hydraulic concession leases where the same are in any way liable to cancellation, so that the ground now tied up and lying idle within the boundaries of the same be thrown open to miners and worked.

There was an opportunity offered to this government, as has already been pointed out, before the passage of the last Order in Council to rescind the first Order in Council and to meet the requirements of the people of the Yukon Territory, thus serving the best interests of these people and the best interests of the mining industry of that country. They did pass an Order in Council rescinding the former Order in Council, but they were not content with satisfying the people of the Yukon but they showed that it was not their interest to serve the people of the Yukon, but that their interest lay in some other direction, and accordingly the last Order in Council was passed. Speaking to the resolution which I have just read Mr. George Black, a citizen of Dawson, made use of this language.

Every man in the territory wishes that the laws should have the approval of the people and meet with the requirements of local conditions. If the mining law in this territory had been made with the approval of the people the country to-day would be in a different condition. But we have the experience of the past four or five years and it is not too late for the people to act. . . . .

If our laws had been made by the elected representatives of the people, we would have no need for this meeting to-night. Concessions would not have been plastered over the country.

I must warn the people against any decrease in vigilance in relation to the Treadgold concession. As it stands to-day the owners of that concession have the sole right to sell water. When the monopoly clause was taken from the Treadgold concession the right of other people to secure water rights was also cancelled. So in reality Treadgold has still the sole monopoly on the water rights.

That is the view which people living in the Yukon and who are familiar with this subject take of the matter and I think we are pretty safe in acting upon their judgment. I am surprised in the face of evidence of that nature that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should stand up in his place in this House and ask for further evidence than that which has been given him to show that this is a monopoly. Now, he takes occasion to remark further that works of this character must be carried on by companies in the nature of a monopoly. I cannot, for my part, agree with the statement. The statement may be right to a certain extent, it may be necessary to induce, in some way, companies, or corporations, or capitalists, to invest their money in enterprises of this kind for the development of the country, but it is only necessary to go as far as the interests of that country demand and it is not necessary, as the government has done, to practically give away the Yukon Territory to a monopoly in order to secure a supply of water. As I understand the attitude taken by the opposition during the discussion of this question they do not object—I do not, at any rate, for one, object—to one company investing their money in this enterprise for the purpose of benefiting the territory and the mining industry there. I do not care whether there is one company or a dozen companies if the rights of the people are so guarded as against the one company, that the company will not be allowed to gobble up everything there is in the country. It has been truly said and I know from the researches I have made myself in different books, that in California and in Australia you cannot find an instance where a concession such as this, has been granted to any corporation.

While there are companies working there and providing water for carrying on mining operations; while there are such companies innumerable in California and Australia, I have failed to discover any company that has been given such sweeping rights, such exclusive rights, such privileges in defiance of the rights of the people as have been given to this Treadgold Company in the Yukon Territory. The Minister of Railways seems to take a very great deal of satisfaction from the fact, that, as he says, the right to fix the charge for supplying water to the miners in the Yukon may be regulated by the Gold Commissioner, and therefore that the people may safely conclude that the government would not—to use his own expression—be so foolish as to sanction the making of any charge that would be exorbitant or unreasonable. Why, Sir, the action of the government that he was reviewing at the very time, answered him completely. He said that the government would not be so foolish as to sanction

a charge of say twenty-five cents per miners' inch for this water, but did he forget that a year or two before this very same government had sanctioned a charge of $1 a miners' inch or four times as great as the twenty-five cents which he thought the government would not be so foolish as to allow being charged. In view of this, what warrant has the Minister of Railways to say to the House or to the country, that the government would not be foolish enough to allow a charge of twenty-five cents. The minister gave us a construction of clauses (B) and (C) in the regulations, and he said that these two clauses must stand separate and apart as they meant separate and distinct things. Well, it is perfectly apparent to any one that such a construction as that can only be placed upon these clauses by torturing the English language. One clause says :

> The grantees shall compensate the owners of any mining claim.

The next clause says :

> Any question of compensation arising under this grant shall be determined, &c.

Why, it is absolutely plain that they cannot be read apart, and if it lacked any further evidence than the mere reading, look at clause (F) of the very same regulation in regard to the charge that is to be made, and see what it says. Does that clause use the word 'compensation ?' Not at all. It says that the 'charge' which the grantee shall make and so on. And if you want any further evidence look at the order made on the 7th of December, following, and see what that says. Clause (S) of the regulations therein contained uses the same language as in clause (F) which I have referred to, and instead of the word 'compensation' the word 'charge' is used there again. It seems to be only playing with the matter for the Minister of Railways to submit such a construction to an intelligent House of Commons.

Then the Minister of Railways took occasion to refer to the very great exertions that were put forth by the government, and the long time it had occupied in the discussion of these Orders in Council before action was taken by the government. Well, it strikes me as a very singular thing, that if the government did take all the care and trouble that the Minister of Railways would have us believe it did take, to use his own words, in negotiating and perfecting the matter in this Order in Council; it is a very strange thing I say that when they got it perfected and fully negotiated and satisfactory, that they had not the courage to make it law. Why have they refused; why have they delayed in making it law ? If it is right it should have been made law at the time, and if it is not right it should never become law, and the government have a perfect right now in the interest of the country to cancel it. I submit for these reasons, and for the reasons that have been urged by other members on this side of the House, that the government ought to avail of the first opportunity of rescinding this Order in Council. They cannot show their disposition to serve the people of the Yukon better than by voting for the resolution that has been moved by my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain).

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker. For my part I have no fault to find with the argument which has been made by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Porter). May I be permitted to tender him my congratulations upon the fact that his speech has been singularly free from the fraud and fury which has characterized some of the previous utterances of members on that side of the House. But in all that has been said, no one so far as addressed himself to the question as to why the government was induced to pass this Order in Council and to give this concession to Mr. Treadgold and his associates. There must have been reason; there must have been some cause for the government to take the action which they have taken, and which is now challenged by the opposition. For my part I am quite ready to take that responsibility for our action which we owe to the House and to the country, and I do not despair that when the whole question has been examined by my hon. friends opposite, that even they will come to a different conclusion than that which has been expressed by them. The reason, and the wherefore, and the cause of this Order in Council, which in its disposition, I admit is somewhat unusual from the course ordinarily followed; the reason and the wherefore of this Order in Council is to be found in the history of the Klondike and in the conditions which now prevail there. The Yukon Territory is a territory embedded in gold, but in which there is a scarcity of water for mining operations. It is an established fact that at the present time there are claims which are worked with great profit, and there are other claims which could be worked with great profit also but for the fact that there is no water to work them. Early in the history of the Yukon the government was appealed to more than once to establish works whereby water could be collected for the purpose of affording facilities to the miners to work their claims. If you look at the several petitions which have been referred to this afternoon; if you look for instance at the petition of the board of trade, you will find that two things are demanded from the government. First of all it is asked that the Treadgold concession should be abolished. And, why ? Simply in order that something else may be substituted for it. That is to say, that as soon as the Treadgold concessions was abolished, the government

should substitute works of its own for the purpose of collecting water and distributing it to the miners of that locality. Here is the petition of the board of trade. The argument contained in it has been cited three or four times and it is not necessary for me to read it again, but the conclusion, so far as my memory serves me, has never been read yet, and here it is :

Your petitioners therefore pray :

(1) That the Order in Council of April 21, 1902, may be cancelled completely, and that no special privileges shall hereafter be granted within this territory with respect to wood, mining, water, or any other class of rights affecting the general public, but that all persons shall be restricted in such matters to the rights conferred upon every member of the community by the mining regulations.

(2) That the supply and distribution of water for general mining purposes within this territory shall not be controlled by any private person or corporation, but either that it shall be undertaken by the Dominion government as a public work, or the power shall be given to the commissioner of the Yukon Territory in council to construct such a system and to raise the necessary funds by bonds guaranteed by the Dominion.

This was the alternative presented to us. There was a consensus of opinion among all the miners of the Yukon that the systems in existence were not adequate to the people's needs, and that something had to be done for collecting water, creating power and distributing water to the miners. How was that to be done ? We were asked to do it as a government work, providing the money by the issue of bonds or otherwise. The matter was looked into, and we found that works of that character demanded by the Yukon board of trade would cost millions of dollars—more than one million, and, if my information is correct, more than two million.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. More than $5,000,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. More than $5,000,000 I am told. The government were not prepared to expend such an amount of money for the purpose of creating the necessary power to distribute water ; and I want to know if hon. gentlemen opposite, who have criticised the action of the government in this matter, and who have constituted themselves champions of the miners of the Yukon, would be prepared to support the government in expending $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 in order to provide these works.

Mr. OSLER. Might I ask the hon. Prime Minister on whose or what report he bases the estimates for $5,000,000 ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I understand that it is upon the report of all the engineers who have tested the question. I am not prepared to say myself, though I am so informed, that these works would cost $5,000,000 ; but I am prepared to stake all the reputation I have that all the estimates will agree that they would cost at least $2,000,000 ; and I ask the hon. gentleman if he is prepared to advise the government to spend $2,000,000 in order to provide the works demanded by the miners of the Yukon. Nobody would ask the government to do that ; and if it was not to be done by the government, it would have to be done by private enterprise. Application was made to us. Capitalists came to us declaring that they would be prepared to undertake the risk and make the expenditure. We made a contract with them, if I remember rightly, in the summer of 1901. The contract was published in the Yukon, and exception was taken to it. It was represented among other things that the price we had fixed for the sale of water was too high. We had put it at one dollar. On investigation, I am bound to say, we found that it would be on the average too high. There is no question so difficult to determine as what should be the price of water in that district if such a work were to be undertaken. One dollar an inch in some places would not have been too much ; and in other places it would have been exorbitant. We reduced the price to twenty-five cents. We had a delegation of miners from the Yukon. That delegation was alluded to this afternoon by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and also by the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle). We discussed the matter with the miners, and they convinced us that even twenty-five cents per miners' inch would be exorbitant in some instances, and we had to provide another method. We cancelled all the Orders in Council, and passed another. We were criticised for doing so. What were we to do ? Were we to remain idle, while the miners in the Yukon were asking us to give them facilities to work their claims ? Only the richest claims were being worked. There were others that might be worked, but owing to the lack of facilities for water, they were not being worked effectively. Therefore we had to provide other methods. If we had failed to respond to the demands of the Yukon miners, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would have been the first to blame us. Whether we act or do not act we are sure to be blamed by hon. gentlemen opposite. We thought that the worst we could do was to remain idle ; and we determined to do our best to meet the views and wishes of the mining population of the Yukon, who wanted facilities to enable them to carry on their operations. Therefore we passed the Order in Council which hon. gentlemen opposite ask the House to censure us for passing. Now, I am prepared to discuss this Order in Council. I am prepared to meet my hon. friends on the other side of the House in regard to the salient points of the attack they have made upon us. What is the first disposition of this order ? It is a very natural

one. It provides that these Treadgold concessionaires shall have the power to erect dams and do all the work necessary in the bed of the Klondike river, between the mouth of the river and Flat creek, in order to create a generating power for electric purposes. But if we did that we ran the risk perhaps of interfering with the operations of the miners who have concessions in the Klondike river and who might be deprived of their water. If we made no provision against that, we might be subject to censure ; but the first thing we did was to provide that, prior even to the right of the company, the miners on the Klondike river would have a primary right to a flow of water sufficient to carry on their operations. Here is what the order says :

The sole right to divert and take water from the Klondike river at any point or points between its entry into the Yukon river and Flat creek for the purpose of generating power with which to pump water to work the auriferous deposits in the district (hereinafter termed 'the district') comprising the beds, banks, valleys, slopes and hills of the Klondike river, of Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks, and of their tributaries.

Provided, that licensed holders of mining locations situated on the Klondike river shall be entitled as against the grantees to the use free from toll of a flow of water sufficient for working their claims, but not exceeding in all three thousand five hundred (3,500) miners' inches, equal to five thousand two hundred and fifty (5,250) cubic feet per minute.

This is what is reserved—the right of every miner to have his claim given priority to that of the company. The miners shall take the water first. No matter what improvements are made by the company, there shall be no interference with the rights of private miners in the Klondike. If it be possible in any way to safeguard the interests of the miner more effectively, I would like to know it. The company having erected its works is given the privilege of selling the power itself to anybody who wants it, and for any purpose whatever. But is the company allowed to sell the power at its own price, or to create such a monopoly as would destroy the operations of other industries ? No, Sir. A check is put upon the company—that same check which we impose in the case of similar concessions—and that is the power given the Governor General in Council to regulate the price. The Order in Council reads as follows :—

Provided that if any power is developed and rendered available by the grantees under this section which they do not make use of, then the same shall be offered for sale to the public and the rates to be charged therefor shall be subject to the control of the Governor General in Council.

This is the method always followed in this country in similar cases. It is the method by which we regulate the tolls on railways and by which we are asked to regulate the tolls of the telephone companies, and it is the best method yet devised in this country for the working of such franchises. Another power is given the company. The first object for which the company was granted its privileges was to collect and to distribute the water so that all these claims—bench claims, for instance—which are not now being worked may be operated. What is the provision on this point ? That provision has been criticised. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has taken the ground that we have not provided any check to prevent the company charging what it likes. I am prepared to discuss that point with my hon. friend. Let me call his attention to this point. It is a point which has been already made by my hon. colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals. But I want to call the attention of my hon. friend from Montmorency to it again. For I do not despair of my hon. friend. If he will only forget that he is a lawyer and bear in mind that he may, some time, be a judge and have to exercise a judicial mind and a judicial authority. I do not despair of convincing him that we have made all the provisions necessary to protect the miners against the greed of the company. Here is what I find in the Order in Council, and what my hon. friend very deliberately and adroitly avoided this afternoon. The right is given—

Subject to the regulations hereinafter contained, to use, distribute and dispose of the water delivered by the grantees within the district.

This is very clear. The right is given the company to use, distribute and dispose of, by sale or otherwise, the water delivered by the grantees within the district. Let me now call the attention of my hon. friend to the regulations imposed in this connection. The regulations are not there simply for an ornament. They must be held to have a meaning. What are these regulations ? They are as follows :—

The grantee shall allow all free miners within the district to tail his sluices, hydraulics, ground sluices and drains, free of charge, in the flumes and drains of the grantees, yet not in such a way as to damage or obstruct the free working of the flumes and drains of the grantees by rocks, stones, boulders or otherwise.

Therefore the moment the company constructs a flume facing a claim, the owner of the claim has the right at once to bring his sluices to the flume and take the water. He has no permission to ask. The company cannot refuse. The right is guaranteed to him, whether the company is willing or not, to take his sluices to the flume and draw the water. My hon. friend will agree that the miner has no permission to ask, and that the moment he has tailed his sluice to the flume the water of the company flows into his sluice, and he is at liberty to use it. What follows ? There must be compensation. If

the miner and the company agree upon a price, there is nothing more to be said, but if they do not, then section C comes in :

Any question of compensation arising under this grant shall be determined judicially by the Gold Commissioner, subject to the appeal of the Territorial Court of the district, and the said court may, on special circumstances being shown, make an order for the taking of further evidence.

I would ask my hon. friend from Montmorency to take the case as it stands. Let him suppose that he is the Gold Commissioner for the Yukon. The company has erected its works. I am a miner and have taken my sluice to the flume, and am using water from the flume to wash out my gold dirt. The company cannot prevent me from using the water. It cannot prevent me from taking my sluice to its flume, but the company says : You will pay me so much. I reply that its price is an exorbitant one. Then we go before Mr. Casgrain, the Gold Commissioner, and he determines what compensation shall be paid. If that is not clear, there is nothing clear. If that is not law, there is no law.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If I should give judgment in that sense, my judgment would be unanimously reversed on appeal.

The PRIME MINISTER. Let me tell my hon. friend that he minimizes his own ability to give a judgment which would be according to law, justice and equity, and to the terms of this agreement.

My hon. friend may point to the abandoned claims. In the first Order in Council—the Order in Council which was passed in June, 1901—we had given to the company the abandoned claims. That seemed to me perfectly fair. If a miner had abandoned his claims, it was perfectly fair to give the company the right to enter into that claim and work it, but when a delegation came from the Yukon a year ago last winter, they represented that, though perfectly fair, it might work great injustice. To-day a claim may be abandoned because there is not sufficient water to work it. But, as soon as this work has been done, as soon as it is possible for the miners to use the water, which it is contemplated they will receive if this agreement comes into force, the claims which are valueless now will become valuable. This was such a good reason that we determined to give this privilege. The privilege is given to the company of taking and working abandoned claims, subject to the payment of no fees except the royalty on the output, and for this purpose to enter upon Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks, such right to be exercised only when the grantees by the construction of works in pursuance of this franchise are in the position to deliver water upon such claim or claims for the working thereof. That is all. So long as the work is not completed, they cannot take possession of any claim. But when the works are completed, when they can supply water to all the miners, if any of the miners then abandon their claims, surely there is nothing wrong in the company taking the abandoned claim and trying to work it for their own benefit. So far, it seems to me that no misconception can exist in relation to this matter.

That is the Order in Council we have passed—I have gone over the salient points, and I think we have satisfactorily answered all the objections raised. I am aware that the miners in the Yukon still are not satisfied ; I am aware that they have passed resolutions against it; I have received resolutions, as for instance from the Liberal Association, on this subject. I do not know if that resolution has been quoted by my hon. friends on the other side. They have quoted so many this afternoon, that, while I have endeavoured to follow them all closely, this one may have escaped me. Still, if it has been quoted before it will bear repetition. This is a petition sent to me personally :

The petition of the Liberal Association of Dawson of the Yukon Territory humbly showeth :—

1. That this supply of water and power to the miners on the creeks is one of the most serious questions affecting the Yukon Territory.

2. That in the opinion of your petitioners the provision of a water system whereby the miners may be furnished with water on fair and reasonable terms can best be dealt with by the government itself and should not be allowed to fall under the control of private individuals.

That the development of the resources of the Yukon has been seriously impeded by the appropriation of extensive areas of rich placer ground by hydraulic concessions believed in some instances to have been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation :

Your petitioners therefor pray :

That the Order in Council of April 21, 1902, granting certain rights and privileges to Malcolm Orr-Ewing, A. N. C. Treadgold, and Walter Barwick may be rescinded absolutely, that the government institute forthwith a careful investigation by competent engineers and obtain reports on the subject with a view to undertaking the construction of a public water supply as a national enterprise.

Well, Sir, notwithstanding the respect which a man has always for his own friends, and notwithstanding the high opinion I entertain of the petitioners who are my own political friends, I cannot but feel that they have put the cart before the horse. They say in effect: First cancel the concession and then hold an investigation. I think it would have been more logical to ask us first to have an investigation and then, if need be, cancel the Treadgold concession. And that is just what we intended to do. After the investigation we shall know whether the Treadgold concession should be cancelled or not. But, Sir, let us note the consequence. My friends of the Liberal Association ask us, if we cancel the Treadgold concession, to establish a national work to give them

the water they want. I have only to say this in answer to the observations made by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Porter). He asks, speaking of the Order in Council : Why have you refused to make this law; why have you not proclaimed it; why have you not gazetted it ? For the simple and obvious reason that we have received objections and remonstrances against it. We have amended it again and again so as to make it acceptable to the miners of the Yukon. Still, though we have amended it, in my opinion, in a way that should make it acceptable, still we have remonstrances from the board of trade and political associations asking us not to carry it further, but to cancel it. Before we proclaim it, before we place it beyond the possibility of being abolished, it is only fair and reasonable that we should investigate all the matters connected with it to see what should be done in the future. I am giving the reasons, why I think, we were justified in making this Order in Council, at all events, why the motion that is presented by my hon. friend should not be accepted by this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Did I correctly understand the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to give the opinion that these Orders in Council came into force only when they were gazetted ?

The PRIME MINISTER. So far as that is concerned, the others were cancelled.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is a remarkable answer. I ask my right hon. friend the question whether he expressed the opinion that these orders came into force only after they are gazetted. And he says they are cancelled. What was the use of cancelling them if they never came into force ? Will the right hon. gentleman tell me that ? It seems to me remarkable that the right hon. gentleman, who has studied this question for two or three years, can give no other answer to what seems to me a fair and courteous question than that which he has just given. I venture to say that the Order in Council of June, 1901, was acted upon over and over again, though it was not gazetted. I asked my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) whether it was gazetted, and I have a memorandum from him stating that it was not. Yet any one who has perused the file of correspondence knows that that Order in Council was regarded as valid and was acted upon. Yet he stands here and ventures to tell this House, and through this House the country, that an Order in Council is not valid until it is gazetted. I do not think he had better chide us on this side for not knowing what we are talking about when he places himself in a position of that kind.

My right hon. friend has told us something about this petition of his Liberal friends in the Yukon, and has taken about as logical a position with regard to that as with regard to the gazetting of these Orders in Council. He says that his Liberal friends in the Yukon have asked too much when they demand that this shall be made a national work. It is a pity that he was not always as careful about the requests made to him by his Liberal friends in different parts of Canada. He seemed very sensitive about this request. But is it necessary because his friends in the Yukon ask him to do something unreasonable that he should turn a deaf ear to a portion of this petition—

> The development of the resources of the Yukon has been seriously impeded by the appropriation of extensive areas of rich placer ground by hydraulic concessions believed in some instances to have been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation.

Because they ask him to make this a national work, is it necessary that he should turn a deaf ear to the statement of his own political friends—a statement which is corrobated by the city council and the board of trade of the Yukon—that these concessions have been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation. My hon. friend the Postmaster General tells us that the government have been deliberating a long time about holding an investigation into this matter. Since when have the government been intending to hold an investigation ? And how does it happen, if they have been intending to hold an investigation into these matters, that, up to the present time, no investigation whatever was spoken of in the House until this matter was brought up on this side ? Has my right hon. friend any explanation of that, because if he has, I will sit down and give him a chance to make it to the House. Apparently my right hon. friend has none. Then further than that, I would invite his attention to this clause of that same petition by his Liberal friends :

> That an inquiry may be set on foot to ascertain the circumstances under which the leading hydraulic concessions were obtained, in order that action may be taken by the Attorney General of Canada in the premises.

What are the premises ? The premises are that these mining concessions were obtained by fraud and misrepresentation, and my right hon. friend who is responsible more than any other Minister of the Crown for the government of Canada, has not up to the present time seen fit to instruct his Attorney General to take the proceedings demanded by his Liberal friends in the Yukon. What further is there ?

> That the Attorney General of Canada do issue a fiat, authorizing proceedings to be taken in his name in every case where action is begun against an hydraulic concession in which fraud or misrepresentation is charged, including all such actions as are now pending.

So I think, even if my right hon. friend comes to the conclusion that it is not expedient in the public interest to begin these works as public works, he finds ample food

for thought, for consideration, and what is more, for action, in the suggestions which have been made to him by his own political friends in the Yukon, who are familiar with these matters as no member of this House can be familiar with them. Has my right hon. friend the slightest idea as to what these gentlemen mean when they refer to fraud and misrepresentation by which these concessions have been obtained ? Has he heard anything during the past year ? Has anything been communicated to him ? Have any documents been shown to him ? Has he understood anything on this subject which he has not communicated to the House to-night ? Can he enlighten us as to what his Liberal friends in the Yukon mean when they say deliberately that these concessions have been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation ? Perhaps some information on those points would not have been out of place when my right hon. friend proceeded to enlighten this House to-night with regard to this Treadgold concession.

Great deliberation was exercised in making this concession, says my right hon. friend, and says the Postmaster General, a deliberation of such extreme value that the sum of $1 per miners' inch was placed as the price to be paid by the miners of this country to those gentlemen who were being urged to accept this concession, a price which, within six months afterwards, was reduced by the government to twenty-five cents, and that reduction, I believe, was made with the consent of the concessionaires themselves. Yet my right hon. friend, and the Minister of Railways and Canals who enlarged upon the work performed by a sub-committee of the Privy Council, and the presence of a certain gentleman on it who now occupies a seat on the judicial bench, these gentlemen tell us what a marvellous amount of deliberation was bestowed by the government on these matters. Was there any difficulty in finding out what would be a fair price for the miners' inch ? How long does it take to communicate with the Yukon? Is there not a telegraph line which this government has erected, and which communicates with other telegraph lines in this country ? Could not my right hon. friend have got an answer back the next day ? How long does it take a letter to go ? What was the need of the extreme haste with regard to this matter which led the government to fix a price to be paid by the miners of that country for water to be supplied by these concessionaires, which their own action, six months afterwards, proved to be absolutely ridiculous and absurd? Yet my right hon. friend gets up and informs the House and the country, indeed two ministers of the Crown get up and inform the House and the country of the wonderful amount of time that was spent in deliberating upon the terms of this concession, and of the remarkable value of the services which they rendered to the country in giving their time and attention to this subject, and in framing a regulation which gave to the miners of the Yukon the privilege of paying one dollar per miner's inch for the use of water.

Now there are one or two observations made, both by the Minister of Railways and Canals and by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, which I am bound to say I did not expect to hear from either one of these gentlemen; because they both have reputations as lawyers in this country, and I hardly expected that either one of them would have adopted the argument in this House with regard to the meaning of this word 'compensation' which has been put forward by both of them. My right hon. friend has carefully assured the House that there is a provision in this Order in Council by which the price which the miners are to pay for water to be furnished to them is to be controlled by some tribunal, that is to say, by the Gold Commissioner, subject to appeal to the Territorial Court of the district. Did my right hon. friend, did the Minister of Railways and Canals, read the first Order in Council ? Did either one of them take the trouble to read that, and did they see at the end of it the subsection (f) in the regulations, which provides that the charge which the grantee should be entitled to make for the use of such water on such claim should not exceed one dollar per miners' inch per hour ? Those regulations are precisely the regulations which are also contained in the second Order in Council, and which are relied upon by my right hon. friend and by the Minister of Railways and Canals as determining the price to be paid. Will my right hon. friend say that these words fulfil any office in the second Order in Council ? which they do not fulfil in the first Order in Council ? Will the Minister of Railways and Canals say that ? Well, I think not. Here is the language of the first Order in Council :

(b.) The grantees shall compensate the owner of any mining claim or lands for any damage which any such owner may sustain by reason of any of the grantees' works breaking or being imperfect.

(c.) Any question of compensation arising under this grant shall be determined judicially by the Gold Commissioner, subject to appeal to the Territorial Court of the district, and the said court may upon special circumstances being shown, make an order for the taking of further evidence.

(f.) The charge which the grantees shall be entitled to make for the use of such water on each claim shall not exceed one dollar per miners' inch per hour.

Now, my right hon. friend bases his argument on the contention that provisions in (b) and (c) which I have read to the House, are contained in the second Order in Council and provide ample security to the miner that he should not be overcharged. Why, if these hon. gentlemen had not stood up in this House and made such an argument to-night, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I would

not have believed that they would have attempted to make such an argument. Are not the same provisions contained in the first Order in Council which definitely fixes the charge ? Further than that, if anything were necessary to be added, let my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways look at the top of page two of the second Order in Council and see what is there contained :

Provided that if any power is developed and rendered available by the grantees under this section which they do not make use of, then the same shall be offered for sale to the public, and the rates to be charged therefor shall be subject to the control of the Governor General in Council.

What was the need of such a regulation as that if the provisions contained in the regulation quoted by my right hon. friend were quite sufficient for the purpose ? Why, Mr. Speaker, any one who looks at this Order in Council, who looks down the first, second and third pages, will see everywhere that these concessionaires for the purposes of their undertaking have the right of entering upon and using private lands, and every one knows that rights of that kind are not usually granted without provision for compensation. Therefore, it would be an absurd thing to expect that in an Order in Council of that kind you should not find, either in the Order in Council itself or in some regulation attached to it, a provision that acts, done in derogation of those private rights should be compensated for by the individuals who have committed those acts. It is the most reasonable and the most natural thing in the world; and yet my right hon. friend and the Minister of Railways and Canals seek to torture those words, and to make the people of the Yukon believe that there is some guarantee and some safeguard to the miners in the words which are contained in the first Order in Council as well as in the second.

Now, this matter has been gone over very fully by hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House and I was pleased with the frankness with which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) admitted beyond all question that this concession is a monopoly. He says it is a monopoly, and he says you must have a monopoly there because you cannot develop a country without creating a monopoly, and he says further that the miners of the Yukon do not know what is good for them. They do not understand their own true interests, that a monopoly of this kind is necessary in the interests of the miners of the Yukon Territory and with considerable force and with all the vigour and all the energy that are so characteristic of the hon. Minister of Railway and Canals he insists that the miners of the Yukon really need this monopoly although they are protesting loudly to this parliament and to the whole country that their interests are being absolutely destroyed by these regulations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have said that they needed it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They have said that they needed it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but they want the government to furnish it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That they needed this concession ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They said that they needed this water.

Mr. BORDEN Halifax). That they needed water ? They have water in the Klondike river and there is one mine owner in that district who raises 1,500 gallons of water per minute for his own use to a height of 300 feet at a cost of less than 25 cents per inch. I will give the exact figures in regard to it. There is one man who has done for his own property and at much less expense a considerable portion of what is proposed to be done by these concessionaires under this second Order in Council. I brought this matter to the attention of the House last year, I have a memorandum under my hand and if I thought it necessary to stop for the purpose I could give it to the House again.

I would like to ask my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) where are the details of these different schemes that were proposed to the government. In the Order in Council that was passed in June, 1901, we had a very pretty recital in these words :

Whereas, the details of different schemes submitted have been considered and discussed.

I do not see the details of any of the different schemes brought down for the information of the House, and if, as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals stated, different persons came and proposed different schemes to the government it seems a singular thing that the House should be deprived at this late date of the inestimable privilege of reading them and of considering what these different schemes really were.

Now, my hon. friend the member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) made some reference in the course of his remarks to the hon. member who represents the Yukon (Mr. Ross), a very able, and I believe, a very estimable gentleman, although I do not know him sufficiently well to understand whether or not he is worthy of all the encomiums which have been bestowed upon him in the government organ in the Yukon, or whether he can be called a 'lightning striker' on all occasions. Whether he can be called a lightning striker on most occasions, I do not know, but certainly in so far as this Treadgold concession is concerned, he cannot be considered a lightning striker because this parliament has

been in session for eight weeks, and although that hon. gentleman was elected on a platform which pledged him to secure the repeal of this concession, he has not been able to attempt anything in regard to it. I was greatly amused indeed to hear the hon. Postmaster General boasting of the return of the hon. gentleman who at present is the representative of the Yukon Territory. I was particularly amused at that because the very platform on which that hon. gentleman was elected to this House was a platform which denounced the action of this government in regard to its administration of the Yukon Territory. Although the election of the hon. gentleman was heralded through the press of this country as a victory for the government, and as a certificate of good character for this government in regard to the Yukon Territory, it was a certificate of exactly the opposite nature because the hon. gentleman who now fills the position of representative of the Yukon would have been snowed under by 1,500 of a majority had he not pledged himself upon the public platform and through his duly authorized agents in that territory to do all he could upon coming to this parliament to remedy the evils caused by this government and particularly in regard to the concessions that have been spoken of. There is no doubt of that because the present Gold Commissioner of the Yukon, when certain eastern newspapers had reached Dawson and when he had read that these newspapers proclaimed that this was a Liberal victory, took occasion to write to a newspaper in the Yukon Territory to say that it was nothing of the kind and that the truth was that Liberals and Conservatives had joined together in support of that hon. gentleman who now represents the Yukon because he had pledged himself to undo the wrongs which had been done by this government and because they thought him more capable of obtaining a remedy for these wrongs than the gentleman who was his opponent on that occasion. Let the Postmaster General not descend to any pettiness of that kind because his own Gold Commissioner, appointed by him only a few weeks ago, has taken occasion to rebuke utterances of that kind and the language which he used then in rebuking these eastern newspapers is just as much a rebuke to the hon. Postmaster General for the language which he had used to-day. Now, the hon. Postmaster General talked in the style that has been heard sometimes in this House about irresponsible individuals who are making charges. When he was asked by my hon. friend from Cornwall to whom he referred by irresponsible individuals, the hon. Postmaster General was somewhat at a loss to answer, and eventually, on being asked if he made the assertion that the board of trade of Dawson was irresponsible he took back——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never made that assertion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, who was it that the hon. gentleman referred to as being irresponsible? Has the hon. gentleman, after cogitating over that matter for an hour, discovered who is irresponsible? I want the House to understand that he did not refer to one irresponsible individual but to irresponsible individuals. It is not the board of trade, it is not the city council, it is not his Liberal friends, it is not the members of the Liberal Association, it is not the editor of the government organ. We are reduced to the editor of the independent journal in the Yukon, who apparently is the only person to whom the hon. gentleman refers when he mentions irresponsible individuals. I will give the hon. minister some responsible individuals and I will give him some of their utterances, because my hon. friends who have been addressing the House to-night, have forgotten a very excellent presentment of this case which is to be found in a report of a committee appointed at a mass meeting of Yukon citizens, and I will tell him when I get through who it was who signed this report and I will ask the hon. gentleman whether he regards this individual as being irresponsible:

> The undersigned who were appointed by the general committee nominated at the mass meeting held at Dawson on the evening of Monday, the seventeenth of February instant, as a sub-committee to collect information and make a report in regard to the objectionable features of the Treadgold concession, beg to report as follows——

The hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will observe that this committee took credit to themselves for doing what the government did. They collected information about this concession. They took apparently as much trouble in regard to it as the government might have taken considering the figure which the government directed the miners to pay for the water furnished them by the concessionaires. Then this is the result of their deliberations:

> It is easy to understand how intelligent gentlemen at the capital should be misled both as to the value of the water supply contemplated by the Treadgold concession, as to the size of the capital proposed to be invested by him and as to the value of the concessions made to him, but in the opinion of your committee no one in possession of the information which your committee has been able to obtain, by search at the gold commissioner's office, by numerous interviews with miners, engineers, and other men practically acquainted with the conditions of this territory, and from every source available, can doubt that the supply of water contemplated by the scheme of the applicants for the concession is a mere stalking horse under cover of which he may obtain absolute possession of enormous mining tracts practically embracing the richest known mining district in the territory.

Perhaps, in order to secure the attention of the Postmaster General to this, I may tell him that this report is signed by a very important friend of his. It continues :

It seems to your committee that while from a logical or scientific point of view the instruments containing the Treadgold concession are of a most imperfect and inartistic kind.

Notwithstanding, you will observe the great work of preparation which the government put upon it.

They are, from the point of view of Mr. Treadgold and his associates, framed with clever adroitness.

Does not my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) think that, after all, Mr. Treadgold put more work upon it than did the government ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It continues :

They are complex, involved and obscure, and as a consequence difficult to readily understand, and appear to have been purposely framed in that way to deceive into the belief that the Treadgold people were conferring an enormous benefit on the country and were receiving small return, whereas they are in effect giving little or nothing and receiving vast benefits.

What a different view they seem to take of the situation from that which my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals presented with so much ardour to the House to-night. He wanted something attractive for capitalists. He told us you could not get capitalists to come forward unless you had something attractive, so the government were bound to make this attractive—and I don't know whether the capitalists made it attractive also or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The report continues :

Your committee has special reports made by individual members of the committee on the various features of the concession, which reports have been submitted to the committee and approved by it and are herewith attached and returned to the general committee for its information.

To summarize the many opinions and views adverse to the concession is most difficult, but your committee desires to lay special stress on the following particulars :—

(1.) That the concession instruments ignore to a very large extent and override the rights and vested interests already created by private enterprises and private capital.

(2.) That Treadgold makes no adequate covenants to insure fair and reasonable supply of water to miners who may require it.

(3.) That the maximum of price is too high and that his powers of impounding water and obtaining abandoned claims and his exclusive, sole and prior right with regard to water, afford him a most potent lever to compel payment of his exorbitant rates of abandonment of property.

(4.) That the closing to the prospector and the miner of large tracts of country, the ignoring of private rights, the exclusive rights and the other special privileges granted to the concession, will create a state of uncertainty in the most important section of the community that will be most injurious to the interests of the territory and will tend both to deprive the government of revenue and the business community of the territory of a large branch of trade.

(5.) That the expropriation clauses are not framed with due regard to the rights of individual owners and have no adequate provisions for indemnification.

I may say, of course, I should perhaps have explained before reading this : that it is directed to the Order in Council as at first framed, and whatever benefit my hon. friends on the other side can get from any differences between the first Order in Council and this Order in Council, they, of course, go to mitigate any criticism in the document I am reading. But I entirely agree with the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House to-night, and who have said that so far as the interests of this country are concerned, and so far as the protection of the Yukon miners is concerned, there is very little difference indeed between the concessions granted under the first Order in Council and that granted by the Order in Council of last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This report continues :

In conclusion your committee very greatly fear that if the concession is allowed to stand in its present form and without most radical amendments and alterations that a monopoly will be created that will practically comminate the richest part of the Yukon Territory. In the opinion of your committee the best scheme for supplying water for mining purposes would be one initiated, operated and controlled by the government, but above all it is undesirable that a monopolist of the water supply should at the same time be a competitor in mining operations with miners dependent upon him for their water supply.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And it is one of the most powerful criticisms that has ever been made against this concession granted to Treadgold and his associates : that not only do you put these gentlemen in practical control of the water supply of the Yukon, but you also put them in actual and every day competition with the very men to whom they are to supply that water.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

An hon. MEMBER. Who signs that report ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We will come to the signature in a moment. It concludes :

Your committee believes that the government has been deceived in this matter, and if a commission were appointed to obtain evidence regarding the true facts of the matter, ample grounds would be furnished to justify the government in rescinding the various Orders in Council, and other instruments relating to the concession, if not in toto, at all events, in so far as they are most objectionable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do you suppose that that report is signed by one of those irresponsible gentlemen who have been referred to by my hon. friend the Postmaster General to-night? Well, I do not know whether the Postmaster General will regard him as irresponsible or not. His name is Fred. T. Congdon, chairman of that committee, and at present he occupies the high position of Commissioner to the Yukon, to which he was appointed by this government just about one year after he signed that document.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to my right hon. friend that one of two propositions is true: Either there is something in these matters that have been so alleged, which the government should have investigated long ago, or else Mr. Fred. T. Congdon is not fit to be Commissioner of the Yukon.

An hon. MEMBER. Governor of the Yukon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Governor of the Yukon, or commissioner, or whatever his official title is; he has put his name as chairman of that committee to a document which contains as grave an indictment of this concession as anything which has been said on this side of the House to-night—as grave an indictment of this concession, I repeat, as anything which has been said by any gentleman on this side of the House to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And yet, without such investigation as is demanded here; without the government making any such amendment in that Order in Council as removes the objectionable features complained of, that gentleman takes the position of commissioner to the Yukon, and I believe he has lately said to the people of that country: that this question of the Treadgold concession is one to be dealt with by the government and the parliament here at Ottawa. And, Sir, we are now trying to get this government in this parliament to deal with it, and we are proposing a resolution here to-night which does not go one whit further in condemnation of this Treadgold concession than the voice of not only the business men of the Yukon, not only the civic government of the Yukon, but even of those gentlemen in the Yukon who are the best friends and supporters of the government that stands at the head of affairs in Canada to-day. And yet my right hon. friend thinks apparently that there is nothing in this complaint which demands any attention at the hands of this House, or which requires this House to hasten the action of the government by some such resolution as that which has been proposed by my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). I shall not go into the argument of the legal question. I have heard no answer to the argument which has been put forward by my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and by my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) and the other hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House to-night.

Until there is some answer given to it other than that which I have heard, I do not think it is worth while for me to take up the time of the House in attempting to discuss that question. In conclusion, it seems to me, not only from the legal standpoint, but, what is even of more importance from the standpoint of public policy in regard to these concessions, that the resolution which has been proposed to the House by my hon. friend from Montmorency is one that ought to command the support of this House and that ought to be assented to by this government; and this Treadgold concession, which has created so much scandal in that western country, should once and for all be done away with. If the government decides to deal with this matter, let it deal with it by open competition among people throughout the country who are willing to undertake a work of this kind. Let it deal with it in such a way that there shall be competition after the waterworks shall be once established. Let it deal with it in such a way at least that the government shall have complete and ample supervision over their operations after it has once established them in that country.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick). Mr. Speaker, with all the skill and all the ingenuity which is born of long experience in the disputes of the courts, my hon. friend who proposed this motion, and those who spoke previous to the leader of the opposition laboured strenuously to establish two things: First, that this concession was issued illegally and improvidently, and second, that the miners do not approve of it. I said that my hon. friends laboured strenuously to establish these two propositions, and I am forced to admit, in view of the heat displayed by the hon. leader of the opposition, that he must be thoroughly convinced that they did not labour successfully.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He found it necessary to add another count to the indictment which is brought against this concession, and he added, not by direct statement, but by inference, by suggestion, the charge of fraud. Now, my answer to that is that if the hon. leader of the opposition was in earnest, if he really meant what he said when he stated that this concession was tainted with fraud, it was his clear duty to say so in the motion he submitted for the consideration of this House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is my hon. friend referring to me?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am referring to the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not quite sure. In the remarks I made I read merely a quotation from the Liberal club in the Yukon, and I said that statements made by gentlemen of the standing which I attributed to those gentlemen deserved consideration at the hands of this government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend rested his case largely on that; but I said a moment ago that he proceeded further, and made the charge, not openly, but by means of an insinuation. I repeat the statement now, and I immediately proceed to prove it. My hon. friend said, in discussing this matter, that the hon. Minister of Railways suggested that this concession had to be made attractive to capitalists, and he added that the capitalists had made it attractive to other people. Tell me what that means if it is not an insinuation of fraud. Now, I say that if the hon. leader of the opposition intended to charge fraud, his clear duty was not to proceed by insinuation, but to make a direct charge.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The charge had already been made by the hon. gentleman's friends.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No friend of mine, or no man would continue to be a friend of mine, who would make a charge of that description, not being prepared to prove it. Now, my hon. friend did not go over the ground covered by my hon. friends who preceded him, and I think that I have substantially answered the greater part of his speech. I would like now merely to refer to what he said with respect to the Commissioner of the Yukon, Mr. Congdon, and I would like to draw the attention of the House to this fact, that the memorandum prepared by the present Commissioner of the Yukon Territory had reference to the first Order in Council, that that memorandum asked for amendments to that Order in Council, and that these amendments having been made, and that that gentleman having accepted the responsibility of taking the position of Commissioner of the Yukon, declared thereby that he was content with those amendments; and, so far as those amendments go, the answer to the memorandum to which my hon. friend alluded is complete. I shall endeavour now to deal with some things that fell from my hon. friends who preceded the hon. leader of the opposition. They tried to make good the last charge to which I have referred, that is to say, that the miners of the Yukon do not approve of this concession, by referring to newspaper articles and to resolutions passed at miners' meetings. With those who are not familiar with the strong, vigorous and picturesque language which characterizes those who frequent mining camps, those resolutions and articles must have some effect; but I for my part take the responsibility of saying that while those resolutions and articles may express the first opinions formed of these concessions by the miners of the Yukon, their sober, second thought is represented by the evidence they gave on the 2nd of December last, when they returned the government candidate with a majority of 891. This not only shows how, on sober, second thought, they considered this matter, but it also shows that they are satisfied that this government will lend not merely a patient and willing, but an anxious ear to any representations they have to make, and that as the first Order in Council was amended to suit their requirements, if in the second objections are to be found, these objections will be met in the same spirit in which the first objections were met at the time the second Order in Council was passed. I am satisfied that the miners of the Yukon have confidence that this government will deal with them fairly and equitably, and that when it can be established that there is any real grievance existing in any part of this Dominion, no matter how remote it may be, that grievance shall be remedied by this government when it is made known.

I am going to deal with the second Order in Council. I do not intend to discuss the first, because, having been repealed, it is absolutely out of the way. But so far as I have been able to follow the argument of my hon. friends on the other side of the House, their argument is that that second Order in Council was unconstitutional, was illegal, that it was not within the power of the government to pass it. In giving my answer to that, I want to say that I give my firm deliberate opinion, because I have had occasion to discuss this question very recently in the Supreme Court in connection with the question of royalty in the Yukon, when this whole question of Orders in Council with respect to mining in the Yukon was before the court. For the benefit of my hon. friends, I will tell them that they can find the whole report of the case in the current number of the Supreme Court reports, Volume 32, number 4. The cases begin at page 586.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are these the cases in which leave to appeal has been applied for ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN. And granted ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. Leave to appeal was applied for and granted on both sides. The Crown appealed on one question, and the miners on the other. We may as well state the facts clearly while we are at it. What is my reason for coming to the conclusion that it was within the powers of the government to make this Order in Council ? Section forty-seven of the Dominion Land Act, as amended, pro-

vides that the Governor in Council may make regulations to provide for the sale or lease or other disposal of mining property in the North-west Territories.

The North-west Territories of course include the Yukon. Then it is provided that the Governor in Council shall have the power by regulation to determine the conditions under which this property shall be disposed of. Acting on the power conferred by this section, mining regulations were made, as far back as 1889, authorizing a subordinate official in the Yukon to dispose of the mines there. But if the Governor in Council has the power to determine by regulation the conditions under which this property shall pass out of the hands of the Dominion government, surely he has the right to do that himself. Surely what the Governor General in Council can do by deputy, he can do by himself. That is my opinion, and I think, without boasting, that it may have some value. If the Governor General in Council can by regulation authorize a subordinate official to sell, surely he can as effectively sell, by virtue of a deed passed by the Council itself. That is at all events my opinion and I give it for what it is worth, and perhaps my hon. friends may in time come to the conclusion that it is worth something. The development district depends very largely upon the creation of hydraulic power. So long as you have rich mining deposits it is easy to take the gold from the bosom of the earth by the ordinary means which the individual miner controls. But when you have exhausted the richer deposits and have to deal with what is called a poor pay streak, then in order to work that successfully, you must have hydraulic power. Therefore, the only question is, whether or not, in the first instance, it was right for the government to authorize the development of that power by a private company, or whether it would have been proper for the government itself to develop it. Whether right or wrong, the conclusion come to by the government was that it was better to give the development of that power to a private corporation—that it was more in the interests of the country that the work should be done by a private company than by the government. The question for the House to consider is whether the granting of that power to a private corporation was surrounded by such conditions as would make the grant as advantageous to the public as possible and as little onerous to the miners. What are the terms of the grant? I am now dealing with the only Order in Council which is in existence. That Order in Council gives to Mr. Treadgold and his associates two things. First, the right to divert the Klondike river for the purpose of generating power. They have first the right to divert and take water from the Klondike river in order to develop power, which power is to be used for mining purposes, but what my hon. friends were careful to overlook is that the right thus given is made subject to the right, which is vested in every miner, of himself taking first from the river sufficient water for the working of his claim, but not to exceed 3,500 miners' inches. The miner has the first right to take that amount of water from the Klondike, and it is only after he has exercised that right that Mr. Treadgold and associates are entitled to take any water whatever for the purpose of generating power. What is the meaning of that right to take 3,500 miners' inches? Let us take the definition of a miners' inch given by my hon. friend from Montmorency. He says it is equal to a volume of water twelve feet square, so that if you multiply 3,500 by twelve feet square, you will see that volume of water which each miner is entitled to take per minute. In addition to the right to take from the river the water necessary to develop power, the company have the right to distribute water in the district. Let me quote the words of the concession so that you may understand the extent to which this right to divert the water goes. Subsection two provides that the company shall have:

> The prior right—subject to the provisions contained in clause one—to divert and take water from the Klondike river for distribution and use in the district up to 5,000 miners' inches.

That is the right they have got, and I should be curious for somebody to make me understand exactly what that means—the right to divert and to take up 5,000 miners' inches. After they have taken that, is their right exhausted?

Mr. HEYD. Out of that 5,000 how much is already disposed of to the miners?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The miner gets his 3,500 miners' inches first before everybod else. Under section ten, the company have an additional right, subject to no payment except the royalty prescribed upon output, to make an entry for and work any abandoned mining claim or claims on Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks, such right to be exercisable only when the grantees, by the construction of works in pursuance of this purchase, are in a position to deliver water upon such claim or claims for the working thereof. What does that section mean? It means that after the hydraulic works have been built and are in operation and the grantees are prepared to divert the water necessary to enable any man to take up an abandoned claim and work it, then, if no one else will take it up, they can do so. After the company have developed the power and taken the water and are ready to distribute it, then only, and not until then, have they the right to take up any abandoned claim. Any one else can take it in the interval.

My hon. friends have objected that they have the right to take up the abandoned claims without being subjected to the preliminary formality or obligation imposed upon the other miners, that is, of paying the entry fee and representation fee. What does the representation fee mean ? The word indicates its meaning. Any man may go on property and work it, but, in order that he may maintain his title to it, it is necessary for him to expend at least $200 to develop that property every year, because a mining location is granted for a year. But, if a man goes away from the country—say, for instance, water is scarce and the facilities are not such as to enable him to work his property successfully—he is represented by the $200 in lieu of the work to be done on the property. That is what is meant by 'representation.' What is the reason for this fee ? It is to provide that the properties may not lie fallow, not remain undeveloped. But, if you have such conditions as that in connection with this enterprise, to carry out which, I am told, it will be necessary to spend perhaps four or five millions of dollars to develop power—I know nothing about the facts, but I am told this is the case—and if they develop the power, and take an abandoned claim and seek to develop it, what is the use of a representation fee from them ? Are they not represented by the works they have done and by the utilizing of the power that they have created ? It seems to me that the reason of the exception in their favour in that respect is absolutely elementary. Now, my hon. friend was very severe and very sarcastic when he spoke of the legal members of the government who had occasion to give a legal construction to this concession. He was good enough to say that no first year's student—if I understood him—would venture to take the responsibility for the opinion expressed by, for instance, a gentleman with such a reputation at the bar as that of the hon. Minister of Railways—leaving out the other two. I am afraid he is going to have another legal student, because I hold, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the House, that the construction put upon the concession by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is arguable, and not only that it is arguable, but that it is the only construction that can be put upon the document if you are going to give effect to all its parts. Take, first, section 2 :

> The prior right to divert and take water from the Klondike river for distribution and use in the district up to five thousand miners' inches.

Then, section 9 :

> The right, subject to the regulations hereinafter contained, to use, distribute and dispose of by sale or otherwise the water delivered by the grantees within the district.

Section 2 is to be read in connection with section 9. The right to distribute the water and dispose of it by sale is vested in the concessionaires, subject to the regulations hereinafter contained. What are those regulations ? They are to be found on page 4. And one of them is that any question of compensation arising under the grant shall be determined judicially by the Gold Commissioner. I do not mean to say that that is drawn as artistically as it might be by a first-class lawyer. There may be better draughtsmen than the gentleman who drew this. But I say that it is susceptible of the construction put upon it, and if effect is to be given to it, this is the only construction. Then take section 10 :

> The right, subject to no payment except the royalties prescribed upon output to make entry for and work any abandoned mining claim or claims on Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks, such rights to be exercised only when the grantees by the construction of works in pursuance of this franchise are in a position to deliver water upon such claim or claims for the working thereof.

There is a provision again that they shall deliver the water on the claims for the working of the claims. How is the compensation to be settled ? By private bargain, or in the manner fixed by subsection c, of the regulations. There is no other way under the Order in Council to determine the question and make an authoritative decision. That is the only construction you can put upon it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) put the same construction on the first Order in Council ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not looking at the first Order in Council at all. That has passed out of the realm of discussion. I am not going to argue on a thing that is not in force.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think my hon. friend would argue that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend draws my attention to the fact that one of the grievances alleged by the miners of the Yukon country is that the hydraulic company would enter into competition with the miners. What is the hydraulic power for ? They develop the power and they take the abandoned claims—the claims that nobody else wants—and develop them. So far as the miner is concerned, he is entitled to his own property and he is working his own property. The company do not compete with them. It is not because the hydraulic miner is in the neighbourhood dealing with another property that he competes with the ordinary miner. I do not see how there could be competition. That is the way in which this Order in Council appeals to me. The people of the Yukon country require the water for the development of their property. And not only that, but it seems to me it would be a matter of oversight on the part of the government if, with the knowledge we have of the properties in that country, we were not prepared to encour-

age any one who was willing to go in and develop hydraulic power. Any man who will go in there and invest four or five million dollars to develop hydraulic power deserves to be encouraged. He is going into a patriotic work to enable us to develop the country, which, without that would develop very slowly and would never come to its full state of development. So long as the powers given to the company are surrounded by such safeguards as will enable them to operate for their own profit and advantage, but not to the detriment of the people of that country, there is no blame attachable to the government. What, in fact, is the concession ? It is a grant to the hydraulic company the right to take from the Klondike river a certain quantity of water to generate power. And that right can only be exercised after the miners have been satisfied to the extent of having 3,500 miners' inches. After they have received that quantity of water the balance may be taken for the purpose of generating power. It seems to me the point towards which my hon. friends opposite should have directed their attention, was to show that when we granted to the free miner that quantity of water, 3,500 inches, we granted them a quantity insufficient for their works. Not a single word has been said on that point. From the representations that come from the Yukon, and, so far as my knowledge goes, having listened attentively to all that has been read, it seems to me that there is a complete misapprehension on the part of those who have made representations with regard to the nature of this concession.

It seems to me that the miners of the Yukon should have shown that when we gave them that quantity of water we did not give them what was necessary to satisfy their demand. If we gave them water necessary to satisfy their demand, and if in addition we supplied them with this power, it seems to me they ought to be thankful to the government for what we have done. We give them what they wanted, and we give them the additional advantage they have now. It seems to me that is something to the credit of the government. The grantees have the right, it is true, to take water from the Klondike river and distribute it in the district. You understand there is a difference between taking water from the Klondike river for the purpose of generating power, and taking water for the purpose of distributing it. They have got that latter power also, but no representation has been made, no statement has been made that either of these rights vested in the Treadgold Company operate detrimentally to the miners. No statement has been made that the miner is not entirely satisfied with the right which he has to take his quantity of water in preference to all the others. In addition to that, they have the right to enter upon an abandoned claim and to work it. Now what does that mean ? It means that after they have developed this concession a year—and they have already had it for a year without spending any money upon it—after they are in a position to deliver water on these claims, if any one else wants the claims they are entitled to have them. That is all they have a right to with respect to these abandoned claims, and there is nothing more in it. Looking at it in that aspect, there is nothing in this that we cannot justify, nothing which we cannot all stand up for, nothing in it which does not show foresight, and careful consideration. But if there is anything wrong in it, as the Prime Minister said when he addressed the House, as the Postmaster General said when he addressed the House, we are prepared to listen, as we were originally, to any grievance that may be made known to us and we are prepared to remedy it.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). I think most gentlemen in this House must have been surprised to hear the Minister of Justice argue gravely that the sober second thought of the people of the Yukon was in favour of this Order in Council because they elected the Hon. Mr. Ross to represent them in this House. Surely the hon. gentleman, in saying that, must presume a good deal upon the forgetfulness of the members of this House. After it has been proved that the Hon. Mr. Ross was elected on the distinct platform that he would see to getting this Order in Council cancelled, to assert that the sober second thought of the people of the Yukon was in favour of the Order in Council is most extraordinary on the part of the Minister of Justice. I understood the Minister of Justice to say further that the present governor of the Yukon had changed his mind as to the expression of opinion read by the leader of the opposition a few minutes ago. I have here a paper printed in Dawson one month ago, containing an interview with the governor of the Yukon, who gave his opinion at that late date upon this very question. It is very emphatic, and I will read it :

> As to the Treadgold concession, I may say I favour its cancellation. I am in the same position with regard to the subject as I always have been.

And his opinion had been expressed in that strong language that was read a short time ago by the leader of the opposition.

> I am satisfied that he should have no more privileges than any one else. I will not say that I favour the total cancellation of the Treadgold concession, that is, I shall not put it in that way, but say I believe he should have no privileges that others do not have. As to what parliament is likely to do with the matter I cannot say.

If anybody could say more emphatically that he remains of the same opinion that he formerly expressed, I do not see in what words he might say it. Now I wish to refer

to a statute the Minister of Justice read, and to another statute that he did not read. Clause 47 that was read by the minister has this provision :

Lands containing coal or other minerals, including lands in the Rocky Mountains Park, should not be subject to the provisions of this Act respecting sale or homestead entry, but the Governor General in Council may, from time to time, make regulations for the working and development of mines on such lands, and for the sale, leasing, licensing or other disposal thereof.

That is sale or other disposal of the mines. But there is a section in the Yukon Territory Act passed in 1899, which reads :

Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Governor General in Council may make ordinances for the peace, order and good government of the territory.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What statute are you reading from ?

Mr. BARKER. This is the Yukon Territory Act of 1899, 62 and 63 Vic., Chap. 11, section 2.

Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Governor in Council may make ordinances for the peace, order and good government of the territory, and of Her Majesty's subjects and others therein; but no ordinance made by the Governor in Council, or the Commissioner in Council shall——

(c.) appropriate any public land or other property of Canada without authority of parliament.

That seems to me pretty clear and emphatic. But notwithstanding that Act, in this Order in Council the government did grant to Mr. Treadgold and his companions the right to purchase any Crown lands required by the grantees for the purpose of their works, at a price not exceeding $10 per acre. I think the Minister of Justice will have to admit, I do not see how he can get out of it, that this is in direct contravention of the Yukon Act which expressly provides that the Governor in Council shall not appropriate any public lands without the authority of parliament. The hon. gentleman then went on to argue upon other clauses of the Order in Council, and he laid some stress upon the provision that the properties of the grantee shall be exempt from representation, arguing that the reason they were exempted from the charges called 'representation' was because of the expenditures they were making, I presume, unusual expenditures. A few minutes afterwards the Minister of Justice tells us that they have been there for a year and have not spent a dollar, but under the very terms of the Order in Council they are not obliged to spend a dollar for six years; and yet during the whole of these six years they are free from the charges called representation. Surely by reason of this concession the public are excluded from these lands, while these people have practically a six years' option to use them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Read section 10.

Mr. BARKER—(reading) :

10. The right, subject to no payment except the royalty prescribed upon output, to make entry for and work any abandoned mining claim or cialms (and so on), such right to be exercisable only when the grantees by the construction of works in pursuance of this franchise are in a position to deliver water upon such claim or claims for the working thereof.

Certainly, but they have this right for six years, they can enter at any time within six years; the whole territory which comes within the provisions of this Order in Council is tied up subject to these conditions, and at any time within six years these concessionaires may come in and claim their rights. I was very much surprised, I confess, that the hon. Minister of Justice should have argued that there was nothing in the objection raised on this side of the House as to the construction of subclause (c) of the regulations in the last order. The hon. Minister of Justice said that he had nothing to say about the first Order in Council, but I think the House will see upon referring to the first one that there is a very substantial reason for the change. Not only do I think it is beyond doubt that the construction put upon clause C on this side of the House is the correct one, but by referring to subclause 3 of the old Order in Council, hon. gentlemen will see the reason for it. Subclause 3—I am reading now from the first Order in Council—says :

The grantees shall supply water to the owners of claims within the district subject to the regulations hereinafter contained.

When we turn to the regulations we find that there is a price put there for the water. If the hon. gentleman will show me in the second Order in Council one word from beginning to end that obliges these concessionaires to supply water, I would like to see it. This obligation has been deliberately omitted from the second Order in Council, and they have therefore omitted to mention any charge whatever for the water if the concessionaires do supply it. It is quite optional with these people to supply the water or not. There is not a word from beginning to end that obliges them to do it. Clause 9 gives them :

The right, subject to the regulations hereinafter contained to use, distribute and dispose of by sale or otherwise——

And so on. But it does not say that they shall supply the water. The first Order in Council provided that they should supply the public with water, and it provided the charge to be made. The second Order leaves it entirely optional whether they shall supply water or not. In the second Order in Council, the duty or obligation being struck out, there is of course no provision as to what the charge shall be. There is not a word providing what the charge shall

be, nor are the concessionaires obliged to supply any water. If the people are not willing to pay what the concessionaires charge them, they will not supply them. There is no question of bargain and sale ; the miners and the public must pay for water at the price at which Mr. Treadgold chooses to sell it. There are other clauses in this original Order in Council which the Yukon people desired to have rectified, but no person who reads this first Order in Council and who then reads the second one can come to any other conclusion than that the second Order in Council was prepared by some person on behalf of the concessionaires. From the beginning to the end every clause has been carefully drawn in the interests of the concessionaires, and there is hardly a provision from first to last that one would regard as having been put in by the government on behalf of the public. Wherever we find a change it is in the interests of the concessionaires, except in one particular, and I am not quite sure that even that is against their interests. It would be interesting if the hon. ministers would tell us when they were all, as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) says, putting their brains to work in the forming of this Order in Council, how it came about that they omitted the original requirement of $250,000 to be expended by the concessionaires. Surely there must have been grave and serious consideration of that subject ; and, if so, what was the reason for omitting that provision ? How did it come to be omitted, and who suggested it ? Did the government insist upon throwing it off, or was that also a clause which was altered by the concessionaires in their own interests ? That payment of $250,000 was a very important provision in the original Order in Council. It has disappeared from the other, from the one which was to be an improvement in the interest of the public upon the previous one. What has become of that $250,000, equal to £50,000, the sum of money that was to be expended by these people ? When the miners of the Yukon protest that this is an unjust Order in Council, when a deputation comes all the way from the Yukon to interview the ministers, and when the ministers sit down to improve this Order in Council in the interests of the public, this clause requiring the Treadgolds to expend $250,000 disappears; and although this has been commented upon by one hon. gentleman after another on this side of the House, we have not heard from the hon. Postmaster General, who spoke at length on behalf of the department, or from any hon. minister, one word in explanation of how that condition was left out. I think we had a right to expect explanations, and it certainly would have been of very great interest to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, to the people of the Yukon and to the public to know exactly how that occurred. Then there was a further provision in the next clause to the $250,000 one,

> The grantees shall deliver within the district during the summer season of 1905, not later than July 1, 1905, a flow of one thousand (1,000) miners' inches, equal to fifteen hundred (1,500) cubic feet per minute.

That was another very valuable provision. If they were to exercise this concession they were to be required to do some work and to have the power ready for use by the 1st of July, 1905, but when this Order in Council was being improved on behalf of the miners and of the public, that provision was omitted. Instead of that provision that this work should be done by the 1st of July, 1905, we find this provision, which, the more it is looked at, the more extraordinary it appears. After granting the sole right and the privileges which have been referred to in regard to the water power, the second Order in Council says :

> Provided that if the right given by this section is not exercised within six years from the date hereof, it may be revoked by order of the Governor General in Council.

This is the one clause in the whole Order in Council that is subject to a positive condition. All the other rights are absolute. There is not from first to last any other provision which enables the Governor General in Council to take any action in respect to the rights given to the concessionaires.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What other powers can the concessionaires exercise if after six years they have forfeited the use of the water in the Klondike ?

Mr. BARKER. They have first the sole right to divert and take water from the Klondike river for the purpose of generating power with which to pump water.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Suppose they lose that right ?

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. Postmaster General mean to say that the other privileges they have obtained under this Order in Council are of no value ? What about the privilege of providing water for the purposes of the public. There are two distinct powers given in this Order in Council. One enables them to provide power from the Yukon waters, and the other enables them to provide the people with water as a water company in a city might do. Is that not valuable ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is it not quite an ordinary thing to grant powers that are not terminable and yet do not exclude the granting of similar powers to others ?

Mr. BARKER. It is a very unusual thing to grant privileges to a water company without obliging them to supply water. I never heard of such a case.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no doubt there are plenty of cases.

Mr. BARKER. There is not a word in the Order in Council compelling the concessionaires to supply water to anybody. They have the right to do it, but you took out the peremptory words that they must supply, and you gave the company the mere privilege of supplying water if they chose to do so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The only water they have the right to sell is surplus water.

Mr. BARKER. They have the right to sell all the water they please, that comes within what may be called their territory. What I am speaking about is a distinct thing altogether from the right to create and sell power. What does the Order in Council say about power ? The hon Postmaster General made a point of that. That provision is also in somewhat equivocal terms. It says that 'provided' any power is developed which the grantees do not make use of themselves it shall be offered for sale to the public. Is it likely that these people are going to generate power that they have no need of, unless it is to their interest to do so ? What is there to protect the interest of the public ? The Minister of Railways and Canals told us frankly that this is a monopoly, and if so why was it necessary to say that if they created any power beyond what they needed for their own use, they should sell it. Why was it not said that they must furnish water for those who needed it, and that the government could settle what the terms would be ? The fact is, that from beginning to end this Order in Council has been drawn by a set of gentlemen who are seeking to get from the public all they possibly can without undertaking any obligation whatever in return. That is the spirit of it from first to last, and any person who reads that document will come to that conclusion. In clause 5 they are given the right to purchase Crown land, a right, I say, which the government had no power to give. All through there are rights given and no obligations stipulated for in return. They have the right, subject to no payment, except the royalty prescribed upon the output, to make entry over and work any abandoned mining claims on Bonanza.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Read the next clause.

Mr. BARKER. It says :

Such right to be exercisable only when the grantees by the construction of works in pursuance of this franchise are in a position to deliver water upon such claim or claims for the working thereof.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman was proceeding to argue that although the concessionaires may lose the rights in section 1, they would have a lot of other rights. This right in section 10 would also fall to the ground if the concessionaires lost their rights under section 1.

Mr. BARKER. At the expiration of six years and not till then.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman was arguing differently a moment ago.

Mr. BARKER. No. I say that all these provisions are without limitation, if they are not limited by the six years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Section 10 is dependent on section 1, which cannot be perpetual.

Mr. BARKER. Does the Postmaster General think that it was right to give these concessions to the Treadgolds to subject the public of the Yukon to a concession deterring capital, and causing consternation, as this Order in Council did cause consternation ; and all because the government did not take a little trouble to care for the country's interests. Another clause gives Treadgolds the right to assign any of the rights conferred upon them to any person whatever. The whole order from first to last was given to these people, or rather prepared for them, so that they could farm it out as they pleased. They could act upon what part they pleased and sell out what they pleased, and the public of the Yukon were to be subject to them and under their domination. I do not want to take the time of the House further, but I repeat that I think there cannot be any question that under the Yukon Act I have referred to, there is no power at all in the government to contract that these concessionaires should have the land of the Crown at any price, or free. The Act expressly provides that there shall be no appropriation of the public lands without the authority of parliament, and yet all this dealing has been going on upon the assumption on the part of the ministers that they have the right to appropriate the public lands of the Yukon. We on this side say that they have no such right, and the Minister of Justice did not cite the Act to which I refer and which is express on that point.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). What struck me in connection with this interesting and important debate is that the government are perhaps most to blame for having gone into a transaction of this sort without their evidently having any knowledge of the requirements of the country. I asked the right hon. the Prime Minister whether he had any report as to the probable cost of the work which is supposed to be covered by the Treadgold concession, and I gathered from his reply that the government had no report, and had not caused any reports to be made as to what the cost of this necessary work would be. Surely, in the case

of a private individual owning such a territory and owning valuable property rights which were to be developed to bring in revenue; surely before such a concession as this was granted a private individual would have had his own engineers and his own scientific officers to report as to the probable cost of the work proposed to be done by people asking for such a valuable franchise. I gather that the government took no steps to ascertain what the proposed work would cost. The first Order in Council was given in June, 1901, and very shortly after that strong opposition was made to the terms of the grant. Later on another order was passed altering in some points the case in which there has been practically a case in which there has been practically a continuous opposition and not one demand from the people of that country for the confirmation of this concession; from that day to this the government apparently have taken no steps whatever to ascertain what the cost of these works would be. Now, as a rule, I am against the government undertaking works of this kind, but I hold that it was the first duty of the government before granting the concession, to ascertain what the cost of such work would be to the concesionaires. In the face of the government having no such knowledge, they gave to this company an option—because it is simply and solely an option—for six years of what may be enormously valuable privileges, and the concessionaires are not required to spend a dollar of money for six years. Naturally a body of men with a concession like that, having six years in which to make the most of it, will not be in a hurry to carry the work out or to put such a concession on the market. The market for a year past has not been a favourable one for floating a concern of this kind. The conditions may change at any time within six years, and these men may take advantage of any change in the money market. Naturally they would do so. It would be quite proper for them to do so. Having obtained the concession from this government, it would be quite proper for them, as a pure business proposition, to hold it until they could bring it out at the most favourable time to float it. Naturally they will hold it until they can unload it with the largest amount of profit to themselves. And for six years you are depriving these miners, who you say are so anxious to have water, of the possibility of getting water unless these concessionaires can see the chance in the meantime of selling what you give them at a very large profit. I think it was the first duty of the government, when they found that such a work was required, to ascertain what such a work would cost, and how far it was required to be gone on with at once, and, having done that, to have invited tenders, or let the public know that they were open and willing to receive offers for building these water flumes and developing the water power in that country. On these two points I think the government are very seriously to blame, and have possibly committed that part of the country to a serious loss.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Casgrain.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Avery,	Kaulbach,
Ball,	Kemp,
Barker,	Lancaster
Bennett,	LaRivière,
Birkett,	Lefurgey,
Blain,	Lennox,
Borden (Halifax),	Maclaren (Perth),
Brock,	McCormick,
Bruce,	McGowan,
Cargill,	Monk,
Carscallen,	Osler,
Casgrain,	Pringle,
Clancy,	Puttee,
Clarke,	Reid (Grenville),
Cochrane,	Richardson,
Culbert,	Robinson (Elgin),
Earle,	Rosamond,
Fowler,	Smith (Vancouver),
Gilmour,	Smith (Wentworth),
Hackett,	Sproule,
Haggart,	Taylor,
Hale,	Thomson (Grey),
Henderson,	Tolton,
Hughes (Victoria),	Vrooman.
Ingram,	Wilson.—52.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Lang,
Bazinet,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Beith,	Laurier (L'Assomption),
Béland,	Lavergne,
Belcourt,	Law,
Bernier,	LeBlanc,
Bickerdike,	Lemieux,
Blair,	Logan,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Loy,
Bourassa,	Mackie,
Brown,	MacKinnon,
Bureau,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Calvert,	Macpherson,
Campbell,	McCarthy,
Carroll,	McCool,
Champagne,	McCreary,
Christie,	McGugan,
Copp,	McIsaac,
Costigan,	Madore,
Cowan,	Marcil (Bagot),
Davis,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Delisle,	Matheson,
Demers (Lévis),	Meigs,
Demers (St. John),	Mignault,
Desjardins,	Mulock (Sir William),
Douglas,	Murray,
Dyment,	Paterson,
Dugas,	Power,
Emmerson,	Préfontaine,
Erb,	Proulx,
Ethier,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fielding,	Riley,
Fitzpatrick,	Roche (Halifax),
Fortier,	Ross (Ontario),
Galliher,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.)
Geoffrion,	Russell,
Gibson,	Scott,

Girard,	Stephens,
Gould,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Grant,	Talbot,
Harty,	Thompson (Haldimand),
Harwood,	Tobin,
Heyd,	Tucker,
Holmes,	Turcot,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Turgeon,
Hyman,	Wade.—95.
Johnston (Cape Breton),	

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Parmelee,	Pope,
Cartwright, (Sir Richard),	Tupper, (Sir Charles Hibbert)
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Morrison,	Gourley,
McColl,	Ward,
Fraser,	Bell,
Stewart,	Boyd,
Kendall,	Roche (Marquette),
Tarte,	Roddick,
Tolmie,	Kendry,
Macdonald,	Sherritt,
Sifton,	Calvin,
Fisher,	Maclean,
Gallery,	Léonard,
German,	Broder,
Lewis,	Wilmot,
Oliver,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Ross (Yukon),	Ganong,
Wallace,	Seagram,
Schell,	McIntosh,
Bruneau,	Morin,
Wright,	Halliday,
McLennan,	Clare,
Archambault,	Kidd.

Amendment of Mr. Casgrain negatived ; motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Progress reported.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 1.15 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 13, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

PILOTS ON THE RIVER ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. LEMIEUX—by Mr. Bickerdike—asked :

1. Have any pilots been retired from the lower St. Lawrence river pilotage service on account of defective sight ? And if so, how many during the past ten years ?

2. In each case what was the condition of the form sense, colour sense, and light sense ; and what tests are used to examine these senses ?

3. What is the minimum acuteness of vision accepted as sufficient for (a) pilots, (b) apprentices ?

4. Is the same standard of vision, and are the same tests used, for all apprentice pilots and pilots throughout Canada ?

5. What was the acuteness of vision, and the condition of the colour sense, of the different pilots who have been involved in acidents during the past ten years in the River St. Lawrence ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

1. None.

2. No answer required as it is dependent on No. 1.

3. (a) Candidates for admission as pilots must pass an examination before an oculist and aurist selected by the commissioners as to their sight, colour sight and hearing. Such examination being the same as regard eyesight and colour-blindness that has to be undergone by candidates passing the examination for masters and mates. The minimum required as sufficient is one-third (de Wicker's chart).

(b.) Candidates for admission as apprentice pilots, before being indentured, must pass an examination before an oculist and aurist selected by the commissioners as to their sight, colour sight and hearing. Vision : only (de Wicker's chart) is accepted.

4. The commissioners do not know if the same standard of vision and the same tests are used for all apprentice pilots and pilots throughout Canada.

5. As up to 1902 pilots on the active list were not obliged to submit to an examination of their eyesight, until they had reached the age of sixty-five years, or that a complaint had been lodged against them that their sight was defective, consequently this question can only be answered in so far as accidents have happened to the pilots who were thus examined.

Charles Francis Brown, examined as a pilot of sixty-five years, on April 12, 1893, producing a certificate from his doctor that his sight and colour sight was in good condition, and was also tested at this examination in reading at different distances and in distinguishing colours. Pilot Brown is still on the active list, has been examined every year since 1893 by an oculist employed by the commissioners. At examination of 1902 vision was 1 (de Wicker's chart) and vision of colours was perfect. Pilot Brown grounded a sailing ship on June 27, 1893.

Jos. Phil. Couillard, examined as a pilot of sixty-five years and over, and branch renewed for one year by the commissioners on April 14, 1896. Acuteness of vision was one-half (de Wicker's chart). Condition of colour sight was good (weak). Pilot Couillard had an accident to a vessel in his charge summer of 1896.

Alphonse Asselin, pilot under sixty-five years, examined June 5, 1902. Acuteness

of vision was 1 (de Wicker's chart). Vision of colour was perfect. Had an accident summer of 1902.

Joseph Eugène Lachance, pilot under sixty-five years, examined June 5, 1902. Acuteness of vision was 1 (de Wicker's chart). Vision of colour was perfect. Had an accident summer 1902.

Samuel Rioux, pilot under sixty-five years, examined June 5, 1902. Acuteness of vision was 1 (de Wicker's chart). Vision of colour was perfect. Had an accident 1902.

FISHING IN GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. LEMIEUX—by Mr. Bickerdike—asked :

1. Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received the following petition :—

To the Honourable Raymond Préfontaine,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

The petition of the undersigned fish merchants, fishermen and others interested in the fishing industry in the district of Gaspé, respectfully showeth :—

That the fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence are seriously injured by the use of trap-nets for codfish and herring which have been proved to be very destructive to the fisheries, owing to the fact that large and small fish are indiscriminately caught ; the claim that the large mesh gives freedom of way to small fish is not justified by experience, it being conclusively proved that the large fish block up the meshes, and the small fish, when in the trap, are unable to escape.

That the seining of herring, caplin and any other fish in the spring of the year and at all times for the purpose of fertilizing lands, is a wanton waste of valuable product, and a great detriment to the profitable prosecution of the fisheries, and should be discouraged by every possible means, in order that those fish may be used solely for the purposes of food and bait ; otherwise our cod-fishing industry will be ruined, as no bait can be procured. Your petitioners also pray that the trapping of all kinds of fish by means of steam trawling be made contrary to law.

Wherefore, your petitioners urgently request that you will be pleased to take the necessary measures to prohibit the use of trap-nets for codfish and herring, and also prohibit the use of herring, caplin and other fish for fertilizing purposes. And your petitioners, as duty bound, will ever pray.

Joseph Lemieux, maire,
Louis Letourneau,
Wm. Fruing & Co., Ltd., per U.S.L.
Welson L. Laffoley,
Cléophas Lemieux,
Stanislaus Lemieux,
Cléophas Lapointe,
Alaire Roy,
Isidore Roy,
Frank Bignell, Supt. Mont-Louis Seigniory,
Pierre Letourneau,
Pierre Lapointe,
Narcisse Goupil,
Thomas Bernaltchez,
Anthine Boucher,
Louis Provost,
Stanislas Thibault,
Louis Ouellet,
Aléxis Ouellet,
Albert Ouellet,
Louis Lemieux, fils,
Octave Lapointe,
Théophile Poitras,
Henri Thibault,
Maxime Provost,
François Laflamme,
Alfred Laflamme,
Laureat Cloutier,
Pierre Coulombe,
Joseph Coulombe,
Napoléon Cloutier,
Elzéar Bernaltchez,
Joseph Bernaltchez,
Magloire Bernaltchez,
François Bernaltchez,
Octave Ouellet,
Prime Ouellet,
Louis Bernaltchez,
John Marcin,
Thomas Marcin,
Edouard Fournier.

2. What action does the Department of Marine and Fisheries intend to take on this question ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

1. Yes, through Mr. Lemieux, M.P.

2. The department, after fully considering the matter, has reached the conclusion that sufficient grounds do not exist for taking action on the lines of the petition.

The department does not feel justified in taking an action in the matter, as the three principal statements in the petition are not justified by the facts as officially reported.

The petitioners claim that codfish and herring have injured the fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Statistics officially published show that the cod and herring fishery during the past few years, has shown no decrease in productiveness. In fact, these fish have been unusually abundant, and any local decrease is accounted for by merely local circumstances—rough weather, &c.

The petitioners protest against the seining of herring, caplin and other fish in the spring to be used for fertilizing purposes. While the Fisheries Act prohibits the catching of fish for use as manure, the department has not felt justified in strenuously enforcing the law in this respect, as such fish as herring in the spring are in poor condition, and frequently not very marketable. Such fish as are not marketable, instead of being wasted are used on the land. To this the department sees no objection.

The petitioners protest against the use of steam trawls. This allegation is not found to have a very good basis according to the reports of the departmental officers. Steam trawling is so limited at present that special restrictive steps would not be justifiable.

RAILWAY TRAFFIC, LORNE SIDING, I. C. R.

Mr. BELL—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What number of cars of freight were moved into and out of Lorne Siding, Intercolonial Railway, in the years 1901 and 1902 ?

2. What were the receipts for passenger traffic at the same siding ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. In the year 1901 there were seven cars of freight moved into and ninety-six cars out of Lorne siding.

In the year 1902 there were four cars of freight moved into and ninety-two cars out of same siding.

2. Receipts from passenger traffic at Lorne siding in the year 1901, amounted to $81.06. And in the year 1902, amounted to $92.15.

HARBOUR MASTER, BATHURST, N. B.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. On whose recommendation was M. T. Daly dismissed from the position of harbour master at the port of Bathurst, N. B.?

2. Was his dismissal the result of an investigation ? if so, by whom was such investigation held ; and what charges, if any, were preferred against him ?

3. Upon whose recommendation was his successor, Hachey, appointed ?

4. Had said Hachey resigned his position as a branch pilot of the port of Bathurst, as required by law, before his appointment as harbour master ; or has he since done so ; and if so, when ?

5. Had the result of the late provincial election in Gloucester county, N. B., anything to do with the dismissal of the said Daly ?

6. Is it the policy of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, under its new head, to dismiss officers without any charge or complaint against them of non-performance of duty, but simply upon the request of a member of parliament supporting the government ? If not, for what reason was the said M. T. Daly dismissed from his position of harbour master for the port of Bathurst, N. B.?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

1. On the minister's who is responsible for such appointments.

2. No.

3. Upon satisfactory recommendation to the minister.

4. No.

5. Not so far as the department is aware.

6. No.

Mr. Daly was dismissed because he did not discharge his duties as harbour master in an impartial manner.

FALSE CREEK, VANCOUVER.

Mr. WILSON asked :

1. Has any portion of False creek, Vancouver, been leased to Messrs. Burnett & Kelly ? If so, what is the area so leased ?

2. What is the duration of the lease ?

3. What is the rental per annum ?

4. Have any protests been received from any public bodies in Vancouver against the granting of the said lease ? If so, from whom ?

5. Upon whose recommendation was the lease granted ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No, there has been no such lease.

Mr. BELL.

OYSTER FISHING, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Was a petition received from Prince Edward Island last year (1902) asking the government to prohibit the spring fishing of oysters, and giving reasons for so asking ?

2. If so, what action has, or does the government propose to take, in this matter ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

1. No petition was received.

2. Answered by above.

PENSIONS, SOUTH AFRICAN SERVICE.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What are the rates of pensions paid to disabled, or partially disabled Canadians from South African service ?

2. Does Canada contribute towards the payment of the aforesaid pensions ?

3. In view of the low rates of imperial pensions, has the Canadian government considered the advisability of supplementing the imperial pensions ?

4. Does the Canadian government accept as final the medical reports of the imperial government on subjects for pensions ?

5. Will action upon this matter be taken this session ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) :

1. The rates are those provided by the imperial government for officers and soldiers of the regular army.

2. No.

3. The government has not considered the advisability of supplementing the imperial pensions.

4. Government has nothing to do with the matter of medical reports. But I may say that in cases where pensions were not settled until the applicants for pensions returned to this country, the reports of the Canadian surgeons have been accepted by the imperial authorities.

5. Requires no answer.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. TALBOT asked :

1. Has the Grand Trunk received one or more loans in money from the federal treasury ?

2. If so, how often and in which years ?

3. What were the different sums borrowed ?

4. What sums has the company paid by way of reimbursements ?

5. What is the amount actually due by that company to the federal treasury, capital and interest ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). As to questions 1, 2, 3 and 4, the Grand Trunk Railway Company has received no loans from the federal treasury, i.e., has received no loans from the Dominion of Canada since the date of confederation, 1867. As to question 5, at the time of

confederation the Grand Trunk Railway owed the province of Canada, according to the accounts of that province, $25,607,393.53, and this amount was taken by the Dominion as an asset, and still remains in the balance sheet of the Dominion at that amount, no payment having been made by the railway in respect thereof.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. What appointments to commissions in the North-west Mounted Police have been made from January 1, 1902, to May 1, 1903 ?
2. What previous police, or military, record had each of these ?
3. Were any promoted from the subordinate or non-commissioned officers or men in the force ? If so, what are the names ?
4. What non-commissioned officers were passed over ?
5. Why were such so passed over ?

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

1. Five appointments : R. Y. Douglas, R. S. Knight, John Richards, William Parker and A. W. Duffus.
2. R. Y. Douglas, 36th Peel regiment, Canadian Militia; R. S. Knight, senior sergeant-major, North-west mounted police ; John Richards, sergeant-major, North-west mounted police ; Wm. Parker, sergeant-major, North-west mounted police ; A. W. Duffus, previously in North-west mounted police.
3. Sergeant-Major Knight, Richards and Parker.
4. Service and qualifications considered, none were passed over.
5. Answered by reply to question No. 4.

PIER AT ANNANDALE, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. What amount was expended on the pier at Annandale, King's county, Prince Edward Island, during the years 1900 and 1901 ?
2. What is the name of the foreman, or director, of the work, and his wages per day ?
3. What are the names of the men employed, and the wages per day paid to each respectively ?
4. What are the kinds and quantities of materials purchased for said work ; from whom purchased, and the prices paid ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). Mr. Speaker, I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) to move for a return, as this would call for a voluminous statement, and I will have the information at the earliest possible moment.

RANGE LIGHTS AT ANNANDALE, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. What amount has been expended on range lights at Annandale, King's county, Prince Edward Island, since same have been erected ?
2. What are the names of keepers, and amount of salaries respectively ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

1. $975.41.
2. One keeper ; Alexander Robertson. Salary, $100 per annum.

CAPTAIN W. S. LARKIN.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Did the Minister of Public Works receive the following complaint against Captain W. S. Larkin, of the steam dredge 'Prince Edward'?

Hon. J. I. Tarte,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I have been employed on the dredge 'Prince Edward,' as a deck hand, for the past five years. The dredge is under the control of Captain W. S. Larkin, of Alberton, in this province. In common with some of the rest of the crew, I have to complain of Captain Larkin's conduct, which is objectionable on the following grounds :—

1. There has frequently been drinking and disorder on board, and the captain himself has often given evidence of over-drinking, and sometimes his conduct was violent.

2. His language was frequently blasphemous and indecent, and he often offended the religious convictions of some of the men on board.

For the reasons above mentioned, and for others with which I will not trouble you at present, life on board the dredge became so unpleasant that, though I am a poor man, I could not endure it further under the same conditions. I can put up with much, but not with further service under Captain Larkin. If he is allowed to continue in his present position, it will be a great injury to the Liberal party, of which I and my friends have long been supporters, and will have the effect of turning away more of those who object to having men of Captain Larkin's stamp, in places of authority.

I am respectfully yours, &c.,
FRED W. LLEWELLYN.

Murray Harbour, north, 1902.

2. Has the minister ordered an investigation into this matter ? And if not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). In reply to the question by Mr. Hackett I may say that there is no such letter in the department.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson) moved :

That the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :—That it is expedient to amend the Customs Act, chapter 32, revised statutes, and to provide as follows :—

1. That the expression 'duty' shall include 'surtax.'
2. That a change be made in the composition of the board of customs, and that an assistant commissioner of customs be appointed.
3. That authority be given for the employment of temporary officers of customs.

4. To better define the powers of the board of customs.

5. That further particulars be given in invoices ; and to provide that invoices may be made out in the currency in which the goods are actually purchased.

6. To define the rate of duty upon unenumerated articles, made of more than one material.

7. To extend the time for the submission of claims for refund, including claims for refund on account of damage.

8. That importers may be relieved from the payment of duty on damaged goods, abandoned in certain cases.

9. That the basis of allowance for damage on polished steel, and other articles, be changed.

10. To authorize the granting of relief from the payment of duty on goods, destroyed or damaged while in the custody of the customs.

11. That further provision be made for the valuation for duty purposes of medicinal and other preparations, and in respect of the testing of sugars, molasses, wines, spirituous and alcoholic liquors.

12. To authorize collectors of customs to require further proof in respect of invoices.

13. To vest in officers the power to administer oaths.

14. To confer further powers on the Governor in Council respecting special customs services and overtime of officers ; and also respecting the reduction of customs duties on imported goods.

Motion agreed to.

SETTLEMENT OF RAILWAY LABOUR DISPUTES.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 17) to aid in the settlement of railway labour disputes.—The Postmaster General.

On section 5,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) moved : That the words in the second and third lines of section 5, 'the difference shall be referred' be struck out and the words 'the minister may refer the difference' be inserted in lieu thereof.

Motion agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 6,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) wishes to move an amendment providing for the method of arbitration when the employees of the Intercolonial Railway are involved, and I incline to agree to what he has suggested. If my hon. friend reads his amendment and if it is adopted, then we will have to amend some other clauses so as to make them consistent.

Mr. LOGAN. When we were discussing this Bill before, I pointed out that in the case of a difference on the Intercolonial Railway the men would choose one of the arbitrators or conciliators ; the Minister of Railways would choose a second ; and the third would be chosen by the Minister of Labour. This would in effect be giving the appointment of two of the arbitrators to the government. In order to obviate that, I beg to propose the following amendment :

In the event of the establishment of a committee of conciliation, mediation, and investigation, or of a board of arbitrators to deal with any differences between the government of Canada in respect to the Intercolonial Railway and any of its employees, the power to appoint conciliators or arbitrators which otherwise in accordance with the foregoing provisions might be exercisable by the minister, shall be exercisable either by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the province of New Brunswick, of Nova Scotia or of Prince Edward Island (in this Act called the Lieutenant-Governor in Council) as the minister shall for that purpose in each case of conciliation or arbitration in writing name.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not make it apply to the government of the province of Quebec as well as to the Governor in Council of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick ?

Mr. LOGAN. There is no objection to that. I wish to include the province of Quebec in the amendment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will make the amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) a subclause to section 7.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Suppose there was a general strike on the Intercolonial Railway extending over the four provinces through which it runs, which of the provinces would appoint the third arbitrator ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. One or other of these provincial governments would be asked to name the third arbitrator.

Amendment (Mr. Logan) agreed to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In consequence of the adoption of this amendment it will be necessary to insert in line 30 of section 3, and in line 33, after the word 'minister,' the words 'or such Lieutenant Governor in Council, as the case may be.' In section 6 it will be necessary to make similar changes. I beg to move that these changes be made.

Motion agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. INGRAM. May I ask the hon. minister if this amendment has been approved by the representatives of the railway men ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Then I presume that after the Bill goes through the committee, it will not be read the third time to-day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well, I will let it stand.

On section 20,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved that the words 'chosen by a majority' be added after the word 'number.'

Mr. INGRAM. By election, or how ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The word 'chosen' has been adopted, and there will be some way of choosing them.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 23,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved the following amendment :

In the event of the establishment of a committee of conciliation, meditation and investigation, or of a board of arbitrators to deal with any differences between the government of Canada in respect of the Intercolonial Railway and any of its employees, the power to appoint conciliators or arbitrators which otherwise in accordance with the foregoing provisions might be exercisable by the minister shall be exercisable either by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the province of Quebec, of New Brunswick, of Nova Scotia or of Prince Edward Island (in this Act called the Lieutenant-Governor in Council) as the minister shall for that purpose in each case of conciliation or arbitration in writing name.

Section, as amended agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. FOWLER moved :

That after the word 'strikes' in the fourth line the word 'may' may be added.

The preamble states possibly that these strikes do interfere with proper and efficient transportation, which imports in itself a violation of the Criminal Law.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. INGRAM. In view of the railway men having agreed to certain amendments, I want to point out, that, so far as I am concerned, I am endorsing the amendment which the railway men have suggested, without using my own judgment, because I do not want to interfere with a Bill which they think is in their interest.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Public works—chargeable to income—miscellaneous—to cover balance of expenditures of works already authorized for which the appropriations may be insufficient, provided that amount for each work does not exceed $100, $3,000.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I understand, Mr. Chairman, that under the item which you have just brought to the notice of the committee, we are entitled to discuss the general principle of some of the preceding items. I have not been fortunate enough to be present when some of the items regarding the province of Quebec came under the notice of the committee, and I desire now to obtain from the government, if possible, a declaration which, I think we are quite entitled to in respect of the control of these large expenditures which we have voted and are still busy voting in connection with harbours and rivers. If ever a Committee of Supply of this House was entitled to such a declaration we are entitled to it now—and I will briefly as possible explain to the House upon what I rest that proposition. When the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) came for re-election in the district in Montreal, in the division of Maisonneuve, he came at a time when there had been grave discussions in the province of Quebec, and more particularly in the districts of Montreal, and, perhaps, more especially in the division where he sought re-election, in regard to what was deemed at that time a shuffle of portfolios in the present cabinet. It is known to every member of this House that, after the resignation or dismissal of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) grave difficulties arose as to who should replace that gentleman in the cabinet of the right hon. the Premier (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is known to us particularly in the province of Quebec that very grave difficulties arose among the members of the party in the city of Montreal as to the claims of certain parties to the portfolio which had been left vacant. After a considerable space of time, pressure was brought to bear upon the right hon. the Premier in this direction—that the portfolio should not be given to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine). Reasons were urged right and left. We heard some of these reasons on the street. But they were urged even in the government organs of Montreal. Two newspapers which support the government and receive support from the government, one to a very considerable extent, publicly, a day or two—yes, I believe even twelve hours—before my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was called to his present office, urged strongly and publicly that it was not right, for the reasons stated in these newspapers, that my hon. friend should succeed purely and simply to the estate left vacant at the head of that important department. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will remember in what scathing terms the Montreal 'Witness' claiming, as it has always claimed, that it was a supporter of the present government, urged upon the government and on all serious men of the party which support that government, that my hon. friend should not be given that portfolio, should not even enter the cabinet of the right hon. gentleman. Another organ, the official organ of the government in the city of Montreal, the Montreal 'Herald,' in a very strong article, a very few hours, as I have said, before my right hon. friend had fixed his choice upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, actually warned the government against the

choice of my hon. friend and gave reasons therefor, with which reasons I shall presently make the members of the committee acquainted. I mention these facts in order to show that members of my right hon. friend's party in Montreal, even more than the members of the party to which I have the honour to belong, were eager, were anxious, and publicly expressed that anxiety, that my hon. friend should not be nominated to the portfolio of Public Works. The article of the Montreal 'Herald' created a great sensation, not only in political circles, but all over the city of Montreal, and throughout the province of Quebec. And these are the terms, calm, moderate, but forceful, in which the Montreal 'Herald' reviewed the situation but a few hours before that important nomination was made. I believe in that same number of the Montreal 'Herald' of the 10th of November, the announcement was made that my hon. friend had been officially chosen, and that his partisans had succeeded after a very severe struggle. It is entitled 'Cabinet changes.'

The announcement is made that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has asked Hon. James Sutherland, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to take the portfolio of Public Works, and has offered Mr. Sutherland's portfolio to Mr. Raymond Préfontaine, M.P., for Maisoneuve and Terrebonne. The translation of Mr. Sutherland from the one department to the other will be viewed with favour in Ontario, in which province it had been a standing complaint that the great spending departments of the government were in the hands of representatives of other and smaller provinces. The complaint has not been without reason, for Ontario is the largest contributor to the country's revenue. No doubt the consideration of this fact had its influence in bringing the premier to the conclusion to offer Mr. Sutherland the portfolio of Public Works. In addition, he was probably greatly influenced by a consciousness that Mr. Sutherland is peculiarly well qualified for the duties of his new office. It is well known that during late years Sir Wilfrid Laurier has learned to place great confidence in Mr. Sutherland's business capacity and sound judgment, and in entrusting to him the greatest spending department of the government he feels that he is placing it in hands that will not betray the trust. Mr. Sutherland's long tenure of office of chief Liberal whip brought him in close relationship with the members of both parties, and he is to-day one of the most popular men in parliament.

I am very sorry my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is not present.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, he is here.

Mr. MONK. (reading).

He is gifted with many of the qualities that go to make a successful administrator. Forceful, yet urbane, possessing great capacity for work, and having an intimate knowledge of the Dominion, its resources and its requirements, he is well equipped to give the Public Works Department a business-like administration.

Now comes the gloomy side:

It is to be regretted that the appointment of Mr. Raymond Préfontaine to the portfolio vacated by Mr. Sutherland is unlikely to be received with equal favour. There has been much debate over this matter, and it is to be assumed that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, finding himself confronted by a serious political crisis in his own province, has turned to Mr. Préfontaine as a popular and hitherto successful local leader, and one who, under much provocation, has shown a consistent loyalty to his chief. Those who have discountenanced Mr. Préfontaine's selection for this office did not under value the qualities which fit him for leadership, and which evidently appealed very strongly to Sir Wilfrid Laurier under present conditions. While thoroughly sympathizing with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, however, it is not for those Liberals who have observed Mr. Préfontaine's career as the practical head of the administrative machinery of the city of Montreal to feel that his selection for the head of an administrative department of the government satisfies their ideals of what ought to be. The 'Herald' particularly, during a five years' campaign against corruption and extravagance at the city hall, had no option but to conclude that his powerful influence had been and was being exerted against the city's best interest.

What Mr. Préfontaine's idea of his future may be, and precisely what view Sir Wilfrid Laurier may take of the matter, is not for us to know, but it is clear that in Montreal, where he has lived under the lime light of publicity, there must be grave misgivings concerning the wisdom of the selection, not only on the part of the more or less disinterested general public, but quite as much on the part of those whose particular concern is the welfare of the administration.

The article of the 'Witness,' I think, was even more pointed than this one. If I cite these articles, and particularly this one taken from a government organ whose very existence depends upon the existence of this government, it is in order to show that long before we went into that election campaign in Maisonneuve, that that question was agitating the public mind, and the impression gained ground that my right hon. friend, divided between two strong conflicting forces, had compromised himself, had been an opportunist once more, and had given the Department of Public Works to my hon. friend who occupies that position at the present moment, and had entrusted a department, a spending department, but a far less important department, in the judgment of the general public, to my right hon. friend who presented himself for election before the electors of Maisonneuve. Well, Sir, there were two issues before the great electorate of that division, two issues only. My hon. friend the member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to-day, we understood had parted from the present government, not as a man who elects a seat on the bench, not as a man who is translated to some other office, not as one whose portfolio had become vacant by death or other accident; but he had parted from this government upon a great question of principle, upon a question which we have been discussing in this House to an almost un-

limited extent since we met in the month of March last. That hon. gentleman claimed that the protection afforded to manufacturers was insufficient, and that was one of the issues raised in that campaign. We who believe that the protection afforded to the industrial life of this country is insuffcient, deemed it to be our duty to go down before the electorate and defend the views to which we have given expression more than once since we have assembled in this session of parliament. I admit, Mr. Chairman, that upon that issue we were unsuccessful, and I am prepared to say, what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said very often since, that those most interested perhaps in the principles which we defended, seemed to think that their only hope of escaping punishment by this government was to elect my hon. friend the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who absolutely promised them sufficient protection for every one of the industries represented in that great constituency. We had gone into the constituency of Argenteuil, and we had heard the doctrine of free trade preached there ; and I understand that in the electoral division of Yarmouth, that doctrine was also preached in still less uncertain language. But in the electoral division of Maisonneuve those who, I think, should have supported the principles which we defended, deemed it expedient under the circumstances to elect my hon. friend, not in the hope that the principles which he advocated there would prevail, but with the expectancy that at least their interests would not be completely sacrificed after the promises which my hon. friend distinctly made to them.

That was one issue, Mr. Chairman, but there was another to which I must come at once, because it is an issue which is concerned with the argument which I shall lay before the committee. In the division of Maisonneuve we heard this argument : That my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) having quitted the government because of differences which had arisen between him and the government was no reason why we should be deprived in the city of Montreal of the portfolio of Public Works—not on racial or religious ground.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) says 'hear, hear.' What does he mean by that ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. Not on any narrow ground such as that, but because we claimed in the city of Montreal, and this has been stated here time and again within the hearing of every hon. member of this House, that important works were in process of execution, works which were under the control of the Department of Public Works and there was no reason why we, in that district, and the people of the province of Ontario should be deprived of that department because, forsooth, as expressed in this article in the 'Herald' which I have just read, and there were many others, the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and a certain number of his friends had no confidence in the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine). That is what we claimed and so strong was that claim, that, as my friends from the province of Quebec are well aware, being a just and equitable claim, it was re-echoed throughout the whole press of the province, and if I wished to convince the committee of the truth of what I am saying, I would have to spend part of the afternoon reading quotations from newspapers, Liberal and Conservative alike, wherein it was claimed that it was an unfortunate matter that the right hon. Prime Minister of this Dominion had deprived the province of Quebec and the people under whose very eyes these works of improvement in the port of Montreal, in Quebec, and in the St. Lawrence were being executed, of this department at a moment, when, in the judgment of these people, that department should have remained under the control of a minister from their own province. In other words, we laid down the proposition that the people of the province of Quebec were not concerned with what certain members of the Liberal party must think of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, they were not concerned with the pressure which had been brought to bear on the government not to admit him to the department, but they had done nothing to deserve the deprivation of the services of that department. This feeling found manifestation in the vote of the electorate. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not deny that that was one of the great grounds urged during the election. He knows it and so do all those who participated in the campaign. How was that argument met ? I was not present in this Chamber the other day when the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) read the verbatim report of the first speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in that campaign, but, without taking up uselessly the time of this committee, I appeal to any hon. member of this House from the province of Quebec to state whether it is not a fact that the hon. member for Maisonneuve, in every single public utterance which he made during that campaign availed himself of the opportunity to state what, Sir ?—to state that he had accepted the Department of Marine and Fisheries upon one condition, and that was that everything which concerns transportation, to use his own language, from the extreme west to the Atlantic ocean, every expenditure connected with the carrying out and executing of the works of improvement of the St. Lawrence

was going to be placed under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. He argued, and his friends argued, that it was an anomaly that works connected with harbours, dredging and deepening the St. Lawrence, canals, wharfs, and the carrying out of the plans of improvement in the city of Montreal, should be under the control of the Department of Public Works while the attending to lighthouses and buoys should be under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Transportation was one single, simple work according to them which should be under one department, and the government had decided that from the Department of Public Works would be taken everything in regard to the execution of improvements in reference to transportation and placed under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There were numerous public meetings, there were articles in the newspapers, there were private assurances given right and left throughout that campaign, and I defy any one of my hon. friends who observed that campaign to any degree to deny what I have just stated. Why, Sir, if any confirmation were wanted of the description of the campaign which I have just given, surely the members of this committee will find it in the speech from the Throne, because in that speech hon. members will find a repetition of everything that was stated by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries during that campaign in Maisonneuve. Such was the feeling at that time that had my hon. friend come down to the electors of Maisonneuve and stated that it was not the intention of the government to modify in any way the machinery of the department to which he had been called, I have no hesitation in saying that the result of that election would have been different. We have proceeded during the sittings of this committee to vote, I believe, hundreds of thousands of dollars to be expended by the Department of Public Works, although, on this side of the House on more than one occasion, the government has been called upon to state to us what are the modifications which are going to be made in the Department of Public Works and if the present election pledges of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries are to be carried out. I believe that the government has put off that announcement by stating that when the time came to introduce legislation in regard to these changes the government would do its duty. What I claim now as one who was present and heard these declarations, and as an elector myself in the electoral district of Maisonneuve is that before voting this money not after, we have the right to know from the government clearly and explicitly, what are the changes that are going to be made, and if the assurance as given by my hon. friend when he came down to Maisonneuve to solicit the votes of the electors were really based upon the faith of this government, and if this government intends carrying out these pledges. I certainly under no circumstances would like to fulfil the part of an obstructionist, but I believe we ought to hold firm to the old principles of our constitution, that redress goes before supply.

I claim, Sir, that it is a grievance that we should be called upon to vote money here from day to day, without the government announcing whether or not these changes are going to be carried out. I believe that we would be justified on this side of the House, in preventing the voting of further moneys to the Public Works Department, if the government still continues to refuse that information which we are entitled to. We have the constitutional right to know what expenditures which we are voting to the Public Works Department are to be removed to the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I do not at present express any opinion on the wisdom of these changes in the departments. I do not say that they would be wise, but what I do say is that when we vote this money to be disposed of by a minister of the Crown, we have the right to a distinct assurance from the government, as to whether any reliance can be placed upon the statements of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) when he sought re-election from his constituents.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). For the tenth or twelfth time my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has brought up this question to which he has received an answer, on one occasion at least, if not on more than one.

Mr. MONK. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. It is the first time I brought up this question. I have never mentioned it in the House before.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, I have heard that there were dissensions on the other side of the House, and perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) does not now occupy the position he was supposed to hold in his party. His statement seems to confirm the rumours which I have heard that he is not so much a chief of his party as he is supposed to be, because if he has not brought up the question himself it has been brought up by those who sit behind him, and they have been answered. I would suppose that an answer given to the hon. gentleman's supporters would have been sufficient for himself, but since we have to take it that there is a division in the party, and that the answer given to his followers is not sufficient for the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), I have no objection to tell him once more. I would not have alluded to these rumours but for the fact that my hon. friend himself is the first to bring rumours into the discussion, and his speech of half an hour was based on rumours which he said were current in the streets of Mont-

real at the time my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was called to the government. He has announced that at that time there were rumours in Montreal to the effect that I was drawn in opposite directions as to who should be the successor in the cabinet of the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte). Let me tell my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that he had better not take too much stock in these rumours. I suppose that representations are always made to a Prime Minister under such circumstances, but the Prime Minister has the responsibility of making the selection, and at all events I followed my own course and my own methods. And, Sir, when I concluded to bring into the government my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) I think I made no mistake.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is true that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and others, supposed that I had made a mistake, but that is not my opinion. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had been a member of this House for a number of years ; he was a leading member of the bar of Montreal ; and he was also prominent in the municipal affairs of the city in which he lives. As it happens, in municipal politics, as in other politics, my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) who was mayor of Montreal, did not give universal satisfaction to everybody. He had opponents ; I do not think he had any enemies, but he had opponents. There were those who did not agree with him in municipal politics, though they agreed with him in federal politics, and perhaps those who disagreed with him in municipal politics thought that I would go beyond the record and seek in the municipal politics of Montreal in order to be guided in the choice I was going to make. I made no such mistake as that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I was satisfied with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as a member of the Liberal party. I did not go to seek what had been his record as mayor of Montreal, though had I done so, while I would have found some opposed to him, I would have found thousands of electors in the city of Montreal who were enthusiastic in his support.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no reason to believe that the choice I then made was a mistaken one. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) tried the issue in Maisonneuve and he knows the result ; he tried the issue in Argenteuil, and he knows the result ; he tried the issue in Terrebonne, and he knows the result ; he tried the issue in Two Mountains, and the verdict was the same over again. It is no wonder that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) met with a much deserved rebuke from the people of the province of Quebec. No wonder he was told on four different occasions that the course he followed was the most unpatriotic course that had ever been followed by a public man.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Why, Sir, the doctrine was laid down—I think by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) personally, but if not by him personally, it was laid down by his prominent political supporters and at all events it was laid down in his own organ—the doctrine was laid down that in this matter I had betrayed the province of which I am a native. In some of the speeches of those who at that time were his followers, whatever they may be now, the declaration was made that I had betrayed my native province, because forsooth I had called to the Ministry of Public Works, not a man from the province of Quebec, but a man from the province of Ontario. The doctrine laid down by my hon. friend's party, and I think by himself also, that the portfolio of Public Works belonged to the province of Quebec, and that it was betraying the interests of my own province to call to be an occupant of that office, any one but a member coming from the province of Quebec. Now, Sir, I say that on more than one occasion the people of the province of Quebec have shown that they were not to be misled by such low appeals to their prejudices.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. The people of the province of Quebec are not to be told that this portfolio or that portfolio belongs to such and such a province. In the composition of this cabinet, it matters not where a minister comes from ; whether he comes from this province or that province ; whether it is from that place or from that other place. As chief adviser to His Excellency the Governor General, it is my duty to select a minister, and to select him, who, in my judgment and opinion, is best qualified for the position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. When the portfolio of Public Works became vacant by the resignation of my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) I thought that I could not do better than to give it to my hon. friend and colleague ; my old friend ; my friend of twenty years association with me in the work of the Liberal party on the floor of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I thought that the business ability of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) was such as to enable him to occupy the position of Minister of Public Works, with some credit to himself and some advantage to the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. And, Sir, when I did so it was no disparagement to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine). I thought that between these two portfolios it was advisable to give the one which I considered to be the most important to the man who had the most experience in public life ; the present Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Shall I be told that this was a betrayal of the interests of my province ? No, Sir ; but still, that was the issue upon which the election of Maisonneuve was fought by my hon. friend and his party. Now, Sir, two years ago there was a change in the composition of the cabinet. Two years ago the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Mills, was called to the bench of the Supreme Court, and a good appointment it was. I thought it advisable to recommend to His Excellency the successor of Mr. Mills, a gentleman from the province of Quebec, the present Minister of Justice (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick), and a good appointment it was also. Was there ever a rumour, a murmur, in the province of Ontario that by so doing I was betraying the province of Ontario ? There was not a murmur. It was admitted on all hands that the present holder of the portfolio was worthy of it. Nor has a word been said against the qualification of my hon. friend the present Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) for the position he occupies. Not a word would be said against that appointment even in the province of Quebec ; and when my hon. friend goes to the province of Quebec and tries to repeat what he has done before, tries to rouse the prejudices of the province, he will not do it at the expense of the present Minister of Public Works.

Mr. MONK. I cannot let my hon. friend state things which are not correct. I have never tried to rouse the prejudices of the province of Quebec.

The PRIME MINISTER. Here is what was said : There was a meeting at Three Rivers at which the hon. gentleman was present. It was a great pow-wow of the party, a rally to assert the principles of the great Liberal-Conservative party in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend was there as the leader of the party. I have not his speech, unfortunately ; but I have the speech of one of his prominent followers, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), and this is what that hon. gentleman said :

Mr. CASGRAIN. I will stand by it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will quote it in French, and then try to translate it into English :

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Le ministère des Pêcheries peut avoir une certaine importance par suite du contrôle qui lui est donné des grandes pêcheries des côtes des deux océans, importance qui a été de beaucoup diminuée par le récent jugement du Conseil Privé ; quant au département de la Marine à part la construction et l'entretien des phares, des bouées et des lumières, il n'a de jurisdiction, d'après le statut de 1892, que sur des sujets qui donnent au titulaire peu d'influence et de prestige.

* * * * * *

Par l'action de Sir Wilfrid Laurier, le parti libéral a subi une humiliation, la province de Québec, est bafouée, et M. Préfontaine, en ramassant cette pitance que lui ont jetée ses nouveaux collègues, a montré qu'il n'a pas la moindre fierté personnelle, ni le moindre sentiment de l'honneur national.

My hon friend says the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries may have a certain importance, but it is only of minor importance. Then he goes on to say :

By the action of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Liberal party has been subjected to humiliation, the province of Quebec has been mocked, and Mr. Préfontaine, in stooping to take the sop which his new colleagues have thrown to him, has shown not the slighest personal dignity nor the slightest feeling of national honour.

If this is not an appeal to the lowest prejudices of the people of the province of Quebec, I do not know what would be ; and this was said in the presence of the leader of the party, who now protests that he never appealed to the prejudices of the people of the province of Quebec. If there is anything that can stamp the conduct of the hon. gentleman, it is the language which I have just quoted, which was spoken in his presence, and to which he never took the slightest exception. This is the sort of warfare to which we have been subjected in the province of Quebec. I called upon my hon. friend the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries to take the portfolio. I was in poor health at the time ; I had to leave immediately for the south ; but I told him that in my opinion the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries ought to be reconstructed, so as to give it a more extended jurisdiction on matters purely nautical than it had at that time. I am not aware what my hon. friend said in his election ; he is here to speak for himself ; but as to the question put by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), since he was not in the House to hear the answer given a few days ago by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, and since his colleagues behind him have not taken him sufficiently into their confidence as to inform him, I will now tell him that all the appropriations asked for by the Minister of Public Works shall be expended by him.

Mr. MONK. I am very sorry that my right hon. friend has given to this discussion a direction which I think is wrong.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONK. I do think so. I asked a question in regard to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, to which my right hon. friend has given no answer. He admits, or seems to admit, that we have a right to information. He would not go so far as to deny that principle, but he satisfies himself with launching out against me, the most unjustifiable inuendoes. In a few muttered sentences which he utters with reference to the present incumbent of the office of Minister of Public Works, he states that the appropriations which we are at present voting will be expended under that gentleman's supervision. Now, I ask anybody if that is the pledge which was given by all those who supported my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the campaign of Maisonneuve. Is that a categorical answer ? No ; my right hon. friend knows perfectly well that what I stated in the campaign in Maisonneuve was true, that neither the Minister of Public Works nor any other member of this government would dare to come down into the county of Maisonneuve and confirm what my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries there stated. When my hon. friend was defied to produce a letter or a telegram from the right hon. leader of the government, or from any of his colleagues to the effect that the platform upon which he rested his election was approved by the government, that defiance was never accepted ; and we have the proof to-day, if proof was wanted, that the pledges given by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had no authority, and that there will be no such change in the department as my hon. friend stated that the government had decided upon. It is all very well for the right hon. leader of the government, who is surrounded by men who cannot think of anything but to applaud what he says, to come before this committee and impugn what I stated before the electors of my province. I leave these electors to appreciate the value of the indictment brought by my right hon. friend; but I wish to say to him that the accusation which he has formulated against me can very well be turned against himself and against his friends in that province. Since 1896, and before that time—and my right hon. friend knows it well—we have not been able to have an election in the province of Quebec without those very appeals which my right hon. friend charges me with making. And in the by-election referred to by my hon. friend, he has the audacity to say that the position I took in the province of Quebec, deserved castigation.

Mr. FRASER. You got it.

Mr. MONK. Well, it was after I made a speech before the Cartier Club of Montreal that my huge friend from Guysborough went before his electors and dared to say that the speech I had made was the most disloyal and unpatriotic speech ever made. On that occasion, as on many others, my hon. friend spoke about things of which he knew nothing. But let me return to the indictment of my right hon. friend. I appeal to any one who has followed the by-elections in the province of Quebec, referred to by him, to say whether those elections were not carried on, in his behalf, purely and solely upon the race cry. There was no other appeal made by hon. gentlemen opposite. In the division of Maisonneuve—and I speak on my responsibility as a member of this House—how was the canvass carried on ? Why, the Montreal 'Herald' declared editorially that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had, on more than one occasion, deserved the censure of the ratepayers of Montreal, and pointed out the manœuvres which were resorted to during that election. The electors were visited at night and asked whether they were going to vote for Mr. Labelle or for that great representative of the French Canadian race, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. And when, Sir, an elector would inquire whether my right hon. friend was a candidate for the division, he was told: 'He is not exactly a candidate, but you know Préfontaine is nothing, Sir Wilfrid is everything. He is really the man you are voting for.' Sir, until the Liberals are prepared to discuss in the province of Quebec political questions upon their merits, free from such appeals, it will be very difficult for any man in that province not to receive what my right hon. friend calls castigation.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). And majorities.

Mr. MONK. Call it what you like, but I say that it is deplorable that in my own native province, where the few deliverances which I have made since 1900 have been written out and printed and are not subject in any way to the criticism referred to—I say that it is deplorable that in that great province we are moving towards a state of things when any fair discussion of political questions will become impossible.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONK—and our great institutions for which we have done so much will not be able to work properly.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Thank you for the province.

Mr. MONK. Let me tell my hon. friend, who has made those appeals very often himself——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Never.

Mr. MONK—that if my right hon. friend should transfer his leadership to somebody else, the hon. member for Gaspé, who is essentially a time-server, will be quite prepared to transfer his laudation to whomever may be then chosen. I am not making these remarks for the purpose of disparag-

ing my native province. Very far from it. But we can understand the strength of the bonds of blood, and I say that to take an unfair advantage of this sentiment to stifle free discussion is not the proper direction to give to political struggles in that province, and the day will come when my hon. friends opposite, who now use there no other argument, will find that they have brought about for their own selfish purposes, a state of affairs which will not redound to the good or the advantage of my native province.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine). I know, Mr. Speaker, this speech of the hon. leader of the opposition in the province of Quebec almost off by heart, because I have heard it many times. I heard it repeated ad nauseam during three or four weeks in the county of Terrebonne and particularly in the county of Two Mountains. My hon. friend treats us all the time to the same theme, namely, the sacrifice of the province of Quebec, because the portfolio of Public Works was given to the hon. minister who now holds it. He continually rings the changes on the sacrifice, as he calls it, of our compatriots in the province of Quebec. From meeting to meeting, from caucus to caucus, and from street corner to street corner, we hear this complaint continually harped upon.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend will remember that he never came to any of our meetings.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I took good care to keep away from them. But before citing to the hon. gentleman his own words, which he seems to have forgotten, and which were published in his own organ, the 'Journal,' of Montreal, let me once for all say in this House a word in reply to what has been so often repeated regarding my municipal career. For nearly eighteen years I have been a member of the city council of Montreal. Previous to that time, I was mayor of the municipality of Hochelaga, before that municipality was annexed to the city of Montreal. I have always been elected by acclamation by my fellow-citizens, and after serving eighteen years in the city council, my fellow-citizens of Montreal, without distinction of party, creed or nationality, elected me as their chief magistrate by acclamation. Had my career been so bad as some pretend, it would have been easy, in a large city like Montreal, to find somebody to oppose me. But no one dared present himself, and I was left peaceably in possession of the chair of mayor of Montreal during two years. At the expiration of my term of two years, I was again elected for another term, and I may say, without being boastful or showing pride of any kind, that I could have been re-elected in 1902 during my absence in Europe, had I so desired.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There was a good deal of uncertainty about that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well, I am simply stating facts which I think can stand any attempt at contradiction by my hon. friend. My career in the municipal council was attacked daily and is being constantly attacked even now. In this House frequent allusions are made to it. But let me read only a few lines from an article published in 'La Patrie' on September 20, 1897, when I was about to be a candidate for the mayoralty:

Mr. l'échevin Préfontaine est notre prochain maire. Ses nombreux amis l'ont prié de se porter candidat aux élections prochaines, et il a accepté croyons a nous.

Alderman Préfontaine will be our next mayor. His numerous friends have asked him to be a candidate in the next elections and he has accepted, we do believe.

Cette nouvelle sera accueillie avec joie par tous les contribuables de notre grande ville.

The news will be received with rejoicing by all the tax-payers of our great city.

Voilà plus de vingt ans que M. Préfontaine est mêlé aux choses municipales et qu'il s'est pour ainsi dire identifié avec la prospérité et le progrès de Montréal.

For more than twenty years Mr. Préfontaine has been connected with municipal affairs, and he has identified himself with the prosperity and progress of Montreal.

Il a été maire d'Hochelaga avant que cette municipalité ne fut annexée à la ville et depuis plus de quinze ans il représente le quartier Hochelaga au conseil municipal de Montréal.

He was mayor of Hochelaga before that municipality was annexed to Montreal and for fifteen years he has represented that ward in the Montreal city council.

Grâce à son esprit d'initiative, à son travail, à son activité, l'ouest et l'est de Montréal ont été transformés ; des améliorations partout ont été faites ; nos rues one été pavées nos égouts ont été construits, nos parcs ont été embellis.

Thanks to his spirit of initiative, his work and activity in Montreal from east to west has been transformed. Improvements everywhere have been made, streets have been paved ; our drainage has been improved and our parks have been embellished.

Tout cela a coûté de l'argent, beaucoup d'argent.

All this has cost money—a great deal of money.

Mais les contribuables sont aujourd'hui fiers de leur ville, parce qu'elle fait l'admiration des étrangers qui la visitent.

This cost a good deal of money, but our tax payers are now proud of their city because it is the admiration of all outsiders who visit it.

Préfontaine a travaillé à la prospérité de Montréal avec cette énergie entraînante que tout le monde lui connaît.

Préfontaine has worked for the prosperity of the city of Montreal with the effective energy that everybody knows him to possess.

Son élévation à la mairie sera la récompense due à son labeur incessant.

La popularité dont il jouit dans les foules ne fera que s'accroître, quand il occupera le fauteuil de premier magistrat de notre ville.

His election to the mayoralty will be the due reward of his labour. The popularity he enjoys in the city will be increased when he occupies the mayor's chair.

That is the opinion of my hon. friend the member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), written on the 20th September, 1897. It seems that he has changed from the unanimous opinion of the citizens of the city of Montreal—for that I was unanimously acceptable was shown by the fact I have already mentioned, that there was no opposition, and I remained in the mayoralty for two years. I am sorry to have been obliged to bring this up, but I felt it my duty to do so, because the people may be misled by what has been written and said since then. But I think that nobody will be misled when I cite the exact words of the speeches made against me in the campaign which took place in the month of December last in Maisonneuve division. I will take the first meeting, which is reported in 'Le Journal' on the 26th November last. It is entitled 'The battle is in full blast.' We see in this report that Mr. Labelle, who was running against me in that election, spoke in the presence of the leader of the opposition for the province of Quebec, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). If these utterances of Mr. Labelle were not designed to arouse the national prejudices of one province against another, I do not know the meaning of the words. I translate from the report, which is in French :

Then comes the appreciation of Mr. Préfontaine, whose treachery to the province of Quebec cannot be either excused or explained. Of all those whom Sir Wilfrid Laurier asked to accept the succession to Mr. Tarte, Préfontaine was the only one who consented to bear upon his shoulders the humiliation to which he was exposing his compatriots. Let him bear the responsibility and let him not try to find elsewhere the reason of the opposition.

I must not give too many citations. It was the same cry everywhere. Every day the same thing was repeated at meetings of Conservative candidates. I have kept a number of these reports and printed appeals to the electors, with such lines as 'Treason to the Province of Quebec,' 'The Province of Quebec Betrayed,' and so on—these words often in red letters—distributed at the church doors and circulated in every way, in the hope of arousing the prejudices of the people. Now, let us see what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier says :

Mr. Monk added that it was to be regretted that the portfolio of Public Works was to be taken away from the province of Quebec and from our element, which already is not any too well treated at Ottawa. We have no good reason for the injustice put upon our province, and that injustice so put upon them the elector of Maisonneuve will resent.

Here are the exact words of the member for Jacques Cartier. Why did he pronounce them ?

Mr. MONK. I will answer, as my hon. friend asks me—it is because he is the only one who, under the circumstances, would accept that portfolio.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is confirmation of what I have been saying. Further citations of the hon. gentleman's words are unnecessary. But let me quote a few words further, for, time and again, the same thing was said, the same speeches were repeated—I had sacrificed the province of Quebec ; I had sacrificed my compatriots ; the portfolio which had been held by a member of the majority of the province of Quebec had been given to one who did not belong to that majority. All this was an appeal to the prejudices of the electors of the province of Quebec ; for, as you know, Mr. Chairman, ninety per cent of the electors there are of French origin. That is the meaning of the arguments used to the electors of Maisonneuve by all the Tory speakers that took part in the campaign. Not satisfied with having been crushed by the immense majority which the electors gave me in that election, they carried the same warfare into Two Mountains and Terrebonne, and on every hustings where I met the hon. member for Jacques Cartier there was a repetition of the same argument—the province of Quebec had been sacrificed by the portfolio of Public Works being given to an Ontario man. In the face of these attempts to arouse prejudice in the province of Quebec, had not we a right to try to explain to our people the position of affairs and make them understand the importance of the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I did try to explain, and my friends tried to explain that there were anomalies in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that there were anomalies in the Department of Public Works, and that it would be the aim of the government to try to bring order out of the confusion. What harm was there in that, I would like to know. And when the same announcement was made in the speech from the Throne at the opening of the session, I do not see why there should be so much trouble and discussion unless it is to bring up again the question that has been discussed during those four elections, and particularly during my election. Why, Sir, to hear these gentlemen during my election campaign, you would have thought that the maritime provinces, which in the past have furnished the occupant of the portfolio of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, were degraded, that their people were inferior, because they had been satisfied for thirty years with the small portfolio of Marine and Fisheries. What inferior people they must have been, these people of Nova Scotia

and Prince Edward Island, to have suffered so long the humiliation of filling the portfolio of Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Let me again cite from the language of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, as reported in the 'Journal' of the 28th of November, 1902. Speaking of myself he said :

He is so well aware of his inferiority that he has consented to replace Mr. Tarte in the insignificant role of Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But in belittling himself in that way, he is dragging his province along with him in his downfall. And to-day he is powerless to explain that degradation.

'Degradation' all the time. I am sorry that one of the ex-ministers and one of the leaders of the Conservative party, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is not present in the House to-day, because he would be flattered at being treated in this manner by one of his leaders in this House, at being told that in accepting the portfolio of Minister of Marine and Fisheries he degraded himself. Just imagine, Mr. Chairman, how low he must have fallen. Of course, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would not dare to go down to Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island and repeat language of that kind; but in the province of Quebec, among people who are supposed by a certain class of politicians not to understand political questions very well, such language is quite right and proper, when the aim is to arouse the prejudice of French Canadians against the government, because the Prime Minister had seen fit to confide to my humble self the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries, which is such a degradation to the province of Quebec. Those are the exact words of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, the leader of the opposition in the province of Quebec. If he is not trying to take advantage of a very small issue for political effect, I do not know the meaning of his speeches. Now, hon. gentlemen will find, on referring to 'Le Journal,' a great deal of edification in reading how the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island must have been degraded, because, ever since confederation, they have furnished the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Now, Sir, a great deal has been said about my declarations. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee unnecessarily, but if, Mr. Chairman, you will refer to my first speech delivered before the Liberal club of the east end of Montreal, after having been sworn in as minister, you will see exactly what my declarations were. I pointed out to the people assembled there the importance of the department, because the cry had already been started. It was not a question of politics, it was purely an attempt to arouse the prejudices of our fellow citizens in Quebec against the government. I went there, and what did I say ? I said that there were certain works, certain functions, which were under the control of the Department of Public Works at the present time, but that their control by that department involved an anomaly which the government had decided to remedy. For instance, I mentioned the hydrographic survey. I said, gentlemen, how can you explain that the hydrographic survey, which is one of the most important services for the safety of navigation, is to-day performed partly by the Department of Public Works, from Montreal to Quebec, partly by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, from Quebec to Belle Isle, and partly by the Department of Railways and Canals, from Montreal to Kingston, and again by the Department of Marine and Fisheries from Kingston to and through the lakes ? I said : Why is it that so many accidents are happening to navigation ? When you try to discover the cause of these accidents, you will find that officers of the several departments throw the blame on each other.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is the hydrographic survey in the Department of Public Works now, or in the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is as I said, partly in the Department of Public Works, for the section between Montreal and Quebec, partly in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, from Quebec to Belle Isle, partly in the Department of Railways and Canals, from Montreal to Kingston, and again under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, from Kingston to the lakes. Therefore, you have four sections under different control on the one route, the St. Lawrence route. I stated at this meeting that that was an anomaly, that this work should be all under the control either of one department or the other. Arguing from that standpoint, what did I say further ? I pointed out another anomaly in the case of the harbour commissioners. I said that there were three boards of harbour commissioners, one at Quebec, one at Montreal, and one at Three Rivers, all under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries; but when you have any work to perform you must first get the approval of the Department of Public Works. Is it not reasonable to say that the Department of Marine and Fisheries should have something to say about these works, although they might be entirely under the control of the Department of Public Works as regards nominations and so on, since the works were executed with their own money borrowed on the credit of the government ? Still is it not reasonable that the Department of Marine and Fisheries should also have a word to say in the performance of those works ?

They can build a wharf where there is no water and the Department of Marine and Fisheries will have nothing to say about it.

They can build an elevator or anything they wish regarding transportation or navigation without a word of advice to be taken from the Department of Marine and Fisheries. These are the anomalies to which I referred. There are others. There is, for instance, the work of dredging the St. Lawrence and of sweeping the channel. I do not say that these works should be at once transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, because these vast works which have been begun must better be continued under the control of the Department of Public Works. But, surely a public man has a perfect right to discuss these questions and to lay these facts before his fellow citizens. My fellow citizens accepted my view upon these questions. They knew what I had done, they knew from my public record what I could do and what I would do, and they believed me in preference to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and his confreres who came into the division of Maisonneuve, and notwithstanding what they said about the treachery of the ex-member for Maisonneuve, and notwithstanding that they predicted that I would not be re-elected, my fellow citizens were satisfied to return me for that division. I went into Terrebonne which I had represented and I carried on the campaign in the same way as I had done in Maisonneuve. It was stated right and left that the treachery of which I had been guilty would redound against the Liberal party, yet Terrebonne had never, previous to my election returned a Liberal candidate. At the present time you have a Liberal sitting for that division and elected by a larger majority than has ever been given before. These are the facts and these are the results of the speeches of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and his friends who are trying to rouse the prejudices of the electors of the province of Quebec. I repeat again what has been so ably said by my right hon. leader that the province of Quebec is not led astray by such speeches. It has never been led astray by such speeches—I thank God it has not been—and it never will be. If what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has stated be true that canvassers were going around and asking the electors to vote for the right hon. leader of the government during the last election, that, was a pretty good argument. These canvassers and the people to whom they spoke knew perfectly well who was the candidate and in electing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries they knew that they were electing a faithful and loyal friend of the right hon. leader of the government and of the Liberal party.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Surely, Mr. Chairman, I am bound to say a word or two. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) has just read an article that makes it a duty for me to get on my feet. That article which, I apprehend, I never wrote myself, was published in 1897. I was a little younger then than I am now, and I was not in newspaper work as deeply then as I am at the present time. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was then asking the vote of the electors for the mayoralty. But, before talking of our municipal affairs, I would like to say a word or two as to the main question which has been raised. Let me say, first, that I was never of the opinion and that I am not of the opinion today that the portfolio of Public Works, or Marine and Fisheries, or Finance, or any other department, belongs to one province exclusively. We are a mixed community; we are, I hope, building up a nation here. I had the honour to be for nearly six years and a half Minister of Public Works for the whole Dominion, not for the province of Quebec exclusively, but for the whole Dominion. And whatever differences might have arisen between my political friends of former days and myself I believe they will never reproach me, whatever their race may be, with having been partial either towards or against them. The Department of Public Works did not belong exclusively to the province of Quebec. I would have been very glad indeed if it had remained within the province in which it had been for many years. I was so much of that opinion that in spite of the personal differences very well known between my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself, I distinctly stated in 'La Patrie,' and I had taken full charge of the paper then, that I would have not the slightest possible objection to the hon. gentleman being appointed Minister of Public Works. I stated that publicly and I stated it privately to my hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself. But political friends at that time were raising a violent opposition against the appointment of the hon. Minister of Marine. I had nothing more to do with it; I did not say a word one way or the other. But there was a great row raised and a violent agitation took place in the Liberal ranks against the appointment of the hon. member for Maisonneuve. Most of that opposition came, I may say, or a great deal of it at any rate, from those who had been opposed to the hon. gentleman in his municipal career. I do not believe that we are called upon to discuss within this House all our municipal difficulties in Montreal. However, since the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has seen fit to quote an article that was published in 'La Patrie' six years ago, let me say a word or two on that topic. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries had been for many years Chairman of the Roads Committee of the city of Montreal, and he was mayor for two years.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Four years.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. It is long indeed—very long.

Mr. BELCOURT. It might have been longer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It might have been longer, but the city of Montreal decided in another way. Those who were most violently opposed to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries were the strongest Liberals in the city of Montreal. In 1897 he was elected mayor, and he was elected in 1900 also. I may say that it was very difficult in the past to make any opposition to the hon. gentleman. I am speaking within the hearing of many people from the city of Montreal who took part in the municipal elections. The racial cry was the principal cry that the hon. gentleman used all the time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I beg to deny in the most formal manner what the hon. gentleman has stated just now. He cannot show a single word from me to that effect. It is all gratuituous. Let him try it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman knows very well that I am within Gospel truth. There was for a time an English majority in the city council of Montreal. My hon. friend and others made up their minds—I do not blame them—that the French Canadians should have their share, and they started a strong agitation to take hold of municipal affairs. The hon. gentleman made that fight on the racial cry. He and his friends made that fight on the racial cry for years and years.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I deny it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend may deny it, but I am speaking the truth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I will accept his denial in the parliamentary sense, but my words will be read by the whole city of Montreal.

Mr. COWAN. You supported him apparently.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I said it was very difficult indeed to raise an opposition against him.

Mr. COWAN. You tried.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I tried and I succeeded.

Mr. COWAN. When ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The strongest Liberals came to 'La Patrie' and to myself personally, just as they went to the right hon. leader of the government himself on several occasions and represented to him that the city of Montreal was being wrecked and was being destroyed. The organization against my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) in municipal affairs was in the 'Herald' office. The 'Herald' people came to my office and to me personally. The leaders of the Liberal party in Montreal—I will give the names if I am asked to give names, because there is no secret about it—they came to me and they asked me whether 'La Patrie' would consent to take a hand in the fight, because they felt that if they had not a French paper to speak to the French electors, it was out of the question to have municipal reform in Montreal. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) had made an alliance with a certain group in the Conservative party—the 'La Presse' people—at the time. If there was not a French paper in a position to make a fight against him, a fight was out of the question. I give these explanations so that people will understand how 'La Patrie' was drawn into those municipal contests. It took us some time before we were able to get municipal reform in Montreal. In 1900, most of the aldermen who had followed my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) were defeated ; defeated to a man. He remained the only one of his group in the municipal council. He was allowed to be elected mayor. We had clipped his wings and he was allowed to remain there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In 1902 he tried his level best to be a candidate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was not here.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman went away, but he placed his candidature before the electorate and he could not be elected and he withdrew. But this is only municipal history, and I would not have alluded to it if I had not been invited by my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) to do so. In 1897, it appears that 'La Patrie' supported him. In 1900 he was allowed to be elected under the conditions that have been described. In 1902 he was defeated, to his great happiness, because he has been made a minister since. Now, as to his last election campaign. There is no doubt whatever that he stated to the electorate that a part of the Public Works Department would be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. His words have been reported verbatim. What he announced will not be done. That is sufficient for me. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is right on one point, and that is, when he said that the hydraulic survey should be placed in the Marine Department. I share his views on that point. The reason why the Department of Public Works undertook the survey on the St. Lawrence river between Quebec and Montreal, was because that department was carrying on extensive dredging, and it was necessary to have in-

formation and data, but it was not the intention or ambition to trespass on the rights of any other department. The dredging work is nearly finished now. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) may take over the hydrographic survey if he chooses; after one more year's work it will be finished. I repeat that there is no sound argument to be invoked in support of the contention that one department should always belong to the same province. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has alluded to appeals that have, he claims, been made in the elections of 1896 and 1900. There were apepals on both sides. I have read a great many appeals in these two campaigns. I hope we will never hear them again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I hope that in future we will discuss political questions on their merits. The people of this country have grown big enough to discuss political questions on their merits. Let me tell my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that I differ from him on the point that in the province of Quebec we cannot discuss any political question today on their merits because the name of the Prime Minister is supreme. The name of the right hon. gentleman is a powerful name, I am bound to say, in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I spring from the soil so to speak; I am the son of a farmer, and I claim that there is enough independence in the hearts, and in the souls, and in the conscience of the French Canadians, whether farmers or workingmen or anything else, to discuss political questions and to understand them as they deserve to be understood. There is no doubt that my right hon. friend's name is a powerful one in the province of Quebec, but I would not be afraid in any way to discuss with him now, as I have in past years, the political questions of the day, and I would not be afraid of the verdict, if I am right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The province of Quebec is equal to the other provinces of this Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We are not carried away by a name, or by prejudices, or by passion. There may be people who are prejudiced, but there are prejudiced people in every part of the Dominion.

An hon. MEMBER. Everywhere.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, everywhere. I protest in a friendly way, but as firmly as I can against the assertion that the name of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is so powerful that we cannot with advantage discuss political questions in our province. The time may come when we may be obliged to discuss these questions with my right hon. friend, and the people of the province of Quebec will listen to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, to myself, to anybody who will appeal to them and give us a fair hearing. I am sure that the words spoken by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) do not express his real sentiments and views on this question. Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we from the city of Montreal, have relied too much on the indulgence of the House in discussing our municipal affairs, but as they are somewhat connected with our political differences it was just as well to settle our case kindly, as I have endeavoured to do.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have listened with a good deal of attention to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) and I am surprised that he has raised such a breeze in the House, over an incident which one would think should have been settled by what occurred here a few days ago. I would not have attempted to speak in this debate, were it not that the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) had made some insinuations with regard to my humble self. He has stated that as a member of the Liberal party, I had appealed to passions and prejudices in the province of Quebec to sustain the Liberal party, or what he termed, the cause of the right hon. leader of the government. I beg to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), in the most respectful manner, in the most courteous manner, speaking from my seat in parliament—and this is the right place to make such a denial—that never in my political life did I make any such appeals as he said I made.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have met the hon. gentleman in four counties where elections were held recently; I have met him in many political discussions; and I call upon him now to say if I ever uttered in his hearing such appeals as he has mentioned. I say that I never did. But, Sir, let me show the course which the hon. gentleman has pursued in the province of Quebec for the last four or five years. Last year, speaking on the budget, I quoted the remarks which were made by him before the Morin Club, a very piwerful Conservative association in Montreal. I will again quote those remarks, not as reported in 'La Patrie' or 'La Presse' or any other French Canadian papers, but as telegraphed to the Toronto 'Mail and Empire,' the chief organ of the Liberal Conservative party in this country. Here is what my hon. friend said, as reported in that paper:

Laurier Fails in Duty to Quebec. His Premiership of No Aid to French Canadians. Notable Speech by F. D. Monk.

And the 'Mail' goes on to say:

By the very nature of his position Sir Wilfrid Laurier was obliged every day to make conces-

sions. In the same way when the subsidies to the provinces came up for consideration, Prince Edward Island received a bonus. New Brunswick will also receive one, but Quebec's claims are left without consideration. The same thing applied to experimental farms. Every other province had one, but Quebec was left out. In the Immigration Department, conducted by Mr. Sifton, the French Canadians were practically eliminated. The immigration was directed to the far west, to the detriment of Quebec. Referring to the Montreal harbour works, Mr. Monk said that the necessary works have been delayed for years simply because the government is afraid to do anything for the province of Quebec, which gives Canada its Prime Minister. All along the line Mr. Monk claimed that Quebec province had gained nothing, but, on the contrary, had lost in prestige and advantages by having one of its own sons at the head of the government.

This is the language used by my hon. friend in every political campaign in our province, and he dares to state before this House that we, the members of the Liberal party, are raising racial issues against his own party, when, as I have clearly demonstrated, we have to answer such arguments as these on the platform. Sir, I have met lately the hon. gentleman in the county of Maisonneuve, and in the county of Terrebonne, and I am bound to say for the edification of this House, that this is the kind of language used by my hon. friend when he speaks to the French Canadian electors. I have here the verbatim report of the speech made by him shortly after the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was called to office. He was speaking at Three Rivers on Friday, the 14th of November last. I will translate it. This is what he sand :

What a spectacle is now offered to us ! Of what are we sorrowful witnesses ? You see the most important department of the government taken away from the province of Quebec. If Mr. Tarte has administered his department in a fair and proper way, why cannot there be found an honest man to succeed him ?

That is the way the hon. gentleman spoke of his own province and our public men.

Why have they chosen the occasion when there are so many public works here and in Montreal to be undertaken, to take away the department from us ? The reason for the hesitation which has attended the appointment of Mr. Tarte's successor, is that Mr. Sutherland was contending that the province of Ontario was entitled to the department. Why has not Mr. Préfontaine insisted that this department should be dismantled, and why has he not defended our rights ?

Sir, this is the verbatim speech delivered by the hon. gentleman at the moment the hon. member for Maisonneuve was called to the cabinet. I was present also when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries made his speech before the Liberal Club of Montreal East, and what did he state ? Did he state in a formal manner that the Department of Public Works would be merged in the Department of Marine and Fisheries ? Sir, I state here boldly that he did not. I heard what he said, and I listened carefully. He stated that at an informal meeting held the day previous with his colleagues, he was asked by them to make a report on the feasibility of a scheme to merge a part of the Department of Public Works into the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MONK. Will my hon. friend allow me ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. MONK. This is what my hon. friend himself stated in an interview in 'La Presse:'

As an old fighter I congratulate him on his nomination. I do not know the intentions of the government on the subject of the changes which are to be made in the ministry of Public Works. If the modifications announced are made, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries must become very important. I hope sincerely that they will take place, because the St. Lawrence route, in which the province of Quebec is so interested, will benefit thereby.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Sir, I am reported faithfully, and I will not take one word from that interview. It is true, and I hope it will be found to be true at the end. But really my hon. friend is too old a parliamentarian to revive such dead issues. Does he fancy for the moment that there are not enough reporters, journalists and telegraph officers in this country to record what is being stated by public men during a political campaign ? Let me warn my hon. friend that each time he speaks in the province of Quebec, as he has spoken during the last six or seven years, he will be faithfully reported at least by the Liberal press of Canada if not by the Conservative press.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We are charged to-day by hon. gentlemen ; who, with their political ancestors, have for the last half century been raising in our province political issues of a racial and religious character. I appeal to the old parliamentarians who sit around me ; I appeal to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) who has stood the brunt of the battle for nearly half a century.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let him recall to this House how the French Canadian Liberals, who have borne the battle in the days gone by were treated by their Conservative opponents. Sir, for a number of years the Liberals in the province of Quebec were ousted from public life, nay, even from the church. They could not appear on a political platform. They were branded as bad Catholics and as enemies of society. But slowly and slowly the truth came out. They had a great leader in the person of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. In him we

had a man who appealed, not to the prejudices of his race, but to their intelligence and their conscience, and he made the name of Liberal respected throughout that province, as it is to-day throughout the Dominion. To-day we are no more ousted from the church, we are respected by the powers that be, notwithstanding the unchristian, the unpatriotic attitude of the leaders of the Conservative party towards us. We all have learned, through the great lessons taught by our leader, the value of civil rights. But my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) I understand, has raised this debate in order not to let his hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) take the lead. We all know that to be the case. It is, as we say in French, 'un secret de Polichinelle,' it is secret which is running about every street in Montreal that my hon. friend from Montmorency is the would-be successor of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and the latter asserted this afternoon his leadership by bringing up an old issue which had already been thrashed out the other day. You are probably not aware, Sir, that after the election which took place during the months of November and December last, the leading Conservative organ in Montreal, 'Le Journal,' which was then his organ, but which has since veered around and transferred its allegiance and support to my hon. friend from Montmorency, informed him plainly that he could not continue to act as the leader of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, unless he changed his political tactics. It is well known that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has been disavowed by a section of his own party, and by the official organ of that party, and this explains why we are assisting to-day at this little comedy. Yesterday it was my hon. friend from Montmorency who took the lead by bringing up in the House the Treadgold question, and to-day my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier reasserts his title to the leadership by this attack on the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, notwithstanding the fact that my friend from Montmorency brought the same question before the House a few days ago. But I must say this of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier—and I say it in all seriousness—that he enjoys the confidence of his small but gallant phalanx of followers in the province of Quebec, and that, in my opinion, his rival, the hon. member for Montmorency, will not succeed in ousting him from the leadership.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not rise, Mr. Speaker, to answer at very great length, the rather impassioned address just delivered by my hon. friend from Gaspé, who seems to have a grudge against either the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) or myself.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not at all, you are my best friends.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend got rather excited and angry, for what reason I am not aware, except that he was anxious to follow the lead of my right hon. friend the First Minister and make an appeal on the same lines. But let me tell my hon. friend from Gaspé that these personal attacks come with very bad grace, especially from him, because if we desired to be disagreeable we could refer back to an election which he went through in Gaspé and bring up again some incidents in that election which would certainly not tell to his credit. But I do not propose to go into such personal matters nor do I propose to rake up ancient history, as my hon. friend did when he talked of the times when, according to him, the Liberals in the province of Quebec were ousted from the church by the Conservatives. I shall content myself with going back to the general elections which took place in 1896, during which the chief argument used by hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends in the province of Quebec was that the late Conservative government had got this House to vote $3,000,000 for the purpose of buying rifles and enlisting French Canadians to fight the battles of the empire. From parish to parish they went, trying to hound down the Conservatives because, they said, 'you voted $3,000,000 to buy rifles with which to arm our sons and send them to fight the battles of England in a distant land.' Would my hon. friend not call that an appeal to race and prejudice ? And I might point to an hon. minister opposite me who, though he is not given to raising his voice in discussion in this House, is most vehement on the hustings, and was one of the most guilty parties in this instance. Nor will I give more than a passing reference to an argument used in the election of 1900, by prominent gentlemen on the other side who came to fight me in that election, and whose principle argument was that the candidate they were opposing was born in Ontario and spoke English almost as well as French and sent his son to an English Protestant institution. Would my hon. friend not call that an appeal to racial prejudice ? Yet hon. gentlemen who were guilty of such appeals try to lecture us on this side because forsooth, in the exercise of our duty and of our rights, we say that the province of Quebec was humiliated when the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) accepted the portfolio of Minister of Marine and Fisheries instead of insisting on being given the portfolio of Public Works, left vacant by the resignation of the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte). We say that in taking that sop, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries humiliated his province. I have no need to rise here to explain the words which my right hon. friend the Premier read from the speech I made in Three Rivers. These words require no justification at my hands. I stand by what I there said, and I defy my right hon. friend

to quote one sentence in any speech I have ever delivered in any part of this country of which I need be ashamed before this House. And that is more than my right hon. friend and a great many who sit around him can say. Dare they repeat what they said at Chicoutimi and other places in the province of Quebec during the elections of 1896 and 1900 ? I defy them to do it. I say again let them read, if it is not too fatiguing for them, the report of any speech I ever made either in the province of Quebec or in the province of Ontario and quote any sentence for which I need blush before my colleagues in this House or the people of Canada. What is the position I took in the speech I made at Three Rivers. I said that ever since 1878 the portfolio of Public Works had been held by a minister from the province of Quebec, that it was one of the most important in the gift of the Governor General and the Prime Minister, and that it had been in the hands of a French Canadian of the province of Quebec ever since that year. I said that this department had been ably administered by the minister who had just vacated it, and that, under the circumstances, it was the bounden duty of the hon. member for Maisonneuve to insist, as a condition of his entering the government at all, on being given that department. I further said, Sir, that if I had been in his place I would not have accepted the humiliation of taking an inferior department—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes, Sir, I repeat it—the humiliation of taking an inferior department. I would have insisted upon having the Department of Public Works or one of the other most important departments in the gift of my right hon. friend. What further did I say? I said that it looked very strange, remembering what the 'Herald' had said, remembering what the 'Witness' had said, and what must have been said to my right hon. friend the leader of the government in relation to the past career of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—it looked very much as if my right hon. friend would not trust the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with any great spending department. And I declared that that was one of the causes for the humiliation of the hon. gentleman, and it became the humiliation of the province of Quebec in his person, when he accepted the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which is not an important department compared with the Department of Public Works, and is not a great spending department. These were the sentiments to which I gave expression. I have nothing to be ashamed of in them, and I repeat them here before the House in the hearing of my colleagues, and I know I shall have their support.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THE IMPERIAL COMPANY.

House went into Committee on Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Imperial Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). There seems to be some misunderstanding about this Bill, Mr. Chairman. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Empire, Accident and Surety Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Shipping Federation of Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 156) to incorporate the Montreal-Longueuil Bridge Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 158) to incorporate the St. Chrysostome Railway Company.—Mr. Brown.

Bill (No. 163) respecting the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 164) to incorporate the Pacific Bank of Canada.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 166) to incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

Bill (No. 167) respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, and to change its name to 'The Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company.'—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 169) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of James Sinclair McDougall.—Mr. Gallery.

Bill (No. 170) to incorporate the Nipigon Iron Range Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 171) to incorporate the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.—Mr. Stephens.

Bill (No. 172) to incorporate the City and County Bank of Canada.—Mr. Rosamond.

SUPPLY.

House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Chairman, when you rose at six o'clock, I really had not very much more to say upon the subject which is occupying the attention of the committee, but still, in view of what has been said it seems to me that this discussion can be continued for some minutes more

so as to get from the government what we have been trying to get for some time—a specific declaration of what is the policy of the government upon the important question as to whether or not the Department of Public Works is to be divided between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Public Works. Of course, after the very lucid explanation which was given here this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) probably the committee is enlightened and we should not say any more. On the other hand it seems to me that the government is bound to state whether or not the declarations made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries on an important occasion are to be carried out by the government; in other words, whether the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was really authorized to make the statements which he did make. I noticed that both the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), when they spoke about this question, were not very definite in the expression of their opinions as to what really was to be done. The right hon. leader of this House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) also spoke, but we fail to find in anything which he said a definite policy laid down by him as to what really was to be done. When my hon. friend quoted what he said at this meeting of the Liberal club, or Le Club Liberal de la Partie-Est, I think it is, I noticed that he did not quote what is here put in his mouth by the newspapers of Montreal. I want to know if he repudiates the report of his speech which was given both by 'La Patrie' and 'La Presse' on that occasion, because both of these reports are identical in terms. Now, my hon. friend, as I read to the House the other night, said, in fact, this :

Gentlemen, let us be reasonable, let us examine the situation as it is. The Department of Public Works at this moment are spending several millions of dollars. This sum is spent in public buildings and their maintenance, including the parliament buildings at Ottawa, and in the construction of new buildings in every part of the country where they are needed. Moreover, the Department of Public Works until now has had the dredging of rivers, has carried on the improvements in the port of Montreal, with the assistance, of course, of the harbour commission and of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. But if we put every man in his place, and if we say to the Department of Public Works, not only by words but by deeds, you shall only have under your control the works on the public buildings and the public improvements which relate to the maintenance of the country, but everything which concerns navigation, such as dredging the rivers, the construction of wharfs, the construction of elevators, the building of dry docks, and so on, if we say that all this concerns navigation and therefore concerns the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and if you put this into a law, is it not true that you have there all the guarantees which you can desire ? But you are told : This is to make the province of Quebec believe that you are not sacrificed. Well, gentlemen, again I repeat, let us be reasonable. If I tell you as I have already said twice, that I have accepted the portfolio under these conditions.

I will call the attention of the committee to this :

And, gentlemen, again I repeat, let us be reasonable. If I tell you, as I have already said twice, that I have accepted the portfolio under these conditions and that they have been sanctioned, it is because I sincerely believe the promises which have been made, the declarations which have been made, and it is because I am sincerely convinced that these promises and declarations will be realized.

So there are the words which were pronounced by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He distinctly said that all those works which are now under the control of the Department of Public Works were to be under his department. He went farther than that. He said : These are the conditions under which I accept the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries and these are the sanctioned declarations that I have authority for making to the country. These are the conditions under which I accepted office, and if these conditions had not been granted I would not have accepted. But, there is the indefinite statement that we have now before the committee. We have this statement simply from my hon. friend who spoke this afternoon that probably the hydrographic survey which is now in part under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries would be placed wholly under the control of this department. If the hon. gentleman had not come to the electors of the province of Quebec with the distinct statements he made in this speech, the result of the election in Maisonneuve would have been different from what it was when he was elected. It is strange, after what the right hon. leader of the House said this afternoon, if he had decided from the outset to take into his cabinet the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that it took so long to come to a decision, because it is in the remembrance of everybody that it took three weeks before my hon. friend was taken into the cabinet. And why, Sir ?—because it is well known also that deputation after deputation came up here to Ottawa to urge that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries be not taken into the cabinet, but that the hon. gentleman who sits here as speaker of this House (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) should be appointed one of the ministers of the Crown. Here is the 'Herald' of Montreal, not a Conservative organ, not one which is favourable to this side of the House, but one of the great organs of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec, and it went so far as to publish the portrait of Mr. Speaker and to say :

The 'Herald' is to-day in a position to state that the Hon. L. P. Brodeur, member for Rouville, and Speaker of the House of Commons, will probably succeed Hon. Mr. Tarte as Minis-

ter of Public Works in the cabinet of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

There is no doubt whatever that there was great wrangling in the Liberal ranks at that time. Deputation after deputation came to Ottawa to urge upon the Prime Minister that he should take into the cabinet the Speaker of this House (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) and not the member for Maisonneuve (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine). We were told some time ago that a definite statement would be made to the House as to the policy of the government on this matter, and why is it that such a statement is so long delayed ? I take it, Sir, that the Department of Public Works, having been given to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), it will not be divided now, and that the hon. gentleman is a believer in the motto 'what we have we'll hold.' I suppose that the government should decide to take the Public Works from my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), or suppose they should now propose to diminish the importance of that department, I put it to gentlemen on the other side of the House, if the members from the other provinces, and especially from Ontario, would not resent such a change. There is nothing extraordinary in the views which I gave expression to, and which were quoted by the Prime Minister to-day. The province of Quebec had for a long time control of the Department of Public Works, and I simply expressed the views of one province at the change that had been made. I feel certain that were that department taken from the province of Ontario to-day we would hear the same protest from Ontario. In the Montreal 'Gazette' of November 12th, the Minister of Marine was interviewed, and this is the report of the interview :

'Will there be any new functions added to the Department of Marine and Fisheries' asked the reporter.

'Yes,' said the hon. gentleman, 'but that cannot be done until parliament meets and the change is ratified by the people's representatives. You see the duties of the several portfolios are at present defined by Act of the central legislature, so nothing short of an amending Act of parliament can affect the change. The St. Lawrence river works will be added to the Marine Department.'

I call the attention of the House to the fact that this interview has never been repudiated. The Minister of Marine continued :

'That will give us the service of building and maintaining our wharfs in the different waters of the Dominion. This will give my department the oversight of what is commonly known as transportation. I have had some opportunity for a study of the subject and I will give it more.' With regard to his Montreal critics Mr. Préfontaine remarked that he had nothing to say at present but time will show them. I am not the man they have represented me to be.'

That is a corroboration of the speech made by the hon. gentleman, but that is not all.

Some time after he had been sworn in as minister, he took the government steamer 'Frontenac,' and with certain of his friends he sailed down the St. Lawrence on a survey. The organs of the government in the province of Quebec announced that this was only the initial stage, and that the Minister of Marine was doing this as it were to take possession of that part of the Public Works Department, which he thought should be put into the Department of Marine. These were the excuses given by him when it was urged that when he had accepted the portfolio of Marine he had done a thing which was detrimental to the interests of the province of Quebec. Now, Sir, when the Prime Minister spoke this afternoon, he appeared to be inspired by a spirit of anger which I have seldom seen him exhibit. The only explanation which I can give for that is, that the Prime Minister was so annoyed at the Minister of Marine that he thought he would vent his anger upon my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. There was nothing in the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) which could in any way justify the tone and the manner of the Prime Minister, but the right hon. gentleman was so annoyed at his Minister of Marine that he thought he would take satisfaction out of the member for Jacques Cartier. Now, Sir, reference has been made to the existence of alleged differences among the members of the Conservative party in this House. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen opposite that there are no differences in our party. Never before was the Liberal-Conservative party so united as it is to-day.

Some hon MEMBERS. Oh.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Never before was the Liberal-Conservative party so united in its opposition to the gentlemen who sit upon the treasury benches. Never before was it so united in word and in deed, in the performance of the duty which it believes it owes to the people of Canada. If hon. gentlemen opposite can take any comfort from street rumours as to differences which exist between my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) and myself, they are easily satisfied. When my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), in 1900 was the unanimous choice of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec as their leader, I was one of the first to sanction that choice, and I welcomed it as a sure sign of victory at the next election.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes, and my hon. friends on the other side know that what I am saying is true ; they feel it in their bones. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk), since being elected leader of the Quebec Liberal-Conservatives, has grown in the estimation

and respect of every man in this House, and every man in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) deservedly has the esteem and respect of this House, and I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite, if they do not know it, that he has no more devoted follower than I am. My hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) says I have ambitions. Sir, I have no ambition to be either the leader of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec or the leader of the district of Quebec. I have not the time, I have not the means, and especially I have not the ability to be leader, even if I so desired. But Sir, I am honoured in being an humble and ardent and zealous supporter of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. POPE. I feel compelled to say a few words in this, in some respects unfortunate debate, because early in the session I entered my protest against the removal from the province of Quebec of such an important department as Public Works, which had been presided over for many years by a member from that province. I agree that no province in Canada owns any particular portfolio, but I do say that the two great provinces of Ontario and Quebec have for many years been recognized as entitled to a fair share of the departments which control patronage and the expenditure of public money. These provinces represent the great majority of the taxpayers of Canada, and it is only right that they should have representation in some degree commensurate with the contributions which they make to the public treasury. Upon the ground, as a business ground, irrespective of parties or nationalities or religions, I think it is a sound principle for a Prime Minister to act upon in forming his government, that the two large provinces of Quebec and Ontario should have strong and prominent representatives in the cabinet. I do not think that will be considered a narrow or prejudiced or debatable ground. Well, there must have been some reason for not carrying out this well-recognized principle in this particular case. The ex-Minister of Public Works, we all agree, had been doing good work, according to his best judgment, and subject to the criticism to which every hon. minister, no matter how good his judgment may be, must be subject. He had been putting a great deal of labour and effort into the work of his department, with the object of rendering, to the best of his ability, good service to the country in carrying on the operations of that department and in dispensing the enormous patronage which was placed in his hands. The Prime Minister undertook to select a successor to the hon. Minister of Public Works, who had retired, and he took a long time to decide upon a man. It was not the decision of a moment. He consulted Liberals far and wide; he was sometimes in Quebec, sometimes in Ottawa, sometimes in Montreal; possibly he may have consulted business men, some of whom were outside the ranks of the Liberal party. In choosing a successor to the Minister of Public Works, he was not obliged to take the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He had the names of many other hon. gentlemen before him, the Speaker, for instance, and other men quite capable of taking charge of any reasonable portfolio. But the right hon. gentleman saw fit to select the hon. member for Maisonneuve. When he made that choice, he had the record of the hon. gentleman before him. That record was either one which should entitle the hon. gentleman to favour at the hands of the Prime Minister, or it was not. Having been at the head of the municipal public works of the city of Montreal, which is the largest city in Canada, and which has a very large expenditure, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries had certainly been in the very best possible school for fitting a man to fulfil the duties of Minister of Public Works of Canada. He had been through the kindergarten experience, which is sometimes a good thing for men to have before entering the cabinet. He had made a record there. If that record was what it ought to have been, the Prime Minister was quite right in selecting him, and he should have given him the Department of Public Works. If that record was not what it ought to have been, the Prime Minister was wrong in taking him into his cabinet at all. As we look over the hon. gentleman's history, which he has made for himself in his native province, as that history is recorded, not by the Conservative press, but by his own friends, we shall be able to understand why the Prime Minister hesitated about placing under that hon. gentleman's control a great spending department like the Department of Public Works. That history has been read here to-day very largely from the Montreal 'Herald,' and it is not necessary for me to go over it again. I will quote, however, what the 'Herald' said on the 10th of November last:

> The 'Herald' particularly, during a five years' campaign against corruption and extravagance at the city hall, had no option but to conclude that his powerful influence had been and was being exerted against the city's best interest. What Mr. Préfontaine's idea of his future may be, and precisely what view Sir Wilfrid Laurier may take of the matter, is not for us to know, but it is clear that in Montreal, where he has lived under the limelight of publicity, there must be grave misgivings concerning the wisdom of the selection, not only on the part of the more or less disinterested general public, but quite as much on the part of those whose particular concern is the welfare of the administration.

As I looked over the files of this paper, and found these articles one after another,

beginning in January, 1900, appearing in this leading Liberal organ in the province of Quebec, I saw denunciations against the hon. gentleman so bold and daring that their equal could not be found in any paper in Canada, Liberal or Conservative, against any other public man in Canada. The hon. gentleman said to-day that he had acclamations in the city of Montreal, that after he had been elected mayor of the city, he had been continued in that office during four years. Well, here is what the 'Herald' says on his retirement :

The need of the whole city is to be quit of Mr. Préfontaine's domination, and equally to be rid of the system he represents. Préfontaine-ism means the manipulation of the municipal authority for the benefit of those who have business relations with the city, and it means the neglect of public services, the corruption of civic departments, the dissipation of municipal revenues, which result when members of the council extend to themselves the preferential treatment meted out to great corporations.

That is the opinion expressed by the Montreal 'Herald' when the hon. gentleman was getting ready to retire. The hon. gentleman said he retired because he did not wish to run again. The Montreal 'Herald' does not concur in that statement. It said this :

Mr. Préfontaine was again desirous of being mayor. At the last moment he retired in favour of Mr. Wilson-Smith.

What was the result of this retirement in favour of Mr. Wilson-Smith ? I have no hesitation in saying that when he retired in favour of Mr. Wilson-Smith, he beat Mr. Wilson-Smith. That gentleman was not elected, but the man who was least expected to be elected, Mr. Cochrane, was elected mayor of Montreal. The outside world never imagined that Mr. Cochrane would defeat Mr. Wilson-Smith; but the very fact that this hon. gentleman whose history was told in the press of the city of Montreal, retired in favour of Mr. Wilson-Smith, was quite enough to satisfy the electors with the selection of Mr. Cochrane, notwithstanding the opinion they had previously held of Mr. Wilson-Smith. If that was the stamp that was placed on his candidature, then they did not want him, and Mr. Cochrane was elected mayor. Before I sit down I should like to refer briefly to the lecture which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister saw fit to give this afternoon with regard to the differences of opinion on this side. I have been considerably at a loss to account for this lecture, because I have never before heard that any such differences of opinion existed. Of course I am only a very humble follower of my leader, but still, as we on this side have no need of Privy Council Chambers in which our leaders may separate themselves from their followers and do business without our counsel, we form as a whole an independant caucus of our own, where we hold counsel together, and therefore if there be any difficulties among us they cannot fail to be known to every member of our party. I therefore think that I can speak with some authority on that point. Evidently some one of the right hon. gentleman's friends has been loading him up the wrong way, which, I must say, is rather cruel treatment, because he makes bad bulls-eyes enough when he does his own aiming without having his rifle loaded up and aimed for him by somebody else. He is certainly being misled, and considering that right hon. gentleman's health, it is very unfair for any of his associates to furnish him with information so utterly unfounded. I can, however, understand the right hon. gentleman's anxiety to find companions in misery, for he has certainly been rather tried of late himself. He has been compelled to part with one of his best ministers and to accept, after long hesitation, in the place of that minister, a gentleman who has been criticised by his own party press as no public man has ever before been attacked by the press of the party to which he belonged.

The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) took occasion this afternoon to inform the House that the race cry in the province of Quebec was first raised by the Conservative party. I was rather astonished to hear my hon. friend give expression to an allegation so glaringly contradicted by the facts. Sir, there was at one time in this country a gentleman who occupied the highest position among his compatriots, and who besides commanded the high esteem of this entire country. I refer to the late Sir George E. Cartier. His name has been revered by Liberal-Conservatives, from the day he first took part in politics down to the present. Was his life I ask you, Sir, a bed of roses ? Was he not rather dogged to his very grave by political organizations with which my hon. friend from Gaspé sympathizes ? Was he not held up to public obloquy by that very party in those days, the leaders of which to-day acknowledge him as having been the ablest champion of the French Canadian race in this country ? Sir, the same racial prejudices were then raised against him as are being raised against the leaders of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec to-day. He was accused of being too broad in his sympathies, of not being sufficiently patriotic from a narrow and sectional point of view, because his policy was to make all races and creeds in this Dominion work in harmony. But no man to-day would say that the late Sir G. E. Cartier was not in his life time the greatest defender of the rights and interests of his compatriots which the province of Quebec ever produced. And when the hon. member for Gaspé speaks of the racial cry as having been originated in the province of Quebec by the Liberal-Conservative party, I refer him to the attacks which were made by the Liberals of that day on the man whom they now recognize as having had

all the qualities of a great leader. No, Sir, it was not the Conservative party which was responsible for the exciting of the people by the racial prejudices we have heard so much of during late years. But coming down to recent days, who was the father of national prejudice in the province of Quebec of late years ? Why, everybody knows that it was the late Hon. Honoré Mercier. It was he who set the province wild over racial issues. I have never heard that he was a Conservative. I have never heard that he ever had any sympathy or affiliations of any kind with the Liberal-Conservative party. And when we come down to the present day, let me say that there is no man in political life more keen than our able and our eloquent young friend from Gaspé to take advantage of every small opportunity which he thinks will weigh with his own nationality. Why, I remember when, during the election in Sherbrooke, when the present member for that county (Mr. McIntosh) was opposed by Mr. LeBaron, the cry was raised in favour of Mr. LeBaron that he was not only a French Canadian but descended from one of the oldest families of France, and had in his veins the best French blood in the country. My hon. friend from Gaspé raised the same cry in the county of Bagot, and in fact he never fails in appealing to national sentiment wherever and whenever he thinks such appeals can have any effect. I have always hoped, though in that hope I have been frequently disappointed, that our hon. friends opposite from the province of Quebec would, from their experience in this parliament, become seized with a broader national spirit, and when they went back again to the platform would resort to appeals of a different kind than those made this afternoon by my hon. friend from Gaspé and those around him. And I still do not despair that some day they will learn the great lesson of toleration and become convinced that it is not in the best interests of Canada nor of the French Canadian nationality in the province of Quebec to be continually trading on and prostituting what, in many respects, is one of the best sentiments of our nature.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think, Sir, that it is of some importance that the very words of my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, should be put on record in the official reports of the debates of this parliament. Whether the choice which was made by the right hon. the First Minister in selecting the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the portfolio he holds, be wise or not, does not concern me at present.

The right hon. gentleman has thought fit to make the hon. gentleman one of his colleagues. It was undoubtedly his right. He has done it after a good deal of consideration, I have no doubt. I think that an hon. gentleman whom we all respect very much, the hon. Speaker of the House, had the offer of the same position, that he accepted it, but the position did not come to him. I make that statement without divulging any secrets, for I was not in the secrets of the government then. I make the statement that the Speaker of the House got the offer of the position which the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries got later on, that he accepted it, but that—I do not know for what reason—he did not get it. That statement cannot be contradicted, because it is true. I go on quoting the words of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, so that they may be on record. It is of importance that the programme speech of an hon. gentleman who accepts a position in the government should be known, and that it should be followed, unless reasons to the contrary are given. I quote the words of the hon. gentleman to a greater extent than they have been quoted before, because it is of importance to the country at large to know how we stand in these matters. There is no doubt whatever that the hon. gentleman stated publicly, openly and solemnly that he had been authorized by his colleagues in the government to say that he would get from the Department of Public Works the control of the dredging, harbour improvements and other works relating to navigation. He made that announcement, and stated over and over again that he had been authorized by his colleagues and by the right hon. leader of the government to make it. I shall quote the utterances of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries word for word. They were reported not only in 'La Patrie' and 'La Presse,' but in the English papers also. There has been a campaign or discussion in the province of Quebec for about a month, especially between 'La Presse' and 'La Patrie.' I wrote most of the articles in 'La Patrie' to try to establish the position that the Department of Public Works should not be dismembered, while 'La Presse,' which was and still is, to a large extent, the personal organ of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, contended to the contrary, and held the view that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have control of certain services now under the Department of Public Works. Let me quote the very words of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I will give them first in French :

L'accusation qui est portée contre le chef du gouvernement qu'il a sacrifie la province de Québec en me choisissant comme un de ses collègues et me confiant le département de la Marine et des Pêcheries, est une accusation dénuée de tout fondement de toutes les façons possibles.

Comment ? on pourra le dire ailleurs, dans d'autres parties de la province où je ne suis pas connu, mais on ne dira pas ici, à Montréal parmi la population qui me connaît depuis vingt-cinq ans, on ne dira pas à la population de Montréal et on ne lui fera pas accroire que Raymond Préfontaine est entré dans le cabinet Laurier en sacrifiant les intérêts de la province de Québec.

Il y a un autre sacrifice aussi que je n'aurais pas fait : c'est celui de négliger les intérêts de

Montréal. Messieurs, en quelques mots—je n'ai pas besoin encore une fois de faire un discours politique ce soir, ni un exposé de mon programme, ni un exposé de la politique qui va être discutée d'ici à quelques jours dans les élections parlementaires qui vont avoir lieu, et surtout dans la mienne—laissez-moi vous dire que la question de l'acceptation du portefeuille qui m'a été donné a été discutée franchement, honnêtement, comme cela doit se faire entre gens honnêtes et entre politiciens qui veulent l'intérêt de leur pays. Et à cause de circonstances particulières dans les détails desquels il m'est impossible d'entrer ce soir, je vous dirai cependant que lorsque cette question-là a été discutée, le résultat du débat a été ceci : c'est que depuis 1867, depuis que la confdération existe, jamais le portefeuille de la Marine et des Pêcheries, qui a pris une importance énorme depuis quelques années, n'avait été confié à un homme de la province de Québec et à un Canadien-français. Ah ! l'on croyait que l'on était habitué à croire que le ministère de la Marine et des Pêcheries devait nécessairement être donné à un homme des provinces maritimes, à un homme qui n'avait d'intérêts à sauvegarder que ceux de sa petite province, que ceux de cette partie limitée de la Puissance du Canada. Nous étions habitués à croire cela et une partie du peuple le croit peut-être encore aujourd'hui. Mais si j'ai accepté ce portefeuille, c'est parce qu'il a été constaté que le département de la Marine et des Pêcheries devrait comprendre non seulement ce qu'il comprend actuellement, mais aussi le contrôle des ports, le contrôle des havres, le contrôle de la grande navigation, à partir, je dirai, des rives de la rivière Yukon, du Pôle Nord, jusqu'au Détroit de Belle-Isle. Eh bien, s'il a été décidé et s'il est parfaitement compris à l'heure qu'il est—et messieurs, je suis autorisé à faire cette déclaration—si aujourd'hui je fais une telle déclaration, soyez convaincus d'une chose: c'est que je suis autorisé à la faire, je suis en mesure de vous dire que je suis chargé, comme ministre de la Marine et des Pêcheries, de faire un rapport le plus tôt possible sur les différents travaux qui devraient être confiés au département de la Marine et des Pêcheries.

Parmi ces travaux sont ceux que je viens de mentionner. Et si le département de la Marine et des Pêcheries, comme je suis convaincu que cela arrivera, prend sous son contrôle tous les travaux du havre, tous les travaux du port de Montréal, tous les travaux de la navigation, de la petite et de la grande navigation intérieure et extérieure, ne croyez-vous pas que le département de la Marine et des Pêcheries sera le portefeuille peut-être plus important, au point de vue du patronage et des avantages que n'importe quel autre département ? (Applaudissements.)

Eh bien, je vous le répète encore une fois, afin qu'il n'y ait pas de malentendu là-dessus, on ne peut pas mettre en doute ma parole, car, messieurs, lorsque l'on parle avec la responsabilité qui s'impose à moi dans le moment, il me semble qu'à moins que l'on doute de la parole de tout honnête homme, on ne peut pas douter de la mienne, je vous dis et vous déclare que j'ai accepté le portefeuille de la Marine et des Pêcheries à condition que ce département-là représentât véritablement les grands intérêts de la navigation auxquels nous sommes si attachés ici, dans la province de Québec. . . . Le gouvernement m'a chargé de mettre à l'étude cette question-là afin que tout ce qui a rapport à la navigation soit mis sous le même contrôle et que tous les travaux qui en dépendent soient aussi mis sous la même juridiction.

I shall not translate it into English now—it is rather long. But in two words the hon. gentleman stated then and there that he was authorized by his colleagues to say, and he spoke as a minister of the Crown—he took great care to say that he was speaking as a minister, that his word should be accepted as such—that all the harbour improvements, everything that pertained to navigation from the Yukon down, even from the north pole—he went very far—to the strait of Belle Isle, would come under his control. He made that announcement. This cannot be denied or disputed. We have been told to-day by the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that he himself in an interview had said to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he would get something from the Department of Public Works. But my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, repeating what had been said formerly by the hon. Minister of Public Works, announced to-day, that, for the time being, the Department of Public Works would remain as it is, except that the hydrographic survey would come under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The plain facts of the case are before the country now. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries went to the electors of his own riding. He induced them to give him their suffrages. He announced that the Department of Marine and Fisheries would be enlarged by the addition of the works pertaining to navigation, which in past years had been carried on by the Department of Public Works. He also announced that a school of navigation would be created. We know now exactly where we are as to the first part of his announcement : he will not get the works from the Department of Public Works that he announced he was going to get. Now, I hope that we will get at least the school of navigation. It is in his department. We will get it, I am sure. I do not know if a constitutional excuse can be given by a minister of the Crown who takes it upon himself to state that he has been authorized by his colleagues to say that this, that or the other thing would be done. It may be very well to let the matter drop, but I do not know whether the electorate of either political party will be satisfied that they have been treated fairly on this occasion.

Mr. MONK. I would like to get from the government a clear and categorical answer to the questions that I put this afternoon. I asked the government this afternoon to tell us clearly what were the changes to be made this session in the organization of the Department of Public Works, and what attributions of the Department of Public Works were to be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. To these questions, which I put this afternoon, I con-

sider that this debate has made it clear, that we are entitled to some answer from the government before we vote this or any other item. My hon. friend the member for St. Mary's division has interpreted the very vague intimations we have received so far as evidence of the assurance that we are going to receive, that is to say, that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is going to be endowed with a school of navigation. I do not require to learn anything in respect to navigation, I am not satisfied with that. The assurances which were given us at the time, and which have just been quoted by the ex-Minister of Public Works, were far more extensive, and we are entitled to know what part of those assurances, if any, are going to be carried out. It is news to me, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. the Speaker of this House for a time occupied the very ephemeral position of Minister of Public Works.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In partibus infidelium.

Mr. MONK. Yes. It will be news also to a good many people in Montreal, although I must admit that for a time it seemed nearly certain to us, even the outside public, that my hon. friend the worthy Speaker of this House had been really offered and had accepted that position. But the real question is the one which I have just reduced to writing, and to which I think I am entitled to an answer.

Mr. Chairman, the right hon. the Prime Minister is unfortunately not in perfect health, not in robust health, and I am sure there is no one who is more anxious to see my right hon. friend in robust health than I am myself; and whenever, slight as may be the occasion, that occasion is offered to me, I endeavour to make matters in this House as easy as possible for that right hon. gentleman. But his condition of health must not lead him to petulance and peevishness. The attack which that right hon. gentleman made upon me this afternoon I considered unjustifiable. I did not judge the act of the government in changing the Department of Public Works, whether it did change it or not; I did not prejudge that question. But in order to justify the position which I took here, that we should not pass the estimates without getting that information, I related as calmly as possible what were the issues raised in the election of Maisonneuve, an important election. After I had explained those issues I put my question, and the right hon. gentleman never even vouchsafed me an answer, but he made an attack upon me, because he considered that I had no right, as I did in that election, to raise that question, a most important question, of the transference of the Department of Public Works from the incumbent who had just occupied it to a gentleman of another province. What reason was there for that attack? My right hon. friend says it was not I who raised that question. But the campaign in Maisonneuve did not begin on the day of the nomination of my hon. friend. His nomination was brought to the notice of the public in the press of Montreal on the 10th of November, and on the 11th a number of citizens were interviewed and gave their opinions about that shuffle. Their opinions are consigned in an important newspaper of the city of Montreal, in its issue of the 11th of November. I will pass over the opinions expressed by men who are not in active politics and the opinions expressed by men who share our own in political matters. Now, let us see how, on the day following the announcement of the step taken by the right hon. gentleman and of my hon. friend's assumption of office, how that step was appreciated by his own friends. What did Senator Dandurand say, the first man interviewed, the manager of the Liberal party in the city of Montreal?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. He is no more the manager.

Mr. MONK. This is what he said:

I believe that Mr. Préfontaine is named when I have received official notice of it. He has already been named minister six times and as often displaced.

What did Mr. Globensky say? He is an important member of the Liberal party in the city of Montreal, an aspirant to the bench:

I only regret one thing, that is that instead of the portfolio that has been given to Mr. Préfontaine, they have not made him Minister of Public Works, a position to which his high services and great administrative capacity give him an incontestible right.

Mr. Lafontaine, another gentleman of high position in the party, was interviewed, and makes act of absolute resignation:

I have implicit confidence in Sir Wilfrid. I believe that he has not made such a nomination without grave reasons and I approve his conduct. Roma locuta est, causa finita est.

That was Mr. Lafontaine's opinion. Mr. Morin, another friend of my hon. friend, said this:

It is unfortunate that the portfolio of Public Works has been given to an Ontario man.

That is Mr. Morin's opinion, a gentleman who worked for my hon. friend:

One must believe that grave reasons of state have decided this choice. The future will demonstrate that Hon. Mr. Tarte was the best Minister of Public Works that Canada ever had. He was a man who favoured Canadians of all provinces.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Who said that?

Mr. MONK. Mr. Morin.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Who is Mr. Morin?

Mr. MONK. The notary. Why, is it possible that my hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion) does not know his own friend. What is

the party coming to if they do not know their own friends ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. I thought it was the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin).

Mr. MONK (reading) :

I believe——

Continues Mr. Morin.

That the works on the river are now in charge of Hon. Mr. Préfontaine and that he will find a vast opening for his great activity in this new position. No doubt Sir Wilfrid Laurier in making this choice has been guided by very grave reasons.

Lieutenant Colonel Mackay, another great friend of my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) said :

I am happy to see the Hon. Mr. Préfontaine named minister. It is a reward for his long services.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK (reading) :

Being of the province of Quebec I would have preferred that the portfolio of the ministry of Public Works should have remained in our province but if it is not so there were no doubt grave political considerations which required that this portfolio should go to an Ontario gentleman.

That was the opinion of Lieutenant Colonel Mackay, an important member of the Liberal party. I have already quoted the opinion of my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) but my hon. friend changes his opinion very often and very unfairly, I think. It is a matter of reproach among his own friends to the hon. member that he is a great glutton for patronage and I think he is willing to make great sacrifices in order to secure everything that patronage gives.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Do you quote that from the paper ?

Mr. MONK. I quoted my hon. friend's opinion to show that he had a very different opinion of the hon. gentleman then. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) was Solicitor General for a day. Perhaps, to-day, he expects to become so again. Changes take place very frequently. Mr. Primeau, lawyer of Montreal, is among the young Liberals who exercise, very properly, great influence in their party. He expressed exactly the same opinion as the others :

I do not know Mr. Sutherland but I find it very regrettable for the province of Quebec to lose the Department of Public Works, but, after all, there may be some compensation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Who said that ?

Mr. MONK. That is Mr. Primeau's language.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is your partner.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONK. I wish I possessed the secret of making my hon. friends laugh as easily as the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) does. I do not see anything very curious in his statement. He knows perfectly well that Mr. Primeau has never been my partner. This is how the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike), appreciates this event. My hon. friend was very cautious, but still he went very far :

I do not believe I am in a position to give an opinion on what is yet but a public rumour. In the second place the portfolio of Public Works belongs of right to the French element.

Then further my hon. friend says :

Upon this point the English element has not been consulted and therefore I deem it better to keep for myself what I think upon this subject.

Mr. Geoffrion, a most respected member of our community, commissioner of the port of Montreal and a relative of my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères, which the hon. gentleman will not deny—

Mr. GEOFFRION. No, no.

Mr. MONK. He was still more cautious. He said :

To give an opinion immediately would be premature. It is better to wait and judge of the cause by the effect.

Mr. A. Beaudry, and whom my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères knows, I am sure, said this :

I believe that the transfer from the Department of Public Works to the Department of Marine and Fisheries of the control of the channel of the St. Lawrence and the works of the ports as announced, the province of Quebec will really lose nothing.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). What is his name ?

Mr. MONK. I will give his pedigree to my hon. friend (Mr. Maclaren, Huntingdon) if he desires it. Mr. Wilson, with whom the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) is very well acquainted, who was a candidate against the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) in the election which brought that hon. gentleman here and who is a lawyer of prominence, said :

The Hon. Mr. Préfontaine is one of the oldest fighters of the party and one of the most enterprising. He is perfectly well qualified to form part of the government. I believe, however, that we are diminishing the prestige of our province in allowing the portfolio of Public Works to go to the province of Ontario.

This was the opinion of the Liberal candidate in Laval, a gentleman occupying a high position in the ranks of the Liberal party.

If as I understand it all the works of the St. Lawrence are to be under the charge of the Hon. Mr. Préfontaine, I think we ought to be satisfied. Otherwise we are subjected to great loss.

Here is another gentleman who is described as a prudent Liberal member of parliament. He would not give his name—prudent man. Perhaps it was the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I gave an interview to the 'Witness' which I shall be pleased to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) read. My opinion on the admission of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the cabinet is in the 'Witness.' I wish he would send for it and read it.

Mr. MONK. I do not read the 'Witness' very often, but I will look it up. In the meantime I assume that he is the prudent member of parliament. This gentleman said :

It seems pretty well understood that the new Minister of Marine and Fisheries is going to have a large share of the patronage of the Department of Public Works in reference to the works of improvements at the ports of Montreal and Quebec. Above all things do not say who I am.

No, I do not think it is my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères. If I have quoted these opinions it is in order to show that public opinion upon this question was very much excited. The election turned largely upon that question, and it is the duty of those of us who took part in that election and who voted in that election to ask the government if there is any truth in the assertions which have been repeatedly made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister wandered strangely from what was a simple question, and the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) quite unnecessarily wandered still further. I am not aware that there are any differences in the political party with which I am connected in this House. I have seen gentlemen on the other side torn asunder for months on all kinds of questions, but I do not know that there is any difference of opinion between us on this side. I can tell my hon. friend from Gaspé that during the many years that the Liberal party received no support from the province of Quebec, the Liberal party found nothing but injurious invective to hurl at that province. But what a contrast is there now. When in 1896 the Conservative party, rightly or wrongly, sacrificed itself for the triumph of the cause of justice and equity, the Conservative party, in spite of the result in the province of Quebec, judged it right, that the province of Quebec should be represented on the front benches of the opposition, and I accepted with pleasure what I consider to be most magnanimous treatment to myself as a representative from that province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. It is not a very lucrative position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. It is not a sinecure by any means, and if there are any gentlemen who aspire to that position I can tell them that so far as I am concerned, they are welcome to it.

Collections of slide and boom dues, including salaries of clerks, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that there is only one employee paid out of this vote, one clerk at Ottawa who looks after the accounts, and the balance is for expenses and contingencies in connection with these works.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you put in 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ?'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister explains to me that this is to enable a clerk to be paid more than $400 a year.

Mr. McCORMICK. In the province of Ontario we have to make all these improvements ourselves, and it seems strange that the government should carry on these works for the benefit of the province of Quebec especially.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A part of the expenditure is for the province of Ontario.

Mr. POPE. What is the revenue from these slides and booms.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was $57,335.93 for the past season.

To provide for paying 'the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company' allowance re logs passed Chenaux boom, 1903-4, $1,800.

Mr. POPE. What is the reason for this expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These works were first erected by the parliament of Canada or came in our possession after confederation, and under an arrangement made in 1883, they were taken over by this company and we agreed to pay them.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this in perpetuity ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is liable to be cancelled at any time by notice, but I have not the particulars here.

Mr. McCORMICK. Do the government receive any tolls out of this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find I have not the information. There are some receipts, which are probably equal to if not more than the amount that is paid out. I think we are entitled to four-fifths of the dues, but I have not the detailed information to give to my friend. I will have a statement prepared, and bring it down, showing exactly what the receipts of the past year have been.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that this is an allowance made to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company for taking over some slides from the government ? If it is, the item is strangely worded.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that this is the same wording that this vote has had since 1883.

Mr. FOWLER. What might be proper in 1883 might be entirely improper in 1902. The occasion for this expenditure may have passed by. I think the minister should allow this item to stand until he has more full and detailed information about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to let me know what information he wants? I shall be very pleased indeed to give it.

Mr. FOWLER. We would like to know the history of the whole transaction—why this sum of $1,800 should be paid every year to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company, what are the conditions under which the grant was first made in 1883, how long it was to last, whether the time has expired, whether it is to be granted in perpetuity or not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only question the hon. gentleman asks is how long the agreement was to last. I have already explained that it is a yearly agreement.

Mr. FOWLER. That is only one portion of it. It is necessary for us to know the reason it was given in the first place, and the reason for its continuance. I quite understand that the hon. gentleman may not know, but his deputy minister should know something about it. We want to know whether the country gets any benefit from this. The minister does not seem to have any information about it, and therefore, I think the item should stand.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see by the Auditor General's Report of last year, that this Upper Ottawa Improvement Company paid $1,418.17 for boomage collected from December 1, 1900 to November 30, 1901, and the names of the different parties from whom it was collected are given: J. R. Booth, $2,516.55; E. B. Eddy Company, $274.20; W. C. Edwards and Company, $619.08; Gillies Bros., $684.98; and so on, giving a list of all the parties from whom collections were made; and then it says: one-fifth due to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company, $1,418.17. From that I take it that there was about $7,090 collected.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The item of $1,800 is estimated to be one-fifth of the dues collected. According to the memorandum which I have, $9,500 was the largest amount collected in any one year, so that $1,800 is estimated to be sufficient.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the whole collection goes into the consolidated revenue fund?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then we can understand from the Auditor General's Report that these works have been given over to the Ottawa Improvement Company to collect all the dues and pay them into the government, and receive one-fifth of the receipts in return for taking charge of the works and collecting the dues?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Exactly.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the hon. minister what check the government have on the collection, or whether it is left entirely to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company to make such returns as they please?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The collector of slides and booms in the department here keeps a check. The returns are made to him, and he is able to tell what the collection should be.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is there a government official stationed at the booms?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the government official is in the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then there is no check by any government official to see whether the amounts returned are really right or not?

Mr. FOWLER. I notice that this item says:

Collection of slide and boom dues, including salaries of clerks, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

What does that mean—that any of these clerks get larger salaries than they would have under the Civil Service Act?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already explained that this one clerk gets a larger salary.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you his name?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Gagner has been a long time in the service.

Mr. FOWLER. What salary does he receive?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Three dollars a day.

Mr. FOWLER. How long has he been in the service?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About twelve or thirteen years.

Mr. FOWLER. What salary will he receive under the Civil Service Act?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $400, I suppose.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not wish to cast any reflection on the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company, but it seems strange to me that there is not a government official at these booms to take charge of all these

collections. At any other place where government collections are made, there is generally a government officer to take charge of them. In this case I would like to know why there is not a government official there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall be pleased to look into this account and see what the system of checking is. I shall be pleased to take note of my hon. friend's remarks and have an investigation made of the system and see whether the public interest is sufficiently protected or not.

Mr. FOWLER. Are there local persons in charge of these booms who receive commissions on these collections ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there are resident engineers who are officials of this department and who take charge of these works.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who are the members of the Ottawa River Improvement Company ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no knowledge myself, but my deputy informs me that Mr. G. B. Greene is the secretary.

Gatineau river—to provide for the use of Messrs. Gilmour & Hughson's booms at the Cascades in 1904, $600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a boom which was built by Gilmour & Hughson at the head of the Cascades, and arrangements were made with them to pay them $600 for the use of those booms. This will be the seventh year under that arrangement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Last year it was $630.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was on account of some arrears. Gilmour & Hughson asked for a much larger amount, but we decided that $600 per year would be a fair allowance and last year there were some arrears.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the department get any income from this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The annual revenue last year was $819,234, and the total expenditure $3,370.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I asked the hon. minister whether there are any local men paid anything for taking charge of booms and slides, and he said no, but last year there was an expenditure of $125,916, and in that item there is an amount paid to A. H. Johnson, boom master, 229 days at $2 per day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No doubt I was misinformed and this man must have been in charge.

Mr. McCORMICK. I suppose that the number of logs cut along each river is given the department and the amount of tolls calculated ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the information in detail as to how the amount is fixed, but no doubt, the amount returned by the company is checked by the returns received from the Ontario government of the number of logs.

Repairs and working expenses, harbours, docks, hand slides, $130,900.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is required to cover the annual cost of the staff and repairs.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here of $30,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no increase in this.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The details are given at the foot of page 77 of the estimates.

Mr. FOWLER. Could the hon. minister give us some idea of what proportion the income from these slides and booms bears to the expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total collections under this head of harbours, docks and slides for the last calendar year was $99,187.75. The total expenditure in connection with slides and booms is $81,900.

Mr. BLAIN. How does this revenue compare with that of last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About the same—there is very little difference.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the hon. minister stated last year that the revenue for the year before was $130,000, and, as I understand him, the revenue last year was something over $99,000. There is a difference of over $30,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think there must have been some mistake in the figures given last year. The figures I have given are those furnished by the accountant of the department.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I see here an item of $4,500 for the Lévis graving dock. I would like to ask the minister whether it is the intention of the government to increase the capacity of this dock. A great deal has been said about the dock not being of sufficient length to receive the large ships that come to Quebec, and so being inadequate to the requirements of the port. I would ask the hon. minister whether it is the policy of the Department of Public Works—or if not, whether it is the policy of the Department of Marine and Fisheries—to enlarge this dock. This is a subject that has been discussed for a long time in the press of Que-

bec and on the public platform, and the enlargement of the dock has been advocated as a policy which should be adopted by the progressive party now in power. I would like to know the views of my hon. friend on this question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that about two years ago this dock was very much increased in size—from about 480 feet to about 600 feet. I hope that the large ships coming into the port of Quebec will be able to use this dock for the future. But if this ever proves not to be the case, the matter will receive our consideration.

Mr. MONK. I notice a very considerable amount for slides and booms in the St. Maurice district—$11,100, being $1,100 more than last year. It seems a large amount. Are there many booms there, and were they in a bad state of repair ? I notice that we spent $10,000 last year in the same way. No doubt they should be kept in a good state of repair, but these seem large expenditures.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is an increase——

Mr. MONK. It is not so much the increase that I refer to as the total amount. In two years we are spending $21,000 to repair the booms. They must have been in very bad condition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find by adding the two items together that the total is the same as last year. The engineer informs me that the large expenditure we have been making is made necessary by the very large increase in the business.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention of the government to build other graving docks or dry docks this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no amount in the estimates for that purpose yet, but there may be in the supplementary estimates for 1903-04.

Mr. MONK. Is the minister able to say whether it is the intention of the government this year to put an amount in the estimates to build a dry dock in the vicinity of Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not answer that question. I think we have now on hand the sum of $250,000 for the general purpose. I do not know whether any more will be asked this year, or whether this sum will be expended.

Mr. SPROULE. I think an arrangement was come to some time ago by which the government was to pay a certain percentage of the cost to companies building dry docks. Is that sum you refer to for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. My hon. friend is now referring to docks built by private companies. We increase the aid given to such companies for that purpose from 2 per cent to 3 per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a motion on the paper now for that purpose ; we are increasing the rate from 2 per cent to 3 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. To what extent do you propose giving this encouragement ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The motion now on the paper, I think, probably will come up to-morrow, when I will be glad to give my hon. friend all possible information. At present I may say that the only change made is increasing the rate from 2 per cent to 3 per cent. The general principle is the same. It has been on the statute-book for some years. We propose to enlarge both the limit of the subsidy and the rate per cent.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see that there are $24,500 paid to the staff at Ottawa. How many men are employed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That includes the whole Ottawa river. If my hon. friends turns to page 26 of the report of the Department of Public Works he will find the list of employees and their salaries.

Mr. FOWLER. Why is it necessary for the government to maintain these booms at the present time ? On what principle do we maintain them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not been able to find that any general principle has been followed in the erection and maintenance of these works. Many of them were taken over at the time of confederation, some have been constructed since. Some have been given over to companies. I intend to give these items close investigation to see whether some better arrangement cannot be devised for constructing and maintaining these works, and at another session I hope to be able to present some scheme.

Mr. FOWLER. The lumbering business is one of the best in the country, and the government ought not to pay money for the convenience of the lumbermen, as this is evidently for their benefit. These works ought to be self-sustaining.

Mr. MONK. Did I understand the minister to say that the government has on hand the sum of $250,000 for the purpose of building graving or dry docks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my memory serves me right, this sum is under the control of the harbour board, by Act of parliament.

Mr. MONK. These docks that are mentioned here at Lévis, Kingston and Esquimalt, were all built exclusively by the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Has the government come to any decision in respect to a dry dock in the vicinity of Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. A commission has been appointed to make a report on the best kind of dry docks, and on situations and so forth, but no decision has been come to.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell me whether there has been a report from three gentlemen appointed to make an inquiry ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A report has been made to the department by these three gentlemen, Mr. Keating, of Toronto, and Mr. St. George and Mr. Perrault, of Montreal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Have these three gentlemen been appointed by Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has an engineer of the Department of Public Works been engaged with these gentlemen in making that inquiry ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not particularly on the commission.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Have these three gentlemen been charged by my hon. friend to make an inquiry as to the choice of a site for a dry dock in Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Speaking from memory, I think they were empowered to report on the best kinds of dry docks.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman will permit me to say that neither of these three gentlemen have ever built a dry dock in his life. Mr. St. George was the municipal engineer of the city of Montreal when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) had control of our municipal affairs. He resigned from his office after the several inquiries that took place there. He has never had any experience in building docks in his life. Mr. Maurice Perrault is an architect who has never built a dock of this kind in his life. I know Mr. Keating less. He is a very respectable man indeed, but, while he is an engineer, he has never been engaged in the construction of such works in his life. I was very much surprised when I heard that the Minister of Public Works had appointed these three men over the heads of the officers of the Public Works Department who have been engaged in building docks and other public works. We had some experience in the choice of a site in the port of Montreal. Parties tried to foist upon the harbour commission a site. There was an option taken on a site for $50,000 and there was an effort made to foist a site upon the harbour commissioners for a quarter of a million dollars. There was a public meeting in the city of Montreal, a report of which has been published, held by the parties who wanted to make $250,000 out of the site. I am very much surprised to hear that such a commission of men, who have had no experience, has been appointed over the heads of the engineers of the Public Works Department, who have had a long experience in the construction of such works. The hon. Minister of Public Works would never have done such a thing if he had been better informed, I am sure. Mr. Maurice Perrault is a well known architect but he has never carried out any work of this kind. Mr. St. George has had no experience in that line of business. Let me say also that there is a site in one part of Montreal which the hon. Minister of Public Works will find by looking at the plans which are in his department. He will find by referring to those plans a site which will not cost a dollar to the country, a site which is alongside the shore and which is indicated on the plans of the Montreal harbour. That site is available. I speak of one site. There are other sites in other parts of the city that are also available. It is not necessary to appoint Mr. Maurice Perreault, or Mr. St. George, men who have had no experience in this line, to choose a site and much less to prepare plans. The hon. Minister of Public Works will find in his department several engineers who have had a long experience in that kind of work. Why has he put these men over them ? We are entitled to some information on this point because this is rather a peculiar appointment that he has made. Of course, he was very new in the department; he had just taken office when the appointment was made. I call his attention to the statement I am making now and which cannot be contradicted, and it is that these two men in Montreal are architects. One of them was the municipal engineer under the late regime that the electorate of the city of Montreal got rid of during the last two municipal elections. Mr. St. George resigned after the inquiries which took place. I do not accuse him of anything. He resigned after several inquiries had taken place. Mr. Maurice Perrault is an architect in Montreal. I want to know how it is that these men have been appointed to prepare plans and to choose a site for a dry dock in the city of Montreal when the hon. Minister of Public Works has in his own departments several engineers who have had a long experience in that kind of business.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know the gentlemen in Montreal to whom the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has referred and therefore I can say nothing about them, but when he speaks of Mr. Keating

as a man who has had no knowledge of such matters, I must tell him that he is entirely misinformed. Mr. Keating was the city engineer of Halifax, and as such superintended the construction of one of the largest dry docks on the continent of America, and he has that kind of experience which comes from the supervision of a work of that character. I do not say that he was the engineer of construction, but he was the city engineer of Halifax, and the very fact that he had gained that knowledge in the construction of one of the largest dry docks on the continent, was one of the reasons why he was chosen for this work. In respect to the other gentlemen, I cannot say anything.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is mistaken in saying that these gentlemen were called upon to prepare plans for the dock. Representations were made to the government that a floating dock would be very much better for the purpose than a dry dock. A great majority of the members of the House, and I may also say, of the government are not familiar, perhaps, with the different styles of docks that are used and which are best suited to various localities. I do not know that I have a personal acquaintance with Mr. Keating, but I did ask some people from the city of Toronto as to whom they considered the best qualified engineer in that district for this purpose, and Mr. Keating's name was sent to me by a gentleman in whom I have the greatest possible confidence. I do not think that he is a supporter of my own, nor do I know that any of the recommendations of those gentlemen came from political friends. I was anxious that we should have the benefit of the services of the most highly qualified engineers to look into this matter. They can only make report. My hon. friend said that we were ignoring the engineers in the department. That is not so. They only make a report to the chief engineer of the department and he now has it under his consideration. I have not seen it, I suppose, because he has had it under consideration, but he will report upon their recommendations before any action is taken.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is rather strange to find two well known architects appointed on a commission to report on dry docks. I am very glad that the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) tells us that Mr. Keating has had some experience. I do not know whether he prepared the plans for the Halifax dry dock. I do not think he did, but he may have supervised the work. That does not establish in any way that the engineers of the department should have been ignored and that this matter should have been referred to men who do not belong to the civil service and are not responsible to parliament, two of them being architects, and one of them being the municipal engineer of the city of Montreal under the regime that has been got rid of by the municipal electors of Montreal. That is not, it seems to me, an appointment that should have been made under the circumstances. I am very anxious to see the report that these gentlemen have made. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works says that the report will be submitted to his department. Of course, it will be submitted to his department, but all the same it seems to me that this appointment is very irregular indeed. The commission is not composed of men who have had any experience in respect to dry docks.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Do I understand that these gentlemen were only appointed to visit sites in Montreal and make a report as to the most convenient site for a graving dock ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I explained to my hon. friend and the committee that they were to report on the various kinds of docks and especially as to whether a permanent dock or a floating dock would be more suitable. There has been a difference of opinion about these points. No power was given the commission except to report. It is an independent commission. I have no personal knowledge of these gentlemen but they were recommended by persons in whom I had confidence.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think the report is ready now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief engineer tells me that he has it under consideration now.

Mr. MONK. Is it in the department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Is there any objection to our seeing it ; it is a matter of very great interest to us.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is certainly no objection. It is a matter of public property, and I will have it brought down.

Mr. MONK. What is going to be paid to these commissioners.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the pay was fixed not to exceed $25 a day, but my memory does not serve me as to that.

Mr. MONK. With the exception of Mr. Keating, who may perhaps have had something to do with the dry dock at Halifax——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The city of Halifax contributed to the dry dock and if he did not prepare the plans, he reported on them as city engineer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If we have any engineer of high standing in the country, Mr. Keating is one of them.

Mr. MONK. What is the recommendation of the commissioners as to the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not seen the report, but I will have it brought down at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. TAYLOR. The ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) intimated that certain parties had an option on a site for $50,000, and they were trying to get the government to take it for $250,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is an old story. When I was minister an effort was made to foist on the Harbour Commission and on the Department of Public Works, a site for $250,000, on which an option had been taken for $50,000. Some parties tried to force that on the Harbour Commissioners. There was a public meeting held in Sohmer Park by these parties, but, of course, the effort did not succeed then. That is why I am a little careful when I discuss this item.

Mr. TAYLOR. It may be that this is the site recommended by these Montreal engineers.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Oh, no.

Mr. CASGRAIN. As I understand it, these gentlemen were appointed to report, first, on the site, and second as to whether a floating dock or a dry dock would be best for the city of Montreal. I can bear out what my hon. friend has said : that Mr. Perrault knows no more about a floating dock or an ordinary graving dock than I do, and that is very little indeed. He is an architect of the city of Montreal ; he is a member of the Quebec legislature, but I don't think he ever saw a graving dock in his life before he went to Point Lévis. As to Mr. St. George, he was simply the engineer of the city of Montreal, and in the exercise of his duties, his particular occupation was to see as to the best manner in which the city waterworks were operated. It seems strange that the government which has at its disposal men of vast experience as engineers, should go outside of the department to employ others. Of course, if they did employ men of high standing and men of experience, there would be some justification, as there is in the appointment of Mr. Keating ; but to appoint Mr. Maurice Perrault and Mr. St. George to find a site for a graving dock in the port of Montreal, and to decide as to whether a floating dock or an ordinary graving dock should be built, seems to me to be a most extraordinary proceeding on the part of the government. I do not know what is going to be the pay of these gentlemen.

Mr. MONK. The minister said it was $25 a day.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to know when their pay began, and when it is going to stop ? I may tell the minister that at the last session of the Quebec legislature the Independence of Parliament Act was amended for the very purpose of allowing Mr. Perrault to accept this position from the Dominion government. This must be a permanent or a quasi permanent employment, because otherwise the legislature of Quebec would not have gone to the trouble of amending the Independence of Parliament Act to allow Mr. Perrault to help the Department of Public Works with his light in the selection of a site and in determining whether a floating or another kind of dock should be built in Montreal. I warn the Minister of Public Works that Mr. Maurice Perrault is a very high priced gentleman, and I happen to know it, because when I had the honour of being Attorney General of Quebec, the bills which he had filed with a preceding government came before me, and I may tell the minister that they were the most exorbitant bills I ever saw in my life. If he presents to this government such a bill as he presented to the province of Quebec for work done as an architect, I am afraid the Minister of Public Works will be appalled, and he will be very sorry for ever having employed Mr. Perrault. It seems to me, that in view of the competency of the gentlemen who are now in the Public Works Department, it is a most extraordinary thing that the government should employ two men who have no knowledge whatever and no experience whatever in such matters, and place them over the heads of their own employees. As I said before, these two gentlemen know no more about this thing than any member of the House does, and certainly they do not know as much as the engineers of the Public Works Department.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Have negotiations been entered into for the purchase of a floating dock ? I know that there are floating docks which are very successful now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations were made to the department with regard to these floating docks, but no negotiations with regard to purchase have been undertaken.

Mr. MONK. I desire to advance the work of the committee as much as possible, but this is a matter of such great interest to us that we are justified in saying that we ought to see that report and the charges of the commissioners before we pass this item. I quite agree with those who have maintained that in view of the staff which we have in the Public Works Department we did not require these commissioners at all. If it were a question of selecting a site, I think the Minister of Public Works himself, with the information he could have obtained in Montreal from gentlemen connected with the harbour, could have come

to a decision without this costly commission. As regards Mr. St. George, I am not prepared to make any condemnation of that gentleman. I have known him for many years as engineer of the city of Montreal, and I look upon him as a man of most honourable character. If it were a question of selecting a site, Mr. St. George's opinion would be valuable, but I am not aware that he has any special knowledge with regard to dry docks. I am aware, however, that he left the employment of the city for no other reason than that he desired to enter into a more profitable occupation. Mr. St. George I have known a long time; he resides in my county, and he is a perfectly honourable man.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think this discussion is out of order, as this vote has nothing at all to do with the matter of the committee or the building of a dry dock at Montreal. It may be interesting, politically or for some other reason, to spend a whole day in discussing these matters; but we have done very little work, and to ask that the item stand until information is brought down on a matter with which it has nothing to do, is, I think, very unfair. I think these items ought to be considered in connection with the expenditures which they are intended to provide for. My hon. friend will have an opportunity of expressing his views with regard to the dock almost any day of the session. I know there was a great difference of opinion on the subject, and it was thought by the government that it would be a good idea to have an independent commission of expert engineers make a report upon it. One would have thought that Mr. St. George, having been for a number of years employed as an engineer by the great city of Montreal, was a man of some character and ability. However, there will be many opportunities to discuss the question of a dock; and, as there is nothing contentious about this vote, which is the usual vote, I hope my hon. friend will not press his request that these items stand, after they have been under discussion for three or four days.

Mr. GALLERY. In reference to Mr. St. George, I understood one hon. gentleman to say that he was only superintendent of the water department of Montreal. I may state that he was both superintendent of the water department and city surveyor for years, at a salary of $5,300.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That would not give him any experience in graving docks.

Mr. GALLERY. As far as engineering is concerned, I think he is as good a man as you could get.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Even if he is a good engineer, that would not give him experience in graving docks.

Mr. MONK. I do not know what experience Mr. St. George may have had in graving docks, but my knowledge of him is that he is a perfectly honourable man. I have no objection to letting this item pass, although I do not agree with the hon. minister that this is not the place for us to ask for information on the question of a dry dock, which has been agitating public opinion for a long time. If the hon. gentleman says that he will lay that report on the Table, at the earliest opportunity, I have no objection to letting the item pass.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly; it will be brought down as soon as the engineer makes his report.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like very much to know whether the crane for the Lévis dock which we were talking about when I left office has been placed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not yet.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is the work under contract or under way?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is not under way. I will inquire into that. It has never been brought to my attention.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understand that this commission of three gentlemen was appointed to investigate the question of a dry dock or select a site. Now that their report is in, I suppose their duties are ended, and their services have been dispensed with?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Telegraph lines—Prince Edward Island and mainland, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This $2,000 is voted under an arrangement made at the time of confederation for maintaining the telegraph line with Prince Edward Island.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to ask the minister if he or the government has received any communication from the provincial government, requesting this amount to be withheld, until the Anglo-American Telegraph Company fulfil their contract to give us an up-to-date service?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I have no such communication. I was visited by a deputation, representing, I think, the board of trade, asking me to make some effort to have better telegraphic facilities with the island, better rates, and longer hours. The matter is now receiving the consideration of the department.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to ask the minister if it is not in the power of this government to withhold this amount while the company neglect to give us the service they should?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not like to offer an opinion off-

hand on that point. It is a question on which even the best lawyers might differ. However, the matter is now receiving the consideration of the department, in view of the application made for better rates.

Land and cable telegraph lines, lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, including working expenses of vessels required for cable service, also maintenance of Marconi wireless telegraphy at Belle Isle, $80,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. minister tell us how the Marconi stations which have been installed, one at Belle Isle and one on the north shore, have been working during the last few months ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not myself given the matter much personal attention, but my information from the officers of my department is that latterly they have been working remarkably well.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would invite my hon. friend's personal attention to these two stations. I was informed by some of the officers that they were working splendidly, and I began sending dispatches myself and asking for reports every day, but the reports did not materialize very quickly. I say that some of the officers are very fine men indeed, but they take for granted that the Marconi system is working splendidly when it does not work at all. My hon. friend will find in the department a record of the telegrams which I sent asking for an answer, which did not come quickly. I think the House will agree with me that it is very important to know exactly how this Marconi system works. Every time there is some stock to be placed on the market, it works splendidly, but when the stock is placed, it does not work so well. I would like very much to know how these two stations work. Will my hon. friend be good enough to inquire how many days the two stations have been working. Occasionally on a dry day one of the stations would work, and the next day, although also a dry day, it would not work at all. Then on a damp day it would work splendidly, and on the following day, which was also damp, it would refuse to work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the matter is one of very great importance, not because of the small service we have, but for the experience this will give the country. I have not been able to give it personal attention, but I am informed that for a long time it was very unsatisfactory, but that latterly it is giving satisfaction. I am asking for a detailed report of all imformation regarding the working of the system and will have that laid on the Table.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Are all the cables in working order now, between the North Shore and Belle Isle, for instance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The cable at the Grosse Isle Quarantine station is out of order. We had a report recently that there is something wrong with the cable at Anticosti, but that is now being attended to.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is the cable at Belle Isle in full working order ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I know that for several seasons this cable has been out of order. I had occasion to write my hon. friend when he was Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), complaining that it was very seldom during the summer season that one could get a telegram to Point Aux Esquimaux. I had occasion to cable to Point Aux Esquimaux several times, and my dispatches were not received. It appears that there is a bay there, and the cable between the two points separated by this bay is almost always out of order, and the way dispatches are sent is to give the dispatch at one point to a schooner which takes it to the other point, some six or seven miles or more distant. This is not a quick method of sending telegrams. If the tide happens to be out or the wind is not right, you do not get your telegram delivered for five or six days.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is speaking of the cable on the North Shore off Anticosti as being out of order.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not say that it is now out of order, but am calling attention to the fact that it is too often out of order especially during the season of navigation. I wrote the ex-Minister of Public Works on the subject, as he will remember. I do not know what is the cause, but would ask my hon. friend to look into it. Some years ago the 'Scotsman' was wrecked off Belle Isle, and for want of communication between the mainland and Belle Isle the passengers on the 'Scotsman' could not get succour from the mainland. They were three or four days without relief simply because there was no cable communication. Now that you have the Marconi system, the object for which it was established is to give assistance in cases such as I have just mentioned and also to give information at Quebec and other ports as to the state of navigation in these straits—for instance as to whether there are icebergs in the straits and any other information affecting navigation. It is of the greatest importance not only that the cable of the mainland should be kept in perfect working order during the season of navigation, but that these Marconi stations should be so kept up that they will be of service to the country and navigation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that they had a good deal of difficulty with the cable itself to which my hon. friend refers, but that latterly it is

working first rate. I am asking for all information and will have a report made.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is Mr. Boyer still the chief officer in charge of the lines in the lower St. Lawrence ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. He is a good official, indeed, and I am glad that he has been kept on.

Mr. FOWLER. Does this amount represent the whole amount paid Mr. Marconi ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We pay no royalty. All we purchased we paid for. My understanding is that on account of the grant we have given, we get the instruments without paying any royalty, and the small amount referred to here is for the maintenance of the two instruments established there. That will cover the salaries of two men and any small repairs there may be. My deputy informs me that the estimate made for the maintenance of this service is $4,200, and I am asking for detailed information with regard to the daily work of these stations. That report ought to be down within the next week, as I do not see why there should be any particular delay.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Might I ask if this item, as well as the other we passed this evening, are in any danger of being transferred to the Marine Department.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Oh, we have had enough of that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I intend to spend this money if allowed to do it.

Mr. OSLER. I was absent for a time, and did not hear the discussion, but perhaps, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) would give us an idea whether, so far, the Marconi system has worked so satisfactorily as to give evidence of being useful.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have had quite a discussion in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Osler's) absence. I am only too pleased to be able to tell him that the officers of the department consider that latterly the system has been working satisfactorily. What I have engaged to do—and I think it is of public importance to get the information—is to get a statement in detail showing the working of the Marconi system at Belle Isle.

Telegraph lines—North-west Territory, $20,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How far does the hon. minister propose to go to-night ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have been sitting here from three o'clock this afternoon, and it would be very proper for me to say that we took up a lot of time in discussing a matter not at all so important as the voting of these supplies. This is the third or fourth day we have been trying to get a discussion of these items. I think that this item, No. 238, ought to pass to-night.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I suppose there will be something in the supplementary estimates in regard to the Yukon line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have said so. I may say to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that I do not know of any item here the substance of which will not come up at an early day in case any body may wish to discuss them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is very good. Sometimes, the supplementary estimates have not come down at an early day. But my hon. friend says that they will——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give an undertaking that they will be down at an early day.

Telegraph lines—British Columbia, $15,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is the same as last year. It is for the maintenance of these lines in British Columbia, the payment of salaries and small repairs. I have details here as to where the lines are located, the distances, &c., but my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram), of course, is familiar with them, and would not wish me to give details to-night.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where do we find the statement of the receipts of these lines ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the Auditor General's Report.

Telegraph lines—Yukon Territory (Ashcroft-Dawson line and branches), $121,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. May I ask the hon. minister if he is in a position to tell us the receipts and expenditures on the Yukon lines ? If he has not the information at hand, I will wait until the supplementary estimates are before us. Is Mr. Crean still in charge of these lines ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has he still Mr. Rochester with him ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Who is really in charge, Mr. Rochester or Mr. Crean ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Crean.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Mr. Crean has more authority than Mr. Rochester ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, he is the superintendent. Mr. Rochester, I understand, is sent out to look after the accounts and straighten matters up. The hon. leader of the opposition has asked me to state the receipts and expenditures of last year. In round numbers the receipts were $111,000, and the expenditures $179,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Has there been any lowering of the rates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the rates were lowered from $4.50 to $3.

Mr. CLANCY. When ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last July.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would ask my hon. friend to bring down, as soon as he can, the details of the expenditure. I am somewhat in doubt as to the figures that have been mentioned. I know the hon. gentleman will give his best attention to that item, because when I left office there was some little difficulty that was not settled. I will take it very kindly if he will bring down the details of expenditure as soon as he can—that is to say, before we vote more money for this line, so that the House may know exactly where we stand. I generally had a statement every month, showing the income and expenditure, and I am appalled at the deficit which we have to face.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid, if my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) left some little difficulties existing when he left office, I found some little difficulties existing when I took office. I have been inquiring, and trying to find out how the matter stands ever since. We shall have to ask a supplementary vote, and we can have the matter further discussed. I gave instructions to have a full detailed report with regard to this matter, and I expect to have it ready next week.

Mr. OSLER. I would suggest that this item be allowed to stand over. The sum is an enormous one. During the first year of operating a telegraph in the Yukon, one can understand that the expenses would be heavy, but they might be expected to decrease after the line is in reasonably good order. This sum seems to be so large for the service, that I think we should have the fullest details of the expenditure before the item passes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite agree with that proposition, but I do not see any advantage in allowing this matter to stand. As I have already said, we have to ask for a supplementary vote, and I have promised to bring down the fullest detailed report, which I have ordered to be made some time ago, and which I am informed will be ready next week. There will be another item on which we can discuss the whole matter.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Can we expect that Mr. Rochester will be back before the end of the session ? I have confidence in his judgment and in his honour, and I would like to have him here, if he can be spared from his present post. When I left office I had instructed him to go up there and settle some little difficulties we had. I gave him full authority to take charge of the books and the whole business. I think my letter will be found in the Department of Public Works. I want Mr. Rochester's report.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Rochester is up there carrying out the instructions given him by the minister. There has been no change in his instructions, except that the deputy minister may have informed him that I wanted the matter settled and the fullest details obtained. With regard to the presence of Mr. Rochester here, I may say that when my hon. friend who was at the head of the department gets Mr. Rochester's report, if he is not satisfied with it, then he can get Mr. Rochester to come down. He may be back within the next few weeks, and we can call him back at any time. At present I think he is at White Horse.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that the revenue for the month of April, 1902, on the Yukon telegraph line, was $11,500. How does that compare with last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not yet a return for the present year.

Mr. BLAIN. In a general way, is the revenue increasing on the Yukon telegraph line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since the decrease in the rates in July last, I am afraid there has been a general decrease in the receipts. The increased business has not been sufficient to make up for the reduced rate.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister has before him the revenue for some one month during last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1902 the receipts, in round numbers, were, for July, $12,000; August, $12,000 ; September, $14,000; October, $12,000, November, $7,900; December, $4,733. We can only estimate the receipts since January as we have not the returns.

Mr. OSLER. Did you get the returns of these receipts by mail or by telegraph ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy informs me that they are telegraphed at the end of each month. The last return we have is for February or March.

Mr. SPROULE. It would seem that we are running that line at a loss of $89,000,

and still we are told there will be another item in the supplementary estimates in addition. Evidently we are running it at a great loss. We were led to expect that after the line was completed there would be a reduction in the expenses of operation, but we have here for the staff $100,000, and it seems that won't be enough, because we are told there will be another item in the supplementaries for that purpose. We ought to get full information of the revenue and of the expenditures, and we ought to ascertain why the expenditure continues to be so high.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already explained to the committee that this item will have to be increased by some $50,000 or $60,000. I agree that the committee is entitled to the fullest information, and I am desirous of obtaining this information for the committee and for the department, so that we may know whether there is any prospect of reducing the expenditure.

Mr. OSLER. What is the length of the line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In round figures, about 2,000 miles.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How did that line work during the winter months ? Were there many breakages ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were quite a number of accidents through storms and trees falling, and for some days there was no service. But under the circumstances the service is fairly good.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I cannot understand why there is such a large deficit. During the last six months before I left office the revenue was a little over the expenditure, we had a little surplus every month. I am afraid there must be something wrong in the way the accounts have been prepared, because I do not see how we can be running behind so much. Generally we have a balance on the right side.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid my hon. friend must have been misled by the reports he was receiving. But as I say, we cannot discuss this matter intelligently until we have a full statement of the accounts before us, and this we will have in a short time.

Mr. OSLER. I think this item is altogether too large to pass. As the minister has not the information, I do not think we should pass it. I do not think we can pass blindly $121,000 on the promise of the minister that the matter will be discussed on the supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot agree with my hon. friend. If after full investigation of the accounts of the present year it is shown that this $121,000 will be sufficient, everybody would be very well pleased. I have given the committee the information which, probably if I had wanted to get this vote through I might have withheld. I have said that, basing it upon the estimate of last year, it will require $58,000 in round numbers, and that before a vote was asked for in the supplementary estimates we would have a full return in regard to the expenses and operation of the line and all the accounts explained and that we would then ask only what was necessary.

Mr. OSLER. How is this estimate of $121,000 made up ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for salaries and expenses in connection with the operation of the line.

Mr. OSLER. Give us the details then ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is very unreasonable at this hour of the night to ask me to go through this long list of names, but I will do it if the hon. gentleman insists.

Mr. OSLER. It seems to me that on an item of $121,000 we should have more information, especially when the hon. minister acknowledged that he has not the information to give to the committee.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never made any such statement.

Mr. OSLER. I beg pardon, because I understand that is what the hon. gentleman said. He said that he could not give the information as to the expenditures and how they were incurred until he had further information, and that he hoped later on when the supplementary estimates came down that he would be able to give that information. This is altogether too large an item to pass without having full information upon it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken. The accounts that my hon. friend is referring to I have given in detail and it is quite a different thing from the matter of voting money for the maintenance and operation of the line. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was asking for the full accounts in connection with the expenditure for the current year. That is quite a different thing.

Mr. OSLER. I am asking for the particulars of the expenditure under the estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend insists upon it I will have to read this list. But he will see how unreasonable his request is in view of the ten or twelve hour sitting we have had.

Mr. OSLER. Nothing is unreasonable when you are asking for information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, certainly not, when you are asking for information, but I will leave it to the committee if in connection with any item that has ever been presented in the history of parliament it is usual to require a minister to stand up and read page after page of the names of employees with the monthly pay they are receiving and to give every detail to show how the estimate is made up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is quite within the right of any one to ask for that information, but at the same time there is no desire to take up time unduly. Would it not be better to let the hon. Minister of Public Works hand the statement to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) and then we probably could dispose of these items in a few minutes at the next sitting of the House ?

Mr. OSLER. Yes, I only want to get the information as to how this expenditure is made up.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Osler) has not been here for days and days, and weeks and weeks, during which we have been sitting night after night. We are most anxious to get on with the business of the House. If he would make any reasonable proposition I would be only too delighted to comply with his request.

Mr. OSLER. In your position surely you must expect to be called upon to do some work and you must not grumble if it takes you some time to get through with your estimates. All I want to know is what this expenditure is for. Is it for salaries, or for maintenance ? This is not an item that we can be reasonably asked to pass without full information.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Perhaps the hon. minister would be in a position to tell us what is the monthly expenditure for the working of the Dawson line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimate of the expenditure for next year for salaries, as it has been made up, is $123,885.12. I have detailed information showing every man's name, his occupation, and the amount of his salary.

Mr. OSLER. How many officers are there in this service ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About 125.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Can the hon. gentleman tell us what was the expenditure, say, for the month of March ? We used to have a report every month of the expenditure and revenue.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report has not reached the department yet as to the expenditure.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has there been a telegraphic report for February ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The average salaries would perhaps be about $11,000 per month.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We thought it would be about that much when I left office. Again I say I cannot understand why we have such a deficit.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Unless the salaries alone can be reduced very much next year I do not think there should be any objection to granting this present estimate now of $121,000 because I have explained to the committee that unless the expenditure can be materially reduced for the coming year we will have to ask for a supplementary vote. The ex-Minister of Public Works said that he had sent a man out there in whom he had every confidence to make a full inquiry and report. I have no reason to doubt either the honesty or the qualifications of the gentleman he sent there to make this report, and when we get it we will have the officers of the department make a detailed statement of everything in connection with the expenditure as to the building of the line and as to the operation of it during the past year. Then the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) as well as other hon. gentlemen can exercise their judgment as to whether any reduction can be made in future or any change in the rates charged.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I cannot understand how it is that we have lost such a large amount of money on that line. During the last six months before I left office the expenditure and the revenue were about equal. We had some little balance in our favour and I cannot understand how we made a loss of $70,000 a year. I am very much afraid that the accounts have been prepared by somebody in such a way as to charge to working expenses sums of money that should have been charged to some other account.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend who was in the department when this line was undertaken and built knows that what I say is perfectly correct. The estimates sent in for salaries alone amounts to $123,889.92; provisions, $11,540; freight, &c., $19,376; and other expenses, $24,000, amounting to $175,900, and the vote asked for is $121,000. This is perhaps a disappointing estimate in comparison with the receipts, but I desire the House to be put in full information of all the facts, to see if any change can be made in the expenses of operation, and the full information will be given when it is obtained. No one has a stronger desire than I have, to find out whether the expenses can be made to come closer to the receipts.

Mr. OSLER. Is there an office every sixteen miles ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a house of refuge every sixteen miles and the offices are about thirty miles apart.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I hope I have made myself properly understood. I instructed Mr. Rochester to take charge of the whole organization and I hope my instructions have been followed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as I am concerned no change has been made in the instructions given. Nothing has been brought to my attention to create any doubt as to his qualifications and good intentions, and whatever instructions were given, if he has carried them out faithfully, are the instructions he is working under.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has Mr. Rochester made any report as yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is in communication with the deputy from time to time, but his report as to the full statement has not come yet.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am quite sure that such a deficit as has been mentioned is not the genuine deficit of last year. I knew the circumstances before I left office, and unless there has been some accident and something charged to the working expenses which might be charged in some other way, I think the line is about self-sustaining.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will get all that information.

Mr. SPROULE. When a minister comes to ask for such a vote as this, he ought to be prepared to give us information and not ask us to vote $123,000 blind. We have had difficulty in getting information about this on previous occasions and every succeeding year the difficulty seems to be getting worse.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have given the estimate made by the officers of the department, and I have the details here as to the salaries and the persons who receive them. The estimate is based on the expenditure of last year and that is the only way an estimate can be made. I do not know what the hon. gentleman refers to when he says he did not get satisfactory information in the past. I have all the information on which this estimate is based, but we are speaking of a separate matter, namely, the details for the current year.

Mr. SPROULE. My complaint is that this is all estimate without any intelligent data being given.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is based upon the actual expenditure of past years as contained in the books of the department.

Mr. OSLER.

Mr. SPROULE. And if we ask for this information later on we may be met with the reply that it is not to hand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that is a fair statement to make. These people have to be paid monthly, and I am sorry to say that as the appropriation has been overdrawn, they have not received their pay for some time. What we have been speaking about is the detailed accounts which have not yet come in.

Mr. OSLER. We should know the cost of operating the line and the cost of keeping it in repair. I do not think that there is any necessity for an office every sixteen miles in such a country as that, and that is perhaps the reason why there is a deficit.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have all the information here, but it would take a long time to read it, and I would be pleased if my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) would permit me to hand him a copy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister will send a copy to my hon. friend (Mr. Osler).

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall be pleased indeed.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In moving the adjournment of the House, permit me to call attention to a telegram which I have received, and which will be very gratifying to members on both sides. The flag was placed at half-mast to-day, not only because of the funeral of the late Mr. Justice Mills, but also because the announcement was made of the death of Senator Cochrane, of Hillhurst, Que. A telegram has been placed in my hand from a member of Mr. Cochrane's family contradicting the report of his death, and stating that the hon. gentleman is much better.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business does the hon. gentleman expect to take up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are several notices of motion and resolutions in committee which will be taken up first, and after that Supply. The Minister of Justice will proceed with his estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are two or three items under Public Works which were allowed to stand, and they might be cleaned up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will proceed, then, with the Public Works' estimates first, and after that, if the Minister of Justice is present, we will take his estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, May 14, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

FINANCIAL TERMS BETWEEN CANADA AND NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. BELL—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How often and at what dates were financial terms arranged between the Dominion of Canada and the province of Nova Scotia, between January 1, 1872, and July 1, 1896 ?

2. By what amount was the sum payable to Nova Scotia increased by these different arrangements ?

3. What sum is at present at credit of the government of Nova Scotia, bearing interest, with the government of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). No financial terms were arranged between the Dominion of Canada and the province of Nova Scotia between the dates mentioned. There were general readjustments in 1873 and 1884 of the debt accounts of the various provinces, but they had no special relation to Nova Scotia.

3. The sum now at the credit of Nova Scotia in the debt account is $1,056,111.12.

ST. LOUIS INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION, 1904.

Mr. LEMIEUX asked :

Is it the intention of the government to take part in the St. Louis International Exhibition in 1904 ? If so, will the Canadian commissioners be simply attachés to the British commission, as in Paris in 1900 ; or will they be given all the rights and privileges of an independent national commission, such as were granted to Canada at the Philadelphia International Exhibition of 1876 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It is the intention of the government to take part in the St. Louis International Exhibition in 1904.

The Canadian commissioner or commissioners who may be appointed will not be attachés to the British commission, but will be independent of it. The rights and privileges of the Canadian commission have not yet been determined.

DOMINION ELECTIONS.

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

That a Select Committee, composed of Messrs. Charlton, Casgrain, Russell, Barker, Demers (St. John and Iberville), Northrup, Thompson (Haldimand), and Ingram, and the mover, be appointed to consider the state of the laws respecting Dominion elections ; with power to report from time to time. And that the order respecting Bill No. 3, intituled : 'An Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900,' be discharged ; and that the said Bill be referred to the said committee.

He said : Mr. Speaker, at an earlier stage in the session a discussion arose on the election law in connection with a Bill introduced by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). In the course of that discussion I ventured to suggest that if any good could be accomplished in the way of improving the election law, it might be possible to bring it about by the appointment of a committee representing both sides of the House which would study the subject and which would probably then be able to make a report to the House. That suggestion found general favour, and after consultation with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) I placed this motion on the notice paper. I am by no means too confident that we can reform all the evils which are sometimes mentioned in connection with elections. I am afraid that some of them lie more deeply than legislation, and that in respect to some of them we would have to reform human nature before we could entirely remove them. However, I think that no harm could possibly result but that some good may come of the study of this question by a joint committee in the manner suggested. Therefore without further words, I beg to move that a committee be appointed for the purpose named. I move the motion which stands in my name.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) be good enough to tell us whether this inquiry will involve the duty of looking into the conduct of elections, the actions of officers connected with elections and offences committed during elections ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not understand that the committee will undertake to look into any election that is past.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I mean the law.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, anything which will help to improve the election law would, I think, come under the view of the committee.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The point I wish to make is this : At the present time only the deputy returning officer is allowed to place his initial upon, or to touch the ballot which is handed to the voter. It was my intention to bring in a Bill to deal with this subject, but when I saw that another hon. member had a Bill before the House, I thought that I would have an opportunity to offer an amendment. I think that not only the deputy returning officer should initial the ballot, but that the agent of the candidate should also be allowed to place any distinctive mark he chooses in proper form on the stub of the ballot, so that it may be identified. Would that point be eligible to be brought before the committee ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, in my judgment, it would. That is our intention.

Mr. BELL. I presume the intention of this motion is to lay before this committee all the laws at present relating to the conduct of Dominion elections, and those that are intended to deal with irregularities at elections. It will, I presume, involve the introduction of a new Bill, although I observe that Bill No. 3, introduced by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), is referred to a special committee for consideration. I would suppose that the intention is to review all the legislation now in existence in Canada in reference to the conducting of elections and in reference to irregularities or wrongs done at elections, with the view of introducing a Bill that will cover the ground and probably of substituting some more efficient legislation than that which we now have.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would be our desire, and certainly all these matters will come within the authority of the committee, and if they should be able to reach a conclusion that would, I should think, be in the shape of a Bill to be submitted to the House. Certainly what the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) has suggested would come within the scope of the inquiry.

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose that would include the Election Act as well as the Controverted Elections Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not see why we should not include both.

Mr. BELL. And no doubt it would also include the introduction of some measures which are altogether new—for instance, compulsory voting.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It might be so. The committee would have a free hand.

Motion agreed to.

REVISION OF THE TARIFF.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) if they would find it convenient to lay on the Table of the House all communications or memoranda containing suggestions on the revision of the tariff? Of course, I mean those which are not of a confidential nature. It would be, I think, very convenient to have them. It would help greatly in the debate that we are going to resume shortly on the fiscal policy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I do not know that we could have any objection to it. I can only say that if the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) had desired it, I wish he could have asked for it at an earlier stage in the session. The correspondence will be somewhat voluminous. There is certainly no reason why we should object to the production of any part that is not marked 'confidential,' but I would expect that the motion which my hon. friend might make would call for so much that it would take some time and considerable work in the preparation of the return. However, from a governmental point of view, there is no reason why we should not bring it down if the House desires it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. With the indulgence of the House I would say that if I am expected to make a motion it might take a little more time than it would if my hon. friends would consent to bring down as much of the correspondence as it is possible for them to do. I suppose that these documents are in shape and that it would not be much trouble to lay them on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would be glad at a later stage to make an announcement on the subject. The point is quite new. I did not anticipate bringing the papers down, not, however, on account of any objection on our part. I did not suppose they would be asked for or desired.

Mr. BELL. They are not confidential.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Some of them may be.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Those I do not ask for.

SETTLEMENT OF RAILWAY LABOUR DISPUTES.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) moved third reading of Bill (No. 17) to aid in the settlement of railway labour disputes.

Mr. CLARKE. I thought the hon. gentleman would have the amendments printed before he moved the third reading of the Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no objection. Let it stand.

Debate adjourned.

CONSTRUCTION OF DRY DOCKS—GOVERNMENT AID.

House went into committee on the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to repeal section 1 of chapter 9 of the statutes of 1899, and enact, in lieu thereof, the following section:—

If any company or body corporate, approved by the Governor in Council, as having the ability to perform the work, enters into an agreement with His Majesty to construct a dry dock, with all proper and necessary equipment, machinery and plant, for the reception and repairing of vessels, at a place, and according to plans and specifications approved by the Governor in Council, on a report by the Minister of Public Works, as sufficient for the requirements of the public at such place; the work to be completed within a time to be limited by

such agreement. Then, provided the company performs the work according to such agreement, and to the satisfaction of the Minister of Public Works, under the supervision of whose department the work shall be done, the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, of a subsidy not exceeding three per cent per annum on the cost of the work during twenty years from the time of its completion and acceptance by the said minister ; provided that such subsidy shall not exceed thirty thousand dollars per annum ; and that the cost on which it shall be calculated shall not be greater than the value of the work as estimated by the said minister. Provided also, that the subsidy shall not be payable for any portion of the said twenty years during which the dock is not in complete repair and working order.—The Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This resolution proposes to amend an Act which has been on the statute-book for several years. Some years ago the government constructed some docks as government works, but apart from that an Act was placed on the statute-book making provision for grants by way of aid to incorporated companies which might construct docks of the proper character subject to the approval of the government. The original arrangement was that that aid might take the shape of a subsidy equal to 2 per cent on the cost of the dock, for a period of twenty years, not exceeding, however, in any case, $10,000 per annum, which would be 2 per cent upon $500,000. That was the state of the law for some time. In the year 1899, an amendment was made whereby we still retained the 2 per cent, but we enlarged the amount upon which the payment might be made in order that docks of a larger capacity might be constructed. The Act as it now stands makes provision for payments of 2 per cent upon the cost of the dock, not exceeding, however, $20,000 per annum. The change which we now propose is to make the rate which we may pay by way of subsidy, 3 per cent instead of 2 per cent, and with a corresponding change in the total amount—instead of 2 per cent, or $20,000 we may pay in the case stated, 3 per cent, or $30,000 per annum. The change is entirely with respect to the rate per cent. It has been found that some difficulty has been experienced in floating companies to build these docks upon the present basis, and it is represented to us that if this increase be made, docks would be constructed in some places where otherwise they might not be. The only dock constructed under the old Act was the one at Halifax which was constructed by the joint aid of the imperial, the Dominion and the city governments. The city of Halifax paid a certain sum per annum, the Dominion government a certain sum per annum, and the imperial government gave a subsidy in consideration of which the ships of His Majesty's navy were received into the dock. There is a dock proposed and some progress has been made on it at Collingwood, Ontario, which no doubt would come in under the operation of this Act. They have been negotiating, and a contract was made on the basis of the present Act, but I think not much progress has been made, and I suppose the Collingwood Company would expect to avail themselves of the advantages of this Act. Another dock which has been brought to our notice is at the port of St. John, N.B., where it is represented that with this increased aid, the company will be able to establish a dock of a large character adapted to the increasing trade of the port. The policy of all governments in times past having been to aid works of this character, the only question is one of proportion, and inasmuch as 2 per cent has not been found a sufficient sum to bring about the construction of any docks in recent years, it is proposed to enlarge the aid by granting 3 per cent ; with the maximum of $30,000 per annum for a period of twenty years.

Mr. MONK. Have any companies, except that at Collingwood, applied for the aid provided for by this resolution ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I am correct in saying that no application has been made by any other company. Occasionally mention has been made of projects in other quarters, but I think I am right in saying that no application has been made by any company except the company at St. John and the company at Collingwood.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Of course the plans will be submitted in the usual way for approval by the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no change whatever in the words of the Act in that respect.

Mr. MONK. Is it contemplated that the government itself will not in future build any dry docks ? I speak of this, because for a long time we had expected that the government would construct a dry dock in the vicinity of the port of Montreal. Would we be met by the objection, that now that this system has been inaugurated it would be incumbent upon some private parties to organize themselves into a dock company in order to come under the provisions of this resolution ; or, would the government still persist in what has been promised to the port of Montreal, and build a dry dock there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must not discuss the question of any promise to any particular port ; but under this Act any body corporate, which would include the Harbour Commissioners, if they should see fit, could come in and obtain the benefits of this Act. Whether or not the government will in any case or in no case build or not build a dock in the future ; that is too definite a question for me to answer. In the present instance, the wording of the

Act is such that if the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal desire to come in under the operations of this Act, they would receive the aid. As to whether or not the government will in that case, or in other cases undertake the construction of the work as a government dock, that is a matter that would have to be considered hereafter. I am not at present able to say anything more definite.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is not a new policy at all. It is simply the extension in a small way of the existing policy which has been in force for over twenty years. The inference which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) fears may possibly be drawn from this Bill, is an inference that could as well be drawn from any previous Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I should have added that though the resolution before the House only deals, as the parliamentary rules require, with the money side of the question; in the Bill to be founded thereon, provision will be made that the tolls to be charged on any dock to be constructed hereafter shall be subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council. That has not been so in the past, but that restriction will be placed upon any docks constructed hereafter under the terms of this Act.

Mr. BENNETT. In considering an application to aid in the construction of a dock under this Act, would the first consideration be that there would have to be a certain amount expended for the work to be constructed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have made no rule in that regard. We have rather taken for granted that docks of large size would be undertaken. The only limit is that we shall only pay the 3 per cent on the fair cost of construction; and though the cost may be very much larger than the limit fixed, the amount of the subsidy cannot exceed $30,000. In the case of the Halifax dock the cost was very much larger than the estimated cost on which the government subsidy was paid.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not say that private enterprise must not be encouraged in cases of this kind. I think that what has suggested the present Bill is the case of the dock at St. John, N.B. Some very energetic citizens took up the proposal to erect a dock there. I understand that they received some encouragement or had some hopes of aid from the imperial government. Those hopes did not materialize. If I am not mistaken, they also received some help from the provincial government and from the city of St. John; but they could not get along without some further help. I quite agree with my hon. friends that the measure before the House to-day is worthy of approval. I may say also that the dock at Collingwood is being built by very energetic men. But we must not rely too much on private enterprise in large transactions of this kind. There is no country in the world which is more lacking in dock accommodation than Canada. The United States have many small docks, but they have not one large dock. During the last season there were in the St. Lawrence at one time four or five large ships which suffered damages and could not get accommodation either at Montreal or elsewhere. Suppose an accident happened between Belle Isle and Quebec; there is only one dock at Quebec, and one at Montreal, a very small one, belonging to a private firm. I would call the attention of my hon. friends on the treasury benches to the great importance of equipping our harbours with this necessary improvement. Graving docks are essential to-day, and they will become more and more essential as our fleet increases in size and number.

Mr. BELL. What about the dock at Lévis?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The dock at Lévis can only accommodate one ship at a time, and it is too narrow for the largest ships that ply in our waters. The boards of trade of Montreal and Quebec have applied for a second dock at Lévis. We should also have one at Montreal. I only say these few words in passing, in order to call the attention of my hon. friends to this important question.

Mr. BENNETT. While I do not propose to offer any objection to the resolution, perferring to wait until the Bill is brought down, it seems to me, on the face of the resolution, that unless the Bill goes further, a great deal of difficulty will arise. Since the case of the Collingwood dock has been instanced, let me call the minister's attention to the fact that there is also a dock at Owen Sound. I think the Collingwood dock was originally larger than the one at Owen Sound; but if this Bill goes into effect, the people of Owen Sound will no doubt come and ask that the dock there which has been enlarged at the expense of the company who own it, probably with the aid of the town, be assisted by the government. To my mind the government should lay down a hard and fast principle as a starting point, to the effect that the docks to be subsidized shall be placed at a certain distance from each other, or that only one dock shall be aided in a particular water. I am not in a position to state what was the original cost of the Collingwood dock; but unless a very large amount is expended in improving and enlarging it, it seems to me that $30,000 will be a very large grant towards it. Under the wording of the resolution, the $30,000 might be a greater inducement to the company than 3 per cent of the amount invested.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But they can only get 3 per cent on the cost of the dock, and in any case the amount must not exceed $30,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not notice that it was optional. When the Bill comes down, I think there should be some provision inserted in it as to the size of docks to be aided and the distance that they must be from each other. Otherwise assistance will be asked for very small docks, and the result will be a multiplicity of small docks instead of the establishment of a few large ones.

Mr. INGRAM. Did the hon. minister say that if this Bill becomes law, it will apply to the Collingwood dock ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What I said was that I supposed the Collingwood company would expect to come under this Act in the same way as the company which built the dock at St. John. As not much progress has been made with the work at Colingwood——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Oh, yes.

Mr. BENNETT. The dock has been there for twenty years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But I understand that the whole dock is to be reconstructed.

Mr. HENDERSON. As I read the resolution, the aid is to be granted towards the construction of new docks, but not towards the enlargement or improvement of existing docks. I would like to know from the minister what the intention is in that respect ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the Collingwood dock in its original construction had been subsidized by the government, then anything done later would be an enlargement ; but as it did not receive any government aid in its original form, all the work done on it now is practically new construction. I understand that there is none of the small original dock remaining, but that the whole dock is being reconstructed ; and, as in the first place it received no government aid, it will be treated as an entirely new construction.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The old dock at Collingwood was simply a hole and nothing else.

Mr. BENNETT. I understood the hon. minister to say that this is simply in pursuance of a policy inaugurated a number of years ago, and that the only change was an increase in the percentage from two to three. Might I ask whether under the Order in Council or statutory law, there is a condition precedent that the dock to be constructed should cost a certain amount ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is not any such condition, but the plans have to be submitted to the Minister of Public Works and by him to the Governor General in Council for approval. Whether there should be any amount fixed may be a matter for consideration, but we are simply following the policy laid down in the Act in times past.

Mr. BENNETT. I notice that the Act was first passed in 1899, so that it must have been passed during the hon. gentleman's term of office. Have any companies taken advantage of the two per cent clause ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Act of 1899 was an amendment. The original Act was passed many years before.

Mr. MONK. I think that we should encourage the building of dry docks, but under the provision of this resolution, it will be in the power of the government to grant very large amounts of public money without the special authorization of parliament. I would invite my hon. friend to consider that point when framing his Bill. For instance, when this resolution becomes law, the government will be empowered to grant over $2,000,000 of public money without the special authority of parliament—$30,000 a year for twenty years. And as the construction of these docks may become frequent, although we are proceeding on a law which has been in force a number of years, I think that it is worthy of consideration whether it is prudent to give such a very large power of disposing of public funds to the Governor General in Council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The best answer to my hon. friend is that this Act, in one form or other, has been on the statute since 1882, and up to the present we have only subsidized one dock under it. We may, therefore, conclude that the difficulty surrounding the construction and carrying on of large enterprises of that character will always impose certain checks on the demand for public aid, although, of course, by this amendment, we are making temptation stronger than it was in the past.

Mr. SPROULE. In my opinion the trouble will be that the percentage proposed, is not high enough, because these docks have not hitherto been paying investments by any means. The percentage is not sufficient inducement for capitalists to put money into such enterprises, and, I think, that the government might very well make it much higher.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend's criticism has something in it. It shows that the risk involved is a protection against any excessive payments under the Act. But I hope that the increase from two to three per cent will lead to the construction of one or two docks. The Collingwood dock will be finished and we will probably have one at St. John. Possibly other applications may come forward, and if there are sections where such accommoda-

tion is needed, we shall not regret supplying a portion of the means to furnish it.

Mr. BENNETT. What are we to understand by sections of the country ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier expressed the fear that under this Bill we might incur too large liabilities, but on the other hand my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that financial responsibilities involved in the construction of these docks are such that unless we give very liberal aid, such works will not be constructed at all. He says that, even with the aid we are now giving, we will not find companies prepared to undertake the risk and the responsibility.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to say that this is a very old policy. Was it in existence before 1899 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said that the original statute was passed twenty years ago, which my hon. friend may not consider very old.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The first Act was passed in 1882.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Has the hon. minister received any applications from any parties in Owen Sound with regard to increasing the capacity of the dry dock there ? And is it the intention of the government to give such parties any assistance ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works is the one to whom any such application would be addressed, and I would leave him to answer my hon. friend. As to whether any assistance would be given, I cannot say at present. It is not likely that these docks will be constructed close together. The cost of construction will be large, and if the demands of business are met in any one place, business men will not build another dock close by. Each case will be decided on its merits by the Governor General in Council, and the limitations I have suggested will regulate and restrict applications.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). The reason why I asked whether any application had been made is because one of the strongest arguments used in favour of the Liberal candidate, that if elected, the government would furnish assistance for the purpose of enlarging the dry dock at Owen Sound. I would ask whether the government authorized the holding out of any such inducement on that occasion, and whether it is the intention by this proposed Act to enlarge the dry docks at Owen Sound ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If any application were made, it must have gone to the Minister of Public Works. If any application should come from Owen Sound or any part of Canada, it will be considered and dealt with on its merits.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Owen Sound is a very much larger and more important business centre than Collingwood. The business done there is very large, and It is important that the dry dock should be enlarged. This Bill is in the right direction. We require a larger dry dock in Owen Sound, and although the people there did not support me in the last election, to the extent they would, on account of these promises, I hope they will get the increased percentage on the same terms as Collingwood and other places mentioned by the Finance Minister.

Mr. BENNETT. It is now in order for the Minister of Customs to support the claims of Owen Sound, because when he was politically wrecked in South Brant he was put in dry docks in North Grey.

Mr. CLARKE. My hon. friend from North Grey was referred to the hon. Minister of Public Works for a reply to the question he put, as to whether any communication had been received from any party in Owen Sound respecting the giving of government aid for the enlargement of the dock there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will take a note of the question and inquire whether any such communications have been received at the department or not. I cannot speak from memory. I did not make any promise and am not able to say what the policy of the government may be regarding this matter.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I did not understand the hon. minister to give a direct reply to the hon. member from Simcoe as to when this legislation by Order in Council on this particular subject was inaugurated. I see by the Bill that it repeals the clause of 1899. Was that the first legislation of this kind ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, that of 1882.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Was it on the same lines—that they could build a dock at any point they saw fit ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the wording of the Act is precisely the same in that respect as the Act of 1882; and, although, by the amending Act, power was given to the government to give this subvention to a dock anywhere, as a matter of fact only one dock was subsidized under the Act.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask what success this company has had in obtaining subscriptions to stock. I have a circular issued by that concern in August, 1902, which says :

The Dominion government recognizes the necessity in the public interest of an enlarged dry dock and has decided to grant a liberal subsidy for a term of twenty years ; the annual payments to be based upon the outlays made

upon the work, and to begin, upon its completion to the satisfaction of the government engineer. The Dominion government already grants a small bounty on the tonnage of steel steamships constructed in Canada.

This is a circular in which they ask subscriptions to the stock of the company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not understand what document the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) was reading from.

Mr. RICHARDSON. A document issued by the Collingwood Ship Building Company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already stated that there is a dock in course of construction at Collingwood, that, no doubt, it would get the benefit of this Act. Hitherto they have had the benefit of the Act authorizing a payment of 2 per cent. If this Bill passes, no doubt the Collingwood Company will expect that their company will get the benefit of it, as the dock is nearing completion.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I understand that this Bill is specially designed for the benefit of the dry dock in the town of Collingwood. Now, there has been a dry dock in Owen Sound for twenty years, and I would like to know if this Bill applies equally to Owen Sound ? We want our dry dock enlarged. And, if this 3 per cent is to apply to the enlargement of other dry docks, we want it to be applied to the one in Owen Sound. As I said before, Owen Sound is the most important shipping point on Georgian bay, or, for that matter on the upper lakes. Hence, I would like a definite answer from the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I should like to be as definite as I can. I had the pleasure of visiting Owen Sound. It is a very charming place.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister was warmly received there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In many respects Owen Sound does its duty. My only regret is that some other parts of the county are not so sensible. I would like to say to my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Thomson) that the only difference that I know between the two cases is, that I am not aware that the owners of the dock at Owen Sound have made any application for aid, whereas the owners of the dock at Collingwood have done so. When people want aid of this kind, though they may go to the Minister of Public Works, they generally find time to call on the Minister of Finance and ask that he do not stand in their way. I have heard from the Collingwood and St. John people. It may be that there is an application from Owen Sound, although they neglected to call on me; but to the best of my knowledge, no application has been received from them. If an application comes, it will have to be dealt with on its merits.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I may say that, even if the parties in control of the dry dock in North Grey failed to call on the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Finance did not forget to call on the electors of North Grey. We had the pleasure of a visit not only from the Finance Minister but also from the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) and the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick), and they received their answer. Nevertheless, we want to have a large dock in Owen Sound, and we want this Bill to apply to that work.

Mr. INGRAM. When I asked the Minister of Finance if this would apply to the Collingwood dock, I understood him to say that the Collingwood dock people did not know anything about it. Now, it appears that these people called on the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say otherwise.

Mr. INGRAM. I may have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, but I certainly thought he said that they knew nothing about this legislation.

Mr. HOLMES. Sitting here at a little distance from the Minister of Finance, I am not sure that I have exactly heard his answers to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I want to understand clearly. I understand that this is simply a provision under which dry docks throughout the Dominion, if not too close together, may, on certain conditions, obtain government assistance. Is that the point ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the point, except that the Act does not say anything about their being too close together. That is left to the government, but there is no limit in the Bill.

Mr. HOLMES. It does not apply to Collingwood specially or to any other place specially ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The day before yesterday, I received a letter from large contractors in Vancouver, which city I have the honour to represent, saying that, since the government have decided to raise this subsidy from 2 to 3 per cent, they expect to build a large dock. There has never been any question about this matter with us. We know that when the government bring down a Bill like this, they mean business. I think this is a very commendable proposition indeed, and I know that the fact of making this Bill law will result in our having a very large dock erected in Vancouver.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask on what authority the directors of this Collingwood Company make this announcement, in their circular of 1902, that :

The government has decided to grant a liberal subsidy for a term of twenty years ; the annual payments to be based upon the outlays made upon the work, and to begin, upon its completion to the satisfaction of the government engineer.

In the same circular, later on they say :

While we believe the improvements to be afforded by the additional capital will very materially increase the earnings of the company, we do not expect a higher dividend than six per cent per annum at present.

It would appear that they expect a large annual subsidy from the government for twenty years. Upon what authority did they make that announcement ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as concerns any past transaction the authority given to the government by legislation was to pay a subsidy of 2 per cent. From this time forward, if this Bill passes, we shall have authority to pay 3 per cent. The Collingwood dock is in course of construction, and it certainly is one of the docks that will have the aid of the government—there is no question about that. I think the information was given last year that the Collingwood dock was seeking and would receive aid. At all events it has been announced that the government would aid the Collingwood dock.

Mr. McCARTHY. I presume that the document quoted by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) is the prospectus of the Collingwood Ship-building Company. Every hon. member knows that a dry dock company makes little or nothing. A ship-building company, on the other hand, may make the dividends referred to in the prospectus. I cannot speak as to this company, having nothing to do with it, good, bad or indifferent. But the hon. gentleman will see that the prospectus is in respect to the building of ships, and one of the advantages which the company would have would be that they would be in a position to use this dry dock. The dry dock is only used to take a ship into for the purpose of repair. So, what the hon. gentleman has read applies to the prospective dividends in respect to the building of ships and not for the use of the dry docks for other purposes than repairing ships.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish first to be understood as not speaking in any spirit of hostility to any grant being given to the dry dock at Collingwood. Although I live in a lake town which does a very much larger shipping business, so far at all events as grain goes, than the town of Collingwood, I admire the pluck and energy of the people of Collingwood in constructing the large dock there, and in establishing certain lines of passenger boats which run to that point and have their headquarters there, and which are certainly a credit, not only to Collingwood, but to the Dominion of Canada. Now, speaking of this prospectus which is before the House, it is headed 'The Collingwood Ship-building Company,' and it throws a little light on what the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has said, that this prospectus is not referrable solely to any money that is to be expended in the advancement or enlargement of the dock at that point.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not say it was not referrable to any money to be expended.

Mr. BENNETT. Not exclusively, he said; that is what I intended to convey. According to this document, the authorized capital is to be $2,000,000, which is referrable to the ship-building industry, and also to the establishment of a dry dock at that point. Of the capital issue there is paid up $550,000, and it is intended to issue $300,000 of new stock, of which $80,000 has already been subscribed. The date of that prospectus is August 12, 1902. Now, I assume that the largest part of this capital of $850,000 is to be put in the dry dock, and I have understood that the cost will nearly approach that sum. I understand that the company were of necessity compelled to purchase valuable real estate, so a part of the $850,000 would of necessity be expended for that purpose too. Now, the House must see that the amount to be expended upon the Collingwood dock as a whole will probably reach over half a million dollars. It was announced over a year ago that the Collingwood Dry Dock Company was to have the grant on these terms, then it may be taken for granted that any dock that is to be assisted, if this is to be taken as a precedent, must of necessity cost half a million dollars. Now, I submit that when a Bill is brought down following this resolution, it should be firmly laid down in the Bill that the cost of the dock must be a certain amount, otherwise what will be the effect ? Let me tell the Minister of Finance that in the province of Ontario the people have gone mad on what is known as the bonusing system, rival towns seeking to promote their interests will give bonuses to manufacturing concerns. We have there within a distance of seventy-five miles, on the coast line, the towns of Owen Sound, Collingwood and Midland, all ambitious. And if the government are going to grant such liberal subsidies as under this Bill they will grant, of necessity the result will be a great competition between these towns. I submit it is fair to the people of the town of Midland to have the government announce a line of policy, so that we may set our house in order and get ready for the government grant. When the Bill is brought down, it should state distinctly what amount must be the cost of the dock before it will be assisted by the government, otherwise it would be giving the government in advance a great deal of political leverage, because a certain town may be preferred by the government, and therefore get the benefit, while others may be cast to one side. I submit that when the

Bill is brought down, there should be in it a clear cut statement as to what amount must be expended on the dock before it will receive assistance under this Act.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. There is another remark to be made in connection with this legislation. The Finance Minister is right in saying that the principle of making grants to dry docks by Order in Council was established in 1882, but the grant was then limited to $10,000. In 1899, after hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, they made it $20,000; but the necessities of Collingwood have become such that they now treble the grant and make it $30,000. Now, I can conceive that there may be cases, and probably this is one, where a small amount might be granted by Order in Council, say $10,000. The hon. gentleman also states what is no doubt correct, that when only $10,000 was granted, only one dry dock claimed assistance. But I object entirely to legislation of this kind, especially when you go beyond small amounts. Here the Finance Minister is asking us to authorize the government to issue as many million dollars as they please, provided some one will undertake to construct a dry dock. Now, when it comes to an amount that is equal to a capitalization of a million dollars, I think parliament ought to be consulted. When $10,000 was the limit the Conservative government found it was quite sufficient. Why cannot this government get up a scheme and bring it before parliament, providing that every sum to be granted must be subject to the sanction of parliament? This system is wrong in principle, it is liable to be abused, and it makes people suspicious of such a power in the hands of the government when they can exercise it by Order in Council. There is no better illustration of the objectionable character of this system than is furnished by the town of Collingwood. Does my hon. friend who represents it, and represents it well, claim that it is his ability alone that has made that town a Liberal instead of a Conservative town? There has been a lot of money spent and a lot of promises made in regard to public works in Owen Sound and vicinity about election times, not the last election, but the previous one, where we heard statements about 'cold justice' and 'warm justice,' and so on. We have a right to suspect that this power which is now sought may be exercised. I won't say it will be, but it puts the government of the day, I do not care which party may be in power, in the position of being suspected of using that power for political advantage. Any legislation of that kind, which enables a government by Order in Council to control public funds for party purposes, I am opposed to, especially if the amount is at all large. I approve of the restrictions such as my hon. friend from Simcoe mentions; I approve of assistance being limited to deserving places; but I think that before sums exceeding $10,000 are granted, parliament should be consulted before granting the money. In that case nobody could suspect the government, nobody would have a right to impute improper motives, and the government would be following a sound constitutional principle. There is no reason why it would not be just as easy to form a company to build a dry dock when the grant of a subsidy is subject to parliament as it would be if the government granted the subsidy by Order in Council. Again I say, I object to the principle of giving this power to the government without surrounding it with constitutional safeguards, more particularly when the subsidy amounts to a considerable sum.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I beg to say a word on behalf of the Collingwood people. I am largely responsible for the work that has been carried on there.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I am not saying a word against the Collingwood people.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When I undertook to recommend to my colleagues the construction of the works at Collingwood, the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy was a member of parliament. He was not then a strong supporter of the government. He was quite an independent member of this House. I was invited to a banquet at the board of trade. Banquets have something good about them, and that Collingwood banquet was a great one indeed. I found around the table energetic, sterling business men. They represented to me that if some encouragement were given to them they would do their share to promote the development of the port, one of the most important ports on the great lakes. I came down to Ottawa fully convinced that this was a deserving case. I represented to my colleagues that it was important that the government should carry out the improvements that had been undertaken there years and years ago and which were not completed. My colleagues were good enough to agree with the recommendations I made then. The improvements have been carried out. What has been the result of these improvements? The population of the town of Collingwood has nearly doubled and large industries have sprung up. The people of Collingwood have done their part and for the improvements we have made there we have been paid in hard cash in the shape of development and progress. Let my hon. friend permit me to tell him that there was no political cajoling about Collingwood. These Collingwood men are business men before everything else. The government treated them fairly and they have acted in good faith. These were energetic men. They gave their votes to my hon. friend here (Mr. McCarthy). It may be my fault to a certain extent. I do not regret it. There are thousands and thousands of people in this country who have

no strong party leanings and who are business men before everything else. Well, in Collingwood I feel that we have dealt with men of that character. These men were Conservatives in the past.

Mr. MACLEAN. They were harbourites.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What I think is that they will always vote right. I am glad to say that they proceeded energetically with their part of the work. They had promised me that if the government would help them they would erect large works. They are to-day building ships on a large scale. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has settled there. He has erected a large mill and there are other large industries established at Collingwood. The population of the town has doubled.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I do not object to the expenditure. I said that this was a desirable expenditure but that there was such a large amount involved that it should first be approved by parliament.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. As to the Order in Council I am no longer on the treasury benches and it is not for me to defend that part of the argument, but after having been six and a half years a minister I believe I can properly say in the light of experience that I have the conviction that governments can as a rule be trusted.

Mr. CLARKE. Cannot ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, governments as a rule can be trusted—I say it again —whatever party they belong to. I do not believe that there enough men at the Council Board to do wrong. That is my experience. I have no interest in stating that. I have no political interest to serve in stating that as a public man for the edification of the people and also for their education, perhaps. Let me say again, and I will be borne out by those who have been Ministers of the Crown, that while there may be unworthy ministers, when you have to deal with the whole government there is not much to be feared.

Mr. BENNETT. I find that on the 22nd January a banquet was tendered at Collingwood by the board of trade and that on that occasion the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) was present as their guest. It was only fitting and proper that any needs of the town should be brought before the minister and I see that Mr. John Long who occupied the chair on that occasion made the complaint that he thought the town was suffering. His complaint was this :

> Now, as they were aware, the dock was being still further enlarged, and when finished would be equipped so as to accommodate the largest vessels floating on the lakes. He hoped the government would see its way to pay a greater per cent of its cost than two per cent which had been promised. He wished the government would take over the dock and pay for its cost, and the town would operate it.

Mr. Long then went on to speak about the ship building industry in that town, and as to the future of the industry he expressed very grave doubts and misgivings. He pointed out that they were brought into competition with the British ships and he said :

> At the same time British built vessels were allowed to come here and navigate in competition without any tax being imposed on them.

Mr. Long laid down two complaints; first there was the question of assistance to the dry dock and then the question of competition between the British vessels which were being brought upon the great lakes and those which were built at Collingwood. When the hon. Postmaster General came to reply he endeavoured to soothe the feelings of the Collingwood people present on that occasion. The hon. Postmaster General gave them an assurance as to what was to be done in respect to one of their complaints, but it will turn out, as I will show, that the hon. gentleman was entirely wrong in his view as to what could be done for the people of Collingwood. What did the hon. gentleman tell them ? He seems to have skimmed very lightly over the question of the dock, but he took up the question of duties on ships and he then and there told the people of Collingwood in his own language that they were to be given substantial assistance, that they were to be protected in the matter of the ship-building industry. Here is what the hon. gentleman said :

> As to the question of duties on ships, raised by Mr. Long, it seemed to him that no political economist could justify admitting free a finished article and taxing the raw material.

What did that mean ? It meant that the hon. Postmaster General was holding out to these people hope that British ships would have certain restrictions placed upon them or that certain concessions would be made under the tariff in favour of the Collingwood ship-building industry. What position are the government in to-day ? It is a question whether the hon. Postmaster General by his words meant that the government would be in a position to prohibit by this restriction of which he spoke, the entrance of British ships upon the great lakes, and yet he certainly must have meant that or he meant that the raw materials which were used in the construction of ships would have their duties reduced. The hon. Postmaster General evidently came down to his colleagues. By them he was told that it was impossible to place a restriction on British vessels coming upon the great lakes and as the government were afraid apparently to reduce the duties on the raw materials entering into the construction of ships they are endeavouring to carry out some of the promises of the hon. Postmaster General and now we find that one

of these promises is being carried out by increasing this bonus from two per cent to three per cent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). There is not the slightest connection between the resolution now before the House and my references at the Collingwood banquet in question, to the condition described by speakers as to the manufacture and importation of ships—not the slightest understanding between the government and the Collingwood people. Both these questions stand entirely on their own merits separately and apart, and they are to be dealt with by the government separately and apart.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Chairman, without wandering any farther from the question, permit me to call your attention to the fact that this is a dock Bill, and while no doubt there are questions of duties on ships and ship-building aids, which are all very important, I should like to confine this discussion if I can to the matter before the committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is very gratifying to find that hon. members on both sides of the House appreciate what is being done in the way of development in the town of Collingwood. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) tells us, that after his first interview with the citizens of Collingwood he was impressed that they were an energetic business people, and that if they were encouraged they would develop the resources of that town and district in a manner which would be a credit to themselves and to all Canada. He tells us that having come to that conclusion he did aid the citizens of Collingwood. Truly, he did. And as a result of that aid Collingwood has embarked in a very large enterprise, namely the Collingwood Ship-building Company, which at the present time is employing seven hundred men where some years ago not a man was employed. They have that line of steamers to which my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has referred, and these steamers carry thousands of passengers to the town each year. That line can only be successfully operated by keeping our harbour in a proper condition. In view of what the Finance Minister has said, I do not intend to wander further from the subject, than to say, that when the Postmaster General was in Collingwood it was an accepted fact that the Collingwood Ship-building Company was to be assisted in the building of a dry dock, and at that time this increased aid was spoken of. Therefore when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) said that the Postmaster General was skating over very thin ice at that time, he is not correct. The only question before the people then was a question of giving increased aid to the dry dock, and that is being accomplished to-day by the legislation now before the House. But, Sir, that increased aid is not only for the town of Collingwood, it is to extend throughout the whole Dominion in favour of any worthy proposition for the building of a dry dock. Let me say that there is no money in the establishment of a dry dock per se. The ship-building company can only use the dry dock for the purpose of repairing ships, and the money which can be made out of ship-building—if money can be made out of the industry at all—is in the actual building of new ships. Is it not an argument in favour of this very small increase, that this ship-building company at the very inception of its business is able to find employment for seven hundred men; is it not an argument that that employment will be extended and work and wages provided for the people of Collingwood who by their labour will assist in the carrying on of this enterprise? The Collingwood company has already built three ships, and a great many ships now plying upon the upper lakes which hitherto had to go to the United States come there now to be repaired. We will therefore divert from the United States the repairing of these ships, and we will to that extent benefit our own country. That, Sir, is a laudable enterprise; it is an enterprise which will receive encouragement from the Canadian people when it is fully understood. I am gratified, Sir, that so far as Collingwood is concerned, we never can be looked upon with that suspicion which was suggested by the hon. member for Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale). This question has been very fully discussed, and I think we can take it for granted that very little objection will be offered by any member in this House to giving the Collingwood Ship-building Company the aid which has been asked by them.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think, Sir, that the country is beginning to view with alarm the policy of increasing subsidies to companies of this character. I have in my hand a circular issued by this Collingwood Company last August, in which they speak of being able to pay dividends of 6 per cent per annum, and the circular states that the policy of the directors will be to still further increase their works and earn greater dividends. They say they have no hesitation in recommending the stock as a sound business investment which is likely to become more valuable within a reasonable time. I believe, Sir, that the people of the country at large without respect to politics, have no objection to reasonable encouragement being given to large business enterprises for the development of our industries and commerce. But there is a feeling of unrest and a feeling of alarm, when companies of large capital like this apply to the government to receive assistance which will enable them to pay larger dividends than that already paid by the Collingwood Ship-building Company. It is no wonder that when they are seeking such

help from the government, they can give banquets to the ministers when they go to visit Collingwood.

Mr. McCARTHY. It was not the company that gave the entertainment. It was the board of trade and the municipal council of Collingwood which organized the banquet.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I suppose the company was not at all interested in it, and took no part in it. I find it rather difficult to believe that. I know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) has made an attempt to separate the Ship-building Company of Collingwood from the dry dock company.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did no such a thing.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As far as I can learn they are one and the same company, and the earnings of the one are the earnings of the other.

Mr. McCARTHY. Decidedly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think, Sir, the members of this House will feel it incumbent upon them to pause before they increase the subsidies which have already been granted in this direction.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot allow the insinuation to pass, that the ship-building company was responsible for the entertainments which have been given in the town of Collingwood. That statement is absolutely without foundation. These banquets have been given by the citizens of Collingwood represented by the municipal council and the board of trade, and every man who went to that banquet paid for his ticket. It is that instinct of enterprise which has made the people of Collingwood what they are to-day. They do not sit down and wait for a company to entertain ministers or others when they visit the town. The citizens do that themselves and they pay for it themselves. I refrained from replying to the statement of the hon. member for Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale), but in view of the insinuations he has thrown out, perhaps the question of politics can be referred to. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) has said that as a result of the treatment which Collingwood has received at the hands of the government, Collingwood sent a member to support the Reformers in this parliament. It is true that I have supported the government on most questions, but I supported the government because I thought the government was right. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) knows very well that the town of Collingwood has been voting for the name which I bear since 1878, and I do not expect that the insinuations which are sometimes hurled across the floor of this House, will ever get the people of Collingwood to change their allegiance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In respect to how many places have applications been made to the government for an increase of this subsidy? How many docks are likely to be built under the provisions of this proposed Bill, as far as the government is at present aware?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already mentioned that the only places from which we have had applications are Collingwood, Ontario and St. John, N.B. In the case of Collingwood, the matter was discussed in times past and it was agreed that we should aid that dock to the extent of the legislation then on the statute-book which was 2 per cent. In the case of St. John, N.B., no progress has been made, but they are endeavouring to establish a company and we have reason to believe that with this increased aid a company will be established to construct a dock in St. John. Reference was made before my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) entered the House, to the position of Montreal under this Bill, and I mentioned that if the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal should desire to avail themselves of this method of construction they would be a body corporate and would be entitled to come under the operation of this Act. There may be other places in which docks are thought of, but I think I am correct in saying that these two are the only cases that have been brought before the government. If there are any others, of course we will be prepared to look into them on their merits, upon application being made.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand that there is a dry dock in existence in Collingwood for a number of years which at present they are rebuilding and extending. I do not see how this resolution can cover that case. Here is a dock partially built and you propose to give aid to it presumedly on the approval of plans at the present time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Although there was a dock of a certain character at Collingwood for years, this is practically a new dock.

Mr. McCARTHY. Absolutely a new dock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It may be treated as a new dock. If we had subsidized the Collingwood dock originally, then we would be obliged to treat this as an extension, but the original dock at Collingwood was a small concern and never received government aid. It comes under the operation of the existing law as a new dock, and not as an extension of the old one.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That makes the case a great deal worse. Here is a dock which is already in existence.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A part of it is in existence.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is a hole there.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A part of it is in existence and some of the works are in

existence at the present time. The hon. gentleman intends to advance money for the purpose of purchasing the whole of it, or the value already existing is taken into consideration. It is not like a new structure.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it is a new dock altogether.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Finance Minister says there is an old dock at present being repaired, and he looks on it in the light of a reconstruction.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The old dock has practically disappeared, and the aid under this Act will be upon the expenditure not on the old structure, but on the new.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there any part of the old one being rebuilt ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A very trifling part.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no building going on, is there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it is rapidly approaching completion. It is practically a new work. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) argued as if this was a bonus to a company engaged in a private enterprise. The Collingwood dock, and all other docks which will receive aid under this Act are public docks, rendering a public service. No one who is acquainted with the importance of our inland navigation will fail to recognize the urgent need of providing dry dock accommodation on the upper lakes. The hon. member for South Grey does not find a supporter of his views in his colleague from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) whose criticism was, not that this was an unwise measure, but that we were not proposing sufficient aid. The hon. member for South Grey says the aid is too liberal ; the hon. member for East Grey says it should be more liberal. It is difficult for us to reconcile the views of these hon. gentlemen. This money will not only aid the ship-building industry, but it will be useful to all who navigate the upper lakes; and under the proposed amendment to the law—it is not before the committee at the present time, but will come in due course—the government will have full control over the rates to be charged for the use of the dry dock. This in itself will ensure fair rates, and prevent any extortion, or any private capital that may be invested in the work being unduly remunerative to the investors. When an estimate comes to be made of what rates should be permitted to be charged, a proper account will be taken of the amount of private capital invested in the enterprise, and the amount of the probable earnings, and the rates will be so fixed as only to admit of the proper maintenance of the work and a reasonable dividend to those who contribute capital to the enterprise.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the length of the proposed new dock ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is about 500 feet. I was at Collingwood in the month of January ; my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) was present at the same time ; and I am sure that he was as gratified as I was at the great industrial activity we saw in Collingwood. It gave me the greatest possible pleasure to see the prosperity of that town through the enterprise of its citizens. They were building two magnificent ships, capable of carrying 250,000 bushels of wheat at least. Those ships were expected to be launched in the course of a few months, and I believe one of them is now about to be launched ; and the people are reaching out for further contracts. The construction of such a dock as this will not only aid those who wish to use it, but will also make possible an extension of the ship-building industry at Collingwood, a branch of industry of the greatest importance. There are iron and steel works in operation on the north shore, in the Sault Ste. Marie district, and in many ways the general public will be advantaged by the construction of this dock.

Mr. COCHRANE. What was the length of the old dock ?

Mr. McCARTHY. 100 or 150 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. It is because of the knowledge I have of the difficulties which the shipping industry on the Georgian Bay and the upper lakes have had to contend with that I approve of this measure. For many years attempts were made to induce the government to aid in the construction of a dry dock at Collingwood or Owen Sound, but they would not grant sufficient aid. The assistance they proposed was so small that capitalists would not undertake the work, although the shipping on the Georgian bay and the upper lakes was rapidly increasing. Vessels needing the use of a dry dock had to go to the American side. The dock at Collingwood would not accommodate one of the Canadian Pacific Railway boats, which are over 300 feet long, while the dock is less than 100 feet.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). The dock at Collingwood, before the change took place, would accommodate one of the Canadian Pacific boats.

Mr. SPROULE. The vessel in the dock was partly in and partly out ; the dock could not properly accommodate it. Therefore, there was need to devise a means whereby a dry dock could be provided on the Georgian bay. If Owen Sound avails itself of this government aid, all the better, though it may be inadvisable to have two docks in the same district. If Collingwood raises the capital for a dry dock, so much to its credit. The principle

of the measure is a good one, and if it has any defect it is that it does not go far enough, the amount being too small. We gave a large subsidy for a dry dock at Kingston, and for the graving dock at Esquimalt.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were built by the government.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, they were practically built by the government; but on the upper lakes and the Georgian bay, where the shipping interest is greater than it is in any other part of Canada, the government have given no assistance at all. When they propose to give it, I can only say that for my part, I endorse the proposition, and the only complaint I have is that they do not give greater assistance.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down does not answer the point I raised at all; and my knowledge of his contrary nature is the only reason I venture to say a word in reply. My point has not reference to the amount or the place at all. I said that I knew of no more desirable object to which to devote public money, and I think Collingwood is entitled to a share of it in the nature of things. But I object to the principle of this Bill. I object to establishing a precedent for allowing any government by Order in Council to cover this whole country with dry docks, without submitting their proposals to parliament. I did not object to the sum of $10,000 proposed by the Conservative government; but this was a small amount. Hon. gentlemen opposite propose to grant three times as much. Judging by the past, I do not know that $30,000 will be enough for Collingwood; but what I say is that the government should bring down a grant, as they did in the case of Kingston and Esquimalt, and let parliament vote it. This grant of $30,000 a year, capitalized is equal to $1,000,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is only twenty years, and twenty times $30,000 make $600,000 payable every twenty years.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. With accumulated interest?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Only $600,000. Why, I have seen this House detained for weeks, when we were in power, over an item of $5,000. What I wish to protest against is this principle of expenditure by Order in Council. There is a feeling abroad that the government are going into lavish expenditure simply because they have a full treasury. In my opinion, that is the time to help the people by cutting off the duties on materials that do not need protection. I am not raising my voice against the expenditure itself in this particular instance, but what I am opposed to is giving authority to the government to dispose of large sums outside the control of parliament. It is contrary to the principles of responsible government and it lays the government open to suspicion. Our people do not want the government to be put in a position, that, even when they do right, they are liable to be suspected. Take this Collingwood item, if we were asked to vote $30,000 per year over a period of twenty years, for a dry dock there, I would be the last to object, but what I do object to is the passing of a resolution of this kind, which will put it in the power of the government to expend, without the direct sanction of parliament, such an amount for the construction of dry docks whenever they may see fit. I may be old-fashioned in my ideas, I may be too much wedded to the fine old principles of constitutional British government and legislation. But these principles have done good service for a thousand years, and I do not want to see any one of them swept away, and would rather be thought old-fashioned than allow legislation, such as is now proposed, to pass without protest.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend takes exception to the principle involved in this measure, and no doubt he is now sincere. But I would like to know when he experienced this change of heart? He objects to the principle of allowing the Governor General in Council to decide when the aid provided by this resolution should be granted, but when did he first discover that this was not sound policy?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. When the amount became large.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are not changing the principle of the law. That law was passed with the approval of my hon. friend. All we are doing is changing the percentage from two to three.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I was not in the House in 1882.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend was in the government when this law was on the statutes, and during fourteen years he saw nothing in it to criticise.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The limit was then $10,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is the principle that my hon. friend is discussing and not the amount. It was the government which he supported that adopted the principle, and incorporated it in our statutes. My hon. friend entered that government, knowing that that statute was in existence, knowing what was in it, and he allowed it to remain without any objection on his part. The principle of that legislation was a good one until to-day, when suddenly it becomes most objectionable. When was it that this hon. gentleman became con-

verted into such an ardent defender and advocate of popular rights ? Is it only since he has been in opposition and unable therefore to give effect to his views ? But the proper time for him to have given some practical effect to his ideas was when he had the power to do so. What is the use of a man holding such strong views and refraining from giving any expression to them until he knows that his protests can have no effect ?

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman might ask himself the same question. When did he become converted ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am now dealing with my hon. friend from South Norfolk, and while I am not questioning his sincerity to-day, I should like to know when his convictions became so radically and suddenly changed ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. My hon. friend finds fault with my hon. friend from South Norfolk for his change of principle. I think that the hon. minister might apply his own remarks to himself. He was the most rabid of opponents of all these Acts of parliament and resolutions, passed in this House in 1882, and at other times, giving the government the power to spend money by Order in Council. But this principle, which he formerly held, he has dropped, as he has done every other, since he came into office. We are now dealing with the question of giving $10,000 per year for the building of a dry dock, or two per cent on the cost of its construction now. What is now proposed is $30,000 per year or 3 per cent on the cost.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The principle is not changed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The granting of a small sum may be harmless in itself, but when you increase that sum and make it a large amount, then the question of principle becomes a very serious one. What may be indifferent when a small expenditure is at stake may become a very serious matter when it involves a large expenditure. I have in my hand a prospectus of the company in question, which states :

> The company possesses at Collingwood the only dry dock on the upper lakes, in Canada, capable of accommodating large vessels. It is proposed to increase its capacity so as to enable it to take the largest vessels trading, or likely to trade, on these waters.

They only intend to increase the capacity of the dry dock.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the date of that prospectus ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. August 12, 1902. The company go further and say that they have made an arrangement with the Dominion government for the purpose of assisting them in this work.

> The Dominion government recognizes the necessity in the public interest, of an enlarged dry dock, and have decided to grant a liberal subsidy for a term of twenty years ; the annual payments to be based upon the outlays made upon the work.

The payments are therefore to be made upon the work of enlargement and not upon the whole work. But the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Postmaster General led us to believe that this is an entirely new work.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Practically, it is.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They state in this prospectus, in which they ask people to subscribe money, that they have a dry dock already, and that all they need to expend in this respect is enough to enlarge that dry dock.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) allow me to make an explanation with regard to that ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Certainly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know nothing about that prospectus. But I can quite recall a statement made to me by people in Collingwood when I was there in January last. I think the statement was made by Mr. John Long, though I am not very sure. At all events, one of the gentlemen who knew all about this plan took me down to where the work was going on. He showed me the new work and told me that at first they had expected to be able to utilize part of the old work, but when they endeavoured to do so, they found it impossible, and they had to do away with the old structure——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. At what time was the hon. minister there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In January last. And the hon. gentleman has read from a prospectus issued, I think, in August, last. Evidently, at that time, they expected to be able to use part of the old wharf, but afterwards found that this could not be done.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I know nothing about the circumstances, and did not even know that there was a dry dock there. But I know that this is the prospectus on which they raised money in the market, and I understand that at present their shares are listed in the stock exchange in Toronto. But, the statement made in this prospectus is that they had made an arrangement with the government for an advance——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is under the old law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The prospectus states that the Dominion government recognizes the necessity in the public interest

of an enlarged dry dock and has decided to grant a liberal subsidy for a term of twenty years. And the hon. minister finds fault with the hon. member from South Norfolk for saying that this amounts to a million dollars.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not find fault with that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman said there was only $600,000. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) is absolutely correct—a guarantee of $30,000 a year for twenty years, when you have the undertaking also, is worth in any market in the world one million dollars.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How could that be ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This $30,000 a year for twenty years guarantees the interest for that length of time which enables them to borrow to the full value of this $30,000 a year. Then they have the undertaking, which is an additional security.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. They could sell it readily for a million dollars.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Certainly. Is that not correct ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know how the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir William Mulock) makes that out.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. An annuity of $30,000 for twenty years may have various advantages to the person who is to enjoy it. But we are dealing with it from the standpoint of the Canadian taxpayer, who is to pay it. An annuity of $30,000 a year for twenty years amounts, on its face, to $600,000. But, this is to be reduced to its present cash value. An actuary would estimate that for you—the present cash value of $600,000 payable in twenty annual instalments and calculated at three per cent would be so much less, how much less I do not know. The taxpayer of Canada is not paying $600,000, but only the present value of that sum paid under the provisions named. But I will add to my hon. friend's argument for him. We are considering now only one dock, but, under this Bill there may be other docks. My hon. friend has the opportunity of magnifying this fund by multiplying it by as many docks as his imagination leads him to believe will be brought into existence. He could work up a large bill in that way.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is right looking at it from the point of view he speaks of—the present cash value of the sum to be paid by the government. But we are looking at it from the point of view of the advantage to the men who receive the money. It was from that point of view that my hon. friend from South Norfolk was looking at it, and from that point of view he is quite correct. But let me refer to the point to which I drew the attention of the Minister of Finance, and which he tried to get over by saying that this was virtually a reconstructed work. But, first of all, before they are entitled to any money, before any arrangement can be made, the plan must be approved by the engineer of the department. I understand that the work is nearly completed, or, at least is well under way. How, then, can this apply to this particular case? The work is to be built under the supervision of the engineer attached to the Public Works Department or there must be a report of the engineer that this money has been expended on the work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) allow me a moment ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Before that dock at Collingwood was put under construction, Mr. Coste, an officer of the department was authorized to supervise the work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is he on it ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was an agreement made ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. An Order in Council ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. An Order in Council passed when I was in office. The work is perfectly regular.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We shall be delighted to get the whole information from the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps I may be allowed to suggest that the difficulty is that my hon friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) came in late, and so had not the benefit of the information that was given to the hon. gentlemen who were here. I stated that we had agreed to aid the Collingwood dock to the extent of two per cent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But here is a new agreement. The old Act which limits the amount to two per cent on the amount spent, or in this case, $20,000. But there is a subsidiary agreement, evidently, by which the government promised to bring in legislation for the purpose of paying three per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Here is the resolution. Here is the expression of the intention of the government, and we have

the announcement from the government that it is intended to apply to this particular dry dock. They made a bargain but they were unable to carry it out under the old Act, and now they find it necessary to have further legislation——

Mr. CLARKE. They could not deliver the goods.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. For some reason which I do not know——

An hon. MEMBER. Banquet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have the assurance of the hon. member for Simcoe that none of the parties had anything to do with that, and I accept his statement. However, there must have been a bargain to give them assistance beyond that authorized by the old statute. It is time, in any case, that this system of grants by Order in Council, all this system of governing the country by Orders in Council was done away with. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) twits the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) with being a supporter of this system in 1882. We have discarded those principles. The country has advanced, as the hon. Minister of Finance has assured us. This is a growing and a better time in intelligence and otherwise, and it is time that this kind of legislation was wiped off the statute-book—this governing of the country by Orders in Council and granting large subsidies to corporations or individuals without the direct sanction and support of parliament.

Mr. CHARLTON. The discussion has taken a rather wide range; and it strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that the criticisms of hon. gentlemen opposite in relation to this matter are somewhat captious and unfair. I am pleased to find that my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) has imbibed such correct and constitutional impressions with regard to the expenditure of money by Order in Council. It reminds me of the old days in opposition when a great deal of capital was made out of criticisms of that kind, and when perhaps we were not in possession of facts which might have modified our opinions with regard to the criticisms that were made. The government of which both my hon. friend from South Norfolk and my hon. friend from Lanark were supporters, distinctly recognized this principle in the matter of grants to dry docks. The principle of granting $10,000 to aid a dry dock in 1882 was on all fours with the principle of granting $30,000 in 1903, under the changed circumstances with regard to transportation, the size of vessels built and the extraordinary size of the dry docks necessary. I can see, Sir, no particular objection to the plan adopted under these resolutions on which a Bill is to be founded. I have confidence enough in the members of the ministry who meet in Council and discuss these questions in a business-like way, I have confidence enough in their ability to arrive at a correct opinion, to believe that in an adjustment of business matters of this kind they could be fairly trusted with the discharge of that duty. I have confidence enough in their honesty to believe that they would not stoop to anything irregular or improper in granting subsidies of this character and under the provisions of this resolution. I am not able to see how, if they were disposed to do so, it would be convenient or possible for them to travel very far from the paths of rectitude.

The building of a dry dock is a business proposition. The aid granted under this resolution by the government is not sufficient to build it. It is merely the granting of a certain amount of aid which will enable the parties engaged in the operation of building a dock, perhaps to float their bonds to secure the resources necessary for the purpose of going on and constructing a dock that otherwise they would be unable to do. I do not think it is necessary to come to the House of Commons with every separate and distinct proposition for the construction of a dry dock in the Dominion of Canada. Here is a general principle laid down. The government is protected in the request made upon it to grant aid by the fact that the parties making that request have got to put up more money than the government does, they have got to show their good faith and confidence in the scheme by investing the major part of the money necessary to construct the dry dock. An annuity of 3 per cent for twenty years capitalized, does not amount to the aggregate of that annuity for that time. Six hundred thousand dollars, the maximum sum of $30,000 per annum for twenty years, falls far short of the capitalized sum of $600,000.

Now, Sir, in the discussion of this question we have had exhibited here certain local jealousies, jealousies between different ports on the Georgian bay. There is Owen Sound, there is Collingwood, there is Midland, all thriving towns, all of them important shipping points, and it is necessary for the commercial wants of the Georgian bay to have a first-class dry dock in each one of these towns. One dock would serve the purpose as well as three; but if one would hardly have business enough to make it a paying investment, not enough in the locality which has put itself in the position of building a dry dock, which would be sufficient to meet the commercial wants of that section of the great lakes, why, that locality has a just cause in appealing to the government for aid, and the government is warranted in giving to that place or locality the aid necessary for constructing that dry dock.

Now, what are the circumstances upon the Georgian bay? There has recently been developed on that bay a large commerce, a large carrying trade in grain, a large passenger traffic, a large business in lumber,

and there will be a large business in iron ore, a large business in various departments. There has been erected at Collingwood one of the finest ship-building plants on the continent, that has already turned out two large vessels, as large as the largest class of carriers on the upper lakes, a plant that is turning out two vessels now, and is prepared to add from year to year to the mercantile marine of the Dominion three or four of these vessels. This is an enterprise that is a credit to Canada, an enterprise that ought to command our respect and appeal to our pride. Well, it has been found necessary to have in connection with this business, resources and accommodations for the docking of these vessels. It was not creditable to us that vessels of this class had to be sent to Detroit, or Cleveland, or Buffalo, for repairs. We had no dry dock upon the upper lakes that would accommodate vessels of this class. One is being built at Collingwood and is approaching completion, a dry dock ample for all the purposes that will be required in docking the large class of vessels that sail the upper lakes.

Now, the objection is raised by the hon. member for North Lanark that part of this dry dock is an old dry dock, and, for some reason I am not able to understand, he says because this company is making use of a hole that has been dug there for the old dry dock, they are not entitled to this subsidy. Even if the walls of the old dry dock were capable of being utilized for the new dock, I am unable to understand why it would not be to all intents and purposes a new dry dock. But they were not capable of being utilized—they had to be torn down ; all they could use of the old dry dock was a little amount of excavation, the cross walls of the old dry dock had to be built entirely new, and to all intents and purposes it is a new dry dock. All the advantage derived by the company from the existence of the old dock was infinitesimal. Under these circumstances, I think we are wasting our time here in haggling over this matter in the way we are doing. I do not think it would be a workable method even to allow these things to drift along, and, before the government will give any assurance of aid to a company that desired to build a dry dock or make improvements of this character, to wait until parliament could be consulted. If that had been the case with this dry dock, it would not have been constructed even now, it would not be built perhaps for years hence, and it would have been a great loss to the public interest of the Georgian bay and a loss to the commercial interests of the Dominion for that delay to have occurred.

I was in Collingwood last week and saw this dry dock. It is a creditable work. The company had to buy land right in the heart of the town to extend their dock landward. They have got an enormous plant there. In connection with the ship-building they had to take up a railway track and move it landward, they had to destroy buildings to find room for their excavation, and they have gone on here and built a dry dock of a first-class character, a dry dock that will dock a man-of-war, that will dock a vessel with a carrying capacity of 300,000 bushels. The whole of the commercial interests of Georgian bay and the upper lakes realize that this is a work of the utmost importance, realize that it is a work that reflects great credit on the enterprise of the town of Collingwood. If Collingwood is enjoying the prosperity it deserves, it is because it has had wide-awake business men that grasped the situation with courage, men who are ready to invest their money, men whom the government might legitimately aid in promoting the construction of a work of this kind. The town has subscribed a large amount, the town has stood ready at all times to promote any of these enterprises that were calculated to increase its prosperity. The result has been the location of the Cramp steel works there.

Mr. BENNETT. They are pretty sick of it now.

Mr. CHARLTON. They will be all right in regard to that. They may be sick of it but they will, I hope, have reason to be gratified that they have invested that money. I think if we look at this thing from the proper standpoint, if we realize that a dry dock is absolutely needed and needed now and that it could not have been had now if we had resorted to the method recommended by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) and the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) if we realized that the commercial interests of the Georgian bay require that improvement, that there is no investment of public money asked for in this session that will produce more satisfactory results or that will be more necessary in the public interests than that which is covered by these resolutions, if we realize all these things, then, we had better drop this discussion and be thankful that we have this ship-building plant and this magnificent dry dock accommodation at Collingwood which is sufficient for the upper lakes and the effect of which can only be to promote the commerce of this Dominion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad to observe that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) seems to have a higher opinion of politics and politicians in this country than that which I am told he expressed a few weeks ago in a sermon which he delivered, I think, in this city.

Mr. CHARLTON. That applied equally to both sides.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand the hon. gentleman, of course, being on that side of the House, was speaking out of his more especial knowledge concerning his own party and indulged only in a surmise

so far as this side of the House is concerned. But, I am glad to observe that the confidence of the hon. gentleman has been somewhat restored and that he agrees entirely with the very proper remarks of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that there may be confidence extended even to a government such as this. I understand that the remarks of the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) in regard to a dock partly constructed, or to a dock partly in existence, were intended in the sense that he desired to have this resolution drawn in such a way that it would be workable in regard to the Collingwood dock which has more especially been mentioned in this discussion. Any observations I have in regard to it are intended in the same sense. This resolution could hardly apply to a dock which has already been constructed. I do not know whether I correctly understood the hon. member for North Norfolk when he said that this dock was partly constructed now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it is far advanced.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I have not considered the question very carefully, but it would seem to me to be possible that some different construction might be given to the words of the resolution in that regard. I do not pretend to have considered it very carefully, but I can see some force in the argument of the hon. member for South Lanark. To enter into a contract with a company which is about to construct a dry dock is an entirely different thing from entering into a contract with a company which has already substantially constructed a dock, and there are reasons of public policy why a resolution of this kind should be applicable in one case and not in another. However, this is a matter entirely for the hon. Minister of Finance, and I am only offering this suggestion because I think there may be something in what has been said by my hon. friend from South Lanark. Now, the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) has spoken of a change of heart. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) did not see fit to make any observation upon a change of heart on the part of the hon. Postmaster General. I do not know that it would be necessary for me to remind the hon. Postmaster General of certain changes that he has experienced—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could also compliment the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in the same way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)—during the last five or six years in regard to matters of public policy. I would almost think that some other member of the government might make observations of that kind rather than the hon. Postmaster General. There is one matter to which I would like to call to the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance and it is that the resolution in these terms seems to provide for a subsidy to a company which might have no need of any such assistance. I am speaking of this because this resolution does not apply to the Collingwood docks, but it applies to docks all over Canada, wherever they may be built. As I understand the situation it is impossible for this dock to be proceeded with at Collingwood without some assistance; nevertheless, we might not have similar conditions elsewhere, and I would point out for the consideration of the hon. Minister of Finance that while this Act is in force you might have conditions somewhere else in Canada which would enable a company to go on with the construction of a work of this kind as a fair commercial enterprise, yielding a legitimate return and yet the Governor in Council, it seems to me, would be bound to approve of that company. The only thing that seems to be required by the terms of the motion is that the company shall satisfy the government of its ability to perform the work. Such a company as that to which I have referred could abundantly satisfy the government that it would have the ability to perform the work. Would it not be worth while to consider whether or not some amendment might be made in the terms of the resolution in that regard? It may be that all this has been considered by the hon. Minister of Finance, and that he has some perfectly valid answer to give, but not having heard any answer up to the present time in that regard, I thought it well to bring it to his attention.

Then, there is another matter which I would like to mention. I do not know whether or not the terms of the resolution of 1882 were exactly embodied in the statute which is in force at the present time, but I observe in the concluding part of the resolution which was moved by Sir Leonard Tilley on the 16th May, 1882, this provision:

> And further, that these docks shall be free for the use of all vessels and dredges owned by or in the service of the Dominion government.

I do not know whether a provision of that kind has been considered by the government.

So far as the principle of the resolution is concerned I must say that I am in favour of granting this assistance to dry docks and particularly to docks on the great lakes. It should be the object of government in this country of all political parties to build up a great shipping industry on the lakes, to increase our mercantile marine there, and I do not think, so far as my limited information goes, that that can be effectually done unless we have dry docks of sufficient capacity on the lakes to accommodate the vessels of the very large tonnage which are required now in our inland navigation. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I approve of the principle of the resolution and I hope the dry dock at Col-

lingwood will be completed and that it will be of material assistance in increasing Canadian shipping on the lake.

As far as the question of government by Order in Council is concerned, I have expressed my views in regard to that on more than one occasion in this House. I believe we should have as little government by Order in Council in this country as possible. I also believe that at present we have a little too much of it, as we possibly had before the present government came into power, but I am bound to say, so far as this particular resolution is concerned, that I do not see that the objections which are applicable in some other cases have really very much force. The only function of the Order in Council in this case is to signify approval by the government of the company. That approval is of course in regard to the ability of the company to carry out the work. It is quite right that the government shall not enter into an agreement for assistance to a company that is not able to carry out the work. You must have some tribunal to judge of the company's ability, and I do not see that you can constitute any other tribunal except the government itself for that purpose. Under these circumstances it seems to me, subject to the observations which I have already made, it is a proper resolution to be passed. I trust it will have the effect of stimulating the Canadian shipping industry upon the great lakes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I suppose the government have very carefully considered the raising of the guarantee to 3 per cent. When I had the honour of being a colleague of the Minister of Finance, we made an agreement with the Collingwood Company whereby they undertook to carry out their works for 2 per cent, and they are going on with the work now. The St. John, N.B., Company thought they could get along with the same guarantee of two per cent. They have received a guarantee from the local government and from the city of St. John, but they failed to get the guarantee they expected from the imperial government. The Collingwood Company is building their dock without any guarantee from the town of Collingwood, their only inducement being the two per cent which they are entitled to under the present law. If this Bill passes, of course the Collingwood Company would have the same advantage as other companies would have, but all the same the facts are that the 3 per cent for twenty years will practically cover the total cost of the work. It is a very good guarantee. I do not blame the Minister of Finance; I am sure he has gone carefully into it, and that he is satisfied himself that with a less guarantee the St. John Dock Company could not go on. The hon. Minister of Finance is a very careful man on matters of this kind.

I grant that cheerfully, and I am sure that he has given a good deal of attention to this matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. leader of the opposition in a criticism which is eminently fair, read from some words of the resolution of Sir Leonard Tilley in 1882, from which it would appear that any dock constructed under the provisions of the Act to be founded on the said resolution, should handle the dredges of Canada free of charge. I have not looked up the early history of the matter, but, however, that may be, it is quite evident that the Minister of Finance of that day, for good reasons no doubt, found it better to withdraw this stipulation, and while those words appeared in the original proposal to the House, they were not carried into the resolution or into the Act which was founded on the resolution.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It will still remain a question whether in view of the increased subsidy that is being given now, some such provision should not be inserted in the present resolution.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a fair question for discussion, but it would seem that we would be giving the company a subsidy with one hand and to a certain extent taking it back with the other. As to the point, whether in some cases the subsidy of three per cent may not be more than is necessary, we have a provision which will correct that. I propose that the Bill shall provide that the tariff of tolls for the operation of these docks shall be subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council. Experience has shown that it is difficult to raise capital for works of this character, and that such works when first erected are not as a rule profitable. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is aware that the Halifax dock was not for years a profitable enterprise. Even yet, I do not know that it is a money-making concern, although I am glad to know that in recent years it is busier than it formerly was. If experience should show in any case that an enterprise would pay more than a fair return to the promoters, we have the remedy in the shape of a reduction in tolls, and in that way the shipping community and all concerned will have the benefit of it. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will admit that is a fair answer to his criticism.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would admit to a certain extent it is an answer, except that you might have a company doing an enormous business and paying large dividends, and if the government reduced the tolls in such a case, then at the end of twenty years it might put the company in the embarrassing position, having its tolls reduced once, of undertaking to raise them again.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The usual way is that the subsidy would prob-

ably be converted into cash and would go into the original capital expenditure. It would not affect future transactions.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That might be, but there still remains the difficulty that if you reduce the tolls the company might be constrained to raise them again at the end of the twenty years.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). From the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) I would infer that it was the intention of the government to grant the increased subsidy of three per cent to the Collingwood Dry Dock, only, because Owen Sound and Midland are not many miles from that point. If that is the case, it would be a great disappointment to the people who own the dry dock at Owen Sound. The dry dock in that town is owned by the North American Bent Chair Company, who operate it, and at the last election in which I was the Conservative candidate, two members of that firm, who hitherto voted Conservative, canvassed their employees to support the government candidate because they expected a large subsidy from the government for the purpose of enlarging that dock. Now, if the hon. member for North Norfolk was inspired in his remarks—he was visited just a moment before he made them by the Postmaster General—I must say it would be a great disappointment to the people of Owen Sound—

Mr. CHARLTON. I may say, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thomson) will permit me, that I am not inspired by the government. I was speaking only upon general principles, and I expressed my individual opinion that the dry dock at Collingwood would serve the purposes of the Georgian bay district. I have no objection to a dock being built at Owen Sound. I trust that my friends at Owen Sound will be able to raise the money to build one, and if they do they will get the grant under this resolution.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not mention the subject of Owen Sound to my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) nor was that very important centre in my mind when I made some observations to that gentleman on an entirely different subject.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I am very glad to hear the explanation, but the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) cannot forget that he said it would be out of place for the government to grant a subsidy to Collingwood, and also to Meaford and Owen Sound, they being so close together.

Mr. CHARLTON. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Well, words to that effect.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, not to that effect even.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I would like to hear the Finance Minister define clearly the policy of the government in this matter. It is a matter of great importance to the constituency from which I come. If these people canvassed the electors in the late by-election on the ground of receiving a large subsidy from the government, and if the government will not grant that subsidy, I would like to know it, and the people of North Grey, especially the people of Owen Sound, would like to know it. The town of Collingwood is not the only town that has constructed large vessels plying on the upper lakes. The largest and most palatial of these vessels were constructed at Owen Sound. I refer to the steamship 'Manitoba,' the ferry boat 'Ontario,' which plies across the straits at Detroit, and many other large vessels, including three cruisers which were built for the government of Canada. I would like the Finance Minister to declare specifically whether Owen Sound is to be permitted to participate in these grants. Before I sit down, I wish to congratulate the government on taking this step. I believe it is one in the right direction. For many years Canada, though possessing such a large body of fresh water, has been under such disadvantages for the lack of dry docks that a Canadian vessel of any capacity had to leave her own shores and go to an American port to be repaired. Such a condition of things was not to the credit of Canada, and I am very glad that the government have taken this step to promote the construction of dry docks in this country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In order to remove any doubt as to whether the Act to be founded on this resolution will apply to a dock now under construction, I propose to insert the words 'dry dock' in the the fifth line, the words 'or to complete a dry dock in course of construction.'

Mr. CLARKE. Would you not also include the enlargement of a dock ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have other provisions relating to enlargement, which is a different matter.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I am glad to see that the government are keeping faith with these two ports. The prospectus which has been read is evidence that there was some understanding on this subject, in violation of the constitution. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works was quite correct. He says he made an agreement at 2 per cent, and that was going as far as the law permitted. You cannot satisfy the public, nor do I think you can satisfy this House, that that company had not some promise on which they issued their prospectus. They would have no object in making absolute misstatements. It would be equivalent to a fraud to get subscriptions to their stock in that way. We have now legislation enlarg-

ing the scope of the government aid, not to meet a specific case, but generally. Whether Owen Sound will succeed in getting any portion of this aid the future only will tell, because, unfortunately for Owen Sound, my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Thomson) was elected to the opposition benches, notwithstanding this promise, and I am afraid Owen Sound will only receive cold justice, while warm justice will be given to Collingwood. Now, the Act does not go far enough. The hon. Finance Minister is making it broad enough to enable the government to keep faith with Collingwood at any rate, and we shall see what they will do with Owen Sound. But I rose to make a few remarks in reply to my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). His was an extraordinary speech. Sometimes we think him an extraordinary gentleman, and no doubt he is. He started by congratulating me on my conversion, as he put it, to sound constitutional principles in regard to Orders in Council, and he made quite a long speech justifying the government's departure from those principles in this particular Bill. My hon. friend is on record on this question, as on many others, and he ought to have a better memory than he sometimes displays in dealing with matters of this kind. In regard to Orders in Council, the hon. gentleman said :

The motion that I have put into your hands, Mr. Speaker, refers to a matter of very considerable importance, and to a line of conduct adopted by the government which, in my opinion, is a usurpation of power. The government, of course, must have a majority to sustain them as a government, but the majority should keep the government in its proper place. If it merely fills the functions of a majority and is guilty of slavish submission to the government, and permits the government to usurp the powers that a ministry of a free country ought not to possess, then the majority becomes subservient to the government and recreant to its duty to the people who sent it here. The independence of this House has been seriously impaired in the last few years from various causes, and I think we are gradually drifting into a course of procedure and into a policy in respect of which it is high time we should call a halt, and adopt a policy more in consonance with the principles of free and representative government. In the English colonies on this continent, from almost the time that they were established there was a constant struggle on the part of the people while these were crown colonies against the power exercised by the Governor in Council, and a constant demand made by the people for representative government, the benefits of which, though so highly appreciated by the early colonists, we seem in this Dominion at present to place a lower estimate upon than was placed upon them 150 to 200 years ago. The objections to the system of legislation by Order in Council are numerous.

I could give considerably more, but I will give the hon. gentleman's wind-up.

I wish to point out that in the last eight or nine years the government have, by Order in Council, adopted important fiscal legislation which should not have been adopted without reference to this House.

I think the hon. gentleman's approval of this measure, contrasted with his speech which I have quoted, justifies me in saying that his speech to-day was an extraordinary speech.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will say that in my speech to-day I have merely taken ground in favour of the expenditure of money which has been already authorized by this House, and the remarks he quotes do not apply to the present occasion.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I will leave the hon. gentleman to be judged by what he said, and I will venture to say that his speech, as reported in the first edition of 'Hansard,' at all events, will bear out my strictures upon him. Just one word with regard to the remark made by the hon. Postmaster General, that I had in any way changed my views on the principle of this legislation. I would simply point out that while, in many cases, the expenditure by Order in Council would be a matter of very slight import, where the expenditure involved was comparatively slight, and where it was much more convenient that such expenditure should be dealt with in this way, the question assumes an altogether different complexion when serious expenditure is at stake, and in such case I feel justified in insisting strongly that such, as a practice, is contrary to constitutional principles.

Resolution reported.

CUSTOMS ACT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to amend the Customs Act, chapter 32, revised statutes, and to provide as follows :—

1. That the expression 'duty' shall include 'surtax.'

2. That a change be made in the composition of the board of customs, and that an assistant commissioner of customs be appointed ?

3. That authority be given for the employment of temporary officers of customs.

4. To better define the powers of the board of customs ?

5. That further particulars be given in invoices ; and to provide that invoices may be made out in the currency in which the goods are actually purchased.

6. To define the rate of duty upon unenumerated articles, made of more than one material.

7. To extend the time for the submission of claims for refund, including claims for refund on account of damage.

8. That importers may be relieved from the payment of duty on damaged goods, abandoned in certain cases.

9. That the basis of allowance for damage on polished steel, and other articles, be changed.

10. To authorize the granting of relief from the payment of duty on goods, destroyed or damaged while in the custody of the customs.

11. That further provision be made for the valuation for duty purposes of medicinal and

other preparations, and in respect of the testing of sugars, molasses, wines, spirituous and alcoholic liquors.

12. To authorize collectors of customs to require further proof in respect of invoices.

13. To vest in officers the power to administer oaths.

14. To confer further powers on the Governor in Council respecting special customs services and overtime of officers; and also respecting the reduction of customs duties on imported goods.—The Minister of Customs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson). The first clause has reference to the surtax. This is a new word introduced into our tariff and customs laws, and it was thought well that it should be defined and included in the term 'duty.'

Mr. MACLEAN. What is the definition of the word 'surtax' in the dictionary of the free traders? This is the first time we have had in Canada this expression introduced into our tariff laws. It is one of the most pronounced protectionist words, involving one of the most pronounced protectionist principles, and here we have free traders, who wish for free trade as they have it in England, adopting this expression. Let me offer them my congratulations.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the exact effect of making the word 'duty' include the word 'surtax'?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It would, I presume, be included in any case, but this puts it beyond doubt. With reference to these changes in the Customs Act, of which I have given notice, I may say that I am bringing forward these amendments, which are not very important, this session, so that they may be included in the consolidation of the Customs laws which is now taking place.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The present board of customs is composed of many of our appraisers, some of whom reside in Victoria, Winipeg, Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal and Halifax. We have occasion at times to call the board together to discuss certain questions, and it may not be convenient, nor may the business be important enough, always to call officers from such distant points. It is proposed to specify that the Commissioner of Customs shall be chairman of the board, and leave to the Governor in Council the naming of such other officers as may be required to act with him and constitute the board. Of course, new members to the board could be added from time to time. As regards the assistant commissioner, I have already given the reasons, during the discussion on the estimates, why it was thought desirable one should be appointed.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the new members of the Board of Customs be members of the civil service?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They must be.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How is the board constituted at present?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is constituted of gentlemen in the different outposts. For instance, at Victoria, I think that the collector is one of the board. At Montreal the appraisers of dry goods and hardware are on it. At Hamilton one of the appraisers is a member, also at Toronto. Mr. Breadner, who is the chief clerk in the department here, is also a member of the board, and one or two of the other officers in the inside department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What functions do they exercise, as distinguished from those of the Commissioner of Customs himself?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. As hon. gentlemen will understand, questions arise, owing to the changing conditions of business and new lines of goods coming in, in which there will be differences of opinion as to the rate of duty that should be imposed upon a certain article. If these claims are not very pressing, we set them aside until a number of them are awaiting a decision. Then a meeting of the board is held and the members of the board in meeting discuss these matters and arrive at a decision. Opinions not always unanimous, but, as in every case, questions must be decided by a majority. When a decision is reached, it is reported to the Minister of Customs. If the minister approves it and signs it, that ruling of the board of customs has the force of statute law, subject, however, to an appeal to the Governor in Council.

Mr. KEMP. Is it contemplated under this new Act, and with these new appointments to provide, at the large ports—Montreal, Toronto and perhaps some others—appraisers who will understand each a particular line of goods? At the present time, a single appraiser is supposed to understand hardware business, textile business, grocery business and so on. The difficulty under which we labour in this respect grows more apparent as the country's business increases. I think the business going through these larger ports is sufficient to warrant the government in specializing more than we have done in the past. This is the system followed in the larger ports of the United States. Has the government in contemplation any such step as this?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Of course, this Bill will not be effective in that way; it is a matter of departmental arrangement. The question, of course, is one of importance. The objection is largely one of the expense and the multiplication of officers. No doubt it would be more satisfactory if we were able to increase our staff of appraisers, and, perhaps, at some ports where

we have not them, we should have them. But, of course, the expense of the department has increased considerably of late; and, while we have endeavoured to keep pace with the business, we have hesitated to employ all the officers, or create all the new offices that, perhaps, might be desirable. We intend, to try to keep pace with the requirements of the service. If we find ports where the appraisers are overworked, I think the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) will have to be given effect to in one or more of the ports before very long.

Mr. KEMP. I think the argument given by the hon. minister will hardly be an excuse for not taking some definite step at an early day. As to the question of expense, what the government would save by levying the duties properly chargeable on goods would more than offset the expenditures involved by the appointment of these officers. If the hon. minister has looked into the system in the larger cities in the United States, he has found appraisers who are to be considered more as specialists than are those of our own country. My own opinion is that each appraiser with us is supposed to be informed with regard to too many lines of business. He can not do justice to all, and, the proper duty not being charged, the revenue is often cheated of what it should fairly receive. I do not see that the consideration of expense should stand in the way of the improvement I have suggested.

Mr. MACLEAN. The object of the Tariff Act and the appointment of the appraisers is, not only to collect revenue, but to carry out the principle of protection. There is a lack of appraising force in the Customs department, and by reason of this, Canadian manufacturers have been discriminated against. My own attention has been drawn quite recently to a case in which certain machines were brought into a city in Canada at a valuation of $1,000, when further investigation proved that they should have been brought in at a valuation of $1,800. The work of making this change had to be done by the manufacturer who was interested in the business in Canada. He found the American manufacturers sending the machines into Canada, and Canadian appraisers putting them through the customs at a valuation of little over half of what they were bought for. So, it is not only in the interest of the revenue, but in the interests of the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian workman that the appraisers should be competent and sufficiently numerous, and that they should be encouraged to perform their duties in the way of protecting the Canadian manufacturer. And in that relation I would like to ask the Minister of Customs whether there is any punishment for the perpetration of acts of this character?

Hon. Mr. PATERSON.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Section 8 of the Customs law provides that, if articles are undervalued by more than fifteen per cent, double the duty on the undervaluation shall be collected. This section is mandatory. Of course, where fraud is suspected and proven, penalties are levied upon the perpetrators of them. As to machinery coming in under-valued, in some cases second hand machinery is brought in, which may not have a market value. To meet cases of that kind, we added to our staff an agent who was for many years connected with one of the large machine works. If machinery comes in at a port where there is not an appraiser or where we are not satisfied with the valuation of the regular appraiser, it is the duty of this officer to proceed to the port and appraise the article and see that it is entered at proper value. In the larger cities, I think, the appraising is done very fairly. In Toronto, for instance, we have a textile appraiser, a grocery appraiser and a hardware appraiser. These are the principal ones. I grant you that one or other of these departments would have to take in stationery, boots and shoes, and other lines. But, I think, we are pretty well manned in that respect in many ports. In addition, we have the check of the department here. If anything seems wrong, the port is written to and, if necessary, the invoices are called for and an inquiry made; then, if there has been an under-appraisement, an amended appraisement is made and the amended duty is paid by the importer.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) has taken power to appoint an assistant commissioner. Is the gentleman who is to be appointed now in the service, or will an outsider be brought in?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He is in the service, and has been since 1896.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has raised the question of penalties for under-valuation. I presume the hon. minister finds a growing tendency to attempt to defraud the customs by undervaluation. I understand that this is not a criminal offence under the Customs Act, as it is under the law of the United States.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is certainly an offence.

Mr. KEMP. A criminal offence?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It has never been so dealt with since I came into office. No parties have been proceeded against with a view of having them imprisoned. But they do, no doubt, proceed in that way, and there is generally a money penalty.

Mr. MACLEAN. Should there not be a clause in the Criminal Code dealing with offences of this kind?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think there is power under the Inspection Act to do that. As hon. gentlemen will understand, there are two sides to a question. Sometimes the entry may have an appearance of deliberate fraud, there are cases that look suspicious ; and where there really have been contraventions of the Act penalties have been put upon the offenders. But they put forward their side of the case and claim that they acted in ignorance of the law, that they bought the article for that price, and thought they had a right to enter it at that price. As the hon. gentleman knows, there are export prices ; foreigners, when effecting sales in this country to our own merchants, will quote an export price. Well, that is right enough, the Customs Department cannot interfere with that. If a man in another country wishes to sell his goods at 25 per cent under the domestic price, that is a perfectly legitimate transaction as between the seller and the buyer. But the law makes it imperative on the Customs Department to see that the duty is paid on the value of that article in the country of production, and that law we endeavour to carry out.

Mr. KEMP. Representations have been made to the Minister of Customs with respect to making the law more stringent with regard to undervaluation, and it has been proposed to adopt some clauses of the law in force in the United States. Is not that the case ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, there was a suggestion in some of the Toronto papers, I think it was in the 'Toronto News,' that we should adopt the practice of the United States in fixing the value for duty. Well, I think the writer of that article is under a mistake. The United States law is virtually the same as ours, it takes the value of the goods in the country from whence they are exported and levies the duty upon that value. It is the same in the United States, as it is with us in that respect. I do not know that you could fix any other standard. I have thought the matter over a good deal as to what should form the standard, say of the Canadian value. How would you determine the Canadian value of an article ? I think the fairest way is that when an article is sold in the country of production you get an affidavit from the seller, and at present as hon. gentlemen know we do not require such affidavit, it is something that we put in operation since I took charge of the department. But previous to that, all the exporter had to do was to certify his invoice as correct. Well, he sold goods, we will say, 20 per cent less than they were sold in the country of production, but the transaction was correct as between the two individuals, the buyer actually bought them for that money, but that was not the value at which they should be entered for duty. So the importer here would say, when he was called upon for an amended entry. Well, I did not know what the value was, the drummer told me that was the price. Well, the man who sells the goods knows, and we will oblige him to make a declaration on his invoice that the price appearing on the invoice is the price at which the goods are sold in the country from whence they are exported ; and when there is any advance, then that is noted upon the invoice. Say an article was charged at $1.00 and the selling price was $1.25 ; the difference is noted, and the entry is made upon $1.25 instead of $1.00.

At six o'clock Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 2,

Mr. HENDERSON. I assume at the present time, from the wording of this resolution, that there is no assistant commissioner. I notice by the Customs Act, chapter 32, of the Revised Statutes, that authority is given there to appoint an assistant commissioner. Why repeat it in the proposed amendment ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is no authority in the present Customs Act, as we have it, for the appointment of an assistant commissioner. There was an assistant commissioner a few years ago, but I think that was changed in 1894, or perhaps before that. There is no provision in the present Act for the appointment of an assistant commissioner, and so we propose it now.

Mr. HENDERSON. I find, referring to chapter 32, which the hon. minister proposes to amend, that clause 4 says :

> There shall be a commissioner of customs who shall be the deputy of the Minister of Customs and an assistant commissioner.

I presume, from what the hon. gentleman new tells us, that the clause has been amended subsequent to the revision of the statutes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, and the assistant commissioner has been dropped.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), before the committee rose at six o'clock, was discussing the question of undervaluation. What I said that brought forth these observations was not in reference to the policy that had been promulgated, I think he said in the 'News.' I do not know what the policy was. I hardly know what it had reference to. What I was trying to impress upon the hon. minister was the fact that in our laws in regard to undervaluation, I have been informed, there is no such thing as

a penal offence. There are money penalties, but there are no penal offences such as exist under the customs laws of the United States. I was under the impression that representations had been made to the government—I do not know whether they came under the observation of the hon. Minister of Customs or of some of his colleagues—recommending that the American law be considered, and that in such cases as it is practicable, the provisions in relation to undervaluation be embodied in our law. I do not see anything in these amendments looking in that direction. The hon. Minister of Customs said that because of the facilities for preventing undervaluation and fraud upon the revenue in the larger cities, undervaluation was not likely to take place in the larger cities to as great an extent as in the smaller towns, and that brings forward a very important matter. I, for myself, do not see that it is possible to have goods valued or to know whether the invoices represent the proper value at any of the smaller ports. I do not know how this thing is regulated in other countries, but I do know that in this country it is often said that when an invoice for goods is presented at an outlying place, it is likely to go through with greater facility than if the goods are passed through customs at a larger place. Of course, the hon. Minister of Customs has said that each invoice is reviewed by the department when it reaches Ottawa, but it is almost impossible to tell without being able to examine the goods and make a proper comparison, whether the valuation has been proper or not. The officers in these smaller places have not the information before them; they have not the price lists and necessary data. I think perhaps we have too many ports of entry, and that there are too many small places where facilities of that kind are given, and that, consequently, a great deal of fraud must result. I do not know whether the hon. minister has ever thought of making any changes in respect to the administration of the customs of this country that would obviate that kind of thing.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is this difficulty; in the United States I think they have no more ports of entry than we have in Canada.

Mr. KEMP. In the whole of the United States ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not mean proportionately. I think that, perhaps, in the whole of the United States, they have no more ports of entry than we have in Canada.

Mr. KEMP. That is what I understand.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Representations have been made to me by merchants in the larger places that it would be in the interest of the community if we had a less number of these smaller ports, and if the ports of entry were more concentrated. Well, there is that aspect of the case; there is no doubt about that. We do get a better examination of goods, but the difficulty we experience in reference to that is that the smaller places are asking for the convenience of customs officers, and the pressure upon the department was never greater than at the present time for more ports. I think that I have at present applications from perhaps twenty places now for customs facilities. They represent that they are many miles away from a customs port, and that they cannot receive their goods without going backward and forward and thus they are making out a very strong case. I cannot very well see that you can refuse one section of the community the facilities that are given to another within proper, reasonable bounds. To say that persons living conveniently, perhaps, to one of our larger places shall enjoy customs facilities, while others living at a greater distance and who are contributing to the revenue too shall not have the same conveniences is what presents the difficulty in not only attempting to close small ports, but in dealing with applications for new ports to be created. It would be a very difficult matter indeed after a place is once established as a customs port, even where the business would not warrant it, as far as the revenue is concerned and where the revenue actually will be perhaps 50 per cent of the sum required for the payment of the expense attendant upon its collection, to close such a port. All we have been able to do is—shall I say to resist the pressure as far as we can from other places in order that we should not increase the number of ports immoderately. Where you have ports now existing, where the revenue is a certain amount and where another place of equal importance and of equal revenue presents its claim to have customs facilities it is rather difficult to answer a request of that kind. The convenience of the public must, in a measure, be sought. It is accompanied with the disadvantage that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) has alluded to, and which we use as an argument when we are presenting the difficulties to those who are pressing for additional customs ports. It is one of the arguments that we have to make use of that we have better facilities for the examination of goods and determining what the proper value and rate of duty are at the larger places where we have competent officers. I have no doubt that the collector does his best to carry out the law, but in many of these smaller ports we have only the collector. He has to be the appraiser, he has to do the whole of the work, and he will do it to the best of his ability. However, there are no very heavy importations at these ports, and I think, taking it all in all, that perhaps no very serious charge can be made that the revenue is

suffering or that other traders whose interests must be considered as well as the collection of the revenue are put under any serious disadvantage. Of course, you can understand that if at one port goods can be entered at a lower rate of duty, or that the proper valuation is not scrutinized as well as at another, those doing business at a port with a more efficient administration would be at a disadvantgae as against those who were importing their goods through the other port. I quite recognize that, but all invoices are scrutinized by the check department in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. BLAIN. Suppose an invoice is presented to a customs-house officer at a small point, is he the absolute judge as to the classification under which these goods shall pass the custom-house ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, he takes the entry and passes it to the best of his knowledge. All these entries at the large ports as well as the small ports come to the headquarters here, and they are scrutinized by the check department, but in the first instance, the collector has of necessity to make the entry, and he has to do it to the best of his judgment as to his duty under the circumstances.

Mr. BLAIN. There is very considerable dissatisfaction in the commercial world with regard to the value for duty placed on certain articles. I am informed by one of the leading scale manufacturers in Toronto, that in the case of certain registering scales imported from the United States which are sold retail in Canada for $60 or $70 each, they are valued for duty at only $6 or $7 each. The American manufacturer seeing that there is a market in Canada for a new article which is not made in Canada, invoices it from himself in the United States to himself in Canada at a low rate, and as in the case of the scales I have mentioned the difference between the value for duty and the price at which they are sold to the public is out of all proportion. Has this matter been brought to the attention of the Minister of Customs ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The question as to the proper value for scales has been before the department several times, but I do not know that the particular scale to which the hon. gentleman has referred has been under consideration. We have officers in the United States whose duty it is to ascertain the value of articles in that country. We have not such officers in Great Britain or on the continent. The officers in the United States go to headquarters and ascertain the value from an actual inspection of the books, and the manufacturers in their own interests, wishing to have no trouble with the customs-house when they send goods to Canada, are anxious to afford our officers all proper information in that connection. Our officers satisfy themselves as to the price at which that article is sold in the United States, and when it comes into Canada in like quantity and in like condition, no matter what the invoice may say, the duty is levied upon the value of the article as sold in the United States.

Mr. LAVALL. Are there any means by which the public can know the rate for duty that is fixed on an article ? I may state to the minister that during last winter, in the business with which I am connected, we had on two different occasions two different sets of invoices sent to us. It is, I suppose, needless to say that that was not done at our request. However, what is supposed to be a reputable business house in the United States sent us one invoice, being the price we were to pay, and another invoice being the price on which we were supposed to pay duty. We sent back the lower invoice which was the only invoice which had the certificate on it. This incident would go to show that such a practice is quite common. I may say also that the agent of a large manufacturing concern in Canton, Ohio, called on me and desired me to import a large quantity of goods, and in giving me his estimate of price he calculated the duty at just one-half of what we were supposed to pay f.o.b. at Canton. I asked him if that was his way of doing business and he said that it was. If that be so, and if other firms are doing the same thing, it would appear to be conducted on a fairly large scale. If the public knew the rate at which these articles were valued by the customs, I believe that the publicity would tend to prevent such things occurring.

Mr. WRIGHT. I may say that we bring in carbons from the United States which are made in Cleveland, and when these carbons come to us the officer collects from us the duty on the price which these carbons are wholesaled for in the United States, no matter what the invoice may say.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The matter alluded to by the hon. member (Mr. Lavell) would be a case of fraud, and if that came to our knowledge we would deal severely with any house which practiced it. The forwarding of the two invoices would be a fraud upon the revenue, and it would be a serious matter for that house if they were detected.

Mr. LAVELL. The point I wish to make is, that it appears to be a common practice. We declined to have any business dealings with the house whose agent suggested the lower rate for customs duty to us, and we have not sent any further orders to the man who sent us the duplicate invoices. It would appear from their representations to us, that it is a very common thing for them to do. I am sorry I did not send the duplicate invoices to the minister.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are very pleased whenever any one gives us

information that will enable us to detect frauds of that kind, and of course we do not divulge the names of those giving us the information. Whenever a matter of that kind comes to our knowledge you may depend upon it that it is followed up, and penalties imposed that would effectually prevent its recurrence so far as that house was concerned. If a man sold a bill of goods to this country and sent a fraudulent invoice, I question if he could collect the amount at all in Canada.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am afraid I did not make myself clear with reference to the duty on carbons to which I have referred. We buy these carbons in the United States for $8 a thousand, but as they are sold to dealers in the United States for $9 a thousand, we have to pay duty on them at the rate of $9, although we only pay $8.

Mr. BLAIN. If these articles were presented at an outport of customs and the officer was not familiar with the value, the invoice for $8 per thousand would be the price on which the duty would be assessed. If it was afterwards shown that these goods were sold in the United States at $9, it is possible the department would take some action, but in the meantime the goods would have found their way into Canada on the valuation of $8 per thousand.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If I understand the hon. gentleman from Renfrew (Mr. Wright) he rather complains that while he only pays $8 per thousand, we make him pay duty on $9 per thousand. Sometimes we receive complaints of that kind. Parliament determines what the duty should be, and we carry it out. It is our duty under the law to collect the revenue that properly accrues. If an entry of the kind referred to by hon. friend for Peel were made at one of the smaller ports, the only check we have is that a copy of the entry has to come to Ottawa, where it is examined by our checking department. I do not say that we detect everything, but if an entry of a certain class of goods came in at a different price from that prevailing at other and larger ports, the officer would immediately call for an amended entry.

Mr. LAVELL. When I first mentioned this matter I asked if there was any way in which the public could find out the value fixed by the department upon certain standard goods. If this information could be obtained, it would be easy to head off many of these frauds.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. When decisions are given by the department on certain questions that may not be plain, circulars are sent out to the different collectors, conveying the information. In the great majority of cases the collectors themselves will know what valuation to place upon regular articles of merchandise which have a known market value. There may be special cases in which they would not know. In these cases we avail ourselves of the safe-guard provided by our checking department; and if an entry comes in which has been undervalued and an amended entry is called for, that would be a guide for the collector in the future. In addition to that, there are trade journals which are made use of, such as the 'Iron Age,' as guides for ascertaining correct valuations.

Mr. LAVELL. Is there any way in which one business man can find out the figure at which goods are being imported by others? Take, for example, a certain class of carriage, which is well known in the trade. It is purchased at a certain price, but is invoiced at $4 below that price. One dealer might accept that invoice and another might refuse it. Is there any way in which a person importing these goods or the general public can get information as to their valuation from the Customs Department?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Of course, the Customs Department is not at liberty to reveal to the general public any invoices or values; but the officers themselves are supposed to know the values, and to be able to tell the importer, when he comes to make his entry, what the proper value for duty should be. Further than that I do not know that we can go.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to ask the minister if within recent months any specific charges have been placed before him in relation to the improper or fraudulent importation of German goods under the British preference. The reason I ask this is that during the famous tour of the leader of the opposition and his party of friends through the west last fall, members of his party made charges throughout the country—one member in particular, I think it was the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain)—at various public meetings, which charges by inference or implication meant that certain citizens of the North-west Territories had been guilty of fraud in bringing into Canada German goods under the British preference.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that the hon. member for West Assiniboia is quite correct when he says that the party travelling in the west last year with the hon. leader of the oposition made the charges against the government that German goods were brought into this country under the British preference. That would not be news to this House, for the hon. member for West Toronto, when discussing the matter at the last session, showed this House, and his statement went uncontradicted, that a large quantity of German goods were imported from time to time into the country. The hon. member for West Assiniboia has made a statement that is very wide in its character, to the effect that some members of the party made this charge at every place in

western Canada. That is not true. I may say that I made reference to it at one point in the west, though it could have been truthfully made at every meeting, because it was well understood. The charge has been made by the Liberal-Conservative party in this House, that German goods were brought into this country under the guise of the British preference. The government, endorsed by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, said that was not correct; but what is the condition of things to-day? The government at this session of parliament give notice to the world that they would abolish the preference. Why are we discussing this item now? For the reason that we are going to place in the customs tariff of this country a surtax specially directed against German goods. That is surely a proof that some irregularity is going on—the goods manufactured in Germany were brought into this country and under that so-called British preference, which has proven to the people of this country and to the government itself to be not a British preference, but in the interest of Germany and other foreign countries.

Mr. SCOTT. It seemed to me, at the time I was reading the reports of the statements and charges which the hon. gentleman says he made at only one point, but which were reported in the newspapers of Manitoba and the Territories as having been made at several points, either by himself or some of his friends, that if these gentlemen believed the statements they were making, they should have taken immediate steps to place their facts before the Minister of Customs or the Customs Department. Since coming here this session, I have been waiting day after day, at all events during the budget debate, to hear those charges repeated, on the floor of this House, publicly and before the Minister of Customs, so that the officers of the department might proceed to take steps to do justice in the circumstances. It seems to me too, that if there was a temptation to people to bring in German goods under the British preference while it amounted to 33⅓ per cent, there is twice as much now, since the surtax has been imposed and the preference on British goods as against German goods is made 66⅔ per cent. Considerable doubt raised with respect to certain statements alleged to have been made by my hon. friends while in the west, has been raised and it is perhaps fortunate, therefore, that I took steps to get well authenticated reports of the particular statements to which I refer. Some of them have given my hon. friends considerable trouble. Statements were made by one of these gentlemen, Mr. Powell, of New Brunswick, at some points in British Columbia respecting the officials of the Intercolonial Railway, which, I noticed by the newspapers, gave him considerable trouble later on. There were other statements made by the hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Fowler), who, I regret, is not here now, and who, according to the press reports, had considerable trouble in explaining away or denying what he was alleged to have said respecting certain sections of the people of this Dominion.

Mr. BROCK. Has this any connection with the customs matter we are now discussing?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, I shall endeavour to come a little nearer to the customs matter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We might as well have the others, what are the facts?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have allowed a good deal of latitude because I understand that so much has to be said about various matters in this connection that we may as well have them discussed now, and then we will pass over the other items more rapidly. It is pretty hard, in a discussion of this kind, to keep hon. members down to the particular clause before the committee, and probably we may as well now have a general discussion of the whole resolution and then pass the remaining clauses more rapidly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I want to endorse the objection taken by the hon. member for Toronto. I do not think that we should go outside the particular resolution before that committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think so too, but I would not care to have these statements go unchecked, and I do not think that statements of this kind should be allowed to be made from hon. gentlemen opposite and then have a ruling from the Chair which would prevent our replying. If necessary we will move that the committee rise for the purpose of dealing with those matters which the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has, with so much good taste, brought before the House, when my hon. friend from King's is not here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that there will be ample opportunity on other votes to discuss all these matters, and I hope that the committee will confine itself to the particular subject before it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am willing to accede to the request of my hon. friend, but if he wants to avoid the discussion of irrelevant matters of this kind, I hope he will put a little better check on some of his injudicious followers, such as the hon. member for Assiniboia, or otherwise we shall have a very long discussion on somewhat irrelevant matters, which would not be pleasing to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that there is quite as much fault on the side of my hon. friends opposite in departing from the strict letter of the various resolutions.

Mr. MACLEAN. Not to-night.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have discussed in Committee of Supply all sorts of questions, and no objection was taken, although I think objection should have been taken on both sides.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. SCOTT. I have not quite finished the statement I intended making, but I will endeavour, after the very severe reproof made me by the hon. leader of the opposition—

Mr. BORDEN. And the hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. SCOTT. And, if my hon. friend wishes, indirectly by the hon. Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Directly.

Mr. SCOTT. I am perfectly willing to gratify the hon. gentleman and accept the reproof in good part, and I will endeavour to confine myself to the matter before us as closely as possible. I hope that my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, did not understand me as making any charge against the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I refer to certain alleged remarks quoted in the absence of the hon. member for King's, as having been made by him, which that hon. gentleman has previously contradicted. This, I said, was not in good taste, and I see no reason for changing my opinion.

Mr. SCOTT. I hope that my hon. friend did not understand me as having attributed to the hon. member for King's any statement which that hon. gentleman denied. I endeavoured to convey to the committee the fact that the hon. member for King's had contradicted, and, as a matter of fact, had been compelled to contradict, certain statements he was alleged to have made in the west. Since the opening of the session my hon. friend himself has deemed it necessary to contradict certain statements alleged, in his own organ in Winnipeg, to have been made by him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I did nothing of the kind. I said that the report was not a full report of what I had said, that I had said something further on that occasion, and the newspapers admitted that I had.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope that the members of the committee will confine themselves to the resolution before us, and not refer to anything which has taken place in any other section of the country.

Mr. SCOTT. Before I am through, I have here a statement to present which is in the form of a statutory declaration, regarding what was said by my hon. friend from Peel. I may say that my hon. friend, when in the town of Regina, where I live, went into a mercantile establishment and purchased an article of German ware in the form of a teapot, and if that teapot were not exhibited more than once, and if my hon. friend did not repeat his remarks in several places during his tour, then I am very much misinformed. In fact that teapot, became a feature of the tour and was spoken about at every meeting, and referred to in every newspaper. I have been very much surprised not to have seen it during this session on the desk of the hon. gentleman, or to have heard from him remarks concerning it similar to those he made in the west. If the statements were proper ones to make in the west, they should also be made here. With regard to his statement that he only spoke concerning this teapot at one point, let me read this statutory declaration, made by Mr. William Trant, whom, my hon. friends who were on that trip, will remember very well, because he accompanied them during a part of it :

CANADA.

North-west Territories.

I, William Trant, of Regina, in the said Territories, solemnly declare :

1. That I am a reporter for the newspaper press ;

2. That from the 25th day of September to the 3rd day of October, in the year 1902, I attended public meetings as follows, that is to say, a meeting at Moose Jaw on the said 25th day of September ; a meeting at Regina on the 26th day of September ; on the 27th day of September a meeting at Qu'Appelle ; on the 29th day of September a meeting at Wolseley, and in the evening of the same day one at Grenfell ; on the 30th September a meeting at Whitewood, and on the evening of the same day one at Wapella ; on the 1st day of October a meeting at Moosomin ; on the 2nd day of October a meeting at Virden, in the province of Manitoba, and on the 3rd day of October a meeting at Brandon, all in the year 1902, and that I attended said meetings in my said capacity as reporter.

3. That at the said meeting held at Moose Jaw on the said 25th day of September, at the meeting held on the 27th day of September at Qu'Appelle, and at the meeting aforesaid held on the evening of the 30th day of September at Wapella, I heard and I noticed a speech at each of the three said meetings delivered by a person who told me his name was Richard Blain, and that he was a member of the House of Commons, representing the constituency of Peel.

4. That at each and every of the three meetings mentioned in the paragraph next immediately preceding, the said Mr. Blain said that the British preference then existing was used by manufacturers in Germany to send their goods to Canada as British goods and so defraud the revenue of the Dominion of Canada ; and further, he, the said Richard Blain, explained that the said object was attained by the said manufacturers in Germany, first having the said goods shipped to England and thence reshipped to Canada as British goods entitled to the preference given such goods by the law of Canada.

5. And I declare particularly that at the aforesaid meeting held at Qu'Appelle on the said 27th day of September A.D., 1902, the said Richard Blain produced a razor which he said he had bought at Regina, in the said Territories, the day before and which he said was a razor of German manufacture and had been imported into Canada under the British preference in the manner described in the paragraph next immediately preceding.

6. And I further say particularly that at the aforesaid meeting held in the evening of the 30th day of September, in the year 1902, at Wapella, the said Richard Blain said he had bought a teapot in Regina that had been made in Germany, and that the merchant who had sold him, the said Blain, the said teapot, or the assistant to the merchant had, at the request of the said Richard Blain, shown him the invoice of the goods, of which the said teapot formed a part, and that the said invoice was as if for goods that were shipped from England and had received the benefit of the British preference.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of 'the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.'

(Sgd.) WM. TRANT.

Declared before me at Regina, in the said Territories, 13th day of February, A.D. 1903.

(Sgd.) JAS. BALFOUR,
A notary public in and for the
North-west Territories.

This is, to a certain extent a generalized statement, but I would ask you to take note of the fact that Mr. Trant makes the statement that the hon. gentleman made the statement on the subject at the meeting at Wapella.

Some hon. MEMBER. More.

Mr. SCOTT. I will tell the hon. gentleman what he said at another point according to a statement of another gentleman.

DOMINION OF CANADA.

Province of Manitoba.

To wit :

In the matter of a speech delivered by Mr. Blain, M.P., in Victoria Hall, Morden, on October 8, 1902.

I, Robert George McCuish, editor of the Morden 'Chronicle' of village of Morden, in the province of Manitoba, do solemnly declare that the following quotation from Mr. Blain's speech, which appeared in an editorial headed 'Mr. Blain's teapot' in the Morden 'Chronicle' on October 16th, is correct :—

Then follows the report of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) remarks which appeared in the Morden 'Chronicle' and the editor makes a statutory statement to the truth and accuracy of the report, I shall not weary the House by reading that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. SCOTT. Very well :

The preference is not a preference on British goods. I have here a teapot bought in Regina (holding it up) made in Germany and it came in under the preferential tariff. The merchant who brought it in told me he got the benefit of the preference on it. The Liberal-Conservative party say the preferential tariff is not in the interests of Canada as these things should be made in Canada. This teapot is stamped 'made in Germany' it was purchased there and there was no British labour put on it or British material in it but it got the preference of 33⅓ per cent. Exporters get the same preference on German goods shipped from London as on British made goods and we are opposed to the preference in so far as it lets in German goods. If a traveller comes along and takes an order for $100 worth of German goods, he takes them from Berlin to London and invoices them at $125 under the British preference and so a preference is given on German goods. We tell the Liberals that the preference is working a benefit to Germany and an injury to Canada.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of 'The Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

(Sgd.) R. G. McCUISH.

Declared before me at village of Morden, in the province of Manitoba, this 21st day of January, A.D. 1903.

(Sgd.) STEWART M. BATHAM,
A commissioner, &c.

What is recited in the declaration is exactly what I have read as the report of my hon. friend's speech. And the committee will notice that the hon. gentleman stated at Morden that he bought this tea pot in Regina and that the merchant informed him that the teapot had come in under the preference. So, the merchant was indirectly accused of fraud by my hon. friend. The merchant—at my request I may say— furnished me with a statement respecting the matter. He writes to me :

Regina, N.W.T., December 23, 1902.

Walter Scott, Esq., M.P.,
Regina, N.W.T.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your communication pointing out that at certain public meetings in the eastern part of the Territories and in Manitoba, Mr. Richard Blain, M.P., one of the party of gentlemen who accompanied Mr. R. L. Borden, M.P., on his western tour, spoke as follows :—

I have already read to the Committee the report of the speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read, read.

Mr. SCOTT—(reading) :

The preference is not a preference on British goods. I have here a teapot, bought in Regina, made in Germany and it came in under the preferential tariff. The merchant who brought it in told me he got the benefit of the preference on it. The Liberal-Conservative party say the preferential tariff is not in the interests of Canada as these things should be made in Canada. This teapot is stamped 'Made in Germany.'

Mr. BLAIN. What meeting was that ?

Mr. SCOTT. At Morden. And Mr. McCuish makes this statutory declaration.

Mr. BLAIN. That is the same meeting ?

Mr. SCOTT. No, there was the meeting at Wapella. Mr. Trant makes the statement with regard to that.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott). I was asking for information.

Mr. SCOTT—(reading) :

It was purchased there and there was no British labour put on it, or British material in it, but it got the preference of 33⅓ per cent. Exporters get the same preference on German goods shipped from England as on British-made goods and we are opposed to the preference in so far as it lets in German goods. If a traveller comes along and takes an order for $100 worth of German goods he takes them from Berlin to London and invoices them at $125 under the British preference and so a preference is given on German goods.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. SCOTT. Now, I come to the merchant's own statement, and I wil read this loud enough for hon. gentlemen to hear.

I note also that as you pointed out a portion of the press makes the charge that the Regina firm from whom Mr. Blain bought the teapot has been guilty of defrauding the customs in as much as the benefit of the preference could not have been obtained upon such an importation without the making of a false declaration. I believe that the Smith & Ferguson Company, Limited, is the firm against which the charge is directed, because when in Regina, Mr. Blain did buy a teapot marked 'made in Germany' over our counter. And in justice to the firm I beg respectfully to say that the charge is wholly untrue.

There can be no question, because this is the only firm in Regina that carries this particular line of German ware.

As I have stated, Mr. Blain when in Regina, paid a visit to our store and purchased a German teapot from Mr. T. W. Peart, one of our salesmen. He made particular inquiries about his purchase, asking where the article was manufactured, how it was shipped to Regina, &c.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) prepare that or did his friends ?

Mr. SCOTT. I place it before the House for what it is worth.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the hon. gentleman might well answer my question.

Mr. SCOTT. It may have been the merchant's assistant who sold the tea-pot.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did the hon. gentleman say that his friend prepared it ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is free to give the information or withhold it, as he pleases.

Mr. SCOTT—(reading) :

He also volunteered to Mr. Peart the information that the consignment of goods of which this teapot was a part had come into Canada under the British preferential tariff, which information Mr. Peart was not in a positon either to confirm or deny.

So, it was my hon. friend who was giving the information and not the merchant.

The fact is, however, that if the fraud were committed it was not committed by our firm as the duty upon the consignment of which the teapot was a part was not paid by us at Regina but was paid by the brokers from whom we purchase the consignment at Montreal.

One of the newspaper statements which you place before me credits Mr. Blain with saying that the teapot was part of a consignment worth $100. The consignment actually was invoiced to us at $346.68. The goods are known as Stransky steel ware.

And will the hon. gentleman note this—

The invoice is dated at New York, where is the head office of the company in America. We ordered the goods through the broker in Montreal and the duty was paid at Montreal. The goods were shipped from Montreal to Regina via Canadian Pacific Railway and came through in the original large wooden boxes in which they left Germany, each of which is bound with iron. On each box, printed in large letters is the word 'German.'

Great evidence of fraud in this.

On the side of the boxes, also printed in large letters are the words 'Stransky steel ware lasts for years.' On each piece of ware in the consignment which included teapots, basins, pitchers, pans, &c., there is pasted a label bearing the number of that piece and in bold black-faced type the word 'Germany.' I have to say emphatically that when Mr. Blain sought to convey the impression that we informed him that these goods come in under the British preference he was either labouring under a misapprehension or was guilty of deception. We had nothing to do with the payment of duty. We do not know what duty was paid and could not give Mr. Blain information which we do not possess.

(Sgd.) J. W. SMITH,
President of The Smith & Ferguson Co., Ltd.

I may state that Mr. Smith was at that time and is at present mayor of the city of Regina.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to read the last paragraph again, or to send the document over to me ?

Mr. SCOTT—(reading) :

I have to say emphatically that when Mr. Blain sought to convey the impression that we informed him that these goods come in under the British preference he was either labouring under a misapprehension or was guilty of deception. We had nothing to do with the payment of duty.

Mr. BLAIN. That is the point.

Mr. SCOTT.—(reading.)

We do not know what duty was paid, and could not give Mr. Blain information which we do not possess.

But the fact appears, as the committee has already learned, that these goods came via New York in a large wooden box in

which they were put by the firm in Germany, with 'Germany' stamped on the box. There are ninety-nine chances to one against any fraud having been committed with regard to these goods. If my hon. friend still thinks there is any doubt about the matter, I can furnish further information with regard to the invoices, and we will have an inquiry made and find out at Montreal whether my hon. friend's charges were true or untrue.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would just give us the balance of that letter, or send it over to me. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, you would allow the document to be laid on the Table ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is obligatory on him to do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have no control over the hon. member for Assiniboia. He is free to lay the document on the Table or not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When an hon. gentleman reads any document in the House he is obliged to lay it upon the Table of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A minister is obliged to do so when he quotes from a public document.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). We should have both the document and teapot laid on the Table.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When a minister cites from a public document and bases an argument thereon, he is bound to place it on the Table. But a private member can cite from a public document without this necessity.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to know the difference between a minister and a private member in this House. There is no difference whatever.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no difference in person, but there is a difference in the functions.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Any one who quotes from a public document has to place it before the House, and a minister has no privileges in this House that a back-bench member has not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A minister should have a control of a public document which a private member does not possess, and if a minister uses that document for the purposes of argument then he is bound to put the House in possession of it. But this is not a public document, it is a matter entirely for the hon. gentlemen to settle among themselves. This is not a state document, it is not under the control of any minister. The hon. member may read it or not ; he is not obliged to read it except as a matter of good taste.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Chairman has given the ruling that a minister has a privilege in this House that a private member has not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Only as respects a public document.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is that if a minister reads a public document from which he cites and bases thereon an argument, he is in duty bound to place that before the House. But a private member can cite from even a public document, and he is not required to place it upon the Table.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But here is a gentleman who makes a charge against another gentleman in the House, charging that my hon. friend on a particular occasion made a statement that is false. He reads an affidavit in the House in relation thereto, and do you rule that when that affidavit is read in the House the member reading it is not obliged to lay it upon the Table ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is the rule, I will read it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is a most monstrous thing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. On page 409 of Bourinot I find :

> It has been laid down by the highest authorities that 'when a minister of the Crown quotes a public document in the House, and founds upon it an argument or assertion, that document, if called for, ought to be produced.' But it is allowable to repeat to the House information which is contained in a private communication. When such private papers are quoted in the House there is no rule requiring them to be laid on the Table.

Mr. BENNETT. Except decency.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to retract your ruling about a minister having a privilege which is denied to a private member. I must request the Chairman to retract that ruling, because there is no such a thing in this House as a minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is such a thing in this House as a minister. Ministers are held to account for many things for which private members are not. The ruling of the Chairman was that when a minister is quoting from a public document he is obliged to lay it on the Table if called for. The essence of the matter is that the document is a public one.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—(reading.)

> It does not appear that the English Commons has ever applied this rule to the case of private members citing public documents not in the possession of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There have been occasions now and then, I believe, in this House when letters from persons outside the House, or statutory declarations such as that read by the hon. member for Assiniboia, have been read in the House for the purpose of contradicting or discrediting one

of its members. I have always thought that the practice was absolutely wrong, and I see in 'Bourinot,' at page 408, immediately before the page from which you, Sir, have just quoted, that the rule is laid down in this way :

> Nor is it in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or other communications, whether printed or written, emanating from persons outside of the House, and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

I think that is a very good rule to be followed, one which I think the dignity of the House would require and one that we should observe in the future, particularly in a case of this kind. My hon. friend from Assiniboia has not, as I understand, seen fit to observe a rule, not contained, it is true, in any written regulation of the House, but a rule depending on that courtesy which is usually observed among gentlemen, that is, to give to any gentleman whom it is proposed to attack notice that the atack will be made. I have not in my recollection at the present time any occasion when that rule, founded upon the usual courtesy observed between gentlemen in this House, has been departed from. The hon. member for West Assiniboia has seen fit to depart from that for reasons which are best known to himself. I would only like to say to my hon. friends on this side of the House that whatever provocation of that character may be given to them by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia, or any other hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, I trust that not one of them, on any provocation whatever, will ever see fit to follow so bad an example.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that your ruling should have gone a little further. Your ruling should have commenced further back. When this document was first proposed to be read by the hon. member for West Assiniboia reflecting upon the character and veracity of an hon. gentleman in this House, it was your duty to have interposed and to have said, according to the authority which is laid down in Bourinot, that that is not a practice which the rules of the House would permit, and that it is not a practice which tends to promote the dignity of the proceedings of this House. It may be that the hon. member for West Assiniboia may think that it comports to his position as a member of this House to make, in the first place, this attack without notice, and then, in the next place, to withhold his documents which he has seen fit to read. I do not think, if he sees fit to pursue that course—

Mr. SCOTT. Would the hon. gentleman allow me ? I have not at all refused to let the hon. gentleman have these documents or to lay them on the Table.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I apologize at once. I have misunderstood the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. I am perfectly willing to lay the documents on the Table of the House or to hand them to the hon. gentleman if he desires them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I apologize to the hon. member for West Assiniboia. I regret that I was so obtuse as to suppose, that, his sitting there and holding the document in his hands for a period of five minutes and awaiting the ruling of the chair, was equivalent to a refusal on his part. I most humbly apologize for the misunderstanding in which all the other members of the House shared in regard to these papers. I am very glad there has been a misunderstanding in regard to the matter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Chairman--

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Chairman, would you allow me to make an observation before you give your ruling ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I wish to put myself right in regard to the accusations made against me by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax).

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You can do it afterwards.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order. According to rule twelve—

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Chairman--

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the Chairman the right to give a decision before hearing the point of order discussed ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. According to rule twelve—

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon being heard before you make your ruling.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Haggart, please resume your seat and hear the Chairman.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Let me hear the rule under which he prevents me being heard before he makes his ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. 'A member called to order shall sit down.' That is rule twelve. It is this :

> A member called to order shall sit down, but may afterwards explain.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). So may the Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. What I wanted to explain was the reference made by the hon. leader of the opposition to my ruling in not calling the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) to order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Please do not understand me as levelling any accusation against you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think you just conceived the meaning of this clause.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. leader of the opposition to say that documents could not be read in the House which made any reflection upon hon. members in the House. What the rule says is this :

> Nor is it in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or other communications, whether papers, letters or other communications, whether printed or written, emanating from persons outside of the House, and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

These were not proceedings within the House to which the letters referred but proceedings in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). 'Anything said by a member.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes, 'anything said by a member' within the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does not say so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. These proceedings in Manitoba and the North-west Territories were not within the House and therefore the hon. member for West Assiniboia was perfectly in order in reading these papers. Had these papers referred to the conduct of any hon. gentleman within the House, or anything that he had said within the House, then, I would have at once ruled him out of order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will read the quotation again.

> Nor is it in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or other communications, whether printed or written, emanating from persons outside of the House, and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on the proceedings within the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. These were not within the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does not say 'by a member within the House' and the object of the rule would be entirely nullified if any such construction were put upon it, because, if any hon. member is at liberty to come within this House and make an attack in the words of a communication written by some person outside of the House upon an hon. gentleman in this House, you at once see what a condition of affairs would result. The result would be that any hon. member on either one side or the other of this House might have a most insulting communication addressed to him in regard to another member of the House, not, it is true in regard to any action of any member within the House, but in regard to some public or private action outside of the House; and then he comes into the House, reads the communication, and the Chairman says that he is perfectly in order in doing so. What was the object of the rule laid down by Bourinot ? Was it not to prevent any action of that kind ? Certainly, and it seems to me that that interpretation of the rule would better comport with the dignity of the proceedings of this House, and it seems to me to be the reasonable construction.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Upon what order or rule Mr. Chairman, did you prevent me from making any remarks before you gave your ruling ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I called the hon. gentleman to order.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How was I out of order ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When the Chairman gets up to decide a question—

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There was no question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We were deciding whether the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) was in order.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely you allow the discussion of a question of order before giving your ruling.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I stood up for the purpose of deciding whether the hon. member from West Assiniboia had the right to read these documents, and then the hon. leader of the opposition arose and quoted a passage that I did not quote, saying that my ruling was wrong in not calling him to order. I rose to put myself right and when I did so the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) rose in his place and I called him to order, and when an hon. member is called to order, according to rule twelve, he has to sit down whether he is in order or not until the matter has been decided, and then he has the privilege of rising and explaining. Now, it is very well understood that the Speaker, or Chairman, has not to sit down when an hon. member gets up whether the Speaker, or Chairman, is in order or not. The rule is that an hon. member must sit down until the point of order is decided. That is the rule and that is the procedure of parliament.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I must object to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. Every member of this House has a right to discuss a question of order before the Chair decides it, and we have an appeal from the chairman, thank goodness, to the Speaker of the House. We can at any time ask you, Mr. Chairman, to vacate the chair and ask the Speaker to come in and decide a question of order. I intend to speak to the question of order. The hon. Minister of Finance is perfectly right when he states that any member is required when he quotes from a public document to put it on the Table of the House. No member of the House has the right to quote even an affidavit, or a writing, or an article from a newspaper, when a question is discussed in the House, attacking the integrity of an hon. member of the House when the hon. member denies it. The point was decided some years ago. Sir Charles Tupper made a statement in this House and an hon. member produced an affidavit to deny it. The Speaker ruled that no affidavit or statement made by any man outside of the House could be read in the House for that purpose. Now, the chairman of this committee seeks to override that well established rule of the House. He has drawn a distinction between statements made outside of the House and statements made inside the House. There is no such distinction. A member has a perfect right to make a statement outside the House, and there is no right on the part of any member to bring in an affidavit or written document or newspaper quotation, to show that a statement made by an hon. member inside the House or outside the House is false.

Mr. BROCK. One of the most important things in connection with our customs system is that there should be uniformity of valuation, and the minister has taken steps to attain that as nearly as possible by getting the customs appraisers to meet from time to time and make uniform rulings. I must say that in the province of Ontario, and I think in Canada generally, we have very little fault to find with the administration of our custom affairs at the present time. Under the management of the present minister (Hon. Mr. Paterson) we have had very little fault to find indeed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROCK. I am afraid, however, that the principal difficulties of the Minister of Customs, come from his own friends who try to turn everything they can to political account.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROCK. Apropos of this, I notice that a Bill has been introduced by a gentleman who has made himself very conspicuous this evening. It is an Act to Regulate the Sales and Provide for the Inspection of Textile Fabrics. I have not seen the Bill, but I am told that it requires that all textile goods shall have stamped on them what they are made of. After an experience of fifty years in the textile fabrics business, I may say that I do not believe it is possible to get persons sufficiently well posted to enable them with any degree of certainty to put such a stamp on the goods manufactured in this country alone. This Bill is introduced by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). Now, Sir, if there is any one thing we should expect from our great west, it is that the members who represent that country in the House should be somewhat commensurate in their ideas with the broadness of the magnificent country from which they come. If there is any place from which we could expect largeness and broadness, it is from the North-west, and to have such a matter introduced to this House as was introduced this evening by a gentleman coming from the west, is rather disappointing. I think his constituents should take charge of him when he goes home, and keep him there because his conduct here is not provocative of the best feeling. He has succeeded in creating a very serious difficulty for our worthy chairman whose decisions, as a rule, we are very anxious to support in every way. When we come to consider this Bill introduced by the hon. member, I hope the Minister of Customs will be a little careful about it, because he will find that if he allows it to pass he will require to double the number of the employees who are at present dealing with textile fabrics, and I do not think that is desirable. I make these remarks having noticed that this gentleman from the North-west has introduced this very unpleasant matter this evening, although it is much more unpleasant for himself than for any member on this side of the House. I contend that he having introduced a matter of this kind, and brought into this House such discord and unpleasantness, we will have to review this Bill with a great deal of care, because I have not the least doubt that he may find himself confronted some day with some very serious affidavits from his country, whereby he could probably find a hole in the armour of even the Minister of Customs.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On the question of Order, I wish to have it decided by the Speaker of the House. I rose for the purpose of discussing a question of Order and you, Mr. Chairman, rose and you said that when Order was called I had no right to make any observation on the subject. Further than that you made a ruling which I think is contrary to the rights and privileges of members of this House. I ask that you vacate the Chair and ask the Speaker to come in for the purpose of deciding the point of Order which I intend to discuss before Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I wish to state what is the rule of the House. The Chairman decides all questions and from his decision an appeal can be made to the

committee, but no appeal can be made to the Speaker of the House to decide that question of order. But if a question of order should arise, and it is required to censure a particular member for violation of order, that censure cannot be given by the Chairman, but must be referred to the Speaker. That is the difference between the powers of the Speaker and the powers of the Chairman. This committee cannot refer my ruling to the Speaker. The Speaker has no more power to rule on anything that may arise in the committee than I have, when he is in the Chair, to rule on a matter that may arise in the House. Let me read rule 76 :

Questions of order arising in Committee of the Whole House shall be decided by the Chairman, subject to an appeal to the House ; but disorder in a committee can only be censured by the House, on receiving a report thereof.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Might I suggest to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that we have really passed from that question to other matters. The point of difference between the hon. member and the Chairman was that the hon. member continued to stand on his feet while the Chairman was on his feet. Clearly the hon. member should have resumed his seat. That is the only point of difference. We have passed from that now, however, and no appeal was taken at the time, and I rather think we had better let the matter drop, especially as the documents have been sent to my hon. friend from Peel.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has hardly grasped the point. The point made by my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is this : A question of order was raised which required to be decided by the Chair. My hon. friend from Lanark rose to discuss the question. The Chairman rose to give what practically amounted to a decision upon it. The contention of my hon. friend from Lanark, which I think is well founded, is this, that the Chairman has no right to prevent any member from discussing a question of order. He cannot stop discussion on a question of order. Every member of the House has the right to express his opinion on that question, and after every one who desires to speak upon it has spoken, then and not till then is the Chairman to decide the question. Perhaps the Chairman did not understand the situation. If he did, I would not be inclined to agree with his ruling, because I do not know of any rule of this House which prevents any member of the committee from fully discussing the question of order before the Chairman gives his decision. This is the whole question, and perhaps, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance suggests, my hon. friend from Lanark has no objection now to let the matter rest. However, I will not interfere.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Chairman of the committee has read the rule of the House in which there is no appeal from the Chairman but to the committee. I do not think that appeal would avail much; but I have very strong opinions on the subject. I have seen this question very often decided in this House. I have again and again seen appeals from the Chairman of the committee to the Speaker of the House, and I have again and again seen the Speaker called in for the purpose of deciding the question. I have often heard the rule laid down in this House that where an hon. gentleman contradicts a statement made by a member, no matter what the opinion of the House may be, no matter what affidavits or quotations from the public press he has in support of that contradiction; he has been refused the right to read those quotations or affidavits.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not propose to occupy very much of the time of the House on this small question which has been introduced by a small representative from the west. There is another small representative who is interrupting me who has a record. He had better take care of those things that crawl on him. I may say that I do not propose to make any personal references in this House; that is not my mission here; but I will not allow insinuations to come from the other side of the House without giving an answer to those who interrupt me. The only question of difference seems to be as to whether goods from Germany have been brought into this country under the British preference. Before I proceed to say something on the question, I wish to state that during the western trip I had the honour of being present at one meeting, and one meeting only, in the town of Morden, at which I exhibited the teapot which my hon. friend said was carried up and down all through western Canada. I make that statement on the floor of the House, knowing my responsibility; and when the hon. member for West Assiniboia comes down with letters written by himself, trying to get information from gentlemen in the west to prove anything to the contrary——

Mr. SCOTT. I beg to call the hon. gentleman to order. On what basis does he say that this letter was prepared by me ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You said yourself that you prepared it.

Mr. SCOTT. I said no such thing.

Mr. BLAIN. I may have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, but I certainly understood him to say that he had perhaps written it himself.

Mr. SCOTT. I made no such statement. I stated that the letter was given to me at my suggestion, as the reading of it certainly shows.

Mr. BLAIN. You wrote to him and got the letter back. I said the hon. gentleman was seeking to get information from the west in respect to statements I made during the western trip in respect to the German teapot which I exhibited at Morden. Let us read the letter and see if this is correct or not:

Walter Scott, Esq., M.P.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your communication.

How did this letter come into the hon. gentleman's hands at all? Was it offered to the hon. gentleman in order to give him information about some statements that I had made? Not at all; the hon. gentleman sought it by writing a letter to this gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. It must be perfectly plain to the House that there is a very great difference between a letter being sent to me at my suggestion and my preparing a letter.

Mr. BLAIN. There was a telegram among these documents. Did the hon. gentleman take it out before sending the documents over?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought you did; just like what the hon. gentleman would do, of course the House would not expect anything else.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Chairman, these are not questions of order.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman asked me respecting a telegram. It was either a copy of a telegram sent by me to the gentleman at Morden or one sent by him to me.

Mr. BLAIN. We need not thank the hon. gentleman for placing the documents on the Table. He absolutely refused to do so.

Mr. SCOTT. I beg your pardon; I did not.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not beg any pardon about it. I know what I am stating. Why was the question of placing the documents on the Table raised at all, if you did not refuse to place them on the Table?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The order in discussion is this, that the hon. member who has the floor need not permit, against his will, any obstruction or any question during the time he has the floor, except a question of order or a question of privilege.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it open to me to raise a point of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Of course, a point of order can be raised; but if it is against the will of the hon. gentleman who has the floor, no interruption can take place except on a question of order or a question of privilege.

Mr. SCOTT. I raise the point of order, that the hon. gentleman is misrepresenting me. I said before, and I say now, that I did not refuse to place the documents on the Table.

Mr. BLAIN. I ask the hon. gentleman to state his point of order, and it will be answered. He is not going to keep the floor all night. I was just going to remark that the committee does not thank the hon. gentleman for laying these documents on the Table, because he refused to lay them on the Table, and refused to send them across for my inspection. I have to thank the hon. Minister of Customs, who, turning around, said to the hon. gentleman: 'Lay them on the Table.'

Mr. SCOTT. You are mistaken.

Mr. BLAIN. I will leave it to the hon. Minister of Customs if he did not say that. I heard it, and I call upon him to say whether that is correct or not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is that if a statement is said to have been made by an hon. member, and he rises and says that he did not make that statement, his denial must be accepted there and then.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I rise to discuss that ruling.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will you allow me? In this case the statement was not attributed to the hon. member for West Assiniboia, and although he denies it, he had no authority to deny it. It was attributed to the hon. Minister of Customs, and the hon. member for Assiniboia had no right whatever to deny it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) to have said that the hon. member for Assiniboia had made a certain statement and that that hon. gentleman had denied having made it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, it was the hon. Minister of Customs who made it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I understand the rule to be that when an hon. member in this House makes a statement concerning another hon. member but does not make that statement of his own personal knowledge, then he must accept the denial of the hon. member, and withdraw it. But when he makes a statement of his own knowledge concerning another hon. member, there is no rule to make him retract that statement.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for Assiniboia was asked to lay on the Table the documents he had read, and he refused to do so. The point of order was raised, and the Chairman of the committee read the rule from the book. But I repeat that the hon. Minister of Customs turned in his place and said to the hon. gentleman: 'Lay them on the Table.' I leave to the hon. Min-

ister of Customs to say whether that is correct or not.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). This is the biggest tempest in a teapot I have ever witnessed.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A discussion having arisen as to whether the hon. member was compelled to lay the papers upon the Table, it was pointed out that if a minister had quoted from a public document, he could be required to lay it upon the Table, but that this rule did not apply to a private member. I then turned around in my seat, and the hon. member for Assiniboia said to me: 'I have no objection to give them the papers,' and then I said to him: 'Lay them on the Table.'

Mr. BLAIN. In view of this statement will the hon. gentleman now apologize to the committee and to myself for having denied the statement I made that the Minister of Customs had turned to him and told him to lay the documents on the Table? The hon. member for Assiniboia denied this, and said that the hon. Minister of Customs had done nothing of the kind. In the face of this contradiction by the Minister of Customs of the statement made by the hon. member for Assiniboia, how can we believe anything which that hon. gentleman may say? This document looks as if it had been mutilated, for here is the corner of a telegram which the hon. gentleman acknowledged having torn off. He made a charge against me in his place, and when called on by the Chairman to lay the documents on the Table, instead of complying with that order, as he should have done, he tears off a part of the document and now acknowledges having done so. However, I do not propose taking up any more of the time of the committee on this point. But the contention between the hon. gentleman and myself is this: He says that I travelled up and down the country producing a certain teapot and making certain statements at every meeting I attended in the west. I repeat that at no meeting, out of the forty-five held by the hon. leader of the opposition, was that teapot presented except at one, and I challenge the hon. gentleman, or any of his friends to gainsay that statement. The meeting I refer to was held at Morden, and it does look as if the hon. gentleman were a little worried about the German goods and the tariff. During the last few years he has been pointing out in his newspaper to the western people that this government should be supported because it introduced the preferential tariff, and the consumers in the west were getting great advantages from it. Now he applauds the government because it has given notice that it will abolish that preference, and the consumer in the west will no longer have the benefit of it in the case of these goods. To show how much the merchant knew whether these goods came in under the preferential tariff at a low or a high valuation, let me refer to what he said himself over his own signature. It was in Regina, I think, that I purchased the teapot in question. I went into a store there and asked the clerk if he sold German goods. He said, yes, we have some, a package up stairs that are not yet opened. I asked him: will you be good enough to sell me an article from one of these packages, and he replied that of course he would. I went upstairs with him, and he opened one of the packages. The first article he took from the box was this teapot. I said: 'That will do, come down stairs and I will pay you.' I went with him to the office and he produced the original invoice. I never made the statement that the invoice was for $100, and the hon. gentleman has no right to say that I did. What I did was simply to give as an illustration the $100 item I mentioned, and not the amount of the invoice at all. I think the invoice was for more than $300. To show how little these people know about how these goods come into this country, let us see what they say in their letter to the hon. gentleman, by which the hon. gentleman was going to prove that these goods did not come in under the preferential tariff at all. They say: 'We have nothing to do with the payment of duties whatever. We did not know what duty was to be paid.' The hon. gentleman has produced a declaration from a gentleman with whom we had a good deal of trouble in the west, and perhaps he will be good enough to communicate this to that gentleman, either when he goes home or in his newspaper, or by letter, or send him the telegram which he tore off this lot of papers, or a copy of it. Will he be good enough to inform this Mr. Trant—a government official forsooth, as well—that when private citizens are travelling through the west, he should not crowd himself into their private car and beat his way through as a newspaper reporter? He is a newspaper man like the hon. gentleman himself, so he will know how this goes. Perhaps he was a writer for the hon. gentleman's own newspaper. Will the hon. gentleman say whether he wrote the report for his own newspaper?

Mr. SCOTT. He did not.

An hon. MEMBER. He was too boozy.

Mr. BLAIN. That is right—a very proper statement; but I am not making it. Now, this is a long letter, but there is nothing in it, and I regret that the time of the committee is taken up with the matter at all. What I say is that the Liberal-Conservative party contended in this House and in the country that the British preference, so-called, was not a British preference in fact, that it allowed German goods to come into Great Britain and, after a small amount of labour had been put upon them, very

often in the shape of labels and boxes, they were then shipped to Canada under the guise of British goods and allowed to come in under the preference of 33⅓ per cent. The hon. leader of the Liberal-Conservative party, in addressing the House, made the statement that that traffic was actually going on. And I heard the Finance Minister in his place in this House say that this was a matter that should be investigated. Neither the Minister of Finance nor the Minister of Customs was ready to stand up in his place in the House and deny the statement made by the hon. leader of the opposition. And that statement so made was not denied, I repeated in the west, and I repeat it here—that, so far as the British preference allowed German goods to come into this country, we were opposed to it. That is all that the Liberal-Conservative party said. The government declared that the preference was all right. But this year the Finance Minister stated in his place, and gave notice to the Canadian people, that German goods would be retaliated against, that this country could not allow these goods to come in except on the payment of twenty-five per cent higher duty than the general tariff. I do not think it is worth while to say anything further on the teapot question. I bought a razor out there. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) stated that, and it was so.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not say so.

Mr. BLAIN. Did not the hon. gentleman say so ?

Mr. SCOTT. I read it.

Mr. BLAIN. And is not the hon. gentleman responsible for what he reads ?

An hon. MEMBER. Address the Chair.

Mr. BLAIN. 'Address the Chair,' says the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt). Perhaps he will be good enough to address the Chair when he is interrupting me. What I say is that I purchased the razor referred to. It was made in Germany. Did the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) make the statement that they were not German goods? They were German goods ; the label was upon the article itself, both upon the teapot and upon the razor. This kind of goods brought in under the so-called British preference to compete with the Canadian goods. I have this to say—and it is more than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) can say with reference to the tariff—that the Liberal-Conservative party has taken one stand upon the tariff question, and that we should have one policy, a national policy for the maintenance of Canadian interest, not to allow German goods to come in to compete with Canadian goods. We have taken that stand under our honoured leader in this House. And what we say inside this House we say outside of it. And, as a humble supporter of the Conservative party, I make the same statement everywhere, and advocate the national policy everywhere. I am very glad to know that in the discussion that has taken place within the last few years the government has been converted, and that under its recent action these German goods will not have the opportunity of coming in except upon the payment of much higher than the ordinary duty.

Mr. WRIGHT. Before this tempest in a teapot is over I would like to say a few words on this subject of German goods. I have been an importer for twenty-five years, importing goods both from Germany and from Great Britain, and I think I can tell the House something about the procedure in the importation of these German goods. A traveller comes and takes our order for whatever German goods we want. He guarantees us prices delivered in Montreal, duty paid. The goods are packed in Germany and brought out in the original packages to Montreal. The invoice is made out and the goods are shipped to us. The duty is paid in Montreal—we have nothing to do with paying the duty. Let it be clearly understood that these goods are sent in the original packages and some direct from a German port, the packages being marked on the outside 'Made in Germany,' each package also bearing the name of the place of shipment. How, then, can they go over to England and there be repacked and be brought in here under the preference. It is utterly impossible for anything of that kind to be done. Besides, the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) says these articles are all stamped with the maker's name, or with a ticket placed upon them 'Made in Germany.' Take, for instance, a razor. Suppose it to be one of Bokers' razors—the name of the maker is stamped on the blade near the shank. How can that go over to England and have anything done to make it appear as a British product ?

Mr. BLAIN. I will tell the hon. gentle man, as he does not know.

Mr. WRIGHT. I can tell the committee how it is not done. It is utterly impossible for the goods to go to England and then have anything done to them, and to be shipped here as British goods, because, as I say, not only are they stamped 'Made in Germany' but they come here in the original packages and the name of the maker is stamped on every article—whether it be a razor, a pair of skates or practically anything else. The teapot to which the hon. gentleman referred, he tells us had a ticket on it with the words 'Made in Germany.' How is anybody to contend that goods thus stamped can be put forward as British goods ? This point came up last year, and some of these hon. gentlemen undertook to tell us in dollars and cents the amount of German goods that went into England, and were afterwards shipped here under the preference. The hon. member for East

Toronto (Mr. Kemp) gave the exact amount. But I brought him to task by asking him how he knew. Let me quote from 'Hansard' just what took place :

Mr. WRIGHT. How does the hon. gentleman ascertain the amount of goods imported from England that have been partially made in Germany ?

Mr. KEMP. I am making an estimate.

Now, all this talk that goes on is estimate or is based on estimate. Why, any boy ten years old can make estimates, and I think that almost any boy could estimate a good deal better than the hon. member for East Toronto. It is utterly impossible that these goods shipped to us in the original German packages can come in as British goods.

Mr. BLAIN. Let me explain just that one point. I asked the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) to be good enough to give us an explanation, but he has not done it. I would point out to the committee how this is done. First, the razor has a bone or ivory handle, chiefly a bone handle. Then is added to it a small quantity of steel; that bone and steel are both furnished in Germany. Then the article is made and shaped in Germany, and what my hon. friend refers to is put on in Germany. After that is done, it represents three-fourths of the value of the article. The article is then shipped over into Sheffield and polished and boxed up, and sent into this country under the British preference. Is not that a German preference ? The bone, the handle, the steel, the shaping is all done in a foreign country, and then they come over and receive a little finishing in Great Britain, and after that is done, they are invoiced under this so-called British preference, and are permitted to come to this country under the guise of the preference as British goods, when there are three-fourths of them German-made.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would ask how the hon. gentleman knows that that razor was ever in England at all ? It is impossible for him or any other man to tell that.

Mr. SCOTT. The point made by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright) must be clear to every person, that is, that goods marked 'made in Germany' brought to New York, from New York to the port of Montreal, and then taken up to the North-west Territories, certainly came under the general tariff. Now, where is the possibility or likelihood of fraud ? Does not the whole evidence trend the other way ? It is at least as good as proved that there was no fraud attempted, and that these German goods, a sample of which my hon. friend bought from the merchant at Regina marked 'made in Germany,' which came into the country in a large box, that box stamped in large letters 'made in Germany,' or 'German'—I say it is as good as proved, at all events, that no fraud was attempted and that the proper rate of duty was paid.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us what rate of duty was paid upon this invoice of three hundred odd dollars' worth of goods that were brought into a hardware store in his own town. Because he is attempting to enlighten the committee upon this question, perhaps he would be good enough to tell us what rate of duty was paid upon them, and whether they went to Great Britain or not ?

Mr. SCOTT. I am not able to tell that.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought not.

Mr. SCOTT. The merchant was not able to tell me, and the editor of the Morden 'Chronicle' swears to the accuracy of his report, stating that my hon. friend said the Regina merchant told him what the merchant says he did not know and did not tell.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if that letter does not say distinctly that these goods came to Regina in the original package, and that the words 'from Germany' were on the outside of the package ?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Then it would be impossible for any collector of customs to pass these goods.

Mr. SCOTT. Practically impossible. Therefore the argument of the hon. member for Peel had no point. Notwithstanding the various reports that appeared in the North-west newspapers, notwithstanding the statements made by my hon. friend as appears by this statutory declaration, it is plain that the goods came in under the general rate of duty. I do not know the rate of duty, but I would like to know it, and I will give the information to the Minister of Customs, which may enable him to know. The goods came in seven cases, numbered from 4364 to 4370. They were received at Regina on September 2. The Minister of Customs should take a note of this. The invoice was made out by Stransky & Company, New York. The goods were sold to Smith & Ferguson, Limited, Regina, on August 8, 1902. Perhaps before the end of the session the Minister of Customs will get us the information, and we will have the question definitely settled. Now I want to make a reference to my conduct with regard to this affidavit. My hon. friend repeated several times, in face of my specific statement to the contrary, that I refused to give the documents to the House.

Mr. BLAIN. So you did.

Mr. SCOTT. I say here again that I did not refuse to give the documents to the House.

Mr. BLAIN. I leave it to the judgment of the House.

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend stated that the Minister of Customs turned to me, or directed me, to pass these documents over

to my hon. friend, and I said he was mistaken. Now, I will repeat exactly what did occur. When I sat down, after reading the documents, an hon. gentleman on the other side got up and commenced making a statement. After he had said a few words he called attention to the fact that these documents ought to be given to the House. The question of order arose as to whether I should be compelled to give them to the House, and certainly I did sit back for a little while wondering what would happen. I am a new member of the House, and am not well acquainted with the rules. But I understood the Minister of Customs to say to me, in turning towards me, either 'you do not need to' or 'you had better not,' or something to that effect.

Mr. BLAIN. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You claimed the protection of the Chair when he was interrupting you, now let the member for Assiniboia go on.

Mr. BLAIN. Then I suppose we will have the same rule applied to both sides of the House ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. State your point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. I understood the Minister of Customs to advise me not to give the document to the House.

Mr. BLAIN. I rise to a point of order. When I understood the Minister of Customs to call upon the hon. gentleman to lay the documents on the Table, was that correct ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not a point of order, that is a question of fact.

Mr. SCOTT. As I was saying, the Minister of Customs turned round and said something to me, advising me, as I understood, not to give the documents to the House. The point of order was discussed for several minutes, and after awhile I arrived at the conclusion myself that, no matter how the point of order was determined, I would give my hon. friends the privilege of reading the documents. I then called across to the Minister of Customs and said 'I have no objection,' or something to that effect, meaning that I would prefer to give them to the House. I say now that I did not refuse to give these documents to the House. My hon. friend says I ought to apologize for this, he says I had insinuated or had contradicted the Minister of Customs. Certainly I did no such thing, and there is no call for me to make an apology in that regard. But I do think that after my hon. friend has slept over this matter himself he will arrive at the conclusion that an apology is due from him to the people of the North-west Territories, at least to the people at Morden, where he addressed that meeting and told the people that a Regina merchant had informed him so and so with respect to this dutiable article, when it has now been proved that the Regina merchant told him no such thing.

Mr. BELL. We now see the consequence of allowing a mode of controverting a statement made by a member of this House by introducing outside evidence, which, we are informed, it is your duty to prevent.

Mr. SCOTT. I was interrupted by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell).

Mr. BELL. I would like to have the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The ruling from the Chair is this : When a charge is made against any hon. member of having said anything, if he gets up in his place and says that he did not make such a statement the hon. member who makes the charge is bound to accept that, and to allow the matter to drop without argument. That is the rule.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, I will wait until the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) takes this course.

Mr. BLAIN. Takes what course ? I do not understand what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SCOTT. I understand that——

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SCOTT. I am certainly willing to follow the course which has been indicated as being the proper one to follow, but the hon. member for Peel has not denied the statement made in this House that he stated to the people of Morden that a Regina merchant told him so and so. He has not made any denial that he made such a statement.

Mr. BELL. That is precisely what the hon. member for Peel has said, and now the hon. member for West Assiniboia is going on for the second time to introduce into this House evidence derived from parties outside of this House to controvert what the hon. member for Peel has said. He is entirely out of order, and he has been ruled out of order on two occasions.

Mr. SCOTT. I have not understood it so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Let me state it again. If an hon. gentleman charges another hon. member with having said this, that, or the other thing, on a certain occasion, and if the hon. member says that he did not say that which is charged, then, the hon. gentleman making the statement must accept that from the hon. gentleman who denies it, and the debate then and there ceases on the subject.

Mr. SCOTT. I quite understand that. What I was pointing out was that the hon. member for Peel had not denied it, and therefore, I was not called upon to say

anything further on that phase of the subject. Just a word about the question of preferential duties. Many hon. gentlemen —whether the hon. member for Peel did so or not—have gone up and down the country and throughout the length and breadth of the North-west Territories condemning the British preference largely because a merchant in Regina had told the hon. member for Peel that he had brought in certain German goods that had got the advantage of the British preference. I have proved to-night, and I think the proof has been submitted to this committee that the hon. member for Peel was mistaken in regard to that. I believe that all my hon. friends on the other side of the House are just as much mistaken in a great many of the assertions and very much of the condemnation they make on the subject of the British preference.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Mr. Chairman, I am about to pour some oil on the troubled waters. I ask you, Sir, to bring this committee back to the question under discussion. We have not had the question before the chair discussed within the last hour. That is my opinion ; of course, I may not be right, but I think I am right. It is your duty, Sir, to see that personalities are not discussed in this House. I regret to say that we have had nothing but personalities since the committee resumed after recess, and that the debate has taken this form not only to-day, but yesterday as well. It appears to me that this House is getting to be a beer garden, or is getting as near to it as it seems possible for it to get ; in fact it has been a tempest about a teapot. It is about time that we discussed the questions that come before the House in a proper manner. Yesterday we washed all the dirty linen from Montreal and Quebec, and today we have to wash the dirty linen that comes from the North-west Territories and Manitoba.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is costing $28 a minute.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). We have had the razor question discussed, and some hon. gentlemen who are participating in this discussion look as though they never saw a razor. They might have been right on that matter, but whether they are right or not, I am sure they are not right in introducing personalities in this House. Therefore, I call upon you as chairman of this committee, to confine the debate to the question before the Chair, and not to permit personalities to be indulged in. I hope that the time of the House will not be further wasted in the way in which it has been wasted during the last two days.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish, of course, to allude to what has passed, further than to state that there has been a misapprehension, and I simply allude to it because I do not think any hon. gentleman desires to put any other hon. gentleman in a wrong position. As far as I understand the matter, the hon. member for Peel states that he heard me saying to the hon. member for West Assiniboia to lay the papers on the Table. He heard me saying that, he said, and he judged from that that there had been a reluctance on the part of my hon. friend to do that.

Mr. BLAIN. No, no.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will explain how that happened. Prior to that, when the discussion was going on as to what was incumbent upon a private member, I had said to my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) : You are not compelled to hand the papers to the hon. gentleman. Then, there was a little rest, and my hon. friend, speaking to me, said : I have no objection to giving the papers out. Then I said : You can lay them on the Table. That is why the hon. member for Peel, hearing that from me alone, and not hearing what my hon. friend had said to me, thought that it was through some instructions to him and not through any willingness on his part that he did it. I simply mention that.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to tell the hon. minister that that was not my understanding of it at all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In view of the fact that it was through no unwillingness on his part, I thought it was only right that I should say that it was in view of his statement to me : 'I have no objection,' or words to that effect, to give them the papers, that I said : Then you can lay them on the Table.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sure the hon. minister would not wish to misquote me.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Will you allow me to say this ? I called to the Chair and said : Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) lay the papers on the Table, or send them across the floor of the House to me—and he refused to do it.

Mr. SCOTT. No, no.

Mr. BLAIN. Well there was a chorus of 'don't do it' from the other side of the House.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). That does not prove that he refused to do it.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) wished to make it appear that he was always willing to lay the papers on the Table of the House. It was because he was unwilling that the question came up for discussion at all. I made the statement that we were to thank the hon. Minister of Customs for the papers being laid on the Table, because he turned around and said

to the hon. member for Assiniboia : 'Lay them on the Table.' When the hon. member for West Assiniboia got up he said that the hon. Minister of Customs did not make any such statement to him at all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is just where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) is mistaken in what passed between us. But we come now to the question which is an important question, as to the introduction of goods under the preferential tariff. The committee will understand, and business men especially will understand, that it is a very difficult matter under the preferential arrangement to prevent frauds being perpetrated in the bringing in of goods. But I think the House will agree that there is a great deal said in reference to this, that, when it is traced out, as we have had to trace it out in many cases, is found to be without substantial foundation. Without any offence to the hon. member for Peel, let me point out just in this case ; I have no doubt that he thought that the German article which he exhibited came in under the preferential tariff, and that it had been manufactured in Germany.

Mr. BLAIN. I made no such statement. What I said was that it was a sample of German goods such as were coming into this country under the guise of the British preference.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I understood that it had been made as an illustration of an article that had come in under the British preference.

Mr. BLAIN. I never made such a statement.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I thought the reason that it was exhibited was that it was an illustration that that article had come in under the preferential tariff. I do not say that no articles come in, but this article could not have come in, in such a way. If the statement of the merchant is true that it came from New York in an iron bound case to the port of Montreal where we have our sharp appraisers, then it could not come in except under the general tariff. I will examine into it, but I feel positive that that article could have come in in no other way than under the general tariff. I cannot conceive it possible that in a port like Montreal these goods could have come in an iron bound case with 'Germany' stamped on it, and the goods themselves being stamped 'German,' and passed our appraisers there. I am not arguing that there are no goods that so come in. We require the exporter to declare that he is a member of the firm or one who is cognizant of the facts to which he subscribes, and we have not been able to find many houses that would be so careless of their reputation as to make a false declaration.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister found any goods coming in in the manner in which he has described that it was possible for them to come in ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think that there have been cases before the department where the question arose as to whether there was the amount of British labour upon the goods that entitled them to the preference, but I have not in mind now any case where such goods came in. I can say that there were no goods solely of German manufacture that came in under the preference.

Mr. BLAIN. I never said that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Nor any that were below the limit. There may have been differences of opinion as to certain goods, but there have been exceedingly few cases. If they were below the limit and we knew it we would put on the full duty. Now the German surtax does not affect the preference at all. It only does this : that now, if German goods have 50 per cent of the value created in Germany they not only pay the general tariff but they pay the surtax on top of the general tariff. If there are any members of the committee who are able to give me the benefit of their experience as to any further precautions that can be taken in the regulations under the preferential tariff I will be only too glad to hear them.

Mr. KEMP. These declarations are not what we understand in this country as declarations having the effect of an oath.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No; they are not affidavits. At the commencement of the preferential tariff we required that affidavits should be made, but there were a great many complaints. In England they cannot go to a justice of the peace and make an affidavit free of charge as we do here ; they have to go to certain parties who charge them three shillings for each affidavit. That seemed to be a tax upon them, and the department came to the conclusion that if a firm would make a false written declaration over their own hand, they would not hesitate to make a false affidavit and therefore we facilitated business by accepting these declarations.

Mr. CLARKE. I wish to say a few words in connection with the discussion which has been sprung upon the committee without any notice having been given to my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain). I can assure the hon. gentleman from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) that I shall avoid indulging in personalities, for I hold that personalities should never be heard in this House ; but I certainly think that my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has reason to complain that when affidavits were to be introduced attacking his truthfulness no notice was given to him by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). When the hon. member for Assiniboia knew he was going to raise such a question in the committee, it

was due to the hon. member for Peel that he should have been notified. It would also be conducive to the better conduct of debates, if when documents are presented to the House all the documents in connection with the matter under discussion should be laid before us. My hon. friend from Peel has declared that there was a telegram connected with these papers which was torn off before they were sent across the floor of the House.

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. CLARKE. If I am wrong in that I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. SCOTT. The telegram was certainly torn off before the papers were sent across the floor of this House, but it was really torn off three or four weeks ago. It was either a copy of a telegram from me to Mr. McCuish, of Morden or from Mr. McCuish to myself, and it had no bearing on the matter.

Mr. CLARKE. I have no hesitation in accepting the statement of the hon. gentleman, but I must say that these documents bear indubitable evidence in themselves that they are not complete. If an hon. gentleman reads letters in this House in reply to letters sent by him, and if he expects them to receive the credence of honourable men, it is only reasonable to ask that the letters to which these are replies should be included in the correspondence. After all, what statements are contained in these affidavits that cast the slightest discredit upon the accuracy of the assertions made by the hon. member for Peel ? I will not refer to Mr. Trant because the member for Peel has dealt with him, but let us see what are his declarations. The first three paragraphs refer to his attending certain meetings, which are not important to the issue, and then he goes on to declare :

4. That at each and every of the three meetings mentioned in the paragraph next immediately preceding, the said Mr. Blain said that the British preference then existing was used by manufacturers in Germany to send their goods to Canada as British goods and so defraud the revenue of the Dominion of Canada, and further, he, the said Richard Blain, explained that the said object was attained by the said manufacturers in Germany first having the said goods shipped to England and thence re-shipped to Canada as British goods entitled to the preference given such goods by the law of Canada.

5. And I believe particularly that at the aforesaid meeting held at Qu'Appelle on the said 27th day of September, A.D. 1902, the said Richard Blain produced a razor which he said he had bought at Regina in the said Territories the day before, and which he said was a razor of German manufacture and had been imported into Canada under the British preference in the manner described in the paragraph next immediately preceding.

6. And I further say particularly that at the aforesaid meeting held in the evening of the 30th day of September, in the year 1902 at Wapella, the said Richard Blain said he had bought a teapot in Regina that had been made in Germany and that the merchant who had sold him, the said Blain, the said teapot, or the assistant to the said merchant, had at the request of the said Richard Blain shown him the invoice of the goods of which the said teapot formed a part and that the said invoice was as if for goods that were shipped from England and had received the benefit of the British preference.

What does my hon. friend hope to make by reading an affidavit of that kind to the committee ? How does it asperse the character of my hon. friend from Peel for truthfulness, or affect the statements made by him or by others on this side of the House respecting the British preference, and its operation in the past in securing a preference for German goods ? The statement made in this affidavit is quite consistent with what has been said on this side of the House, and reflects accurately what the hon. member for Peel has said here and elsewhere, and what he has stated to-night. The statement is a fact that can be corroborated.

Mr. BLAIN. It is not denied by the minister.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the hon. gentleman take now the answer to his question ?

Mr. CLARKE. Well, what is it ?

Mr. SCOTT. The reason I read this affidavit was that the hon. member for Peel said, in answer to a statement which I had already made, that he had only brought up this subject at one point.

Mr. BLAIN. I never made such a statement.

Mr. SCOTT. That is what I understood the hon. gentleman to say.

Mr. BLAIN. What I said was this, that I exhibited a teapot at one meeting only, and that was at Morden.

Mr. SCOTT. That was a second statement.

Mr. CLARKE. I may be particularly obtuse, but I certainly cannot appreciate what point has been made by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia by reading this affidavit.

Mr. SCOTT. The affidavit showed that the subject was discussed at more than one meeting.

Mr. CLARKE. That is not denied. I had occasion to discuss the British preference on many occasions during my trip in the west.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did you have a teapot ?

Mr. CLARKE. I left the teapot with the hon. member for West Assiniboia and the hon. member for Peel. The hon. gentleman brings into the discussion this affidavit, which does not amount in value, so far as the matter of the teapot is concerned, to the

worth of the paper on which it is written, and this other affidavit made by Mr. McCuish, which I have not been able to read. Then, attached to these documents is a letter from the Smith & Ferguson Company, Limited, hardware merchants, of Regina, signed by J. W. Smith, the president of the company. On the second page of the letter is this statement, to which I draw the attention of the committee :

I note also that, as you pointed out, a portion of the press makes the charge that the Regina firm from whom Mr. Blain bought the teapot has been guilty of defrauding the customs, inasmuch as the benefit of the preference could not have been obtained upon such an importation without the making of a false declaration.

I appeal to my hon. friend if it accords with the measure of fair play which he would expect to have dealt out to himself to suggest to this gentleman that a portion of the press had made allegations reflecting upon my hon. friend, without giving the statements made by other portions of the press ? Why should he make suggestions to the gentleman who wrote the letter ?

Mr. SCOTT. They were true suggestions.

Mr. CLARKE. My hon. friend from Peel has denied them again and again, and surely my hon. friend from West Assiniboia will not repeat them after that denial ? I heard the statements made by my hon. friend from Peel, and there is not a particle of truth in the suggestion that he charged the firm at Regina with fraud.

Mr. SCOTT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I do not think anything in that letter indicates that the hon. member for Peel charged the firm with fraud. What the letter indicates is that there were certain charges made in a portion of the press against the firm, based on the statement made by the hon. member for Peel.

Mr. CLARKE. My hon. friend bases the whole of his argument on the letter which he got from the Messrs. Smith & Ferguson, of Regina, referring to statements made in certain portions of the press and for which he wants to hold the hon. member for Peel responsible. I am sure that in his calm moments he will not regard that as a very strong argument to press against my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman, if he wanted to make this file complete, should have included in it a copy of the letter to which this is a reply. I am sure that if he had written to the members of the firm for the letter, they would willingly have sent it back. In their letter they say :

The fact is, however, that if the fraud were committed, it was not committed by our firm, as the duty upon the consignment of which the teapot was a part was not paid by us at Regina, but was paid by the brokers from whom we purchased this consignment at Montreal.

Now, I do not know that there is much more for me to say about this matter. I am sorry I cannot read the affidavit of Mr. McCuish; but I have no doubt the hon. member for Assiniboia read it correctly. Now, the hon. Minister of Customs made a statement with regard to this matter which I think will bear investigation. He said that goods manufactured in Germany could not come in under the British preference, unless they were enhanced in value to the extent of 25 per cent by British labour. He also said it was impossible for these goods to come direct to the port of Montreal and get the advantage of the British preference if they were shipped in the original packages. Where does the hon. minister get his authority for these statements ? Let me read a paragraph from the circular issued by his department defining and interpreting this regulation, to the customs collectors at Regina, at Winnipeg, at Toronto, and everywhere else throughout the Dominion :

In estimating the labour of the United Kingdom entering into the production of articles manufactured therein partly from imported material, the extent of such labour may be reckoned by the value of the manufactured article ready for shipment at the place of production after deducting therefrom the value on entering within the limits of the United Kingdom, represented by the component parts of such articles which are the produce of countries not entitled to the benefits of the preferential tariff.

What does that mean ? It means exactly the interpretation put upon it by the hon. member for Peel and by others on this side of the House, that the profits of the importer can be added to the value of the goods brought in from Germany, and these profits are to be accounted and reckoned as British labour. There is no reason why these packages to which the hon. member referred, if imported into England and valued at $800 should not have been exported thence to Canada at a value of $1,000, and come in under the British preference ; and if that be the case, my hon. friend is vindicated in every statement he made. I took the liberty last year of drawing the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs to a statement made by one of the most influential papers published in the United Kingdom, describing the way Canada was being robbed under this preferential clause, and I shall again quote that statement for the information of the hon. member for West Assiniboia :

How Foreigners Rob Canada.

Since Canada granted a preference tariff to Britain, tons upon tons of German and foreign textiles have been brought over to England and reshipped to Canada after the so called process of 'finishing.'

My hon. friend from Peel has explained how this is done.

In order that they may be classed as goods partly of British manufacture. In some cases this 'finishing' in England consists simply in taking off the German and French or Austrian labels, doing the goods up again and then giv-

ing them a British name or label. There is not a branch of trade in which this style of smuggling is carried on to the extent that it is in the textile trade.

Has any hon. gentleman any doubt as to what that means ? Will any one hesitate putting faith in that statement which I have taken from one of the most influential papers published in the United Kingdom, the Belfast 'News' ? If the hon. member for Assiniboia has any doubts, he can look up the files of that newspaper and see for himself whether I have not quoted exactly what it said. That statement may be further proven by the circular letter which the hon. Minister of Customs issued to his officers throughout all the customs districts, instructing them how they are to interpret this preference. That being the case, can there be any doubt entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the effect of this preference, and is not my hon. friend from Peel amply sustained in every statement he made with reference to its operation, at every meeting which he had the pleasure and the privilege of addressing in Manitoba and the North-west? My hon. friend from Assiniboia has been always a great stickler for this British preference and has continually appealed to the people of the west to support the government because it had reduced the cost of the goods which they consumed which were imported under this clause of our tariff. Yet, as my hon. friend from Peel pointed out in the course of a recent debate, the hon. member for Assiniboia had not a word to say when the government introduced the surtax, which cannot fail to destroy the effect of this preference on the large importations of goods brought into England from Germany and thence exported into Canada. As the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Finance well know, that is what the surtax will do. What are the provisions of this surtax :

Articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of any foreign country which treats imports from Canada less favourably than those from other countries may be subject to a surtax over and above the duties of schedule A, such surtax in every case to be one-third of the duty as fixed by such schedule A.

Such surtax shall apply to any article, the chief value of which was produced in such foreign country, although it may have been improved or advanced in value by the labour of another country, notwithstanding the provisions of the British preferential tariff and regulations thereunder.

What is the effect of this enactment ? I will let the hon. Minister of Finance answer that question. Two years ago, I asked the government its intention in regard to barring out goods partly manufactured in Germany, or manufactured from raw materials grown or produced in Germany, from the advantage of the British preference clause, and the Minister of Finance replied :

In answer to the question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) I beg to say : No. Such provision would practically destroy the British preference inasmuch as British manufactures are largely produced from foreign raw materials.

I do not intend to take up the time of the committee at greater length. I congratulate the hon. member for Assiniboia on any political capital or advantage he has gained from this discussion, and the hon. gentleman who is leading the House (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the hon. Minister of Customs on this additional evidence of their desire to transact, as expeditiously as possible, the business before parliament.

Mr. CLANCY. As the hon. member for West Assiniboia has spoken to-night with regard to the preferential tariff and how it works, I wish now to call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs to the fact that the customs regulations make it possible for goods to be imported in Canada under the preference, which were finished in England, without any regard as to what value had been added to these goods by the finishing process. I would call the attention of the minister to his own regulations and to the manner in which they have been carried out. Here is the affidavit to be made both by the importer and the exporter.

That the said goods are properly described in the said invoice ; that there is included as specified in the said invoice the true value of all cartons, cases, crates, boxes and coverings of any kind and all charges and expenses incident to placing said goods in condition packed ready for shipment to Canada.

What does that mean ? It means that the values of all cases, coverings, crates, &c., on which there is not duty at all, may be included in the value. It means that the labelling of the goods and everything else, whether meaningless or not, whether it adds to the value or not, may be included in order to give the appearance of twenty-five per cent of British work having been added, and thus entitle the goods to come in under the preference. The ingenuity of the trade will always take advantage of that, and I have no hesitation in saying that these regulations are open to the greatest possibilities of fraud on the revenue. I do not propose at this stage to continue the discussion and would not have said anything if the hon. Minister of Customs had not made some references himself to this point.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As there has been oil poured on the troubled waters, I propose now to move that the committee do rise, in order that I may discuss the ruling which you, Mr. Chairman, made a short time ago with reference to my right of appeal from your ruling to the Speaker. I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General,

who is a lawyer and an old member of this House, and also—and especially—the attention of the Finance Minister, to this point. I said that in all cases there was an appeal from the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, to the House. I was ruled out of order by you, Sir, and you quoted in support of your ruling clause 76 of the Orders of the House :

Questions of order arising in the Committee of the Whole House shall be decided by the Chairman, subject to an appeal to the House.

I, unfortunately, said that the appeal was to the Speaker. I had seen it a dozen times in this House, yea, twenty times, when the Chairman's ruling was objected to, the Chairman, perhaps, as on the present occasion, may have been at dinner, but he was called instantly from dinner and brought into the House for the purpose of deciding the question. I was overruled by you in the Chair, and you decided that there was no appeal to the Speaker in the Chair. I would like to know what the meaning of the rule is 'subject to the appeal of the House ?' Does not the House mean the House sitting with the Speaker in the Chair ? In confirmation of my interpretation of the point, let me draw to your attention the authority whom you quoted to prove that my contention was entirely wrong, and you will see that the quotation I make applies exactly to the question now under debate :

Questions of order arising in Committee of the Whole House shall be decided by the Chairman subject to appeal to the House, but disorder in the committee can only be censured by the House on receiving a report thereof.

Now, writing in reference to that rule, Bourinot says :

The first case of appeal to the House under this rule occurred in the session of 1885, but it has its grave inconveniences, since the House is called upon suddenly and without debate to decide a question of order which many of its members may not have heard discussed in committee and the result is, in the majority of cases, a political vote. Under all the circumstances the committee should hesitate before resorting to such an extreme measure. In such a case, it is for the Chairman of the committee to report in writing the point of order which he has decided, and the Speaker must then submit the matter to the House in the language reported to him, and put the question, 'That the decision of the Chairman be confirmed.'

And he goes on :

If it be found expedient in either House to refer a point of order to the Speaker, a member will move that the Chairman report progress and ask leave to sit again that day. When the Speaker has resumed, the Chairman will report that the committee wishes to be instructed as to the point in question. The House will then proceed to take the matter into consideration, and the Speaker having been requested to give his opinion will decide the matter in dispute ; then unless there is an appeal to the House against the Speaker's decision, the committee will resume its proceedings.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

Now, I wish to draw your attention, again Mr. Chairman, to my interpretation of the rules of the House, supported by Bourinot's remarks upon the procedure ; and I have no doubt that, upon further consideration of the question, and, after consultation with the Speaker, if you will be kind enough to ask his opinion, there will be no occasion for an hon. member again to be overruled in this committee on this point, for I think that the authority I have given clearly confirms my view and establishes it as the correct one in the premises. As this is a question of privilege, and a grave one, I would like to hear the government's opinion upon it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thought my hon. friend from South Lanark had accepted the suggestion that, as we had passed from the point then in discussion and taken up other matters, this question should be left in abeyance. He is aware that it is too late to make a formal appeal, because unless it is taken at the moment that the question arises, we are likely to be confused as to the precise point. I confess that, at the moment, with other matters that have been discussed, I have some difficulty in appreciating exactly what was the point which arose. At all events, he could not now take appeal against the decision. I think his own suggestion is a good one, that you, Mr. Chairman, might look into the matter and consider the point more at your leisure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This, I understand, is not brought forward for the purpose of making a formal appeal. But, as I understand you, Mr. Chairman, your decision was that in such a case as arose, the appeal was to the committee. Of course, we do not expect any chairman to be infallible in giving decisions, as he is called upon to give them, at short notice. But I think it is perfectly proper and highly judicious for the hon. member for South Lanark to call the attention of the Chairman to the rule and its interpretation showing that the appeal in such a case is, apparently, not to the committee, as I understood you to say, but to the House, the Speaker being called for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As I understood the point under discussion with the hon. member for South Lanark, it was as to whether the Speaker was bound to give an opinion. It would appear that, under the rule, the Speaker would decide nothing himself but would submit the case to the House.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg the hon. minister's pardon, the Speaker decides the point, and then if necessary, there is an appeal to the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My view of the rule is just as I put it and that is my view of the rule still—that the Speaker does

not decide the question, but that the appeal is to the House.

Mr. BELL. How can the Chairman hold that opinion in view of the rule that the hon. member for South Lanark has just read? It is an appeal to the House, but the House is not constituted until the Speaker is in the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule says:

Questions of order arising in Committee of the Whole House shall be decided by the Chairman, subject to an appeal to the House.

I would understand that to be an appeal not to the Speaker, but to the House, the Speaker putting the question to the House as it has been conveyed to him. I think my interpretation is perfectly correct.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I trust, Mr. Chairman, you will take the matter into consideration and will consult the Speaker. And, perhaps, at a later day, you may revise your opinion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am not of opinion that my interpretation is wrong.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, well, you are altogether wrong.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood, Mr. Chairman, that the rule you laid down, perhaps inadvertently, was that the appeal was to the committee. It seems quite apparent, from the rule and the interpretation by Bourinot, that the appeal is to the House constituted by the Speaker taking the Chair.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I withdraw the motion that the committee rise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We can get a decision again. I am perfectly satisfied, on looking into it that my decision is in accordance with the rule.

Shall this item be adopted?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What item, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Now, I want the committee to rule just here. When the committee decided to consider this matter item by item, did they intend that I was to keep the speakers to the consideration of the question in each item? The committee fails to support me when I try to keep the discussion within the proper limits. Now, I want to know just here if it is the will of the committee to discuss each of these items separately? If that be so, then the speeches must relate to each one separately. If it is understood by the committee that there is to be a general discussion upon the whole Bill, then I will know what to expect.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The opinion of the committee should not govern you at all, Mr. Chairman. The rules of the House and the proceedings laid down in such cases should be your guide. Never mind what the opinion of the committee is, because it would be impossible to know what it was at every moment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must differ with my hon. friend there, because the rules say that when a resolution consists of a number of items, it is for the committee to decide whether the resolution shall be discussed as a whole or item by item. But if the committee decide to discuss the resolution item by item, then they are to be restrained from going outside the particular item under discussion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The direction is positive that whether the resolution is discussed item by item or in the whole, the Chairman must be guided by the rules of the House of Commons, independent of the feeling of the committee of the moment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We had better keep the discussion to each item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are on item No. 2, about the composition of the board.

Mr. BELL. I presume a Bill will be found upon this resolution?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Unless the government are prepared to communicate their intention, to say what they mean by making a change in the composition of the board of customs, which is a difficult thing for them to do in the absence of a Bill, I do not see that we could discuss this section at the present time.

Mr. CLANCY. Before we assent to the resolution, we should understand what they mean. I think the Minister of Customs should now explain why he is seeking this change.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The intention is that the board of customs shall comprise in the future the commissioner of customs as chairman, and such other officers in the service as shall be designated or appointed by Order in Council. At present the board has upon it members from Vancouver to Halifax, and it is not convenient to summon them at all times when it may be desirable to have a meeting. It is really to get over that difficulty as much as anything else, that we propose this change. The powers of the board will be the same as before. Many members of the present board will, no doubt, continue to act in that capacity.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Who are the members of the board in Montreal?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Brossard is one, the hardware appraiser, Mr. Douglas, is one, and Mr. Andrews. Mr. Thompson, of Hamilton, is on it, the hardware appraiser in Toronto is on it. These

gentlemen generally attend here. I do not know that we would call the appraisers from Vancouver or Halifax. In addition to those I have mentioned, are Mr. McMichael, the chief inspector, Mr. Breadner, of the inside department, and Mr. Woods, another gentleman in the department.

Mr. BELL. What are the duties of the assistant commissioner of customs to be ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is stated in the Bill that he shall perform such duties as the Governor in Council and the minister may assign to him. Of course he will take the position of chairman, if the commissioner of customs is absent.

Mr. BELL. Is it the intention of the department to divide up the duties of the commissioner and to allot a portion of them to the assistant commissioner, or is he rather to be regarded as deputy of the commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He will only be an assistant. The commissioner will be the deputy head of the department. The assistant commissioner will only be an assistant to the commissioner.

Mr. MONK. What salary will he have ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am asking the House for $2,800. The commissioner gets $3,600.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Three or four days ago I got a letter complaining of the way in which duties are collected on salt. I was given to understand that the amendments are not followed in Hamilton as they are in Montreal. If I remember right, I was told that in some ports they charge a duty on the bags and not in other ports. Would that matter fall under the control of the board ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That would be a matter for the department to arrange, we should attend to that ourselves. There are complaints once in a while, and they are always looked into and rectified. We have to have a uniform rule. If it is stated at any port that they do not understand a rule in the same way as at other ports, a ruling goes out from the department to make the custom uniform. If a new article of commerce comes in which is not specifically mentioned in the tariff, and there is a question under what head it comes, then the board gives a decision. As I said before, when they arrive at a decision it is submitted to the minister, and when the minister signs it it has the force of law, except that there is an appeal to the Governor in Council.

Mr. KAULBACH. Is not the minister mistaken in regard to the salary of the commissioner of customs ? I understood it was only $2,800.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It was $2,800, then he got $800 as chairman of the board of customs. In the east this year I did not think it desirable to have it divided and I think the committee have already endorsed the recommendation that it be fixed at $3,600, the same as it has been in the past only it was put under two different heads. I saw no reason for that. I thought it looked better and that the commissioner was worthy of having his salary stated at $3,600. I am free to confess he is a cheap man at that money.

Mr. CLANCY. When the item in regard to the assistant commissioner was run through the committee I think the hon. minister then stated that in many instances he would take the place of the commissioner. In such a case does the assistant commissioner receive anything above the salary voted to him as chairman of the board of customs when he acts as such ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, it would be an exceptional circumstance that we should call a meeting of the board of customs during the absence of the commissioner. I do not recall anything that would occur to lead us to call a meeting of the board of customs when the commissioner of customs was away. I should want the commissioner to be there because it is important, and if he did preside he would not get any extra salary.

Mr. MONK. In answer to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) I understood the hon. Minister of Customs to say that the work of the assistant commissioner would be confined to performing the duties of the commissioner in his absence and of assisting him generally. If that is his duty it seems to me that the salary of $2,800 is rather a heavy salary to pay such an officer as that. It seems to me that for a much smaller amount you could get a man whose duties are simply those of a deputy.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That amount was determined upon because when, a few years ago, we had an assistant commissioner, that was the salary that was paid. When you remember that at some of our ports the collectors get $4,000, that the commissioner who is over the whole Dominion gets only $3,600, and that the assistant commissioner, who, in his absence will have to do his work, gets only $2,800, it will be seen that their salaries are not excessive.

Mr. MONK. A collector has large financial responsibility.

Mr. KAULBACH. The collector for the port of Lunenburg does not get the salary mentioned by the hon. minister. He is doing more work than any collector in the province of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, he does not get $4,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. The salary is so small that the man can hardly manage to live, and he is doing more work than any two, or three other collectors in the province.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Perhaps it should be increased.

Mr. KAULBACH. We are asking the hon. minister if he will not increase this collector's salary.

On section 3,

Mr. BROCK. In employing temporary officers in the customs do they pass a civil service examination ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not necessarily. If they become permanent officers they would have to pass the civil service examination save and except in one position; that is that of preventive officer, which is not required under the law.

Mr. BROCK. If, in view of the enormous business which is being done in the customs' houses all over the country, it is necessary at all to employ a man or men I think it would be necessary to employ them permanently. I think these temporary officers are expensive and inefficient, and that by the time they become efficient they get other employment, whereas, if you required them to pass a civil service examination and put them on the permanent list you would be much more likely to get good men.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock). We have what are called temporary officers who have been eight, twelve or fifteen years in the employment of the department and I would like to have them all on the permanent list if they could pass the qualifying examination. But, they are men who are up in years, who were appointed many years ago, and who could not pass the civil service examination. They could have passed it when they first left school. I have no doubt but they would hesitate to undertake it now and for that reason they are retained as temporary officers. In some cases we have appointed them to the only position we could without their passing the civil service examination, and that is to the position of preventive officer—but we like them to pass the examination in every case when they can.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). There is one point I want to explain and it is that no officer over thirty-five years of age can apply for examination under the Act. He must be thirty-five years of age.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is in the inside service.

Mr. CLANCY. How many temporary officers has the hon. gentleman ? He seems to be asking for authority to appoint temporary officers. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has in the service what may be termed temporary officers.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is in the outside service.

Mr. CLANCY. I quite understand that. In the outside service no examination is passed by persons who may be collectors or preventive officers. The hon. gentleman does not exact of those whom he makes collectors of customs that they shall pass an examination. I am not finding fault with the character of those who have been appointed, I believe they are efficient officers, but there are men of advanced years who could not pass the examination. In fact I believe it has not been the rule.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Collectors of customs have not under the law to pass the civil service examination.

Mr. CLANCY. Nor preventive officers ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Nor preventive officers. Appraisers pass a technical examination. You can understand that a man who has to value goods must undergo a technical examination, which takes place under forms set by the commissioner of customs. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman how many temporary officers we have, but we have a very large number in different places and some of them have been ten or twelve years or more in the service.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman wants authority to make them permanent officers in the outside service. Is that the power the hon. gentleman is asking for here ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No. We have been appointing temporary officers, as all governments have been doing. You could not work the department unless there was power to appoint temporary officers at times, because the need arises very suddenly. A man is placed on the temporary list to do the work that is required of him. We thought that the Act would be made clearer in reference to the appointment of them if the power to appoint these temporary officers was specifically placed in the Act. It has been done ever since confederation, it has been recognized as an absolute necessity and we are now just simply making it clear that the law gives its sanction to such appointments.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. gentleman propose to increase the number of temporary officers or do I understand that he simply wants to put himself right by taking power to do what he is at present doing but without authority or law ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Speaking of those temporary officers, while I know they cannot be made permanent under the Civil Service Act, yet at the same time steps should be taken with a view of placing them on a permanent footing in the service. There are a number of excellent officers in the customs service, and although many of them were appointed years and years ago and have continued in the employment of the government until they are passed doing anything else in life, yet they still remain in a temporary position. I do not mean to say that they should be given the annual increase in salary, but there should be some understanding that they are permanent officials. For instance, the present government have made a number of these appointments, and should a change of government take place these officials always feel uncertain as to their position. I believe that civil servants who have faithfully discharged their duties should not be subject to such a contingency. I believe they should be free from the whims of any political party and the government should consider some means of protecting that class of employees.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) says, but the Civil Service Act stands in the way.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there no way of getting over it; surely the Act could be amended.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any fixed scale of salary for the temporary officers in the employ of the government ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is no fixed scale, but there will be a provision in the Bill that we shall not appoint temporary officers at higher salaries than permanent employees receive in the rank to which they are appointed. The statutory increase does not apply to the outside service. Applications for increases of salary come in, and we have to give our best consideration to them. Under existing circumstances I think myself that we have officers in our employ who are not receiving ample compensation, and that is one of the reasons why I will ask the House for a larger vote for next year.

On section 4,

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman seeking by this clause to enlarge the power of the board, or is it to define existing powers that are considered uncertain ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. When the Board of Customs makes a ruling, that ruling has the force of law when signed by the minister. Suppose a ruling is given that an article should be only 20 per cent on which 30 per cent had previously been charged at different ports, then the parties could make claims on the department, or if the regulations were vice versa, the department would call upon the parties to make amended entries running back two or three years. This is to define that when a ruling of the Board of Customs is given, it takes effect at once and that there shall be no claim for refunds by the parties who have paid too much, or no claim by the government on the parties who may have paid too little.

Mr. CLANCY. Is not that unfair ? The customs officers through the country have the matter very much in their own hands. and the importers must pay such duties as are exacted. I should think that under the ordinary working of the Customs Act the cases would be rare in which the importer paid too little, because before he could get his goods he has to submit to whatever ruling the departmental officers may make. It seems unfair that in case a mistake was made the importer should have no means of recovering the excessive amount which he paid.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It might have that appearance on the face of it, but we have given this matter a good deal of consideration and I think the hon. gentleman will see that it is not so unfair as he thinks. If we said that we would not let them come upon us for refunds, but that we would call upon them to pay if the rate charged was too low, that would be unfair. But the rule works both ways and there will not be many cases in which the Board of Customs will give rulings contrary to what has been the usual practice ; although exceptional cases may occur. Suppose the Board of Customs should rule that the duty should have been 30 per cent when only 20 per cent was paid, and the department was to ask all the merchants to pay the extra 10 per cent, their reply would be that they only charged for their goods on the basis of a 20 per cent duty and that the department was in effect taking the money out of their pockets. On the other hand, if they have paid too high a rate of duty they would have put that duty on their goods when they were selling them and these goods would have been sold in all probability on the basis of the merchant having paid 30 per cent duty.

Mr. CLANCY. It does not change the nature of the grievance that the extra tax has been paid by the customers of the importer, rather than by the importer himself. The hon. gentleman is now imposing a burden upon persons who are entirely innocent, because they were subject to the rulings of his own department and they had no alternative but to submit to the mistake of the customs officers. Some cases may arise where it is not possible to have a general rule on the matter, but so far as it is possible we should not punish innocent persons for mistakes made by the customs officials. I do not think the hon. gentleman should

have such a law. Nobody should be made to suffer for inaccuracies committed in the Customs Department, without having an opportunity for redress.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) The rule is that when a person goes to a customs office to pass his entry, if there is any doubt about the duty to be paid, the article is sent to the appraiser to decide what the duty will be.

Mr. INGRAM. Is he an expert ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Yes, there are expert appraisers on hardware, medicines and everything else. In case the duty paid has been less than it should be, the merchant is asked to amend his entry; but if the duty paid has been more than it should be, an appeal is made to Ottawa and the excess is refunded to him. This has been the practice in Halifax, where I was collector of customs for fourteen years, till the Tories turned me out.

Mr. CLANCY. Suppose a man pays too high a percentage of duty, and no reference is made to it at the time, and it is not discovered for a long time afterwards, say six months. There may be many cases of that kind arising in which there is great room for hardship, and I think they should not have effect given them by an Act of parliament.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). In most instances there is too little duty paid rather than too much.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to know from the Minister of Customs what the meaning of the legislation is that he proposes to found on these resolutions.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I thought I had explained it already. What the hon. member for Victoria has said is correct, and covers the greater part of the question. If the rate charged has been too much, the case comes to Ottawa, and a refund is paid to the importer. If, on the other hand, it is discovered in the check branch that he has paid too low a rate, then he is required to make an amended entry and pay the balance. These cover the great bulk of the transactions. What this clause refers to is a case that may come before the board of customs. Such cases, however, will be very few and far between. These are cases in which there has been a certain ruling for a length of time, but when attention is called to it, the board of customs decide that the ruling has not been correct, and they lay down a correct ruling. In such cases no claims should come from parties who have paid too much nor any charge made against parties who have paid too little.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not the class of cases I call attention to. Suppose an importer pays say 30 per cent duty through the mistake of a collector when he should have paid 20 per cent. He makes no complaint or protest at the time, but six months later he discovers that he paid too much. How would the hon. gentleman deal with a case of that kind under the authority he is now asking to close the door ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If it is not a decision rendered by the board of customs his claim would be considered and he would get his refund. Suppose three or four or six months have elapsed. It is true, we may have taken money that we should not have taken, but that has not been a burden on the importer. The extra duty has gone into the price which the consumers have paid for the article, and it would be practically impossible to refund the excess to them. The importer has not lost anything as an individual. In these rare cases we do not propose to pay anything on the one hand or take anything on the other. If the hon. gentleman will think the matter over until the Bill is introduced, and still sees the objection he now refers to, we will discuss it further with him.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to ask one thing more. It seems to be the object of this legislation that the department will not be compelled to exact payment in such cases ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. BROCK. In another case, suppose you have charged too little duty, say 20 per cent when you should have charged 30 per cent, and the goods have been disposed of. It would be a great injustice to the merchant then to demand the additional duty because of a mistake having been made by the collector of customs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Quite so, and, if this clause passes, we should not be compelled to ask the man for the extra 10 per cent.

Mr. BROCK. That I think would be very fair.

On section 5,

Mr. CLANCY. Will that not lead to complication ? There are many cases in which some of these officers would not be able to convert the foreign currency into our currency.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They have tables for that. If goods are made say in Belgium, and purchased in Germany, the present law requires that the invoice shall be made out in the German currency. We are going to allow such invoices to be made out in Belgian currency.

Mr. HENDERSON. What does the hon. minister mean by 'further particulars shall be given in the invoices.'

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That will be more definitely explained in the Bill. I think it is to see that packages and other particulars are sufficiently mentioned in the invoice.

Mr. BROCK. I hope the hon. minister will see that there are no more complications than at present.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is to secure uniformity as much as possible in the invoices, and to give us sufficient information to know at once how that each invoice can be dealt with.

On section 6,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Suppose an article is made of different components. Suppose, for instance, it is made partly of iron and partly of brass, and there is a duty on the iron machinery of 25 per cent, and on the brass of 30 per cent. If only a small portion of the article is brass it will come in at the 25 per cent duty, whereas under the present it would have to be charged the higher rate.

Mr. CLANCY. Does this apply to that section of the Customs' Act which imposes a duty on unenumerated articles of 20 per cent. Or is the hon. minister making two classes of unenumerated articles ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The unenumerated articles which are charged 20 per cent, are articles that can come under no other definition, but there are certain articles which are not of this class, but which are composed of different component parts, each of which may be subject to a different duty.

Mr. CLANCY. I would suggest to the hon. minister to find some other name for the latter than that of 'unenumerated articles' or he will be confounding them with the unenumerated articles which are charged a duty of 20 per cent.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The Bill itself clearly explains the difference, and I do not think that there will be any confusion. The unenumerated articles referred to in this clause would be manufactured articles composed of two or more materials. For instance, an article might be composed partly of iron and partly of brass. In that case, it would have to come under one or other of these denominations. That having prevailed in the past the article would have to come in under the highest duty applicable to any of the materials of which it was composed—brass, iron or whatever it might be. Under this, it will come in as I said before, under the rate of duty on the article of which it is most largely composed.

Mr. CLANCY. How would the hon. gentleman determine a case of that kind ? It seems to me he is raising a very difficult question. Suppose an article composed of a number of different materials—iron, wood, brass, some silver, some lead—how can this be decided with any degree of accuracy by any collector of customs ? I doubt if even a customs board could do it. I would not offer an opinion, but, no doubt, the matter has been studied in the hon. gentleman's department. I believe it was found well to lay down an arbitrary rule covering articles of that kind, it being found impossible to come to a correct conclusion in each case. I am not opposing the hon. gentleman, but it seems to me he is getting into deeper water rather than reaching firm ground.

Mr. HENDERSON. Suppose an article were composed of 75 per cent of something that was free and the remainder of some article that had a duty of 25 per cent. In that case, I suppose the whole would come in free.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, no, we are not in the habit of letting anything come in free if it is composed of dutiable material.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of course, the Minister of Customs is proceeding upon the idea of a tariff for revenue. I want to assist him in carrying out his policy.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is not designed to go so far as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) suggested. The article would be dutiable. But, this is a new idea.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would come in under 25 per cent as unenumerated.

Mr. HENDERSON. This supersedes the unenumerated ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, it assists it, not supersedes it.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell the committee if he has been actually collecting the duties on the scale he proposes here, or whether he is proposing a new departure from the arbitrary rule of collecting 25 per cent on these articles as coming within the class of unenumerated.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are making a new departure, and we think, establishing a fair rule. Suppose that an article is composed one-tenth of a material which is subject to a duty of 30 per cent, and nine-tenths of a material which is dutiable at 30 per cent, it would be hardly fair to charge the whole 30 per cent.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is charging 20 per cent now under the unenumerated class.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, we are charging 30 per cent. These articles do not come in under the unenumerated class. An article is accounted unenumerated only when it cannot be classified under one or other of the headings. Articles composed of iron and brass, for instance, though not specially mentioned, are not counted unenumerated, but would be classed either as manufactures of iron or as manufactures of brass.

On section 7,

To extend the time for the submission for claims for refund, including claims for refund on account of damages.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Claims for refund now are required to be put in within ten days from the date of entry or they are shut out. It is thought that that is too short a time, and we propose to extend it to fourteen days from the date of entry or landing. Sometimes an entry is made even before the goods arrive. In many cases, merchants tell us : When these goods were brought into our warehouse, opened and examined, we found they were damaged, but the ten days had elapsed, and we could not enter a claim for a refund.

On section 8,

That importers may be relieved from the payment of duty on damaged goods abandoned in certain cases.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is new. If a man has a lot of goods coming in and they are so thoroughly damaged that they are not worth to him the amount of the duty, he may abandon them altogether, in which case we shall have the right under the law to take the goods and destroy them, charging the importer no duty.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would it make any difference how this damage was brought about, whether from fire or from careless handling on ship-board ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think this would cover cases of damage from whatever cause. The hon. gentleman will see that the object of the customs duty is to secure revenue on goods that go into consumption. If goods are damaged so much that the importer would rather abandon them than pay the duty, we would destroy them and they would not go into consumption. The question of damage would be a question for settlement between him and the parties who sent the goods.

Mr. CLANCY. Suppose the damage was caused by the transportation company from whom the importer could recover. He would abandon the goods, but he would receive the value of them from the transportation company. In that case, some person ought to pay the duty. If the damage arose in such a way that no person was liable, I could understand that the hon. minister's position would be a fair one, but not if the importer could recover the value of the goods. In that case, if the hon. gentleman proposes to relieve the parties from the payment of duties by their merely abandoning of the goods, he goes too far. If a transportation company damages goods, then they ought to be liable. Suppose a man, through carelessness in handling goods, damages them and they became of no value, would that be a reason for relieving him, if they were damaged through his own act ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman must not lose sight of the fact that the revenues we collect are on goods that go into consumption in Canada. If the goods do not go into consumption in Canada then we do not expect the people of Canada to pay anything. For instance, $1,000 worth of goods come into this country and go into a bonded warehouse and remain a year or two, they pay no duty, and they are exported to another country. Now this is what we propose : Here is a quantity of goods that are so damaged that the owner says, I will throw them out, I do not want them at all, I will give them to you instead of paying the duty on them. We take these goods, but we do not put them on the market, we destroy them. Now, these goods would have gone into consumption if they had not been destroyed, but after destroying them a like quantity of goods must come in to replace them. Look at it from the customs standpoint alone, the question of abandoning the goods is a question that may be considered with the transportation companies or others who may have damaged the goods; but so far as our revenue is concerned we only collect revenue on goods that actually go into consumption.

Mr. CLANCY. I remember a case with which the hon. gentleman is acquainted. I had paid duty upon goods entered for consumption, they were destroyed and never went into consumption. But the hon. gentleman collected a duty. I know of cases in which he has done it. I know of a case in which he came to this House and asked for a refund, he put an item in the estimates to refund to the person who had suffered a loss of that kind.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman has mentioned a case which illustrates this. A quantity of goods were destroyed at Montreal. Duty had been paid upon them, and before they got into the merchant's warehouse they were destroyed. They were in our custody. The present Act prevents us from giving him back his money as a refund. If he had not paid the duty we could not do it. If he had not paid the duty, then he would not be called upon to pay the duty, because the goods were not there. But he had paid the duty, the goods were there, and before he got them into his possession they were burned. We had the duty, but the law did not allow us to refund it. That case was one of so much hardship that I put a special item in the estimates to pay him back the money.

Mr. CLANCY. I am arguing in the hon. gentleman's proposition that no duty was supposed to be collected unless the goods went into consumption. Suppose a case where the man paid the duty, removed the goods to his own warehouse one hour after the duty was paid he took possession of them, and half a million dollars worth of goods were destroyed and never went into consumption, yet the hon. gentleman

would not think under such conditions of refunding the duty. But he based his argument that no duty is supposed to be collected on goods that do not go into consumption.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The expression 'entering into consumption' is generally understood to mean taken from the warehouse for that purpose. Once the goods are on the shelves of the merchant, I do not see how you can follow them there. The line has to be drawn somewhere, and the line is drawn between goods in the warehouse which have not yet entered into consumption, and goods taken out of the warehouse.

Mr. BROCK. In many cases where the goods are partly destroyed or injured, the way in which the customs deals with them is very fair, that is, they appraise the value of these goods and give a rebate equal to the damage that has been done.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is the case when they are wholly abandoned, we waive the whole duty. We destroy the goods, we do not put them on the market.

Mr. BROCK. That may apply to some kind of goods, say the goods are damaged or wet through, they still may have some value. Do you destroy those goods ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In that case the owner would not abandon them. We would give a proportion.

Mr. HENDERSON. Take a case of fruit coming from a long distance which had become entirely decayed and not fit for use. Would the law apply in that case ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In a case of that kind it would be a fair thing to say to the man, not only must you lose the fruit, but we will make you pay the duty on it, though it may never have entered the customs at all.

9. That the basis of allowance for damage on polished steel and other articles be changed.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The present law says that we shall only allow on an amount damaged over 50 per cent. We change that, and allow for a damage of over 25 per cent, the same as we do on other goods.

On section 10,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is the clause that covers what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) alluded to. As the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) has pointed out, after goods have left our possession and gone into the warehouse of the merchant, if they are burned, they are covered by insurance, while, if the goods are burned in our possession he has to pay the duty and we have no power to give it back to him without coming to parliament, because the insurance would not cover the goods on the wharf. If they are in the merchant's warehouse, in his possession, then, he has them insured, but if they are destroyed while in our possession before they have reached him and if he has happened to pay the duty upon them we are powerless to pay him back the duty. We propose to make power, if they are destroyed in our possession, to return the duty.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) would be able to enlighten the committee in this respect. Suppose goods were damaged by water on the ocean voyage to such an extent that the importer was ready to abandon the goods rather than pay the duty, and he had them insured against such damage and collected the insurance—that would be just the other case to which the hon. gentleman referred. In that case the duty ought to be paid.

Mr. MONK. Is it necessary to have an enactment for that purpose ? In case goods are destroyed upon which the duty has been paid in the custody of the customs, is it not a matter of right that the duties are refunded ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, we have not that power. We have to ask for a special vote to cover it, but we are taking that power now.

Mr. BLAIN. Suppose ten packages valued at $10 a piece were in the custody of the customs and the custom house was burned who would be responsible ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are at the owner's risk.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the government not be responsible ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. BROCK. The goods are all insured in transit from the time they leave Liverpool until they reach the warehouse. They are actually insured against all accidents from the time they leave Liverpool both on the voyage and while they are in charge of the customs; in fact until they are in the possession of the merchant.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would they be insured during transit after they had been landed in Canada ?

Mr. BROCK. Yes, they are insured in store, on the wharf and in the warehouse.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) the goods had been landed in the afternoon and that night before the merchant could transfer them to his warehouse they were destroyed. Therefore, there was no insurance on them

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This will be the section of the Bill that will deal with this matter :

Upon production of satisfactory proof to the Minister of Customs of the actual injury or destruction in whole or in part of any goods by accidental fire, or other casualty, while the same remained in the custody of the officers of the customs in any customs warehouse, or while in transportation in bond from one port of entry to another port of entry in Canada, or, while within the limits of any port of entry and before the same have been landed under the supervision of the officers of the customs, the duties on the whole or the part thereof so proved to be injured or destroyed may be abated or refunded; provided the claim be made within 14 days after the date of the casualty and that due appraisement be made of the goods so alleged to be injured, as soon as they can be examined.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Peel asks a question as to the responsibility for the loss of the goods themselves. They would be at the merchant's own risk.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, the goods themselves. We are dealing with duties only.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does it not seem reasonable, when the government take possession of a man's property and retains it for two or three days until the necessary entries have been made, that they should be entirely responsible for those goods? I think they ought to be liable to the individual for the property which they have in their possession.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The government are not warehousemen. Warehousing is a separate matter.

Mr. BROCK. The goods are insured even when they are in charge of the customs.

Mr. BLAIN. What I mean is this; supposing a poor man imports an article worth $10. That article is sent from New York and put in the customs-house at Ottawa to-night, it is in the possession of the customs and the importer cannot receive it. He could not possibly get possession of it and it is burned up to-night. Is it fair that that poor man should lose that article?

An hon. MEMBER. Get it insured.

Mr. BLAIN. An hon. member says get it insured. Ninety-nine out of every hundred of these small packages are never insured.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) says they are.

Mr. BROCK. I refer to importations of goods from England or elsewhere.

Mr. BLAIN. Here are ten small articles in the customs house, in possession of the government and they are burned up—should not the government be responsible? Is it right that these ten men should lose all their effects? Is it not fair that the government, holding these articles, should be responsible for them until the purchasers of them have an opportunity of getting them into their possession?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If that is true in regard to a small parcel, it would be a matter of principle that would apply equally to large consignments of goods in warehouse. The question is whether the government are to be responsible for the ownership of property simply because it is put in the warehouse, because the principle is the same. I do not see how you could hold the government responsible. The government simply acts as agent in passing these goods through the customs and in collecting the duty.

Mr. BROCK. If goods come in by mail and are lost, I do not think the government is responsible for them.

On section 11,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In this and the next section it will be found that we are simply taking these from the tariff Act. For convenience, as we are getting this up with a view to the Consolidated Revenue Act in the revision of the statutes, we are taking from the Tariff Act this and the next clause without change.

On section 13,

Mr. LANCASTER. What officers does the hon. member propose to vest with that power? I have had occasion to find that some officers—I do not say customs officers particularly—are very lax about the way in which they administer an oath. They seem to think that by the person signing a paper and saying: 'This is all right,' that they have done their duty.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the way the lawyers do.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, the lawyers do not do it in that way with all due deference to my hon. friend. There should be some discretion exercised in regard to the officers who are given power to administer oaths. Some officers, and not inferior officers either, are very lax in administering oaths, and if a charge of perjury were laid, the guilty person might escape because of some technical objection. I impress upon the minister that great care should be taken in the selection of officers to whom be given this authority.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. At present we have to get an Order in Council to appoint an officer for this purpose and we want to change that so that the Customs Department can of its own action appoint such a person. There will be just as much care exercised by the department as if these officers were appointed by an Order in Council.

Mr. HENDERSON. This only gives them power to administer oaths in relation to the Customs Act.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes

On section 14,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. At the present time the railway and steamship companies are charged for the extra service rendered by officers after hours. They have for years protested against that. Their argument is that the officers are there to protect the revenue of Canada and that the revenue of Canada should pay them. Where officers have rendered services outside of the hours between eight o'clock in the morning and six at night, we have charged the railway companies and steamship companies twenty-five cents an hour, and that money has been paid by them to the Receiver General, and it is checked out and paid through the collector of customs to the men who are entitled to it. I have never been able to find a satisfactory answer to the contention of the transportation companies that the government itself should pay its own officers. I might have said to them that you must have your business transacted at certain hours, but it is our duty to facilitate trade and commerce, and it would be unreasonable and out of the question to require them to run their trains between eight in the morning and six at night. They hold that it is our duty to collect our revenue and pay our own servants, and I must say that they appear to have the best of the argument on their side. The hesitancy about undertaking this before, was I suppose, because a minister does not wish to undertake an expenditure which will run into many thousands of dollars, but I have made up my mind to ask the House to sanction an appropriation that will enable us in the future to pay those men who are our servants and who attend to the duties that we require of them. We take power under this resolution, however, in cases where we consider that private interests and not public interests are served, to charge the private interests for the service rendered. For instance, if a railway company should ask that we shall have a man at Boston to examine baggage that is coming into Canada so that it may be bonded through, we would look upon that as being a convenience to the railway company and in such a case the railway company would be required to pay for the services of that officer.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who fixes the salary of an officer at Boston say.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The Customs Department fixes the salary.

Mr. INGRAM. I am bound to say that the Customs Department fixes a very small salary for some of these men in view of the arduous duties they have to perform. The government are bound to have officers on the frontier both day and night, but I do not think that the officers on the boundary experience as much hardship as some of those in the interior of the country. For instance, a pasenger is coming from the state of New York into Ontario, and he may arrive at any hour of the night and the custom officer may be obliged to be on duty. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Michigan Central at St. Thomas contribute something like $25 a month towards the pay of these officers, and to my mind that is a very small amount indeed. If the minster is going to remedy that, he will be doing right. Officers who are called out of their beds to perform duties for the country, should be better paid than they are now.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It was announced some time ago in the newspapers, that baggage coming into this country could only be sent in bond to certain points. For instance, persons coming from Chicago to the town of Smith's Falls, and checking their baggage to that point, find it detained at the border instead of being sent on.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the commissioner met the transportation companies a little time ago and discussed this matter with them. They were anxious to have the baggage examined at the frontier as far as possible, but there were certain other points fixed upon to which the goods might be bonded. The trouble arose in this way: Suppose the goods were coming to some place this side of Cobourg, which was not a port of entry; they could not be bonded further than Cobourg, and they would be held there to be examined. The party, having arrived at his destination, would miss his goods. It was thought most convenient to have them examined at the frontier; but in some cases it happened that while the goods should be stopped at Cobourg for examination, the railway company might let them pass on to the other point which is not a customs point at all. That was the reason of the arrangement between the commissioner and the railways under which certain points were selected where the goods might be examined.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I notice that in the list there were very few places to which trunks could be consigned. For instance, the town I come from is not in the list, so that a person coming there would have to have his baggage examined at the border, perhaps at midnight.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman's goods were not on the same train with himself, they would be sent on the next day.

Mr. MONK. Is this going to entail the appointment of a very large number of new officers?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think it will not entail any new appointments, but it will entail a large expenditure.

Mr. MONK. Will the service become much more expensive than it was before?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I think we can perhaps rearrange it so that it will not cost so much, but it will cost the country a good deal more, because we shall not have the revenue from it.

Mr. MONK. Has the hon. minister made an estimate of what amount this service will cost us ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think altogether it will cost very nearly $70,000, and I am not sure but that I may have to ask for $100,000 for it.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman propose to fix the compensation in each case for the officers of the department doing these additional duties, or does he propose to come down with a general scale so that the House will know what it is paying in each case ? I am not now complaining of the departure the hon. gentleman has made, because I think what he has stated has been a great hardship, and I see no reason why the change should not be made and the burden shifted to where it belongs, namely, on the companies. But the question is whether the hon. gentleman is taking power to deal with these cases at his own sweet will, or whether he will come down with some fixed scale.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It will not be at my own sweet will, though I suppose it will be pretty much as I wish. I should have to submit it to my colleagues, and obtain an Order in Council. Many years ago an Order in Council was passed, fixing the rate paid by the railway companies at twenty-five cents an hour, and in my judgment that is not too much.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that at the boundary line ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, wherever an officer is rendering a service. This extra amount is paid to the officer in addition to his salary. Take the port of Montreal, where we have to have men on the wharfs at night. These men get $500 a year, but they may make an extra $60 or $70 by doing extra service at night. The transportation companies now pay these men at the rate of twenty-five cents an hour, so that if we made a rearrangement, the men would go on doing the work they have been doing, but they would be paid by us instead of by the railway companies. We hope that we may be able to reorganize the department so as to economize a little. I do not think that a man who has to put in a day's work from eight a.m. to six p.m. can do his work efficiently if he also does night work, and I think we can reorganize that system and have men go on for certain hours and then be relieved by others.

Mr. MONK. In the United States, does the state pay for that service ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the United States bear the whole expense of the collection of their revenue by night and by day.

Mr. INGRAM. Where you have a night staff and a day staff, I do not see what necessity there can be for paying men overtime, unless in the exceptional case where a man on either staff happens to be ill and has to be replaced by one taken from the other staff. But the complaint I make has reference to ports of entry, where you have no night men. A man may come from New York state and have his trunk come to this port of entry. What he wants and what the railway company wants is that he should get his trunk immediately on arrival at the station, and have that trunk released by the customs officer. But if a regular man be called out of his bed to perform that service, he should receive extra pay. In the town of my county, that railway company have been paying at the rate of $25 per month for that service, and if the hon. gentleman will rearrange that kind of service and pay the men more money, he will be doing the proper thing.

Mr. CLANCY. Section fourteen of this resolution is very far-reaching. It gives the Governor in Council power to reduce the customs duties. At present he has power to remit the duties but not to reduce them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My hon. colleague the Minister of Finance pointed out in his budget speech that while the Governor General in Council had the power of taking off the duty altogether, he cannot reduce it. There are many cases in which the government might be disposed to reduce the duty in order to help the manufacturers of certain kinds of goods, but would not feel justified in remitting them altogether.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no hesitation in saying that this is a most unreasonable proposition. The government have now the power of remitting the duties, but only under certain conditions. They may place certain articles on the free list for certain purposes clearly specified, but without any safeguard of that kind the hon. gentleman proposes to take the power of reducing these duties and of practically fixing the duties, which this House ought to have the right to do.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not taking the power myself.

Mr. CLANCY. It amounts to the same thing. All the hon. gentleman has to do is to get an Order in Council, which his colleagues would certainly give on his representation, and the Governor General would not refuse to sanction such an Order in Council. I cannot conceive anything more dangerous than handing over to the Minister of Customs the power of fixing the duties at whatever rate he may think proper. I remember when it was proposed to give

the government the power to put goods on the free list, which were the composite parts of articles manufactured in this country, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and the hon. gentleman himself protested strongly against the proposition. But his proposition goes a long ways further. It was safeguarded with everything that was possible—certain conditions had to obtain before the minister could act. Now, he opens the gate as widely as he can and asks the right to reduce the duty on any article without asking parliament.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong. You will observe that this is a paragraph to be appended to section 245 of the Act, and it will be known as subsection 'U.' We have run down the whole alphabet already to and including 'T.' So, you have given the Governor in Council power—not myself—to make regulations for many things, for instance, for slaughtering cattle and grinding corn in bond.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the Governor General do it of his own will or by the recommendation of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The Governor in Council must do it.

Mr. CLANCY. But does the Governor in Council do it upon his own motion or upon the recommendation of the minister ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The recommendation in these cases probably comes from the Minister of Customs. Of course, it must originate somewhere. Under subsection 'L' which is now in existence, the Governor in Council has power to transfer to the free list articles imported to be used as material for Canadian manufacture. It is proposed here, with regard to the same class of articles, to allow the Governor in Council, instead of placing the articles on the free list, to reduce the rate of duty.

Mr. MONK. I do not think it is the same thing at all, I have not seen the section of the Act to which the hon. minister has referred. But I understand that in certain specified cases mentioned in the Act the Governor in Council may transfer articles to the free list, the cases being there specified.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not specified but classified generally—articles for manufacturing purposes.

Mr. MONK. But upon what ground and to what extent would the Governor in Council reduce the duty ? It gives large discretionary power.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not more than to-day.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. MONK. A great deal more, The Governor in Council can now place goods on the free list in certain classified instances determined by parliament.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is the same case, except that he reduce the duty instead of making the articles free.

Mr. MONK. Yes, but it is intended to increase the classes in which the duty may be reduced.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has spoken of certain well understood limitations which, he says, will not apply in this case. He has taken up this section fourteen and judges from it alone. But this is a mere draft statement of the substance of the Bill to be introduced. In conformity with the rule respecting measures of this character, these resolutions are first presented in committee. But these do not purport to set forth the details which will appear in the Bill. Every restriction which surrounds the placing of goods on the free list will surround the reduction of the duty. Surely, if the Governor in Council may be entrusted as at present, to make a free gift, they may be trusted to do something less than that.

Mr. LANCASTER. With all deference to the Minister of Finance, I would say that, in one case he is simply making certain goods free, but in the other case he is making a whole tariff. Parliament has fixed the tariff, but, under certain restrictions, has authorized the Minister of Customs or the cabinet, to allow goods to enter free to be used as material for manufacturing. That is a vastly different thing from parliament saying that the duty on a certain class of goods shall be for instance thirty per cent, but giving the government power to say to any particular class of manufacturers : Because we like you or for some other reason, we will let you have these goods at fifteen per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Taking my hon. friend's (Mr. Lancaster's) illustration—at present we can say : Because we like you, or for some other reason (quoting my hon. friend's words) we will let you have these goods, not at a reduced duty, but without any duty.

Mr. MONK. No, the cases are specified.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is mistaken, there is no change in the specification. The conditions will be the same in both cases. A manufacturer makes a proposition to us to transfer an article to the free list. We may feel that he is not entitled to have the goods free, for that is a great privilege, but that he makes out a fair case why the duty

should be reduced. We simply ask to be allowed to reduce the duty instead of making the goods free. How it can be argued that there is any extension of the power of the Governor in Council in this proposal passes my comprehension. If we have the power given us for the reasons specified to make a free gift, surely it is no extension of the power to say that we may give only part.

Mr. MONK. Suppose you want to increase the duty ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But that is not proposed.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely the hon. Minister of Finance will not contend that that is an answer. He proposes that the government shall have power which should rest with parliament alone, that of fixing the rates of duty. Whether goods should be entered at a lower rate of duty or should be free are two entirely different reasons.

An hon. MEMBER. Move it.

Mr. CLANCY. No, it may be moved at a later stage. What would be the effect of this ? The government have represented to the country that they have taken off some of the protective duties they complained of, and what have they given in return ? A lower rate of duty on some raw materials coming into the country. Parliament has thought right and has deemed it safe to give authority to the Governor in Council or to the minister, to come more nearly to the case—under certain conditions to make certain articles free of duty. Now, surely, if they give the minister or the Governor in Council—that makes no difference——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It does.

Mr. CLANCY. None whatever. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) presented an Order in Council and his Excellency refused to give it his assent he would resign. The hon. gentleman knows that his recommendations are passed—the passing of them is a mere formality. But I hope the parliament will not surrender to any party in this country the right to fix rates of duty. They may go a long way without abuse—I am not certain that it is not without abuse, though I think on the whole it has been—but there is no parallel between this special grant of power to make goods free under certain circumstances and a new departure in the form of legislation giving power to the Governor in Council to fix rates of duty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend were attacking the right of the Governor in Council, he would touch this question.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not doing that at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is where he is illogical. If he were attacking the right of the Governor in Council to deal with this matter at all, then I could recognize that at least he was basing his argument upon some principle. Now, it is well understood that the Governor in Council shall not be allowed to increase a tax, and it is not proposed to violate that principle. But suppose a manufacturer opening a new industry comes to us and says, I am using a certain article, and for the encouragement of this industry I would like to have it put on the free list. We say, no, we cannot do that, the duty is a considerable item, we don't want to lose it, and we do not think you have made out a good case. Your industry has already a certain tariff advantage, and if we give you free materials in addition to that, you are getting an undue advantage. But he may say, I cannot carry on my industry on these conditions, can you not give me some concession ? Then the Governor in Council shall have power to say: No, though we will not give you that thing absolutely free, we will give it to you at a lower rate of duty. If parliament is the only body to be entrusted in the one case, it is the only body to be entrusted in the other. Every condition is the same, and if it is wrong to give the Governor in Council power to reduce a duty under these precise conditions, surely it is equally wrong for parliament to give the government power to make the article free. My hon. friend would say to the manufacturer : No, we cannot give you that at all. Now we might get a considerable revenue out of that, but by the course proposed by the hon. gentleman we would be obliged to sacrifice the whole revenue and make it free.

Mr. INGRAM. You are dealing with an article that may enter into manufacture.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose the manufacturer is making a class of goods upon which he has a duty of so much; would the government step in by Order in Council and say : We think the duty is too much, and we are going to pass an Order in Council to reduce it again ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have power to-day to ask to make it free, and under the proposed amendment we will take power to say to him : No, we cannot give you all that advantage, but we will help you by reducing the duty. My hon. friend's objection would oblige us to give him the whole thing.

Mr. INGRAM. No, I say it is too much power to put into the hands of the Governor in Council. In the matter of the tariff, a manufacturer establishes his business on the understanding that he is going to have so much protection. Then I say in justice to that man no power outside of parliament should be allowed to interfere with that duty, and that interference should only take place at the session of parliament. But if, in the manufacture of his goods, he is using

a certain class of raw material upon which there is a duty, and that is not interfered with by any other manufacturer, then it might be proper to reduce the duty on the raw material.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not on the raw material, but on the material.

Mr. INGRAM. What I object to is that when we frame a tariff it ought not to be interfered with by Order in Council. The hon. gentleman spoke about the will of the minister. Suppose you dislike the manufacturer, suppose you want to take him by the throat and say: Unless you do so and so we will reduce the duties?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a proposal to reduce the duty on some article, not necessarily raw material, that he is going to use. Now if a man comes and asks us to give him some concession with regard to an article not made in Canada, and where there could be no question as to its affecting any other industry, we will be able to help him, but it might be too much to give him absolute freedom. Instead of that, we reduce the duty, and the hon. gentleman thinks we are enlarging the power of the government. If he will contend that the Governor in Council should not have power to touch the tariff question at all, there is a principle in that. But if a manufacturer desires a certain privilege and we have power to make an article absolutely free, how do we enlarge our power by being able to say to him: No, we won't make it free, but we will lower the duty.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose a manufacturer establishes a business on the idea that he is getting so much protection, and the government, between the sessions of parliament, steps in and passes an Order in Council to reduce the duty on that particular article, which might drive him out of the business. I say that power should only belong to parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have now the power, every government has had it, to put that article on the free list, though it may have the effect of driving the manufacturer out of business. Where is the difference?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, and that is what I hold is wrong, making it absolutely free without the consent of parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a consistent position, but that is not the position of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. CLANCY. Suppose a manufacturer is making a certain class of goods, and he says that his goods have been driven out of the markets by the hon. gentleman, who is a free trader, not giving him adequate protection. The hon. gentleman says he is aiding that manufacturer less by giving him a reduction of duty than by making the article free. That would seem a very rational argument, but in appearance it is all wrong. The hon. gentleman must justify himself when he puts the article on the free list in the public interest. But according to his own theory, if he reduced the duty partially instead of giving him additional protection, how can he argue that he is doing it in the public interest? This is giving such a power to the hon. minister that we might just as well relieve him of the necessity of coming down to the House and asking the House to fix the duties on any article which may be brought into this country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may be obtuse, but I cannot see the force of the hon. gentleman's argument. The procedure in both cases is precisely the same. You can only do this by Order in Council. I do not object to the contention that it means the Minister of Customs, because we pay great respect to his recommendations. It has to be done in the usual way, the minister has to make a report to council, council must pass judgment upon it and the decision must be published in the 'Canada Gazette.' That condition which exists now in respect to placing an article on the free list must continue to exist in respect to reducing the duty.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not the point.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not quarrelling with the hon. gentleman as to who does it, or the form in which it is done. Our contention is not in respect to the way in which it is brought about. This is going a long way in the direction of giving the government power to legislate by Order in Council, to take certain articles from a fixed duty and place them on the free list. This additional power is going too far and is placing a weapon in the hands of the government that should never be wielded by any government I care not which party may be in power.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not asking additional power; we are asking a lesser power than we have now.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the hon. gentleman is asking for a power that he will exercise very much more than he would exercise the present power.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I really do not think so.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now, the minister at all times requires to have a revenue. He hesitates about placing an article on the free list because he knows he is going to lose the revenue that would accrue from that article. That alone would restrict him very much in the exercise of this extraordinary power which has been placed in the hands of the government for so many years. It is an extraordinary power and

perhaps in that we have made a mistake. It may be desirable to go back the other way, to undo something we have done, but in regard to the partial reduction of duties, the minister may say: I want revenue; here is an article on the list which pays 25 per cent. There is very little of that article coming into the country under a 25 per cent duty; I will reduce it to 15 per cent to meet the views of this manufacturer and I will get a good deal more revenue out of a 15 per cent duty than I will out of a 25 per cent duty. Hence, I fear that power, if it were for nothing more than the purpose of getting revenue, may be exercised a great deal more than the present power of putting an article on the free list. The government would have an incentive if they wanted revenue to make these reductions which perhaps would be altogether contrary to the wishes of parliament. There is a strong point in this and I think it is well that it should be thoroughly considered before we embody it in the law.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I agree that the subject is important and before the Bill to be introduced reaches its final stage, there is no reason why it should not be reconsidered. There is no disposition on the part of the government to exercise that power frequently and although the hon. gentleman describes this power as an extraordinary one I think he will find that not only by this government but by all governments it has been used very sparingly, and I am sure it will continue to be used very sparingly and only for good reasons.

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly, at this hour of the morning I have no intention of inviting further discussion on the preference tariff subject, but I do wish to make an appeal to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) regarding one of the gentlemen who was referred to, the author of one of the declarations that was presented to the House tonight. Mr. W. Trant, of Regina, is a reputable gentleman and has like all of us a reputation to uphold. The reference that was made by the hon. member for Peel to Mr. Trant was, to say the least a very disagreeable reference——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid I will be compelled to prevent this discussion from being reopened.

Mr. SCOTT. I beg to move that this committee——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The committee have agreed to abide by each resolution and to discuss the question there submitted. I am bound to carry out their behest.

Mr. BLAIN. I have no disposition to modify. All I can say is that I would desire with a great deal of pleasure to have an opportunity of repeating this statement again.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 174) to amend the Customs Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, is it open to me to make a statement on this motion?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, it is not regular on a motion to adjourn to make any statement. A discussion can be brought up on a motion to adjourn when it is proposed by a private member during a sitting of the House, but when we come to the adjournment the only question which is open for discussion is as to whether the House shall adjourn or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) can find other opportunities to revive the discussion if it is thought necessary, but I think it is not expedient on this motion.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. Minister of Finance give us the order of business for to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will proceed in Supply with the remaining items of the estimates of the Department of Public Works, excepting one, which, by arrangement with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), will be held over, and after that with those of the hon. Minister of Justice or of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence as may be found the more convenient—with those of the hon. Minister of Justice if he is able to be present, but if he is absent, with those of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice to the hon. Minister of Finance, that, when he moves the House into Committee of Supply to-morrow, it is my intention to introduce a resolution dealing with the participation of Dominion Civil Servants in elections about to take place in Manitoba.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.15 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 15, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 175) respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.—Mr. German.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

That on Monday next, Public Bills and Orders, if not reached earlier, be called as the first order at 8 p.m.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT FOR HOLIDAYS.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, the 20th instant, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, the 26th instant.

He said : The reason for this motion is no doubt familiar to the House. There will be a holiday on May 21st—Ascension Day, and another holiday on May 25th—Victoria Day. As there would be only the one business day, namely, the Friday, intervening, it has been suggested to me that under the circumstances it would be preferable that the House should not sit on Friday, and that the adjournment should be for the time mentioned in the motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. The Ottawa 'Citizen' of this morning contains the following :

In the talk which followed Mr. Talbot, of Bellechasse, was indiscret enough to interject a gratuitous sneer at Mr. Blain who by the way of retort made indirect reference to a story which Mr. Talbot resents allusion to as an insult of the most exasperating kind.

A little further down I read :

'It is no smaller than you are,' Mr. Onésiphore Ernest Talbot called out.

'That's another small member,' Mr. Blain retorted hotly ; 'Let him look after certain small things that crawl upon him.'

Some members tittered ; others looked aghast ; but nobody said anything, though doubtless many were reminded of the scene of a few sessions ago in which the heated disputants over a somewhat similar remark were the same Mr. Talbot and the late N. Clarke Wallace.

I may add, Mr. Speaker, that this morning I had an interview with the reporter of the 'Citizen,' Mr. MacLeod, who was in the gallery last evening, and Mr. MacLeod has promised me that he will rectify this article. Now, I appeal to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), and I ask him, as I do not see these words in 'Hansard,' if it is true that he uttered them ?

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, I would just say, in reply, that I took part in the debate before the committee last evening, that the hon. gentleman was present in the Chamber throughout the whole debate, that whatever statement I made then I stand by, that I have nothing to retract, and that I am not responsible for the items that appear in the Ottawa paper nor in any other paper, and in taking that position I have good authority in the references that have been made this session by some of the cabinet ministers.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I must in justice to myself say that the words which have been placed in my mouth by this paper were never uttered by me, and I have no means of knowing whether or not the hon. gentleman used the words attributed to him by the paper. But if he did use these words I think it devolves upon him as a gentleman to take them back. He is the last man in the world to whom I would have directed a word of rebuke or anything of an insulting nature. I have always had the greatest respect for the hon. member for Peel, and I cannot understand how I could have drawn upon myself expressions of this kind from him; and I think it devolves upon him now to withdraw these words. If he does not wish to withdraw them, of course he is not obliged to do so; and if he does not, I wish him to say now what he means by them.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is not desirable to enter into a discussion of this matter. The hon. gentleman, so the newspaper tells us, if he wants to be quoted by the newspaper, sneered across the House at the member for Peel.

Mr. TALBOT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. What I said was not any sneer at all. I said : 'What a storm in a teapot.' These are the very words I used.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman wanted to attach the story of the teapot to myself, and I retorted by a reference to a story which is well known throughout the country in regard to the hon. gentleman. If he says it is not correct, he knows more about it than I do.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame, shame.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentlemen need not worry about it. If they want to give a better explanation of the story than I can, they can have the floor. I have nothing to add to what I have said. I have no disposition to cast any reflection upon any hon. member of this House. Those who have sat in the House during the three sessions that I have been here, know that it is not my mission here, as I said last night, to cast any reflection on any member of the House, and I have not done so. But if the hon. gentleman commences a discussion in the committee and makes statements which seem to me to be incorrect, whether they are or not, I cannot tell—then he will have to suffer the consequences if I correct them.

CELEBRATION IN THE COUNTY OF ELGIN.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to thank the Prime Minister for allowing us to adjourn during the latter part of next week; because in the county which I have the honour to represent along with my hon. friend Mr. Ingram, we are to have a grand celebration at the city of St. Thomas from the 21st to the 25th, and we expect the members of the House to come up to the county of Elgin and assist us. On the 21st of this month it will be a hundred years since the first tree was chopped down in my constituency by Col. Talbot, and I wish the members of this House to come up and assist us to celebrate that event, and see the fair women and stalwart men that we have in the county of Elgin.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. T. EARLE (Victoria, B.C.). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries about the correspondence in reference to the lease said to have been given for the Vancouver False Creek.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The lease has never been granted.

Mr. EARLE. There was an Order of the House passed asking for the correspondence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was not aware. The correspondence will be brought down.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders are called, I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following passage in the speech from the Throne at the commencement of this session :

> The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

As nearly nine weeks have passed since the commencement of the session, and as there have been rumours from time to time of the appointment of that commission, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether any commission has yet been appointed, and if not at how early a date we may expect the appointment ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The principle of the commission has been assented to, and it has been referred to the Department of Justice to be drafted, and I expect it in a short time.

SUPPLY—'RAGGING' IN THE BRITISH ARMY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief reference to a despatch from London of the 12th of May, which deals with a question which I apprehend will be one of great interest to Canadians, and refers to an abuse which I think ought to receive some notice from this House. The despatch is as follows :

> A court-martial is in progress at Dublin against certain officers of the 21st Lancers. They are accused of 'ragging' a brother officer, Lieutenant Willows. Lord Roberts is in Dublin to-day and is especially interesting himself in the trial. Williams is a colonial ranker who gained his commission through heroism displayed in the South African war. He takes his profession seriously. His brother officers ragged him first because he had risen from the ranks, and secondly because he is a colonial. This kind of a scandal is common in many regiments where commissions are held by colonial rankers. The ordinary English officer considers the army a social preserve and not a public service.

With regard to this matter, we have from time to time accounts in the press of affairs of this nature. We have the fact revealed that among the aristocratic officers in the British army, there is not only prejudice against men risen from the ranks, but a double prejudice against men who have risen from the ranks and are colonials. This prejudice develops into violent action towards these officers. There are cases where they have been subjected to the most shameful indignities and violent treatment, and where such treatment has been visited upon them, not because they are not military officers worthy of the positions they hold, but because they do not belong to a certain grade of the aristocracy, because they are not patricians. We find that Britishers seem to have bowed to the circumstances and resigned themselves to this kind of usage without making much fuss about it, but I apprehend that colonials will hardly take this treatment with as much complacency. I do not think it is out of place to call attention in the House to this matter, and I desire to put on record my protest, as an individual member of parliament and a Canadian citizen, against the treatment meeted out to our fellow colonials in the imperial service. The best blood of the country, the most successful business men, the ablest public men, professional and military, have come from the middle classes. These classes have always outstripped those above and those below them, and surely no policy should be tolerated that discriminates against men who owe their promotion not to social influence, but to merit and bravery. I can conceive of no greater outrage to an officer like Lieutenant Willows, who owes his commission, not to social influences but to distinguished bravery in the British service in South Africa, than the 'ragging' to which he was subjected by the patricians of the 21st lancers. All history gives us

information and experience as to the value of the class of men who rise from the ranks The great marshals of Napoleon, the great soldiers, the men whose fame spread over the world, were men who came from the ranks because of their intrinsic qualities, because of their superior capacity, demonstrated in the field of practical experience, and that is the place to demonstrate whether a man possesses the qualities that will make him famous or not. These qualities are not due to the fact that he happens to belong to the aristocracy, that he happens to be the son of a duke, of an earl, or of a lord, but are brought out in the crucial test of active military duties. In the civil war, which made the United States a great military nation, the most famous names in that struggle, with the exception of a few West Pointers, were those of men who had risen from the ranks. And even these graduates of West Point were boys, selected from the middle class, recommended by their respective members of congress, and sent to that military academy, from which they graduated and entered the army. There is no other military service in the world, I venture to say, where the conditions in the respect I have mentioned, are such as exist in the British army. There is no other military service in which a man who receives a commission because of merit and bravery will not be accepted as a proper companion for those whose social standing is a little better than his own. The British army, in my opinion, should be made a fighting machine and not a social preserve. It should not be a place intended to afford positions to patricians, where they may lord it over those below them, but should be made a fighting machine composed of the best material obtainable, and if it were, the British army would be the best in the world. If anything would detract from this and render it less efficient, it is the kind of thing described in this despatch which I have just read. A few weeks ago, the death occurred of a 'ranker,' one of the bravest of the brave, a man who had acquired as enviable a military reputation as any man who ever belonged to the British army. I refer to the late General Sir Hector Macdonald. True there were charges made against him, but the charges were never tried and the law supposes him to be innocent until proved guilty. He had a brilliant military record, yet he was treated in a manner a little better than shameful, so far as the authorities were concerned. His treatment was due largely to the prejudices of the British aristocratic classes against men who have come from the ranks and who belonged to the middle classes and not to the patrician order. When we talk of imperial unity and hear arguments in favour of imperial defence, when we are asked to tax ourselves for that purpose, I would like to ask what influence will be exerted in favour of such a line of policy by the treatment given to Lieutenant Willows and, in numerous other instances, to colonials who have risen from the ranks? If the British people expect Canada to fall in with their views on imperial unity and to aid in the defence of the British empire, they will have to see that in the army fair play be made the rule, that merit be recognized as it should be, and that colonists should have their sons, who have gained promotion in that army through their merits, placed on the same social grade, as the best men in the British army, so far as blood is concerned. Our people will resent this outrage perpetrated on an independent colonial citizen by imperial officers because forsooth he is not a patrician. I have a right to protest as an individual, and I do so in the hope that my protest may be heeded, because a perpetuation of this kind of treatment to which I have referred, will have an effect most lamentable, so far as the relations of the colonials and the motherland are concerned.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). I did not know that my hon. friend intended bringing this matter up, or I perhaps would have been a little better prepared to say something with reference to the particular case to which he has referred. But I cannot help taking the view at the outset that my hon. friend has departed somewhat from the sound doctrine which he laid down in this House, not very long ago, namely, that we had perhaps enough to do in attending to our own business without interfering with that of the imperial parliament. It seems to me, if the exception which he took on that occasion was good, it would be very much stronger in the case which he has brought up to-day, which is purely a case of discipline within the British army itself, with which we can possibly have nothing to do. However, I may refer briefly to what my hon. friend has said. There is no doubt that in certain aristocratic regiments of the British army, there is a strong prejudice against what are called rankers, or men who rise from the ranks. I do not think, however, that that is at all general throughout the British army, nor do I believe that the prejudice is any stronger against the colonial ranker than any other. The hon. gentleman has intimated that Canadians have not received fair play in the British army. I do not think that that is a fair statement. Let us look at men in the British army, distinguished Canadians like Girouard who, in South Africa was placed in one of the most responsible positions in the army, being the right-hand man of the commander-in-chief for a long time during the concluding months of the war. I might mention many other Canadians, not only graduates of the Royal Military College, but men who have gone from the active militia of this country, and have been treated fairly in the British army, and from whom no complaint whatever has been

heard. So, I think it is hardly fair to charge that there is a determination, a preconcerted determination, on the part of British officers or the British authorities to place Canadians who become officers of the British army at a disadvantage as compared with officers born in the British islands. I do not think that is the intention of the British authorities, and it seems to me only fair that I should make that statement here.

SUFFERERS FROM FIRES IN THE OTTAWA VALLEY.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). (Translation.) I wish to call the attention of the government to the destruction caused by fires in the valley of the Ottawa, and more particularly in the county of Labelle. The poor settlers who have been burnt out are now deprived of all the necessaries of life for themselves and their families. All has been destroyed, their dwellings, their barns, their agricultural implements. I do not mention the minor losses sustained by several other people, through the destruction of hedges or of live stock in the pastures.

I think I am not mistaken in saying that the government granted relief to the sufferers of Russell county, a few years ago, when great fires devastated that region. It is also to my knowledge that we voted large sums for the relief of the sufferers in the great Hull and Ottawa fire. I hope the government will deem it as reasonable, in the present instance, to grant assistance to the sufferers from the fires in the valley of the Ottawa.

These unfortunate settlers are in a most lamentable position. They have lost all their property at the very time when they were the least capable of facing such a contingency. Most of them settled on these new lands not more than four or five years ago, at the cost of great sacrifices. They opened up roads, cleared their lands, built houses for themselves ; but as yet they have not reaped any benefit. As a matter of fact their position is almost a desperate one. If the public do not extend relief, many of them will have to abandon their farms. It is stated (and truly, I think), that a contented settler is the best colonization agent that could be found. It is, to my mind, equally true to say that a disheartened settler is the worst enemy of colonization. The public are, therefore, interested in relieving at once the really grievous condition in which these settlers are, not only with a view to helping these poor people out of the calamity which has befallen them, but also with a view to preventing the exit of settlers which is threatening this region. To my mind it is the only means whereby settlers in these parts, after having sustained such great losses, may be induced to remain on their farms.

We are making constant sacrifices to promote and develop the settlement of the North-west Territories. I do not object to that ; but it seems to me it should not make us lose sight of the condition of the settlers in the older provinces. We are going to great expenditures with the object of attracting to our country immigrants from various European countries ; we are helping on foreign immigration. With still more reason should we endeavour to prevent our own people, those who have made sacrifices to open up new lands, from leaving the country, as this contingency would soon have its counterpart in another, just as sad, by discouraging those who would otherwise have been disposed to settle on, and clear, our new lands.

I trust, therefore, that the government will tender some assistance to the relief committees organized for the purpose of helping the sufferers from the fires in the Ottawa valley.

The PRIME MINISTER (The Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier(. (Translation.) The question brought up by my hon. friend is surely one not only worthy of the consideration of this House, but appealing very strongly to its sympathy. However, I cannot give rise to expectations which circumstances would not permit the government to fulfil. I for one would most happily comply with such request ; but on the other hand, I do not wish to entertain hopes which it would be impossible for the government to satisfy. No doubt, these poor settlers, so grievously stricken, are worthy of help and protection. However, so many applications of a similar character would be forthcoming, were we to accept this one, that I fear we will find it extremely difficult to comply with the very legitimate wish expressed by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa).

'RAGGING' IN THE BRITISH ARMY.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Would the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) be good enough to express his views on the subject brought up by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That has been amply answered by the Minister of Militia (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). The subject brought forward by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has no reference to this other matter.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I understand that.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am satisfied with the answer given by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I must say, for my own part, that I think

we should not pass over the matter introduced by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in such a way as to leave the impression outside of this House, and perhaps with the mother country, if the incident be noticed there at all, that this House, or the members of this House, or the Canadian people, look upon the system generally described as 'ragging' with anything like favour. I think it is quite proper that the Minister of Militia (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) should have made the remarks he did, so as to guard this House, and, I presume the members of the House generally, from any imputation of charging misconduct generally against the officers of the British service, or any class in the British islands. As I understand it 'ragging' is not a matter of regular discipline, but rather a system of punishment established by the mess or by the association in connection with the mess of a regiment, a sort of club constituted of the officers of the regiment, which undertakes to impose punishments for infraction of the arbitrary rules which it undertakes to enforce. And these punishments take an insulting and belittling form, as I have learned. Generally speaking, the great interest in this matter for us is the fact that there is a large—and likely to be larger—number of young and educated Canadians, very largely educated and trained at the expense of the Canadian people, who are passing into the British army, and taking their places there as commissioned officers. There is a provision, as I understand it, under which His Majesty gives a certain number of commissions regularly to the graduates of the college we maintain. So, I think, Canadians are interested in seeing to it that the men whom we send there, who, so far as mental ability, courage and professional qualifications are concerned, are we believe, at least the equals of the officers born in the British islands—we should see to it that these gentlemen are treated as gentlemen when they go into the British service; and, if they are not so treated, we should give the impression to the people of the British islands that we have no sympathy with the system of absurdities and nonsense that interferes with proper military discipline. Therefore, I think it would be unfortunate to allow this matter to pass as though the people of Canada had any sympathy with such absurdities. From what I have seen in the press and heard in conversation with soldiers from South Africa, where our sons fought side to side with the British regulars and under British officers, I have gained the impression that, though our men have come back with a highly developed respect for 'Tommy Atkins,' on the other hand, many of them have formed the opinion that the British officer is not the man he ought to be, if the British army is to continue to be what it has been. The British private has courage, and all the qualities that have given us our extraordinary military record. But, as I gather from the reports in the newspapers and from what I have been told by returned soldiers, too much is the officer given up to sport, too much is he attracted by social considerations, and too much is he influenced by the official rank. As citizens of Canada, and of what is unquestionably, next to the mother country, the greatest partner in the imperial federation which we hope to see accomplished, which we hope to see go on from one stage of accomplishment to another, we have a direct interest in the efficiency of the British army; and I think it is not out of place that we should, in a case of this kind, where a brother, a friend, a fellow countryman is affected, state that, so far as we are concerned, we look with great disfavour upon the system which is called 'ragging,' and are inclined to regard with a great deal of displeasure any instance in which its indignities are inflicted upon a Canadian.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is not my intention to take up much of the time of the House in dealing with this subject. I had expected an utterance from the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) upon this subject. He gave us a lecture the other day which, I think, has not very much pleased either himself or the general public. I must say I heartily endorse the views expressed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell). Now, 'ragging' in the service, as I understand it, is as it has been defined by the hon. member for Pictou. But there is more than that, there is this social ostracism, there is forcing the men to follow certain lines and ways. I want to tell this House that this is not by any means a colonial complaint, it is a complaint on the part of the best men in the British service, sons of the highest noblemen who have entered the service with a desire of becoming proficient in their profession, so that in case they should ever be called upon to do duty for their country they would be as well posted and as efficient as possible. But the social etiquette—I think that term will include the entire cause of complaint—is such that it prevents a man from devoting his attention to the service; and as a consequence, men who have gone into the service with the highest ambition to be a credit to their country have left the army broken hearted. Their high spirit would not stand the humiliating mode of social life that these officers have unfortunately to lead. Of course we know that these officers as a rule have very little to do. The best men are either lost to the service entirely, or they have to fall in with the current custom which is in vogue in the army.

The Minister of Militia has referred to the Canadians who have risen in the service. I am glad, Sir, that Canadians have risen in the service, but it is chiefly in the engin-

eers. I want to point out that the custom of ragging cannot prevail in the engineers department because there is no regimental etiquette or mess among these. Those faults we find belong chiefly to the cavalry regiments. But we do not find in the engineers' corps anything like the mess service or the regimental esprit de corps which you find in others. I shall not enter into a detailed discussion of that matter to-day, but I want to point out that the complaint does not come from colonials alone, but from the best men in the British service.

There is another matter of much importance to us colonials. We send our officers over there for training. I do not know whether we always pick our best men; I presume it is rather difficult to get a good man to settle down into a military life in a country like Canada. But whether we pick the best men or not, it is unfortunate that Canadian officers—and I wish the Minister of Militia to make a note of that and examine into it, I do not want him to take my word for it—but I say it is unfortunate that Canadian officers who have gone into training in the imperial service, or who are in our permanent corps, seem as a rule to adapt themselves to the objectionable features of the regular service, and do not become sufficiently posted on important matters of their duty. I want to say that the customs of the British service undoubtedly reflect upon ours. These improper customs are not peculiar to the British service. We find the tyranny of the German service infinitely greater than that of the British. Why, only the other day, the press of the coun try was filled with a story where a young German officer meeting a non-commissioned officer and not considering himself properly saluted, shot the non-commissioned officer, and he has been upheld by the German Emperor himself, I understand. Why, Sir, any such condition of affairs in the British dominions would bring on a revolution inside of an hour, and rightly so. If the King of England even endorsed any such attitude on the part of the officers, there would be a republic proclaimed throughout the British dominions before twenty-four hours were over.

Mr. FRASER. Not as long as you and I were here.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am afraid I would not be able to cover my hon. friend. My proportions are not sufficiently broad a shelter to my hon. friend, either in advance or in retreat. Reference has been made to South Africa. It is a well-known fact—and I have shown, and I trust will show again. that I appreciate the British army as highly as any man should appreciate an army—but I want to point out this fact, that when Canadians went to South Africa, when colonials of all sorts went to South Africa, while Canadians did splendid service there, and while the Canadian soldier, I think, was the best man in Africa, still I must say that the Australian and the New Zealander, officer and man, was considered ahead of him, taking them altogether. I had a very good opportunity of knowing that the New Zealand officer and the Australian officer was better individually than the Canadian officer, taking them man for man. But the point I wish to make is this, that when the colonials went to South Africa it was never the intention that they should see fighting—we might as well understand that. It was a very short time before the colonials were raised and sent to South Africa, that the highest officers in the British service in the colonies, informed the Prime Minister of Canada and informed the British government that colonials in the imperial service would be a 'menace' to their armies in South Africa, that is the word, would be a 'menace' to British arms in South Africa. When the colonials reached South Africa they were regarded with considerable curiosity, looked at through various eye-glasses, and regarded as rather fit subjects to guard lines of communication, to be posted along wayside stations and that sort of business. The idea was utterly abhorrent to the imperial officers that these men could possibly take their places in the field in the line of battle alongside the British troops. I want to point out that it was not until after the memorable engagements of Stormberg, Magersfontein and Colenso, that colonial troops began to be recognized. It was not until after the strategy and tactics of the British officers had been proven to be absolutely at fault, when the whole British army in South Africa stood face to face with the most deplorable position that it has ever been in, it was only then and not till then that one solitary Canadian, one solitary Australian or New Zealander, was ever put into the fighting line.

However, I do not know that this is pertinent to the subject of ragging. I have very little respect for the colonial who would waste his time, a man who has arrived at mature years, who would waste his time, being a regular officer under existing conditions. I may say, and I say it frankly, that I have a son whom, in former days, it was my highest ambition to see in the field wearing the uniform of a British officer. But after my experience—I do not think I would be justified in saying that I would prefer to follow my son to the grave—but I will say that I would as soon see him in any other position as following the profession of a British officer. I am glad to say that he refused a position in the imperial army, one of the highest positions given to Canadians, the Royal Engineers in India; he refused the commision of his own accord. Had he asked my advice in the matter, I would have told him frankly to refuse it. As to the matter of preventing ragging, it is a matter of turning the whole life of the British officer inside out, it is a matter of giving to the middle class in Britain, men who have only their own

honour and the honour of their country to uphold, giving them an opportunity to come to the front. To-day it is an open boast in Britain that since the days of commission-purchasing, other systems have arisen which make it just as impossible for a man coming from the middle classes in Britain to rise from the ranks to get a commission in the army or to obtain prominence in it, as it was before. They openly boast that the aristocracy of England will control the officers. With that I have no fault to find, but this condition must be established that the officer shall be trained as highly, shall be a gentleman in his demeanour and as proficient a soldier as it is possible for him to be. It will not do for him to be a Piccadilly dude ; he must make himself efficient, and if ever a colonial or man from the middle ranks in England should be granted a commission, such a person must be accorded the same rights as he himself enjoys. Otherwise, as far as the views of the great majority of people in Britain, as well as those of the colonies are concerned, the whole system of officers' promotion and training will have to be changed and a purely promotion system will have to be instituted. I may tell the House that I know that already magnificent reforms have been made in the army system by the people of Britain. A few already have been introduced into the cavalry corps which has been referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk, since the close of the war, and I know that it is the determination of the British people and government, notwithstanding the Gibraltar of opposition, to rid the army entirely of the barnacles that have so long prevented its progress towards the perfection to which the British army officer should attain. I want to say here that there are thousands of the best officers in the service who will welcome with open arms the change such as has been outlined by the hon. member for North Norfolk, any change that will give them an opportunity of standing on their merits, of being able to make themselves proficient and letting them win their positions by merit and not by society influence. There is no class that I can call to mind at the present moment that will welcome a change like that more cordially than the great majority of British officers in the service to-day. I know this to be a fact. These officers have pointed out again and again the futility of their attempting to make themselves proficient under the present system. If the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence introduces his Bill into this House in relation to the service, I trust he will take note of the fact that there shall be no star-chamber reports by one officer concerning another, that no reports shall ever be made by a superior officer concerning another officer, but which the officer concerned will first see and will show that he has seen it by endorsing his name thereon. That is one of the great drawbacks in the imperial service to-day. More than that we should insist that the system of training shall be such that merit will count on every occasion. However, these matters are coming up at a later period of the session, and I shall not detain the House further on the present occasion.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

Mr. J. R. LAVELL (Leeds and Grenville). Mr. Speaker, before this matter, which has been introduced by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), is entirely dropped, I would like to say a few words in regard to the position taken by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) and more especially as it has been fully endorsed by the right hon. leader of the House. In his opening remarks he seemed to chide the hon. member for North Norfolk for apparently busying himself with matters over which the imperial parliament had jurisdiction. I could not help thinking, in view of some of the votes given in this House, that this was a somewhat remarkable revolution in the opinions of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence. I presume the revolution has taken place in the minds of the right hon. leader of the government as well. Most certainly this House has by a previous example shown that it is quite willing on imperial questions, not at all so closely connected with Canada as this one, to express its opinion. In this matter I submit it is not a question of purely local concern to the British empire. We in Canada have chosen for some reason best known to ourselves, and I hope it will be shortly remedied, to very closely connect ourselves with the British empire and it is very needful for us to know something of the standards of honour and decency that prevail in the British army, and something of the influences through which the men have to pass who come to take charge of our own military affairs. We know that under our law, as well as under our rule, our commander in chief is one who has passed through the various stages of the British army and that in the Royal Military College, which we maintain at Kingston at considerable expense, English military officers have great prominence and that we offer as prizes to our best young men who graduate from that institution, commissions in the British army—where these disgraceful events have occurred. I think it is a good thing that the hon. member for North Norfolk brought this matter up, and it is of far greater importance that we should express our opinion on matters of this kind with which we are so closely connected, than that we should express our opinion on matters which come under the jurisdiction entirely of the British parliament. I hope that this matter will not be allowed to drop, but that it will come up again when the Militia Bill, which is apparently foreshadowed, is introduced.

INTERFERENCE OF CIVIL SERVANTS IN ELECTIONS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the House, and particularly to the attention of the government, a matter that is creating a great deal of adverse criticism in the press of the province of Manitoba at the present time, and which is, in fact, becoming a public scandal owing to the extent to which it has taken place. I refer to the participation of Dominion civil servants in the elections about to take place in the province of Manitoba. I do not desire to go particularly into the question of dismissals, which has been very thoroughly threshed out in preceding sessions, but I merely desire to bring to the attention of the government the law that was laid down in 1896 when these discussions were up, by which the government intended to guide their future actions in reference to officials participating in active political warfare, and I will give some specific instances where that law has been grossly violated, which, I think, demand the immediate attention and action of the government. It has been laid down as a cardinal principle by the members of the cabinet, particularly in their speeches of 1896, that a person cannot be at the same time a civil servant and a political partisan, that he must do either one of two things—he must either cease to be an active partisan or cease to be a civil servant. Dismissals innumerable have taken place since this government have come into power, of officials whose political proclivities were Conservative, on the ground that they were active participants in political warfare, that they had served as active members of political committees, that they had been seen on political platforms, that they had participated in election discussions, that they had canvassed from house to house and that in other respects they were actively engaged in political warfare in the interest of the candidates of the party to which they belonged. Many of these dismissals have taken place without any investigation having been held, without allowing them any chance to defend themselves. Many of them have taken place upon the mere request of the Liberal representative in parliament, or of the defeated Liberal candidate, or of some political committee to whom had been entrusted the duty of demanding the head of the accused person. Now, Sir, with this established as a precedent on the part of the government, and particularly when we review the speeches of the hon. gentlemen during the session of 1896, and when we have no attempt to justify this action on their part, I think that with the instances I will lay before the government to-day, we may fairly claim that the government should be called upon to immediately put into execution this principle to which they gave their adherence and at once dismiss these officials who have violated the law as laid down by themselves. In the first place, I desire to refer to some remarks of the right hon. leader of the government when this question of dismissals was up during the session of 1896, and an expression by the right hon. gentleman should have far more importance attached to it because of the position which he occupies, than of any other hon. member of the House, or than of any other member of the cabinet. I may say that I largely agree with the views laid down by the Prime Minister when he discussed this question some years ago, and I trust that I am not asking too much when I ask him to put these words into action, with regard to the officials whose conduct it is my intention to bring before the House. The right hon. gentleman then said :

> Now, when we find an officer in the civil service, however good a servant he may have been, however faithfully he may have discharged his duties, but has been an active politician, who has taken part in the election offensively and actively, and before the eyes of the whole community, that official has become a scandal in the eyes of the community and I have no hesitation in saying that he cannot be trusted to render faithful service to this government. Where there is a government officer he may hold his opinions, I do not care what they are; they may be Liberal, or Conservative, I do not care ; he may go and vote, and I will not inquire how he voted—but when he is seen on the public platform, when he takes part in party processions and is actively and offensively prominent, that as regards party candidates, that man has taken his life in his hands, and no one can have a word to say if he is dismissed from the service.

These were the remarks of the right hon. gentleman on that occasion, so that if I can produce evidence to satisfy him of the partisanship of officials who are in the employ of his own government to-day, and who have even gone beyond the extent laid down in these declarations of the Prime Minister, I think that we may fairly claim that it is the bounden duty of the government to at once dismiss these officials because of offensive partsanship. The remarks which I have read contain the broad principle laid down by the Prime Minister upon which he intended to guide his future actions. That principle is; that an official of this government may hold whatever opinions he may desire, and the Prime Minister would not question that; he may exercise his franchise in a quiet manner and the Prime Minister will not interfere with him, but that official shall not go one step beyond that—in no manner, shape or form shall he actively engage in the public party warfare, or if he does he places his official position in jeopardy. I do not at all suppose that when the right hon. gentleman gave voice to that declaration, he meant it to apply to Conservative officials alone. I will not believe that the Prime Minister would be so unfair as to discriminate in such a manner. I will not believe that he would apply one

rule to his political friends and a directly contrary one to his political opponents. It is true that Mr. J. D. Cameron, ex-Attorney General of the province of Manitoba, when he was a member of Mr. Greenway's administration and when evidence of offensive partisanship was brought to his attention in the House as to a person who, while being a provincial civil servant also occupied a seat in this House representing a Dominion constituency and who was actively engaged in both provincial and Dominion politics—Attorney General Cameron's reply was : Oh, but he is not offensive to us. That is Mr. Cameron's opinion of what constitutes statesmanship, and I leave it to the members of this House to form their own conclusions as to the political righteousness of a gentleman who would lay down such a most pernicious doctrine. I trust, Sir, that in the wider domain of Dominion politics there will not be found a member of the Dominion Cabinet so lost to all sense of fairness and political honesty, as to discriminate in such a manner and to treat his political opponents in a different way from his political friends. But, the right hon. the Prime Minister was not alone in his declarations in this particular direction. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) in the same debate voiced the following declaration :

> With members of the civil service eating the bread of both parties and deliberately interfering with the elections for the purpose of aiding one political party, if they so act they must be considered as taking their political lives in their hands and they must accept the consequence of their own acts, and the good sense of the people of the country and their natural sense of equal justice will not merely justify but demand at the hands of the government that they should make an example of them.

Therefore, the Minister of Trade and Commerce declares that if we have allowed an official who is found actively engaged in politics to occupy his position, that would not be following out the duty that the country would expect from the government. He tells us that the country demands the instant dismissal of such officials who are in his own words 'eating the bread of both political parties.'

I desire to bring to the attention of the government a few of these cases, but before doing so I might say that it may be argued by some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that such statements refer more particularly to those officials who are opposed to the government of the day, and that these officials run the risk of losing their position upon a change of government; meaning that these gentlemen would allow such conduct to take place on the part of their own friends while they were in power, but that these officials took the risk of losing their situations in the event of a change of government. There was not a single member of this Cabinet who on that occasion expressed himself so that any such interpretation could be put upon the words he used. To prove this it is only necessary to quote from the speech of Sir Louis Davies, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who declared :

> But what I believe by common consent to be the understanding of both political parties is that a civil servant has an unquestionable right to vote for whom he likes without being called to account by anybody, or asked for whom he voted, and that in doing so he does not put in peril his position or right to promotion ; but when a civil servant goes beyond that, becomes one of a political committee to promote the political success of one political party, takes an active part in the canvass or otherwise acts offensively to his opponents in the political campaign by becoming a heeler or actively assisting in the election of members, in my humble opinion by doing so he takes his official life in his hands and renders himself liable to be dismissed. I do not think he could complain or anybody else could complain. That was the position laid down by Lord Dufferin in the celebrated speech made by him on civil service reform some years ago. That is the position I understood to have been taken by both parties in this House. That is the position I propose for one to adopt in the discharge of the duties with which I have been entrusted; and I would go one step further and say this : That if in conducting my campaign I find men holding Her Majesty's commission standing on the platform alongside of me and abusing myself and abusing my leader, and abusing the party to which I belong, calling us all kinds of names, calling upon the people to support them and denounce us ; when the power comes to me their commission will be revoked and the official life shall cease.

Sir Louis Davies continued still further to show that he did not mean the rule to apply to the members of one political party alone. He declared ('Hansard' 1896, page 1091) :

> I wish it to be clearly and distinctly understood what is my personal view of the matter. I do not think it is the right of an officer employed by the government to take an offensive part against the opposition of the day, any more than against the government of the day. I decline to acknowledge that it is the right of any public officer to canvass against either the government or opposition. I frankly and fully acknowledge the right of any public servant to hold what views he pleases and to vote for whom he pleases, and when he pleases, without being called to account. I decline to go one step further.

This shows that a member of the Cabinet of that time was firmly of the opinion that the rule which was laid down by the government in 1896 should be applied not alone to Conservative officials, but to Liberal officials as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the year 1899, there was a provincial election in the province of Manitoba. There was a gentleman named Mr. Martin Jerome, who then occupied the position of Homestead Inspector under this government. Mr. Jerome was nominated by the Liberals for the constituency of Carillon. I asked the Minister of the Interior

at that time, if Mr. Jerome was an employee of the Interior Department; was the minister aware that he was nominated for the constituency of Carillon, and if so were Mr. Jerome's services going to be retained by this government. The Minister of the Interior replied as follows :

1. Mr. Martin Jerome is an employee of the Interior Department in the province of Manitoba as forest ranger.

2. Inquiry has elicted the fact that Mr. Jerome has been tendered but has not accepted a nomination for the legislature.

3. Should Mr. Jerome accept the nomination, his employment in his present capacity will cease.

Well, now what occurred ? Mr. Jerome took some holidays during the campaign. He dropped out of the service or did not perform his duties as forest ranger, while the campaign was on. The election took place, Mr. Jerome was elected and he has sat for the last four years as a member of the Manitoba legislature. But very shortly after the election, Mr. Jerome was reinstated in his position. If he was dismissed, his position was kept open for him. At any rate, he has been acting in a dual capacity during the past four years, discharging the duties of a member of the legislature, while at the same time acting as an official of this government, and drawing a salary of $100 a month and expenses. Can any hon. member of this House state that the hon. Minister of the Interior, in dealing in this manner with Mr. Jerome, has kept faith with the people of Canada, or has kept the promises he made to the representatives of the people in this parliament ? No hon. gentleman I think will defend the action of the Minister of the Interior in allowing Mr. Jerome to drop out of sight during the campaign, so far as his services as an official of the government were concerned, and immediately after the election reinstating him in his position. Has not that gentleman been quite as great a partisan during the four years he has sat in the legislature, making his violent tirades in the House and on the public platform, and acting in the most offensive manner towards his opponents, as he was during the campaign ; and yet, notwithstanding that promise made by the Minister of the Interior, he has been acting in the two capacities during the past four years. Having in view the action of the Minister of the Interior in that case, and also the fact that another forest ranger and homestead inspector, and some postmasters as well, have accepted nominations from the Liberal party for the ensuing election, I asked the acting Minister of the Interior, the hon. Postmaster General, on the 8th of April, 1903, the following questions :

1. Is Mr. S. Jonasson an employee of the Department of the Interior, in the province of Manitoba, as forest ranger, or homestead inspector ?

2. If so, is the government aware that he is the Liberal candidate for the constituency of Gimli, in the ensuing provincial elections ?

3. Will his services be continued by this government while he is engaged in party politics ?

To these the hon. Postmaster General replied as follows :

1. Yes.

2. The government has no information that Mr. Johnson is a candidate for Gimli.

3. If he is a candidate, he will not be continued as a salaried official of the department.

I must admit that when I received that answer, I was not satisfied ; it is rather indefinite in its character. If he is a candidate, he will not be continued as a salaried official of the department ; but how long ? As long as Mr. Jerome was ? Merely during the campaign, to be reinstated after he is defeated ? Or does it mean that as a salaried official of the department he will just drop out of sight, as Mr. Jerome did, or that his salary will cease during the campaign, and be continued again after the election is over ? We are suspicious of an answer like that, having in view the manner in which the hon. Minister of the Interior acted with reference to Mr. Jerome, who occupied a similar position. Here is Mr. Jonasson, a candidate for the legislature for Gimli, and at the same time a civil servant of this government, drawing a salary of $100 a month. Is this an infraction of the law as laid down by the Prime Minister in this House in 1896, when he declared that any man who was found on a political platform or taking part in a political discussion should cease to be an employee of this government ? I think there can be no doubt that Mr. Jonasson comes within the category of official partisans referred to by the Prime Minister.

Another gentleman who is a homestead inspector is Thomas Young, who is to-day the Liberal candidate for the constituency of Gilbert Plains. He did not attend the convention in person ; he had some sense of propriety in not going to the convention, occupying the position he did ; and I will do him the justice of saying that at first he refused to accept the nomination on the ground of being an employee of this government. But since then, pressure has been brought to bear upon him by his Liberal friends, with the result that he writes the following letter :

Grandview, April 22, 1903.

To Dr. Geo. D. Shortreed, President Liberal Asociation.

Dear sir,—After duly considering the nomination unanimously tendered me by the Liberals of the electoral division of Gilbert Plains, I am pleased to consider the wishes of my friends by accepting the same and standing for election. Since I hold an official position under the Dominion government which compels me for the present to refrain from active campaigning I look to my friends and the opponents

of the present government to do active service in my behalf. In due time when my resignation has been handed in, I will then earnestly co-operate with you for the overthrow of the present administration. I trust that since you have shown such confidence in me you will leave nothing undone to ensure my election as your representative.

Yours sincerly,
THOS YOUNG.

So that if the acting Minister of the Interior desired any evidence of the fact that these gentlemen were candidates, all he had to do was to pick up the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' the organ of the Liberal party in the province of Manitoba, and he would have seen there for the last six weeks a list of the candidates of the party, and figuring conspicuously among them Mr. Young and Mr. Jonasson. It may be that Mr. Young will resign his position during the campaign ; but if so, no doubt the position will be kept open for him until after the election, just as in the case of Mr. Jerome. But fancy Mr. Young attending to his duties during the election, while abstaining from canvassing. This letter was the outcome of the pressure brought to bear upon him by his political friends. He tries to convey the impression that he is not going to engage in canvassing while he holds his office. He hopes to draw his salary until nomination day, and to have the place kept open for him until after the election, in case he should be defeated. No reply that we shall have to-day from the acting Minister of the Interior will be satisfactory to this House, even if we are told that these gentlemen will be notified that they cannot be candidates while they are officers of the government, unless we have the further promise that the public service will not be allowed to suffer by these offices not being filled during the campaign, and that the positions will not be kept open until after the election in order to allow these same gentlemen to drop back into them in return for the sacrifices they are making for their party. I do not think the answer will be satisfactory to the House unless we are told that these gentlemen have to cease at once discharging their duties as officials of this government, or else refuse the nominations of these conventions. This letter was written on April 22nd ; three weeks have elapsed, and still Mr. Young has not been notified to quit his position as an official of this government. When these facts are brought to the attention of the acting Minister of the Interior, he cannot plead ignorance of them. I charge that these gentlemen have been availing themselves of all the prestige conferred upon them by occupying these positions, and have used that fact as a lever to secure votes for themselves and the party to which they belong. The premier of Manitoba, in a public speech delivered in Winnipeg a couple of weeks ago, used the following language in reference to this question :

I want to draw your attention too, to another hypocritical plank of their platform. They say in clause 10, that they declare in favour of the establishment and maintenance of an efficient and non-partisan civil service. Gentlemen, I agree with that expression of principle. I concur in it and endorse that sentiment, but how do their acts contrast with their professions ? Why in this very day's 'Free Press' you will find published a list of Liberal candidates who are civil servants, who are paid officials of the Dominion government, and who are using their positions and their power to coerce and influence electors against the Roblin government. Only to-day I received information of a homestead inspector, a Dominion government official who is using his official position, whose time is paid for with your money and mine, whose travelling expenses even are paid by the Dominion government, and who is canvassing against the Roblin government amongst farmers who have not taken out their patents, endeavouring by the abuse of his official position to coerce and induce them to vote for the Liberal candidates. Sir, I say that a more scandalous and outrageous abuse of the civil service has never been heard of and cannot exist and cannot be conceived, and I go further and I call upon the independent members of the Dominion parliament, whose servants these men are, to refuse to pass the estimates for the Department of the Interior, to refuse to allow one dollar of public money to be voted for that department, until such men as Jonasson and Jerome and Young and others whom I might name who are receiving large salaries from the federal government, either resign their positions as officials of the Dominion government, or resign as candidates in the Liberal interests in this province.

Here is a strong expression from the premier of the province that the officials of this government are abusing their positions in the interests of the Liberal party. No more glaring instances of partisanship could be brought forward. There have been upwards of 150 dismissals by this government, largely in the Interior and Post Office Departments in Manitoba and Northwest Territories alone. All of these were published in the Conservative organ, in the province of Manitoba, a couple of years ago. And many of these dismissals were made without any charges of partisanship or charges of any kind having been preferred. And in nine out of ten of these cases in which charges of partisanship were made, there was no investigation, and no chance of defence. In my constituency a postmaster was dismissed because he had acted as returning officer in the election of 1896. Yet here we have a postmaster, Mr. Ira Stratton, in the town of Stonewall, who is at the same time the editor of a Liberal newspaper and secretary of the Liberal Association. If an official, who acted as returning officer in 1896, had to be dismissed on the ground of active partisanship, surely, this man, Mr. Ira Stratton is far more deserving of like treatment. But Mr. Stratton is not the only gentleman who, if the government were consistent, would lose his position. I am not one to take exception to every coun-

try postmaster, who draws a few dollars a year, being debarred from activity in political matters, although many such postmasters have been dismissed on this charge since this government came into power. But let me give the case of a gentleman who holds a rather important postion and is nevertheless an active partisan. In the city of Brandon, where the former postmaster was dismissed on the ground of active partisanship, his successor was present at the convention recently held which selected a Liberal candidate for that constituency. But he can rest perfectly secure because he happens to be a Liberal. Another postmaster named Lawrie, in the town of Morris, acted as presiding officer at the Liberal convention which selected an opponent to the attorney-general of Manitoba. Mr. J. W. Yeo, who is the Dominion lands sub-agent, was also a delegate to a Liberal convention in the province of Manitoba for the selection of a candidate. There are a dozen other postmasters who have been delegates to Liberal conventions. Mr. Charles Tomlin, immigration official, was also a delegate to a Liberal convention. I do not think that the hon. Postmaster General, who is the acting Minister of the Interior, should hesitate about dealing out severe treatment to these officials, if he proposes to stand by the platform of the Liberal party as formulated in Winnipeg. There was a most curious condition of affairs in that city three or four weeks ago. We had the executive committee, or what is called the 'inner circle' of Liberals, in that province in convention. A certain number of representatives were appointed to formulate a platform on which the Liberal party would appeal to the country, and what do you think was one of the most important planks in that platform ? It was plank ten :

> We declare in favour of the establishment and maintenance of an efficient and non-partisan civil service.

And in that inner circle to which I have referred, there were upwards of a dozen civil servants of this government. Could you conceive anything more hypocritical ? Could you imagine a greater travesty on politcal honesty ? Just imagine these officials of the Dominion government formulating a political platform and declaring themselves in favour of a non-partisan civil service. Further, we had a speech at Brandon by Mr. Greenway, the leader of the Liberal party. In the course of his speech, he was asked this question : 'Are you in favour of a non-partisan civil service ?' He replied : 'Any man who occupies a position in the service of the government, which gives him a livelihood, ought not to meddle in politics at all.' Surely, in view of these declarations of policy, the hon. minister need not hesitate about dismissing these gentlemen or giving them the option either to resign their positions in the service or vacate their positions as nominees of those conventions. I do not know whether the acting Minister of the Interior wants to assume the responsibility or not of doing this. He may possibly think that in so doing he would be trespassing on the preserves of his absent colleague (Hon. Mr. Sifton). But it seems to me that that absent colleague ought to be here attending to the business of parliament. Session after session we find him absenting himself and allowing his place in this House to be taken by somebody else. He has been dubbed by his political admirers 'The Young Napoleon,' but I fail to see any exhibition of Napoleonic capacity or courage when he acts in this manner.

I also wish to point out that there are other officials of this government actively engaged in political warfare. Take Mr. Alfred Martin, who is employed selecting the swamp lands which are to be handed over to the province of Manitoba. Yet, although he is in the employ of this government and paid at the rate of $10 per day, he goes about attending Liberal conventions, proposing Liberal candidates and making partisan speeches. Then there is Mr. Cockburn, who was candidate for North Winnipeg, and who is reported in the press as being the postmaster for the north branch Main street post office in North Winnipeg. I would draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to this case.

I have laid these cases, before the Postmaster General, and am not going to enter upon the broad question of dismissals. I have merely specified a few of the more flagrant cases—in Manitoba, concerning which, there is at present, a great deal of adverse criticism, and which demand immediate action on the part of the government. I hardly think that the hon. minister will take the ground that because these men took part in local elections, they have not laid themselves open to action on the part of this government. A partisan is a partisan, and it makes no difference whether he be a partisan in Dominion or in provincial politics. And a man who takes the platform and is offensive to his political opponents, I care not whether he is engaged in Dominion or provincial politics, and is at the same time a civil servant, should be forced to vacate one position or the other. And, in saying this, I desire to state also that I shall not be satisfied with a mere promise on the part of the government which will allow these gentlemen to drop out of their positions and have those positions kept open for them to be taken by them after the elections are over. This is what happened in the constituency of Marquette, in the Dominion elections of 1900. Mr. John W. Thompson was homestead inspector. The Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) attended the convention that selected this official of his department as the candidate of his party to oppose myself. It is true that Mr. Thompson resigned his position, but that position was kept open for him, and

when he had been buried under an avalanche of votes—I think the majority against him was 420—he was reinstated, and for over two years has been discharging the duties of that position. That is exactly what we expect will be the case with the officials whose cases are brought forward to-day; and I do not think there is any hon. gentleman in the House who will defend such an action on the part of the government. Therefore, I desire to move the following amendment :

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

The Prime Minister speaking in this House on the 1st day of September, A.D. 1896, with respect to political partisanship by officers of the government expressed himself as follows :

'Now, when we find an officer in the civil service, however good a servant he may have been, however faithfully he may have discharged his duties, but who has been an active politician, who has taken part in the election offensively and actively, and before the eyes of the whole community, that official has become a scandal in the eyes of the community, and I have no hesitation in saying that he cannot be trusted to render faithful service to this government. Where there is a government officer he may hold his opinions, I do not care what they are ; they may be Liberal or Conservative, I do not care ; he may go and vote, and I will not inquire how he voted—but when he is seen on the public platform, when he takes part in party processions and is actively and offensively prominent as regards party candidates, that man has taken his life in his hands, and no one can have a word to say if he is dismissed from the service.'

The Minister of Trade and Commerce on the same day used the following language in speaking on the same subject :—

'With members of the civil service eating the bread of both parties and deliberately interfering with the elections for the purpose of aiding one political party, if they so act they must be considered as taking their political lives in their hands and they must accept the consequences of their own acts, and the good sense of the people of the country and their natural sense of equal justice will not merely justify but demand at the hands of the government that they should make an example of them.'

That other members of the government during that session and in subsequent sessions expressed the same views.

That the government acting upon the principles and rules so laid down has since dismissed a very large number of officers on the ground of alleged political partisanship.

That an application of the principles and rules so laid down for the guidance of public officials would result in the dismissal of those officers of the government who have become 'a scandal in the eyes of the community' by taking an active offensive and partisan part in the election campaign now being carried on in the province of Manitoba, and who while 'eating the bread of both parties' are 'deliberately interfering in elections for the purpose of aiding one political party.'

This House regrets that the government has not seen fit to deal with such officials in accordance with the declarations of principle so made and so often acted upon.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette).

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, before this question is decided, I desire, as one of the members from Manitoba to say a few words in reference to it. In any reply I may make to the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), I shall not condone the offence of a civil servant taking an active part in politics. But when the hon. gentleman commences to lecture this House, and to declare the action of civil servants in Manitoba a public scandal, he is the last man who should speak in this way, and he comes from the province which is the last province from which charges against this government should come. For, if there is one province in confederation where the civil servants have been open partisans, where they have been active election agents, it is the province of Manitoba. Before proceeding to deal with the question generally, I may deal with the case of the officials he specifically mentioned. The first is the case of Mr. Martin Jerome, a homestead inspector and an efficient officer. It is true, he has been a member of the local House for the last four years. But it is not fair to speak of Mr. Jerome as being in active politics. He is not to-day a likely candidate for the local House in that province, but is entirely out of politics so far as that is concerned. Before I go further, I may say that there is precedent for Mr. Jerome's action. It is a well known fact that many members of the local legislatures of Canada have been men receiving salaries from the Dominion government. During the time when Sir Adolphe Caron was Postmaster General, it is a well known fact, many of the postmasters were members of the local legislatures of their respective provinces. But we do not need to go to other provinces for precedent in this matter. Take the present provincial secretary and Minister of Public Works of the province of Manitoba, Hon. D. H. McFadden. We find that he, while a member of the local House, for many years was employed by the Dominion government as veterinary inspector at Emerson, from 1884 to 1897. During that time he successfully contested provincial seats in 1892 and 1896. This was during the term of office in the Dominion of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is also the case of Mr. Baldwinson, who for the last four years has been representative of the constituency of Gimli in the local House. That gentleman was employed by the late government as Icelandic immigration commissioner at Winnipeg, from 1883 to 1889. On March 25th, 1889, his salary was increased from $730 to $830, showing that they actually rewarded him by an increase of salary for having become a member of the local house. Now it is not necessary for me to go further. I could mention half a dozen gentlemen who were earning salaries from this government while they were still members of the local house during the Conservative regime. Wm. Wagner

and Wm. Crawford, for eight or ten years swamp-land commissioner under this government were members of the local house and received good salaries. Not only that, but they had not even the decency to resign their positions as land commissioners while parliament was in session. Take Hugh John Macdonald's case. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite will say that he should be a man above reproach, that he should not violate the civil service rule, yet we find that that gentleman was premier and railway commissioner for many months, from January 11, 1899, up to October, in 1900. When he was nominated as Conservative candidate in Brandon he did not resign his portfolio, he did not give up the emoluments of office under the local government, he continued until almost within twenty-four hours of the time he was officially nominated for the Dominion House. My hon. friend alludes to Mr. Jonasson and Mr. Young. Their resignations will be in the hands of the Dominion government before they will dare to accept officially any nomination at the hands of the Liberal party. I am in a position to know that one of the gentlemen he mentions as a local government candidate, although his name did come up before the nominating convention some time ago. I happen to know that he does not intend to run. Surely it would be unfair to ask that man to refrain from attending public meetings or taking an active part in politics until the day of nomination.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Who is that gentleman he refers to ?

Mr. McCREARY. I do not know that I have any right to give away secrets of that kind. The hon. gentleman threw out the wrong hook. Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to postmasters taking an active part in politics, I think the contention of the hon. gentleman is ridiculous. He did not go so far to-day as his brief in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' allowed him to go. They say that postmasters who draw $12 a year should not take an active part in politics, that census enumerators who two years ago received $7 or $8 for service rendered should be prevented from taking an active part in politics. I submit that their contention is ridiculous. I presume that when a man is in the civil service on the permanent list and is in receipt of a large salary he should not take an active part in politics. I have been a civil servant myself for three years and a half and I faithfully observed that rule, and no charge was ever made against me. I submit that that rule should be carried out to-day; but when you ask that a man who is receiving a small salary of $7 or $8 or $12 a year as postmaster to refrain from taking an active part in provincial politics, why the idea is ridiculous. The hon. gentleman mentioned such names as Stratton, of Stonewall; Cockburn, of North Winnipeg; Laurie, of Morris, and others, men who receive actually no emolument whatever from the Dominion government. It is true their names stand there as holders of offices, but they pay out in expenses more than the Post Office Department allows them, because they have stores in these places and they are the most convenient places for the public to go to get their mail.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I were disposed to enter into an argument on this matter, I think I could furnish some interesting reading to the members of the House, because if there is any province in which the civil service law has been abused it is the province of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman has said that there were about 150 dismissals in Manitoba and the North-west Territories by this government since they came into power. But would you believe it, Sir, that the Conservative government of the province of Manitoba, since coming into power on the 11th day of January, 1900, have made 700 dismissals in that province ? I have before me a list of them, it is two years old, two years since I obtained it, but if I were to read that list it would afford interesting information to this House. On the 11th of January, Hugh John Macdonald was sworn in as minister, and on the 22nd of January the mill commenced to grind on the poor Grits. On that day we find the guillotine was applied to Mr. Howrie, game warden, and Mr. A. Taylor was appointed in his place. There was a lull in the proceedings for a few days and on the 7th of February we find the mill began to grind again, and on that day there were some ten or twelve dismissals of men against whom there was no cause of complaint. I have here some of them. Mr. W. E. Perdue, 'guardian ad litem,' was dismissed. He was a gentleman of considerable influence, a prominent barrister of Winnipeg, and he was dismissed. D. W. McKercher, another prominent barrister, was dismissed as official administrator, also S. R. Wright, D. W. McKercher and R. M. Matheson, official administrators, all dismissed without any cause ; Mr. G. Thorsteinsson, police magistrate of Gimli, was dismissed on that day; the bailiff of the county court, A. M. Livingstone, was dismissed. D. Philip, chief clerk of the provincial secretary and Queen's printer, was dismissed on that day. J. W. Sifton, father of the Minister of the Interior, was dismissed from the Public Works Department and on the same day J. A. McDonnell was dismissed from the position of engineer. I have column after column of names of gentlemen who were dismissed within a few months after the advent of the Conservative government. There was Mr. James Thompson, clerk of the timber office, Winnipeg. There was Mr. S. A. D. Bertrand, who was official assignee for the province, dismissed by that government on February 7, and F. J. Nixon, a strong partisan, was appointed in his place. So indignant were the public over that dismissal and appointment that the wholesale

men and the board of trade called a meeting of both sides of politics and threw the appointment back into the face of the premier and said they would give no estates to be handled by any such assignee as that. When the hon. gentleman talks about the civil service of Manitoba he talks to one who knows something about it. Now, coming down to the town of Nepawa, we find on the same day, February 7, less than thirty days after they took power, that Mr. James Thompson was dismissed and R. C. Ennis was put in his place. We find that T. A. Cuddy was dismissed as clerk of the county court of Minnedosa and J. F. Boyd was put in his place. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows about that.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I deny it.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. J. M. Robinson, burser of the Brandon asylum, was dismissed and E. Hughes put in his place. E. C. Conklin, clerk of the legislative assembly, was dismissed and A. H. Corelli was put in his place. Mr. Charles Smith was dismissed as shorthand reporter. Mr. N. Todd was dismissed as bailiff of the county court of St. Francios Xavier, and J. Bourke was put in his place. In fact from the 7th of February to six months afterwards I find that there were dismissed some ninety or one hundred civil servants in the province of Manitoba, some four hundred and forty-one justices of the peace, and over one hundred game guardians. In that one little province alone, six or seven hundred officers were dismissed during six months. The axe was ground up and it was put to work. They have a very peculiar way of dismissing civil servants up there. I do not blame Mr. Hugh John Macdonald so much. Any one who knows the inside reasons for his resigning from the position of prime minister of Manitoba, knows why he got out. There is what we call the Maple Leaf Conservative Club. It is an institution composed of nearly 3,000 members, and I know something of its methods, because I am able to keep pretty closely in touch with it. It has ramifications all through the province and it has an inner circle of nine in Winnipeg, which is a kind of Clan-na-Gael society. This inner circle meets in secret conclave and decides what heads shall be cut off the following day. It makes a list, sends that list up to the premier, and if the premier does not promptly cut off these heads and appoint other men in their places, he gets notice that the secret conclave is going to go back on him. I happen to know that that occurred in at least two cases which came upder my notice. One case is that of Dr. Patterson. Dr. Patterson was a most capable official under the former Manitoba government. He was a great personal friend of Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, being his next door neighbour for many years, and I happen to know that the day before Dr. Patterson was dismissed he was told by Mr. Macdonald himself that he was all right, that he had taken no active part in politics except to cast his vote and that his position would not be disturbed. That night, when the secret conclave met, that position was required for another partisan of the Maple Leaf Clan-na-Gael society, and down went the axe. I can mention another case, that of Arni Freeman, a poor Icelandic boy who came out to this country about twenty-five years ago, and who, although a cripple, was able to earn sufficient money to educate himself. He was employed in the license department and although he was taking no active part in politics and had been assured that he would not be disturbed in his position, he was dismissed. At four o'clock, before he quitted his office on a certain day, he got a letter from Mr. Macdonald in answer to one that he had written, stating that he would not be disturbed in his position, but that night the Clan-na-Gael met in secret conclave, Freeman's head was required and next morning at eleven o'clock he received a letter from Mr. Macdonald saying that he was dismissed. All that correspondence can be brought to the attention of the House if necessary. It ill becomes the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) to stand up and talk about civil servants in the province of Manitoba. The right hon. leader of the government knows very well that I personally went to him to tell him of the position of affairs that existed in Manitoba, and how men were being deposed from their positions to make room for needy partisans of the present government of Manitoba. Men who had come into Manitoba in 1870 with Wolseley and who held small positions bringing them $200 or $300 a year with which to maintain themselves in their old age, were dismissed from their places. These men were dismissed without cause. I only trust that this government will take the matter up and deal with these officials as they should deal with them, if they looked at it from a purely party spirit. I want to pay this measure of credit to the right hon. leader of the government, that I went to his private office and complained bitterly of the treatment that some of these men had received at the hands of the present government of Manitoba. His answer was: They are making a mistake, they are violating the principles of constitutional government, but, because they do wrong, would you ask me to do likewise ? I said : No, sir. Probably if I had gone a little farther there might have been a difference, but I did not choose to do so. I claim that the Roblin government have, during the short time which they have been in office, done more to disorganize the civil service of Manitoba than any government in any province since confederation. I do not intend to deal very fully with this matter because there may be some other western members who know a good deal about the civil service of the west. I can remember the time in Mani-

toba and the North-west Territories when a man's life was not safe if he dared to say a word against the Conservative party. I can remember that during the election of 1887 the number of civil servants imported into the city of Winnipeg to vote was far more than the majority that the member elected got at that time, and there are cases in the Territories much worse than that. The hon. gentleman has also mentioned certain civil servants and for his edification I will just call his attention to a few officers under Mr. Roblin's administration who are taking an active part in provincial elections. Take the case of R. G. O'Malley, who formerly was a member of the local house. He is what is called the noxious weed inspector. During the election of 1900, when I had the honour of being a candidate in the constituency of Selkirk, Mr. O'Malley was the official organizer against me in that constituency. He followed me all over. There was a little snow and ice on the ground. I met him in the parish of St. Laurent. When I reached there O'Malley was there and the first man that I had to speak against at the meeting was R. G. O'Malley, provincial noxious weed inspector. I said: Mr. O'Malley are you finding any noxious weeds here or noxious Grits, while going around here on skates or snowshoes? With the aid of a priest in the parish they thought they were going to defeat me, but I was able for the first time in the history of the parish to get a Liberal majority of eighteen. We also had this gentleman just a very few days ago, Mr. Speaker, getting up in a public meeting in Assiniboia and making a strong political speech; in fact, from the time of the man's appointment down to the present he has been doing nothing but acting as the organizer of the local government. That is his business. But, there are others. There is Mr. Joseph Burke, if you please, a so-called immigration agent of the Manitoba government. Mr. Burke, accidentally, so they put it, slipped up to the parish of St. Claude ostensibly to look after some immigrants to be transferred to another portion of the province, and we have him on political platforms making strong political speeches, in fact the speech of the day. There is Mr. Patenaude, another gentleman who has been appointed an immigration agent, is actually the organizer in Assiniboia for Mr. Caron. Then there is J. J. Golden, another gentleman appointed as an immigrant agent, and who was sent to Kansas for a short time, but who was brought back and is now an active politician in Winnipeg. There is not a single immigration official that they have appointed, and they have appointed probably twenty-five or thirty, who is not appointed absolutely for the purpose of doing canvassing work in Manitoba during the elections. We have another case, that of the police magistrate of Winnipeg—Mr. Dawson. Mr. Dawson was a most capable official. He has been a lawyer of high standing and he held a high place in the estimation of every barrister of Winnipeg. He is a man who had never taken an active part in politics, but this inner circle of nine wanted his place for a member of the association, Mr. Baker. Off went Mr. Dawson's head, and Mr. Baker was appointed to take his place on the bench. But, matters became a little too hot for Mr. Roblin. A petition, signed by the citizens of Winnipeg, was sent to Mr. Roblin and things have become so hot that he would be glad to get Mr. Baker out of it, were it not for the pressure of the Clan-na-Gael that I speak of.

This Clan-na-Gael; this inner circle of the Maple Leaf Conservatives of Winnipeg, is rather peculiarly constituted. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will wonder how I got possession of this information, but I did. A man goes in there and he is given a ticket, with his number on it; nothing else but the number. He is asked to subscribe to a declaration extending over two sheets of typewritten foolscap, and he promises that he will, during the time he belongs to that institution, do all in his power to oust any Liberal from any job, whether it is in the employ of the municipality or the government. He declares that he will do all in his power, if employed as subordinate, to oust the foreman, if the foreman is a Liberal; and that he will do all in his power to bring party politics into municipal, provincial or Dominion affairs or anything else. That is the state of thing we have to fight against in the city of Winnipeg. That is the institution which has Mr. Roblin by the neck, and forces him to make some of these dismissals and some of these appointments I have spoken of. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) say that this state of affairs is a public scandal in the province of Manitoba? What does he think now of the officials in the employment of his own government and not of the Dominion government?

Mr. DAVIS. High binders.

Mr. McCREARY. High binders of the worst kind. I could, Mr. Speaker, at considerable length give the names of Liberal officials who have been dismissed by the Manitoba Conservative government, but I think the House is in possession of sufficient facts to warrant it in saying that if there is a mistake made by one of the officials in this government—and I believe that some officials have gone too far in the province of Manitoba—still it ill-becomes the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche), who comes from the province of Manitoba, to bring these matters up here, when such a condition of affairs exists within the home of his own political party in his own province.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I have listened attentively to the joint speech of the members for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) and Saskatchewan (Mr.

Davis), and they have said nothing particularly which prevents me from expecting that they will both vote for this amendment. Everything they have said shows that there is a great grievance in this country, and more particularly in Manitoba than any other part of the Dominion, which requires the remedy proposed by this motion. Should the government decide to reject the amendment moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Roche), it will be another instance of their breaking one of the pledges they gave to this country. And, Sir, they will break that pledge apparently without any expectation on the part of their followers that it would not be broken. These two gentlemen, whose joint speech we have listened to from the other side, gave us no opinion as to whether they would vote for or against the motion. The member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) simply confined himself to giving instances of the dismissal of public servants for offensive partisanship by the present government of Manitoba, but let me point out that my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) does not say that it is right for a Conservative administration to dismiss Liberal officials, or that a Liberal administration should dismiss Conservative officials. What the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Roche) has said, and what he puts in his motion is, that the interference of civil service appointees in political issues is a scandal upon the country. My hon. friend (Mr. Roche) quoted the language of the Prime Minister and the language of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in support of his motion, and in condemnation of the very thing that he condemns. The hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has taken good care to say that these two ministers were right in stating that such a thing is a scandal, but he intimates nevertheless that this scandal will be allowed to continue in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. McCREARY. I did not say that at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is the inference we must draw from his argument.

Mr. McCREARY. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. The argument that was made by the member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) showed clearly that this government, in 1896, laid down a platform upon this question, containing the rule of conduct for officials therein described, and that this platform has been deliberately broken by the government for three years past. We are here to-day asking that this government should enforce the rule laid down in 1896, or at least explain to the House why they do not enforce it. The right hon. the Prime Minister told us in 1896 :

> When we find an officer in the civil service, however good a servant he may have been, however faithfully he may have discharged his duties, but who has been an active politician, who has taken part in the election offensively and actively, and before the eyes of the whole community that official has become a scandal in the eyes of the community.

Now, the country supposes that the Prime Minister meant what he then said, and we are calling attention to the fact that the rule which he announced has not been carried out, and we ask that a remedy shall be applied. It is charged here, and the member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), who knows more about the details than I do, does not deny the facts in regard to these three gentlemen who are named in the motion. Let us see what their conduct has been individually. Mr. Martin Jerome was employed by the Department of the Interior, and the Minister of the Interior told us in this House that if he accepted the Liberal nomination his employment under this government would cease. Well, Mr. Jerome did accept the nomination and he remained for three years a member of the local legislature, and his employment under the federal government did not cease. If a member of parliament or of the legislature is not an active politician, I do not know who is. I do not know that we can find fault with any one saying that the members elected to this House are active politicians, and so with the members of the legislatures, and if the Prime Minister did not intend his description of active politicians to apply to members supporting a political party in parliament, I presume that he would have said so. I think we are entitled to consider a member of the legislature as being an active politician. This Mr. Jerome remained an active politician and a member of the legislature for three years, and also an employee of this government. Is it possible that the government did not know it, or is it that the government simply trusted to luck that no one would draw their attention to it, or find fault with them for ignoring the policy laid down by the Premier on the 1st of September, 1896. The hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) says that this cannot be called a scandal because Mr. Jerome is now going out, and is about ceasing to be an active politician. Well, what about the scandal during the three years he was a member of the legislature ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) has told us that he has made representations to the government with regard to some other men, but I wonder why he did not have a conversation with the Prime Minister in regard to Mr. Jerome, in which he would tell him that Mr. Jerome was a flagrant example of the disregard of the policy which the government promised to pursue in this matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) says that the Premier told him when he complained of the conduct of the Manitoba government : If they are doing so they are doing wrong; they are false to the principle of constitutional government, and you would not ask me to do the same thing. Why did not

the member for Selkirk say to the Premier : What about the constitutional question, when you have laid down a policy in this connection which you are violating deliberately ?

It strikes me that the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) who, we know, is not a forgetful man, who is in no sense an unwise man, who is well able to defend anything he has in mind, and who is, I hope, an honourable man; should at once have taken the position that the honour of the province of Manitoba was at stake, and should have said to the Prime Minister: It is not enough to say that the Conservative government did what was wrong; that is no reason why a Liberal government should do this thing; we have had this public official in the legislature for three years, and what are you going to do about that ? The hon. member does not say that he even mentioned this matter to the Premier. Therefore we must think that he did not consider it a violation of principle on the part of the government to lay down the platform they did in 1896, immediately on coming to power, and to allow abuses of this kind to go on contrary to that principle. I wish now for a moment to answer the reference made by the hon. member for Selkirk to the much respected Hugh John Macdonald. The hon. member said that the name of Hugh John Macdonald was above reproach. I want to ask him the reason for that. It is because when Hugh John Macdonald made pledges he kept them ; when he laid down a policy, he carried it out. We have an evidence of that in dealing with the prohibition question in Manitoba. If I know anything of human nature, if there is one reason more than another why the people of Manitoba on both sides of politics hold the name of Hugh John Macdonald above reproach, it is because when he made a pledge, he carried out that pledge on attaining power. I do not think that backhanded compliment to this government ought to have come from one of their own supporters. I would have thought it would have been left for one of us on this side of the House. It is true, we on this side of the House have dealt with matters of this kind so many times that the hon. member for Selkirk may have thought that our power had been used up in pointing out so many broken pledges and that we would not again bring up this question of the government breaking their pledges, the good province of Manitoba may have thought it well to have one of the Liberal members take it up. They need not be afraid, however, because the members of the opposition, in their duty to the country, will endeavour to have some of these evils remedied. Now, we have had quoted to us the language of the right hon. the Premier, on this question; we have also had quoted the language of his left hand partner, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who spoke as follows in regard to members of the civil service taking part in elections :

> With those examples before us, yea, with members of the civil service eating the bread of both parties, and deliberately interfering in elections for the purpose of aiding one political party, if they so act they must be considered as taking their political lives in their hands, and they must accept the consequences of their own acts, and the good sense of the people of the country and their natural sense of equal justice will not merely justify, but demand at the hands of the government that they should make an example of them.

We have also had the language of Sir Louis Davies, then a member of the cabinet, quoted by the hon. member for Marquette in the same sense. The hon. gentleman then a member of this government went the length of saying that the principle should be applied to men who interfere against the opposition as well as to men who interfere against the government—that it should be applied to all officials who interfered in any way in political matters. I do not think there can be any question that the principle should be applied to men of both political parties; and I do not expect that the government will take the strong hint given to them by the hon. member for Selkirk, and assert that a Conservative official who interferes in elections does wrong, while the Liberal official who interferes does not do wrong. I want to draw the attention of the government, in the interest of the country, to what is going to be the result if they treat this matter as a huge joke, or pass it over lightly, under the impression that no one is going to pay much attention to it. I ask them to consider if they are not doing much greater harm to the rising generation of this country by laying down these principles and pledges and then refusing to notice any violations of them than they would do by raising a duty higher than they think they should, or putting a duty lower than they think they should. It is not only tariffs or readjusting constituencies, or whether a railway commission should be appointed or not, or how much money should be spent on public works, that this House has to concern itself with. But here is a government just fresh from the country laying down the principles that ought to govern in these matters; and here is an hon. gentleman, the member for Marquette, who knows what he is talking about, who has never been known to misjudge anything stated in this House, who is noted for carefulness in his statements, giving three specific instances of absolute violations of these principles which were thus laid down by this government. Now, we have not yet heard from the government on the subject. I would have thought that immediately on the hon. member for Marquette resuming his seat, some member of the government would have paid, not the hon. member for Marquette but the country whom they

serve, the courtesy of stating what they thought about it. They seem to think their followers from Manitoba should answer the hon. member for Marquette; but I wish to tell them that this matter is not confined to the province of Manitoba. I ask them to pay the province of Ontario the courtesy of explaining what this platform meant, of saying wherein we have misconstrued it, of showing wherein the three cases mentioned by the hon. member for Marquette are not applicable to the platform as laid down by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The government are not obliged to do so; but I warn them that if they think the province of Ontario is not interested in this matter, because it only happened in Manitoba, or is going to treat it lightly, they are greatly mistaken, and they ought to put themselves right before the province and before the whole Dominion. There are words in this resolution which do not appear to me to be capable of any two meanings; but I know that this government has often been able to show that things did not mean what the country thought they did. I appeal to the government to let us know distinctly and clearly what those words do mean, and wherein the cases cited by the hon. member for Marquette are not applicable. If they are applicable, let the government not be satisfied with saying that some Conservative government did worse at some other time; because that is not the question. I am not admitting or denying that they did. We are dealing with the present administration. Although the hon. member for Selkirk said that Conservative governments in the past had done the same thing or allowed it to be done. I want to point out this great moral and national difference between the two governments in that respect; that the Conservative government never made a pledge on the subject and broke it, while this government did. It does not matter, for the purpose of this argument, or his motion, whether the Conservative government did wrong or not, but it does matter whether the government of this country keeps its pledges on not. The difference between the two parties is this: No Conservative government has ever been shown to have laid down within the four walls, of this House any speech or policy or pledge like this one made by this government. No Conservative government has ever been known to break its pledges, and then, when called to task, try to laugh the charges away, regardless to what the people may think. But just the contrary is the course followed by this Liberal government. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to say that it does not lie in the mouths of Conservative members to raise this question, but that answer will not go down to the people. It lies in the mouths of Conservative members to do their duty. It matters not whether the Conservative party did wrong eight or ten years ago—and I am not admitting that they did—that is not the question at issue now. We are dealing with matters of the present. We are dealing with the present administration and calling it to account for its failure to carry out its pledges. These pledges and principles are well laid down in the speeches of the right hon. the First Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and Sir Louis Davies, and the cases cited of Thompson, Young, Jonassen and Jerome, prove conclusively what little respect this government has for the pledges on which it secured public support, and until it can be shown that these cases are not in direct violation of the platform thus laid down by the Liberal party, I shall support the amendment of my hon. friend from Marquette.

Mr. W. SCOTT (West Assiniboia). The position taken by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken is a most convenient one for his party. He has laid down the doctrine that the Conservative party is perfectly free to do wrong, because it never pledged itself to do right.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend has pronounced an eulogium very well deserved on the whole, of Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, of Manitoba, and then proceeded to say that the Conservative party had never made a pledge which it did not keep. This will be news to this House. Why, before the last local election in Manitoba there was given to the people on the authority of Mr. Hugh John Macdonald a platform consisting of nineteen planks, and one of those planks bound the Conservative party to keep politics out of the administration of justice. Yet Mr. Hugh John Macdonald had only been in power a few weeks when he cut the official heads off 450 justices of the peace, and replaced them by 450 Tories. On this side we have no objection to make to the advertisement of Mr. Macdonald as a gentleman who always keeps his word, but whenever that picture is held out to us, it brings to our minds those celebrated nineteen planks in the Conservative platform of December, 1899, and the fact that not one of these planks was ever adhered to. My hon. friend referred to the question of prohibition, which reminds us that although Mr. Hugh John Macdonald promised that if elected he would give the province a prohibitory law, that promise remains still unfulfilled. He also promised that the number of cabinet ministers would be reduced from five to three, yet still we have five. He further pledged himself and his party to reduce the indemnity of the members of the legislature from $500 to $300, yet the very next session they were paid an indemnity of $600. I happen to have the misfortune of living in a part of the country which is not yet a province, but

only a territory, and possibly I do not quite understand the force of the argument made by hon. gentlemen opposite regarding civil servants. I have not been favoured either with a copy of the amendment which has been put into your hands, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member for Marquette, but if I understand his complaint, it is this, that the three gentlemen whom he named, and who are Dominion government officials, have been candidates for the Manitoba legislature. I would ask my hon. friend if that is correct ?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I think that there were more than three, but I mentioned three, Young, Jonasson and Watson, postmaster of South Brandon, though I am not sure whether I mentioned Mr. Watson or not. But I did not mention one-third of those I could have.

Mr. SCOTT. It may be because I live in a territory and not in a province that I fail to see the reason of the complaint. In the North-west we have not yet introduced federal politics into local affairs. As I understand it, the pledge given by leaders of the Liberal party had reference to the interference of government officials in federal politics and had nothing to do with local politics. At all events, that is my understanding of it, and so far as I have heard no attempt has been made to prove interference in federal politics against these gentlemen. I am disposed to question whether it is proper for this House to lay down the principle that Dominion officials have not the right to exercise their franchise, and even take the platform in provincial elections, provided that it does not interfere with their duties as officers of this government.

I would not be disposed to take the position that these servants of the Dominion government have not a perfect right to take part in provincial elections. I know very well—and I think the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) will bear me out—that some of the postmasters of the North-west Territories are actually members of the local legislature. I can cite one instance—the member of the local legislature for the constituency of Whitewood, who was the postmaster at that point, and, I think, is yet, and, at the present time, is deputy speaker of the local legislature of the North-west Territories. However, I would not care to go very far in laying down a position on this subject. I merely wish to say, in support of what has been so very well and forcibly said by my hon. friend from Selkirk, that the Conservatives in the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories are the very last people in the world who have any call or any right to make complaints in this matter. Anybody who knows the conditions which prevailed in the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories for the years from the opening of that country up to 1896, knows very well the tyranny practiced by the government through its officials in that country. Until 1896, it was never possible for a Liberal to be elected in that country, except on one occasion. And one fact referred to by the hon. member for Marquette, the fact that his opponent in the last election had been a Dominion official, Mr. Thompson, a homestead inspector, proved, as well as anything could prove, the difference in the conditions which prevail now from those which prevailed prior to that time. For, up to 1896, while the Conservative government was in power in the Dominion, if an official had taken a nomination on behalf of the Conservative party there is no human power that could have been used by the Liberal party that would have resulted in the defeat of that Conservative candidate. My hon. friend from Marquette also complained of the difference between the treatment that is meted out by this government to officials who happen to be Liberals and that meted out to officials who happen to be Conservatives. Well, I have some knowledge, so far as the territories are concerned at all events, of the conduct of government affairs, and, so far as I have been able to see, there is no difference in the treatment meted out by the various ministers to the officials, whether those officials are Conservatives or Liberals. But I may say that, prior to the Liberal government coming into power in 1896, the lists of civil servants in Manitoba and the North-west Territories might have been searched from top to bottom without discovering a sign of a single Liberal in that service. My hon. friend referred to a long list of officials who, he alleged, had been dismissed by this government since 1896. I suppose he had the old Winnipeg 'Telegram' list as a basis for his statement. I recollect very well that some time ago the Winnipeg 'Telegram' gave what purported to be a full list of the officials dismissed by this government in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Probably the hon. gentleman was correct when he placed the number at one hundred and fifty. But I recollect also, very distinctly that when I went over the list, I found the names of men who had died while in office, as well as the names of others who had left the service of their own volition, either to go into other lines of business or, perhaps, to leave the part of the country where they had been residing. When I analysed the list, to find the basis for these charges of wholesale dismissal of officials, I found that there was only about 25 per cent of the 'Telegram's' list who had actually been dismissed, and in all of those cases concerning which I had personal information, there was very good reason for dismissal. In most cases there had been charges formally or informally made and an investigation held, which, revealed

facts fully justifying the dismissal. My hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) who last spoke, laid down a doctrine which, if the proposal which my hon. friend from Marquette asks the House to accept, were accepted, would be most convenient for the Conservative party in Manitoba. The result would be that this government would immediately put chains on every Liberal official in the country, preventing them from taking any part in politics, from exerting any influence or, probably, even from casting their votes, while at the same time, every local Conservative official appointed by the Roblin government would be free to go up and down the country, as my hon. friend from Selkirk says they have been doing, exercising all possible influence in the elections soon to be held.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have one other matter which is not distinctly germane to this matter which I wish to mention. It relates to the discussion which took place here last night. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), in referring to a gentleman who made one of the statutory declarations which I read before the House, Mr. Trant, of Regina, stated that that gentleman was a civil servant, this being stated to give special weight to charges against him. I may say that Mr. Trant is not a civil servant in the ordinary sense of the term. A most disagreeable reference was made by my hon. friend from Peel to Mr. Trant, and I wish to occupy two minutes in making a statement in reference to that gentleman, as I intended to do last night, but was prevented. Mr. Trant has a reputation, and, like the rest of us, no doubt, is anxious to uphold that reputation. Mr. Trant spends part of his time in performing the duties of secretary to the Lieutenant Governor in Regina. When the party of the hon. leader of the opposition visited Regina, Mr. Trant, who represents the 'Free Press' of Winnipeg—

Mr. INGRAM. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) state the point of order ?

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) has no right to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) is referring to a discussion which took place last night, and which is finished, and it is contrary to the rule of the House to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. SCOTT. I accept the correction, Mr. Speaker, and I will make no further reference to yesterday's discussion. As I understand it, I have a right to discuss any other subject at this time. As I was saying, Mr. Trant is the representative of the 'Free Press' of Winnipeg, and was detailed by the 'Free Press' to accompany the party of the leader of the opposition, as reporter on a part of their tour. He is a journalist with a reputation. For years he was editor of leading papers in India.

Mr. INGRAM. Order. The hon. gentleman is referring to a debate that took place last night, he is referring to a trip of certain gentlemen of this House to the North-west.

Mr. McCREARY. He is referring to the newspaper man in his capacity as a civil servant.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is speaking about a certain reporter, a Mr. Trant, who enjoyed the privileges of that party which went west.

Mr. SCOTT. I am referring to the representative in Regina of the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' and who last fall accompanied the party of the leader of the opposition. He reported their meetings for the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' and accepted the hospitality of these gentlemen, and was invited into their private car.

Mr. POPE. No, not invited—put himself. I deny that he was invited.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. William Trant was in their private car, and afterwards an hon. gentleman has had the lack of decency to get up in this House and charge that gentleman, who had partaken of their hospitality, with foisting himself upon them. It will do them no political good in the North-west Territories, where the people have proper views as to what is honourable and decent conduct towards a guest. I say it is a disgrace. The hon. member for Peel last night was asked to modify his statement and he refused. Other members of the party who are now sitting in this House——

Mr. INGRAM. I rise to a point of order. Does the hon. gentleman really want this whole matter to be threshed out again ?

Mr. BLAIN. I shall expect an opportunity to reply to this hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman for Assiniboia is referring to a previous debate. I call his attention to the rule that it is never permitted to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. SCOTT. I may explain to you that in discussing this question regarding the civil service—

Mr. SPEAKER. But the hon. gentleman was referring to something which happened last night. That is irregular. He may discuss the question before the Chair, but he must not refer to the debate which took place last night.

Mr. SCOTT. I was really referring to something that occurred last fall in connection with the visit to the west of the party led by the leader of the opposition and Mr. William Trant—I think possibly, with these

various interruptions, I have stated about all that I intended to say with regard to Mr. Trant. He is an English gentleman, a journalist with a reputation, who was for several years editor of newspapers in India, and had been connected for several years with some of the best papers in England. In this country he is representative at Regina of the 'Winnipeg Free Press.' I may say too that he is an author of sufficient reputation to be quoted in the Encyclopedia Britannica upon the subject of trades unions. I think, under all the circumstances—

Mr. POPE. The less said the better.

Mr. SCOTT. Probably I have said sufficient. I was going to say that under all the circumstances, any reflections which have been cast upon that gentleman who is not in this House, who has made no offensive statement against any person in this House—I think these reflections might well be withdrawn or modified. I appeal to my hon. friends who were on that trip not to put themselves in the position of casting reflections upon a gentleman who partook of their hospitality.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I may have an opportunity of making a remark in reply to the hon. gentleman. First, let me say to the hon. member for West Assiniboia that the Mr. Trant referred to did not accept, on invitation, any hospitality at the hands of the leader of the opposition on their trip in the west.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before the hon. gentleman goes any further, I would like to know how this matter is germane to the motion which is now before the Chair. I want to know what the case of Mr. Trant has to do with the question before the House.

Mr. BLAIN. I will comply with any rule of the House, but I think it is only fair to myself to say that the hon. gentleman, when the Deputy Speaker was in the Chair, made a statement reflecting upon my character in this House, which I think I should have an opportunity to refute. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you cannot deny me that privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it would be regular now to discuss that question. I have just called the hon. member for Assiniboia to order because I thought he was referring to a previous debate, the same debate to which the hon. gentleman wishes to allude to now. I must ask him not to refer to that at all.

Mr. BLAIN. What I wish to say is entirely with reference to something that was said on the floor of the House to-day, I make no reference to any former debate. I wish to say that the member for Assiniboia has stated that a person by the name of Trant, a newspaper representative from the west, an employee of the government, accepted the hospitality of the leader of the opposition and his party when they were on their western tour last fall. I say in reply to the hon. gentleman that that statement is incorrect. Mr. Trant never received an invitation to accept the hospitality of the leader of the opposition or of any member of his party, but Mr. Trant crowded himself in upon the car, and from one station to another he came in and occupied a prominent seat in the car, and after several days of this intrusion, some member of the party was compelled to invite him to get out of the car. That is the kind of hospitality the hon. gentleman referred to. Permit me to say one word further; that if I wanted to get some instructions in decency and good behaviour I am sure I would not apply to the hon. member for West Assiniboia, for at no time in the history of this parliament—and I appeal to hon. gentlemen who have occupied seats in this House for many years—has an hon. gentleman been permitted to produce affidavits against the character of another hon. gentleman, without first giving notice——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is still referring to a previous debate.

Mr. BLAIN. I have not mentioned it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand this matter was brought up last night, and there is no occasion for discussing it just now. I would invite the hon. member to confine himself to the question before the Chair.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

IMPERIAL AGENCY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Imperial Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). It has been suggested to change the name to the Imperial Trust Company.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I think some of the clauses will require to be amended if the name is changed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. The question of the title received very considerable attention there. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) desires that the name be changed I think it should go back to the committee.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have agreed to a change being made in the title of the Bill. We made a change in the committee, and

before the Bill was through there was only about a quarter of it left.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was informed that the title is to be changed to the Imperial Trust Company.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have no objection.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But I have an objection, because I am informed that there is another company of the same name.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. This question was ventilated before the Committee on Banking and Commerce the other day, and strong exception was taken to the title 'Imperial' being assumed by this company by a representative of the Imperial Bank here, acting under instructions from the general manager at Toronto. The name was changed by the committee from the Imperial Company to the Imperial Agency. The objection is still greater to this latter change because it is said that in small towns where there is an agency of the Imperial Bank the agency is often referred to as the Imperial Agency and there would be a conflict. It would, perhaps, be better to accept the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and refer the Bill back to the Committee on Banking and Commerce and in the meantime we will see that the bank does not raise any further objection. I understand that the Canadian Bankers' Association is entering a strong protest against the use of the proposed name. That is the information I have from Toronto.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I made my suggestion under a misapprehension. When I entered the House I was informed that it was proposed to call this the Imperial Trust Company, whereupon I said that if a proposal of that kind were made, the Bill should be referred back to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence, informs me that that is a mistake, that the proposal is the one which the committee has already approved of; that is to call it the Imperial Agency. I do not wish to go back on any understanding come to in the committee. If it were proposed to call it the Imperial Trust Company that would be a new proposal and I would ask it to go back to the committee, but the objection to the title 'Imperial Agency' was considered in the committee and the committee have dealt with it. I do not know whether the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) was present or not, but a gentleman appeared on behalf of the Imperial Bank and objected, but the view adopted by the committee was that the word 'Imperial' was rather a broad name that any company might properly take unless there were such words associated with it as would go to create a similarity of title. The objections of the Imperial Bank were considered, and the committee took the view that by changing the name to the Imperial Agency the objections were removed.

Mr. INGRAM. A representative of the Imperial Bank was before the committee the other day and stated his objection, and the committee by a large majority ruled otherwise. I have no doubt the committee will rule the same way again.

Bill reported.

Mr. BICKERDIKE moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I think it is better to leave the Bill over for its third reading until another sitting.

Motion (Mr. Bickerdike) agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

Mr. BICKERDIKE moved :

That the Bill be passed and that the title of the Bill be changed to the Imperial Agency.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 165) to incorporate the Algonquin Lumber and Power Company.—Mr. Gould.

Bill (No. 168) to incorporate the Chicoutimi and North Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

SUPPLY—INTERFERENCE OF CIVIL SERVANTS IN ELECTIONS.

House resumed consideration of the motion of (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that the House again go into Committee of Supply and the motion of Mr. Roche (Marquette) in amendment thereto.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker, the question that has engaged a portion of the time of the House this afternoon has been so fully, and I think, so fairly laid before the House that my mission here is a somewhat light one, and if I am to reply to the criticisms of my hon. friends from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) and from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) my task will not be a difficult one in that respect either. I think the House will agree with me that they have not dealt with the question and that the matters which they have brought to the attention of the House will not make the position of the Liberal party any easier or place it in any better position before the country than it was before they addressed the House. Now, the question is this : The Liberal party has laid down, as has been shown by the quotations which have been read from the speeches of the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his lieutenants, the platform that we supposed was to be for the guidance of the party and of all government officials in the country in future. Yet, here we have, in the face of that, no less than, I understand, seven gentlemen, employees of the Dominion government, who have accepted nominations as Liberal candidates in the

approaching elections in the province of Manitoba.

The only excuse made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) is the old excuse which we hear from the other side of the House repeatedly; that tu quoque argument which is now so well known: Well, when your party was in power you did as bad or worse than we are doing. That is the answer from the Liberal benches to the majority of the charges against this government that we bring to the attention of the country. We do not forget what the Liberals promised before they got into power; we know the pledges they made to the public; we know the criticisms they levelled against the Conservative government, and we know how they pledged themselves that when they got into power they would redress the alleged grievances against which they protested. But is it not a strange thing to see those gentlemen to-day, now that they have attained power, perpetuating in an intensified form that which they protested against when in opposition. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) as well as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) told us that Mr. Jerome had not been a partisan. In order to show that these gentlemen are entirely mistaken about Mr. Jerome's character in that regard, I refer them to a letter which he wrote to the 'Free Press' on the 30th September last. I shall not weary the House by reading that letter, but suffice it to say that Mr. Jerome takes up a column of the 'Free Press' in criticising severely the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) who was then a minister of the Liberal government, but who was reported at the time to be not in accord with his colleagues. This would show that Mr. Jerome is so intensely partisan that he is not satisfied with attacking the Conservatives, but that he is prepared to have a fling at even a Liberal minister whose Liberalism is not up to Mr. Jerome's standard. Permit me, Sir, to give a few instances which will explain to hon. gentlemen who do not, perhaps, understand the workings of things in the west, how these officials can exercise considerable power over the voters at the time of an election. These three gentlemen: Mr. Young, Mr. Jonasson and Mr. Jerome, in the discharge of their duties, visit those who have homesteads or who get permission from the government to cut timber. They are in a position to hold forth the possibility of what they can do and what they may do in their official capacity if those people do not vote in the interest of the party they desire them to. An official in that position may, for a year or more, prevent a man from getting his homestead to which he is entitled, by saying that the settler had not quite complied with all the conditions of the Dominion Lands Act. The timber agent might, if he were so disposed, wield a great influence over the electorate, because he might say to a settler: you have cut a few poles more than you are entitled to, and under the power I possess I can punish you for so doing. I have a letter here from the premier of Manitoba, who says that an Icelandic settler came to him making a complaint that he had attended a public meeting which was addressed by Mr. Jonasson, and that the whole trend of that timber agent's speech was to the effect, that in the position he occupied he had the power to confer benefits on those of the electors who did his bidding. At that meeting it is alleged that Mr. Jonasson refused to permit any person to reply on behalf of the Conservative government of Manitoba. These few instances go to show the influence that such officials may use on the electors in that country. In addition to that, these men can go around campaigning and using the government money which is allowed them for expenses in doing so. The hon. gentleman from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) and from the West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) have adduced as a sort of rebuttal evidence, the allegation that when the Conservatives were in power they did as bad or worse than the Liberals are now doing, and if the government is going to rely on such an argument as that, here and now is the place for them to say so. But what took place from 1896, when the Conservative party went out of power in the Dominion, until 1900, when the Manitoba Conservative government was returned. I have here a list of 150 Conservative employees who were dismissed by the present government of the Dominion during the period I have referred to, and before the Manitoba Conservative government came into power. And, Sir, if the Manitoba Conservatives, as has been alleged by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary), did retaliate, it was, what to some extent might have been expected in view of the dismissal of these 150 Conservative officials, the majority of whom were able and efficient officers, against whom not the slightest charge could be made. I am sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) will not say that Mr. H. H. Smith, who was Land Commissioner for many years was not well qualified to hold his office, and was a man against whom no just charge could be made.

Mr. McCREARY. He was not dismissed.

Mr. BOYD. What happened to him?

Mr. McCREARY. His office was abolished and he was superannuated.

Mr. BOYD. Yes, that was perhaps an easy way of doing it, but at all events Mr. Smith was put out of office, and the civil service list shows that Mr. Turriff occupies Mr. Smith's place, and is Land Commissioner to-day. Then there was Mr. Daniel Smith, who was a most efficient officer. He had charge of the public works in the west, and he was an active and energetic man, but he was removed from his position in the prime of life.

Mr. PUTTEE. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) does not pretend that that man was discharged without cause.

Mr. BOYD. What was the cause ?

Mr. PUTTEE. The cause was exposed in the police court.

Mr. BOYD. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) will have an opportunity of stating it to the House. He can get up and do so if he has any charge to make. Was there any charge against Mr. Hargrave, the ex-postmaster, who is still an able and an active man ? Could there be any charge against the postmaster of Brandon, who was dismissed for partisanship, and in whose place was appointed Mr. Campbell, ex-president of the Liberal Association, and one of the most active political workers in the place. Sir, these men were removed from office by this Liberal government notwithstanding the statement of the Prime Minister and his lieutenants on the floor of this House. In view of the fact that the right hon. gentleman declared that men such as these should not be dismissed from the public service, is it not an extraordinary thing that 150 Conservative officials were dismissed from office by this government between 1896 and 1899. When the hon. member for Selkirk speaks of 400 justices of the peace being removed, let me tell him that when the Greenway government came to office the first act of their Attorney General was to pass an Order in Council cancelling all the commissions to all the justices of the peace in Manitoba, so that you could not get a Conservative justice of the peace in the whole province to make a declaration before for election purposes or any other purposes. I do not know what the Conservative party did when they came to power, but that is what the Greenway government did. If this House, to-night, is going to vote down the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Roche), I suppose the country will know what to expect, and for our part, we will know what conduct is to be allowed on the part of government officials in the future. I think, Sir, I have made it perfectly clear that the question that is now before the House is one which is agitating the public mind in Manitoba, and which is the cause of a great deal of public discussion in the press and on the platform. I think, Sir, it would be well for the government to tell us what action they are going to take on this matter before they call upon us to vote the salaries of some of these gentlemen. If the government say these gentlemen may take any part they wish in political affairs, so long as they do not interfere in Dominion issues, it is well for us to know that, because in a short time we shall be called upon to vote the salaries of some of them, and I do not think the minister in charge of the departments in which they are employed will find fault with us if we ask the government to state distinctly what position they propose these men to occupy whether they are to be politicians in the full sense of the word, or servants of the people, who act independently of both parties. That is what we wish to know, Mr. Speaker, and before this debate is ended, I expect that we shall have the position of the government on this question clearly defined.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman made a statement to the effect that there were 150 dismissals by this government between 1896 and 1898. I would like the hon. gentleman to make a list of those dismissals, and place it on the Table of the House.

Mr. BOYD. I have the list here, and I shall be glad to put it on the Table or put it in 'Hansard.'

Mr. DAVIS. Send it over here.

Mr. BOYD. Shall they go in 'Hansard,' or shall I read them ? I do not wish to weary the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is against the rules for anything not said in the House to go in 'Hansard.'

Mr. McCREARY. Would the hon. gentleman not be allowed to let us see the list ?

Mr. BOYD. I will put it in 'Hansard,' and then my hon. friend will see it. I will ask the hon. gentleman to place his 700 in 'Hansard' at the same time. I believe these names were published in the Manitoba 'Telegram' in 1898 or 1899. In going to the library to get a copy of that paper, I found that there was no bound copy of it there. The only Manitoba papers in the library in bound form are the 'Tribune' and the 'Free Press.' For that reason I was obliged to ask the editor of the Manitoba 'Telegram' to tell me where I could find a list, or to send me a list of the names published at that time ; and here is the list : H. H. Smith——

The PRIME MINISTER. What was his position ?

Mr. BOYD. The positions are not given. The next is W. Hargrave——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is that Mr. Hargrave, the late postmaster in Winnipeg ? Does the hon. gentleman say that he was dismissed ?

Mr. BOYD. That is the understanding.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will correct the hon. gentleman then. Mr. Hargrave was superannuated as an old employee and a man advanced in years ; and my impression is, though in this I may be in error, that he was a Liberal appointee. I am responsible for his retirement, and I retired him purely on the merits of the case, because of his advanced years and the ne-

cessities of the service, and on a superannuation allowance. I hope the rest of the hon. gentleman's list is more accurate than that.

Mr. BOYD. Might I ask the hon. gentleman, did he request to be superannuated?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, he did not request it. He was superannuated because the public interest demanded it, and because he was a man advanced in years. The hon. gentleman is contending that this man was dismissed for political reasons. Not only could that not have been the case, but he has a son in the service, whom I have had great pleasure in promoting to a very prominent and responsible position in the Post Office Department, and he fills that position now. So I ask the hon. gentleman to drop that case—it is not a case of political partisanship.

Mr. BOYD. I do not think I will drop any of them. The hon. gentleman may explain any of them to the House that he pleases. As regards the ex-postmaster, if the hon. gentleman met him to-day, he might find it difficult to keep up with him, old and decrepid as he says he is. But that is a nice, easy way of getting rid of a man—abolishing one office in Winnipeg and creating another one with a better salary at Ottawa.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was between 70 and 80 years of age.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Hargrave was not a Conservative; he was a Liberal.

Mr. BOYD (reading)—Daniel Smith, K. Grayburn, J. M. Sutherland, Miss F. Sutherland, Jos. Turenne, Mrs. Scott, Mrs. Livingstone, W. F. Jones, M. O. R. Jarvis, H. Carstens, C. P. Cloutier, R. Dolbear, Miss Turnock, Miss Duff, W. R. Rowan, Jas. Reid, J. F. Tennant, Thos. Shannon, J. J. Arsenault, A. J. Baker, W. S. Cottingham, W. H. Hearn, Robt. Gunn, A. Hetherington, D. Hogg, A. M. Burgess, R. L. Alexander, P. M. Barker, G. J. Cox, J. McD. Gordon, V. H. Hesson, H. S. MacDonnell, Major Montgomery, A. T. Abbey, Wm. Laurie, and J. H. Paul, were dismissed from the Regina registery office; and J. T. Stemshorn, John Dobbin, Miss Pope, Mr. Sherwood, and John Rogers, from the Regina land office. J. R. C. Honeyman, James McAra, A. P. VanKoughnet, J. A. Mitchell, William Lambert, and J. Anderson, were dismissed from the Indian Department, Regina district. Dr. Willoughby was dismissed from the Regina industrial school, and Dr. Cotton, as medical officer of the Regina jail. G. W. Almon, from a clerkship in the land office at Edmonton, and E. Brokorski, from a land agency at Battleford. Leo Schaunus, fishery officer, Fort Alexander; D. Devlin, fishery officer, Lake Manitoba; A. McKay, Indian agent, Berens river; R. La. T. Tupper, inspector of fisheries, Selkirk; A. Muckle, Indian agent, St. Peter's reserve; R. Taylor, hatchery, Selkirk; W. Cleland, hatchery, Selkirk; D. Miller, postmaster, East Selkirk; C. H. West, manager dredge, Selkirk; W. Taylor, dredge, Selkirk; T. R. Vardon, postmaster, McGregor; W. Thornton, dredge, Selkirk; W. Tillson, Selkirk, dredge; S. Davis, Selkirk, dredge; J. Cavanagh, postmaster, Brandon; P. Daly, immigration officer; T. Ferguson, land office, Calagry; A. F. Holmes, immigration officer, C. F. Herbert, immigration officer, Calgary; W. L. Orde, land office, Brandon; J. D. Graveline, postmaster, Letellier; P. Parent, postmaster, St. Jean Baptiste; A. LaSalle, postmaster, St. Pierre; G. T. Landry, postmaster, St. Adolphe; J. Craig, postmaster, Strathclair; G. Stone, postmaster, Rapid City; W. J. Bourchier, land office, Calgary; J. McGuire, Indian Department, C, Phipps, land office, Regina; H. Reed, Indian Department, G. Lindsay, postmaster, Griswold; B. Hogg, immigration sheds, Brandon; Dr. Spencer, jail surgeon, Brandon; W. H. Todd, Indian industrial school; W. H. Hiam, Dominion lands, Brandon; Mr. Daniels, postmaster, Moosomin; C. W. Peterson, mines office, Calgary; H. S. Sherwood, land department, Westaskiwin; J. R. Thompson, homestead inspector, Calgary; S. A. Stewart, park superintendent, Banff; H. C. Ridley, land department, Kamloops; H. Green, commissioner office, A. Cates, postmaster, Napinka; A. J. Baker, lands office, Brandon; G. A. Barnham, assistant post office inspector, M. Fee, lands office, Winnipeg; James Bruce, postmaster, Carman; S. Shaw, postmaster, J. J. Miller, postmaster, Parkin; J. Burke, postmaster, Brookside; J. Carnduff, postmaster, Carnduff; J. B. Mercier, postmaster, Battleford; P. G. Williams, Indian agent, Battleford; J. Carney, agent's assistant, Onion Lake; J. K. Dremain, meteorological officer, Medicine Hat; I. E. Parker, farm instructor, Fort Qu'Appelle; J. Wilson, farming instructor, Battleford; J. C. DeGear, farming instructor, Battleford; F. A. D. Bourke, farming instructor, Battleford; J. Carney, warehouse man, J. Looby, fishery inspector, Edmonton; Dr. Orton, Indian medical superintendent, J. R. Hall, Interior Department, Mrs. Guilmette, lands office, Winnipeg; J. Forcier, quarantine officer, Emerson; J. Secord, Crown prosecutor, A. L. Lunan, governor, Regina jail; S. A. Clark, inspector public works, Mr. Armstrong, tailor, North-west Mounted Police; W. J. Cox, homestead inspector, J. Thompson, homestead inspector, L. W. Herchermer, commissioner, North-west Mounted Police; Mr. Gistorne, Qu'Appelle; J. Ross, Indian agent, Saddle Lake; C. H. Harper, clerk, Saddle Lake; W. D. Beck, Crown prosecutor, W. White, courthouse, Moosejaw; G. S. Davidson, fisheries inspector, Qu'Appelle; J. McKee, Regina jail; N. Campbell, Indian Department, Regina; B. L. Baldwinson, Dominion lands, M. Evoy, jail service, J. Bradner, jail service, R. S. Park, homestead inspector, White-

wood; M. Entemear, postmaster, Kroneau; J. B. Hawkes, postmaster, Balgonie; C. Gass, postmaster, Moosejaw; W. Wayne, farm instructor, Battleford; J. Latka, interpreter, Edmonton; Hon. Francis Ogletree, Indian commissioner, Portage la Prairie; these are the names. In some cases the position they occupied is given, but in others they are not. I had no desire to occupy the attention of the House, but as hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to think they would like to have the names put on 'Hansard,' it is just as well they should appear there that, to a very great extent, gives the reason why the Conservatives in Manitoba, after they came into office, followed the course of action they did. If the hon. gentleman who made the statement that some 700 had been dismissed by the Manitoba Conservative government will also put a list of the names in 'Hansard,' we will have an opportunity of judging the righteousness or otherwise of these dismissals and compare the record of both parties with regard to the matter now before the House.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I would not take up any time of the House, Mr. Speaker, had not the hon. gentleman who has just spoken seen fit to read a list of names of officials who, he claims, were dismissed without cause by this government after it came into power. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his information, but I think he informed the House that he got it from the Winnipeg 'Telegram.' Well, that may be a very worthy sheet, but I do not think many people would take all the statements that appear in it for gospel truth. Why, it is not so very long ago when the hon. leader of the opposition had to contradict a report which appeared in that paper of a speech delivered by him at Morden. If the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to send me the list he read, I would like to go over the names and make comments on some of them. However, I caught some of the names. There is one party, Miss Duff, but Miss Duff is still in the employ of the government and has not been dismissed. Then there is Captain Cottingham, who is also still in the employ of the government.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I did not say Captain Cottingham, but W. S. Cottingham, of the Brandon land office.

Mr. DAVIS. Would the hon. gentleman kindly send me over the list, as we could not hear the names very well on this side of the House. He also gave the name of John Rogers, homestead inspector. Well, Mr. Speaker, that gentleman was paralyzed. He did not do any work for a year, during which the government kept him on and paid his salary. I caught the names of a few gentlemen dismissed in my riding, but they were dismissed for cause. One was an Indian agent, who was dismissed for giving liquor to the Indians. This was proven before a commission of inquiry. There was another case in which a commission was appointed to look into the affairs of a sheriff, but the sheriff resigned rather than go before the commission. I could show you that the other dismissals were equally all for cause, as the hon. gentleman will find if he will make inquiries. I had some experience with some of the officials of the Manitoba government last winter. When out in the election campaign last winter, I came across several Manitoba officials taking active part, not only in the canvass from house to house, but on the public platform, and using every influence in the interests of the Conservative candidate. One of these was an immigration agent, Mr. Burke, and another an immigration agent, Mr. J. J. Golden. I could give the names of scores. I notice that hon. gentlemen on that side carefully avoided replying to my hon. friend from Selkirk. He went over a list of respectable officials who were slaughtered by the Manitoba government without any cause.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). If the hon. gentleman will pardon me——

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman will have ample opportunity after I have done, and I am treating him with the same amount of courtesy as the hon. member for Macdonald gave me a short time ago. There was a list of names read by the hon. member for Selkirk of respectable men, men up in years, who had given their whole lives to the service, and who were turned out practically to starve without any investigation, without any charge having been made against them, but simply because their places were required for others. There has never been, in the history of any province of this Dominion, anything like the wholesale slaughter of officials without cause as by the Manitoba government. I might allude to the case of Mr. Dawson, the very respectable police magistrate, of Winnipeg, whose place was wanted and whose head consequently dropped into the basket. Hon. gentlemen opposite are the last persons who can talk about the dismissals of officials. If there are officials in the employ of this government whom the people want to represent them in the legislature, that shows that the government have selected respectable and responsible men, who have gained high esteem in the community by the way in which they have carried out their official duties. When the Conservatives were in power there were very few of the officials whom anybody would nominate to go to parliament. I know of a case of partisanship previous to the election of 1896 in the district represented by my hon. friend from East Assiniboia, which is a case in point. An Indian agent of the late government was travelling around the country during election time, with two government horses hitched in tandem and a government official driving the team, and he was sitting back blowing a horn so as to call the farmers out and tell them how they should vote.

That was a Conservative tin-horn partisan.

There is another case to which I wish to draw my hon. friend's attention. In the election of 1887 in my district there was a gentleman who was commissioner for the purpose of settling rebellion claims. He was drawing $15 a day from the government. I could quote the figures from the public documents if any hon. gentleman wished to have them. The campaign opened in December and was kept up until the last of March. This gentleman was sent there from Ottawa, he addressed meetings, canvassed, organized, did everything he could to elect the Conservative candidate, and all the time drawing $15 a day from the treasury of the Dominion. Take another case. There was an inspector of mounted police in my district who was at the same time appointed enumerator. I went to him and wanted to see the list, and I had a perfect right to see it, being the accredited agent of one of the candidates. But he would not let me see it; he said they had no use for Grits and that I could see no list there. And, since this government came into power that officer has been promoted to be superintendent—that is his reward for treating us in that way. I could go on all night giving cases of this kind. Now, the hon. member for Marquette has claimed that public officials have been nominated to the legislature. I do not know anything about them. It is only rumour. I have seen the names of Mr. Young and others in the papers, but I do not know, and I fancy that no person knows, as a matter of fact whether they are officials or not. I am not going to say that it is a proper thing for officials to take any part in elections. But I do say that the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are the last persons who should talk about partisanship of officials or the partisan dismissal of officials. However, if the government looks into the case, and it is found to be in any respect as serious as the hon. gentleman trys to make out, the government, no doubt, will see to it that these gentlemen do not continue to occupy these offices. For my part, I hold that no official has any right to go out and work in an election. But I have seen it done even last winter in Manitoba, and I venture to say if the hon. gentlemen opposite had the opportunity again, their officials, when an election came on, would be running about the country as thick as grasshoppers. But, of course, that does not justify anything of the kind under this government, and I hope they will look into the matter.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). As I was not aware that this question was coming up, I shall not say more than a few words. A discussion such as we have had this afternoon can hardly be said to be of an edifying character; it seems necessarily to consist of each side charging the other with being worse then itself. Possibly, that is inevitable under our present political system. My own opinion is that, even from the standpoint of party advantage, there is nothing to be gained by a government on coming into office discharging the employees appointed by their predecessors. But I feel equally sure that every government is in duty bound to deal with this matter purely from the standpoint of the public interest. I am pretty well acquainted with the facts in some of the cases of complaint in Manitoba that have been brought forward during the last few years. I know, as a matter of fact, there were a number of the employees of the old Greenway government who richly deserved dismissal and they got it. But it does not stop there; the very necessity of dismissing some men seem to be used as an excuse for wholesale dismissals for which there is no justification on the grounds of the public interest. One case particularly has been mentioned, that of the police magistrate for the city of Winnipeg. I am not in the confidence of either party there, but I can state that all parties and all fair-minded men in Winnipeg felt that the city was humiliated and that harm was done to the public service by the removal of police magistrate Dawson. A good man was removed from the public service. It matters not whether his successor was a good man or not, the fact was that a good man who was getting used to his job and able to render good public service was dismissed. I do not know what cause brought this dismissal about, but, so far as I can find out, all the public men in the city, and the citizens generally, condemn that kind of action. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House have quoted full lists of officials who have been replaced. The justifiable dismissals are mixed up indiscriminately with those that are purely partisan, and thus the real issue is confused. I do not regret the discussion of the matter in the House; it seems to me that it should be discussed more than it is, it should be discussed until we are sick of it, and the people of the country are sick of it, and look about for a remedy. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) read a list of dismissals. I noticed some names that had no business to be mentioned in this connection, for the parties were rightly dismissed, and dismissed for the public advantage. One case that the hon. gentleman mentioned was the dismissal of the public works officer under this government. I cannot speak from actual knowledge as to what was the alleged cause of his dismissal, but I know upon what it followed upon. I know that within a few weeks before his dismissal he grievously, and, I believe, unprovokedly, assaulted a minor official in the customs house, a poor, weak old man—brutally assaulted him, as was proven in the police court. Of course, his dismissal ought to, and I believe did, follow as a

matter of course. It seems to me absurd that this case should be mixed up with others in which there is legitimate cause of complaint. It must be looked upon as a scandal under the present circumstances that men who are employees of the government, men, who, in most cases, have been appointed to the public service because they have records as active partisans—that is the outcome of the party system—should be candidates in another election while still holding public office. This seems to me to amount to a scandal because the public interest is sure to suffer. We cannot expect that, in the heat of an electoral contest these men, can or will deal fairly with the public whose work they are paid to do. But the cases of a lot of minor officials, men who work for the government only a part of every year or who draw small sums for minor services, should not be discussed in this connection. One case brought up by the member for Marquette was that of a sub-postmaster in Winnipeg who is a candidate in the north district at the present time. I look upon that man as doing a public service in taking a sub-post office in his store. I believe he is serving the country in part at his own expense, as are some other officials. Still, I believe that every official should accept the risk—if he takes a prominent part in politics or accepts nomination, and this action on his part causes irritation or trouble between them and the public whom he has undertaken to serve, the department should immediately insist upon his withdrawing from the position in politics or handing back his commission to the government. That seems to me right and proper, purely from the standpoint of the public service irrespective of party politics. I believe it is a proper principle, even in party warfare, that was laid down in the declaration of the Prime Minister. It appears to me this is an opportune time to bring this question up in the House, because, as a matter of fact, preparations are only now being made for a general election in Manitoba. If the government are prepared to tell us that the position stated in their declaration will be upheld, for my part I am prepared to accept it.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). The question involved in the motion of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), it seems to me, has not been discussed, but hon. gentlemen seem disposed to discuss it from a provincial, rather than a Dominion standpoint. I remember a few years ago when reference was made to provincial civil servants in the various provinces whose governments were favourable to the present government, and when fault was found with them for taking part in politics, we were told it was a purely provincial matter, that this government had no control over matters of that kind; therefore, it was for the provincial legislatures to deal with them. Taking that view, I think we should confine ourselves to the motion before the House. Now, I know that some members of the government entertain peculiar ideas with reference to the rights of civil servants. I may refer to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who, I think, is inclined to the belief that civil servants should be disfranchised. I think he stated on a former occasion that if they were disfranchised they would not get into this trouble. But I never heard any complaint from a government supporter if they did take an active part on behalf of the government. In 1887, when a Mr. McColl was a government employee in Winnipeg connected with the Interior Department, a deputation came here from Manitoba and interviewed Sir John A. Macdonald with reference to Mr. McColl's conduct in the elections. I remember the answer given to the deputation, because I was here at the time, and it was, that unless they could find some good and sufficient cause for his dismissal, Mr. McColl would not be removed from office. Sir John A. Macdonald took the ground that an employee had a perfect right to vote, and he had no fault to find with him, whether he voted Liberal or Conservative, and would not exert any influence upon him to induce him to vote Conservative. Now I find that the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davies, now judge of the Supreme Court, spoke as follows in 1896:

> I say when a public official not only discharges his duty as a citizen and votes, but takes an active political part in the canvas preceding the election, and makes himself in that sense politically offensive, he takes his life in his hands, and if the party which he so actively supports is unsuccessful, his political head comes off.

I think that is quite right. I think that a civil servant who takes an active part in a political election does so at the risk of his official life, and this remark would apply whether a Liberal or Conservative government were in power. Now, I find that in 1879, when there was a change of government, the 'Globe' of the 26th of February, 1879, laid down this doctrine:

> In the public interests there are but two considerations which can justify the substitution of one official for another, except in cases where the holder of a place has been guilty of misconduct; the new appointee may be better qualified for the situation than the old, or he may be able to save to the country a certain sum every year.

I think if the members of the government had carried out to the present time that principle laid down by the 'Globe' in 1879, both sides of this House would have no reason to complain. So I say that the government should make it distinctly understood that any civil servant who takes the public platform or makes himself offensive to one party or the other, takes his official

life in his hand, and would be subject to removal from office. I find this also :

From petty officers whose remuneration is small or nominal, it is idle to expect that subserviency or decorum in regard to political matters that the government could exact in the case of highly paid officials or civil servants proper.

That was the statement made here a few years ago, and I for one think that petty officers like a great many filling positions in the Post Office Department of this country, and whose remuneration is so small, should not be deprived of any of the rights of citizens simply by reason of taking an active part in politics. I think that the Postmaster General frequently finds that it is sometimes difficult to induce a citizen to fill these paid offices on account of the small remuneration attached thereto. Therefore, I do not think that we have a right to include them in the class of persons we are discussing now. What the opposition are contending for is that civil servants who are receiving fair remuneration for their services should have the right to vote if they think proper without any interference on the part of the government, but in my judgment that is as far as a civil servant should have a right to go.

Now, for the purpose of straightening out one reference that was made this afternoon by the hon. member for Selkirk, a note has been placed in my hand :

Mr. McCreary said that T. A. Cuddy, former county court clerk, Minnedosa, was dismissed and J. F. Boyd supplanted him. As a matter of fact, Cuddy was and is a Conservative, was not dismissed but voluntarily resigned, as he was removing to British Columbia. Boyd has since resigned and is now in partnership in British Columbia with Cuddy.

So you see that our hon. friends, in discussing matters of this kind, make some statements that are not in accordance with all the facts of the case, and we do not know how much credence to place on that list of dismissals that was read to us. For that reason I am not in a position to discuss intelligently the causes that have led up to the superannuations, removals, dismissals or resignations that take place in the different provinces. I think that we had better confine ourselves to looking after the civil servants of the Dominion of Canada. If the government will frankly carry out the views that they expressed in 1896, namely, that they will not encourage or allow officials to take part in politics, that is all that hon. gentlemen of this House have a right to expect of them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Perhaps it is to be regretted that the discussion of a very important principle is somewhat confounded with some individual cases. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), who introduced this motion, has rather directed it towards the application of the principle to certain alleged violations than to the endorsement of the principle itself. After reciting in his motion the view of the right hon. Prime Minister, which represented the views of the government then and to-day, he calls, in his resolution, for censure upon the government for not having, as it is alleged, applied this principle to a particular number of cases that the hon. member gave to this House. He named a number of persons in different departments whom he says, are violating this principle. If he had communicated to the government in advance of the motion the names of the officers in question and such information as to the complaints against them as would have enabled us to make an examination, we would, upon this occasion, probably have been in a position to discuss the merits of these cases. But I think it will be conceded that you could scarcely find a more unsuitable body to determine upon questions of fact than a House such as this when the facts are not before us and are only referred to incidentally and with more or less accuracy or inaccuracy by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. For example, the House is asked to pass a vote of censure on the government because it has not applied this principle by dismissing the gentlemen named. In support of that proposition we have the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) telling us that the government had on other occasions dismissed a larger number of officials, he stated it at 150, and he proceeded to read to the House a long list of dismissals. He read the list of, he says, 150 persons who, he says, were dismissed for violating the principle laid down by the right hon. Premier ; that is, that they were dismissed for political partisanship. The second name upon his list was that of Mr. Hargrave. I know all about the circumstances leading to his superannuation, and I have refreshed my memory since I put the question to the hon. gentleman, and it is impossible that Mr. Hargrave could have been dismissed by us for political reasons. He was a Liberal, appointed in the time of the Mackenzie government. He and his people were all Liberals, and he is a Liberal to-day. Nor was he dismissed. He was retired on a superannuation exceeding $2,000 a year. He was a highly worthy man, but Winnipeg has suddenly grown in importance, and it was necessary to place a younger and more active man in charge of that growing office. Solely in the public interest Mr. Hargrave was retired. He himself thought that he was quite fit to carry on the business of his office and he regretted his superannuation. I retired him with regret, but I was convinced that it was necessary to do so in the public interests alone. When he was retired it was not to make a place for any one else, because there was no one in view, and the office was kept vacant for a considerable time until I could find a suitable person. I attached more importance to the ap-

pointment of a suitable person than to any political consideration, and in the selection we have made I think we have been successful in finding a very suitable officer to carry on that work. I dwell upon that for a moment to show how unreliable that list must be when the second name on it is one that I know does not fairly represent the class of cases to which this resolution refers. Yet we are asked to-night to dismiss all these officers without a trial and without knowing the facts. If we were to do such a thing I am sure none would be quicker to censure us than our hon. friends on the other side of the House.

Mr. INGRAM. You have done so all the time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, we have not done so all the time. We have reasons for our act. In regard to the general principle, we have never receded from it, but, as to its application, there must be some degree of judgment exercised. For example, when that principle was being announced by the right hon. leader of the government to parliament, it had reference immediately to Dominion cases; to officers in the Dominion service who had taken a more or less active part in Dominion politics. I am not saying that the principle is to be confined to Dominion politics, but when you come to extend it beyond the range of Dominion politics one might naturally ask how far it is to be extended. There are many sorts of contests that go on in the Dominion wherein political partisanship plays a large part, and yet these contests are not Dominion in their character. For instance, we have, as in the present instance, local politics wherein more or less Dominion issues are involved and political partisanship is awakened. We can go into another arena of conflict between the people—municipal politics. It frequently happens that party politics, in the larger sense, are introduced into municipal politics. It is not many months ago since some prominent representatives of the Conservative party in Ontario advocated municipal politics in our province being run on Dominion issues.

Mr. INGRAM. So did your organizer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will admit for the moment, for the purpose of argument only, that a certain contest in a village turns upon Dominion politics. Is it the opinion of this House that this principle referred to shall be applied to municipal politics? If so, there are other forms of contests wherein political questions and political partisanship will more or less play a part. I am not saying where the rule shall apply, nor would it be wise, I think, to circumscribe the rule or to define it, but it must, I think, be limited to a general and useful application. In my opinion, the first consideration on the part of any government in dealing with its officers is to see that they render efficient service to the government which employs them. That is due, not only to the government, but to the people, whose servants they are, and I take the view that a public servant should be persona grata to the community, and that it is unwise for him to take part in any conflicts in regard to the questions that divide the people into more or less hostile parties, making it unpleasant for some patrons of the office which he occupies to have to deal with such an officer. Take the example mentioned by the hon. member from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), who discussed this question temperately and fairly, in regard to postmasters. I only illustrate the point that he sought to make in regard to postmasters enjoying a merely nominal salary. He thought that they should be allowed to enjoy all their civil rights untrammelled by any such rule as this. Let me give the illustration of a case of which I have knowledge, and we will see whether it would be safe in the public interest to tell all postmasters enjoying a merely nominal salary that they might be at liberty to engage in political struggles. I have had a complaint made to me that a certain postmaster enjoying a nominal salary—we will call it $20—a mere trifle, was an active member of a local political organization at these corners. The committee connected with the revision of the voters' lists met at the post office, and the postmaster himself was so deeply interested in the question of party politics that he intercepted a large number of the notices of appeal to the judge, with the result that one party failed to get the evidence before the judge and all the appeals were thrown out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That was misconduct.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course it was. But the fact that this officer took an active part in politics kept alive in him that partisan spirit, and he yielded to the temptation and misused his office, being for the moment more anxious to promote the interest of his party than to discharge his duties towards the public.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not think that a man who would make a capable and competent postmaster would sacrifice his citizenship for the sake of $20 a year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am merely giving reasons why it is impossible to determine by the degree of salary or the supposed importance of the office, whether or not this rule should apply. I believe that the rule must be, that under no circumstances must a public officer be allowed to place the public interest in a secondary position. No matter how trifling the salary may be, if a man takes a public office, the country is entitled to have him give his first consideration to the public service. Another case comes to my mind where a

postmaster under a similar temptation altered the date of a number of letters containing notices for a political meeting with the result that the meeting did not take place. Therefore, you will see that no matter how trifling the position may be, it is not safe to allow a man to take part in political strife.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the Postmaster General make no dismissals except for offences of that kind.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not discussing the abstract question, and if my hon. friend desires to discuss any particular dismissal made by me I shall be pleased to discuss that with him.

Mr. CLANCY. The Postmaster General will have an opportunity later on.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No doubt. But, when we are discussing a question of this kind on which there is no difference between us as to the principle involved, it would be inopportune to cloud the issue by discussing particular cases. I can understand that more or less feeling is injected into this discussion, because we are told by the hon. gentlemen opposite that the question comes up at the instance of the premier of Manitoba, who reports that some Dominion officials are taking part in the expected provincial campaign. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) stated that certain Dominion officials had used their office to bring undue influence to bear upon the electors. He told us that one went to the homesteaders and brought such pressure as an officer could bring because of their being indebted to the Crown, and in another case he referred to influence being brought in connection with timber licenses. All I have to say is that such conduct as that is highly censurable, indefensible and inexcusable, and will not be tolerated by the government. One can hardly conceive of a public officer committing a more gross interference with the liberty of the elector, than to endeavour to intimidate him by informing him of his indebtedness to the Crown, of his obligations to the Crown, and intimating to him that it may be better or worse for him according to the way he may vote. If any officers in the employ of the Dominion government are guilty of any such offence, I am sure that I can say on behalf of the government that the government will not overlook such conduct. My hon. friend has referred to two cases in my department—one of which is the case of Mr. Stratton, who he said was connected with a newspaper. I do not know what would be the proper way of treating a man who is connected with a newspaper; whether he ought to be dismissed or whether he ought be given the opportunity of withdrawing from one or the other, or whether it would be proper under the circumstances to permit him to continue his paper. There are circumstances particular to each case which would have to be considered. You may fill a dock with accused persons but you cannot dispose of them all by the same tribunal and the same trial, unless they are jointly concerned in the same offence. Each case has to be fairly considered and tested and dealt with according to the existing law. The existing law applicable to such cases is set forth in the speech of the Premier, recited in the resolution, and that law will be properly and justly and equitably applied to all cases brought to the attention of the government. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) on reconsideration, will deliberately ask us to-night to decide to dismiss these men. I do not know if he will persist in asking us, to here and now dismiss them or promise to dismiss them without knowing the facts. I am sure that no fair minded man would ask us to prejudge the cases, and to decide now without our knowing the facts what sort of treatment should be extended to these officers. I have only to say in conclusion, that we will deal with them in harmony with the principles laid down in 1897.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I would like to say to the Postmaster General that I brought at least two of these cases to his attention some weeks ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Which two please ?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Watson, postmaster and secretary of the Liberal Association——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In what way ?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). By the way of questions I put to him. I drew his attention to the fact that Mr. Jonasson was a homestead inspector and candidate, and that Mr. Watson was secretary of the Liberal Association, postmaster and candidate for South Brandon.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, Mr. Speaker, I never until this moment was aware of any of these officers being involved in local politics. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche, Marquette) may have asked me some questions, but it never crossed my mind that these men were trangressing any law. I never heard of their being identified with party politics, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will find that in any of his questions he for one moment suggested that these men were engaged in party politics.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Yes, Sir.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman read the questions ?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I read them in my speech, but I have not got them at hand at the moment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If my hon. friend desired me to look into these cases with the view of announcing to-night what action should be taken it would be fairer if he had pointedly called attention to the matter in advance, so that I might try and inform myself as to the facts. I have only to say that till the hon. gentleman made his speech, I had no knowledge whatever even of the existence of any of the persons named, although I might as a matter of form have answered questions bearing upon the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I remember an instance described by Dickens when Mr. Samuel Weller was advised by his father as to how he should spell his name. 'Spell it with a 'wee,' Samivel, said the old gentleman, and Samuel being asked by the judge whether he could see his father in court immediately looked up into the ventilator and said that he could not. The attitude of the Postmaster General with regard to these men in Manitoba reminds me of that incident. He does not want to see them, although he is sharp sighted indeed about seeing certain individuals who happen to be opposed to the Liberal party, and against whom accusations of this kind are made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that is a fair observation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will show my hon. friend whether it is a fair observation or not. Since 1900, in my own county, a postmaster was dismissed without any opportunity whatever—although he demanded it—to make his defence. He was dismissed on the flimsiest possible declaration of an individual in his neighbourhood that he knew the postmaster had been canvassing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You are discussing the other cases now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am discussing a case which I take the liberty of bringing to the attention of the Postmaster General for the purpose of pointing out to him how much keener his vision is in some cases than it is in others.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am afraid that is a very common complaint.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is my right hon. friend addressing me ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No. I merely remark that it is a general defect.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is, particularly on that side of the House. My right hon. friend's vision is most oblique in regard to matters of that kind. I may say that the names of these men have been published for weeks as candidates in the province of Manitoba, not only in Conservative organs, but also in Liberal organs.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never heard of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And yet my hon. friend the Postmaster General has not yet awakened to the fact that there are officials of this government participating in an active way in the present political campaign in Manitoba; and my hon. friend, with the most delightful frankness, suggests that we must not prejudge these men or dismiss them without an investigation ? How many men have been dismissed since 1896 without investigation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. None, without our knowing that there was good cause for dismissal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And our knowledge is very much keener sometimes than it is at other times. Why, the very case I refer to that took place only two years ago, was a case in which one of the most respectable men in the city of Halifax was dismissed without having the slightest opportunity of saying a single word in his own defence, upon the flimsiest kind of declaration, that the declarant knew that he had been canvassing.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give me his name ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Robert Kaulbach, postmaster of Middle Musquodoboit.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I will give an account of what he did afterwards.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know personally what he did, but I asked the hon. Postmaster General to bring down all the papers on which he acted, and those papers contain nothing more nor less than what I have stated; because I have copies of the papers in my possession, they having been brought down in response to the motion which I made in the House for the purpose of obtaining the documentary evidence on which that man was dismissed. If there was anything further on account of which he was dismissed, all I have to say is that the hon. Postmaster General was recreant to his duty in not bringing it down, when I asked for all the evidence on which Mr. Kaulbach had been dismissed from his position as postmaster. If the hon. gentleman knows anything more, the hon. Postmaster General did not communicate it to me, as it was his duty to do, when I moved for all the information on the subject.

Now, no one is asking the government to promise to dismiss these men. The resolution does not ask that. It simply asks the government to apply to these men in the province of Manitoba exactly the same principles that they announced in 1896, and on which they have acted so many times since. It is only in respect to the non-application of these principles that the resolution casts any censure on this government. I do not deny that matters of this kind are a source

of difficulty to any government. I have no doubt whatever that they have been a source of difficulty to this government, and I have no doubt that pressure has been brought on this government to dismiss men who are still in office. But I do say that the government have yielded to pressure of that kind in a great many cases when I think it would have been better if they had held their hand or had allowed the officials the opportunity of being heard in their own defence before being dismissed. But that is not the question we are dealing with to-night. The question we are dealing with to-night is whether the government meant what they said when they laid down certain principles in this House in 1896. This resolution follows the matter up logically from beginning to end, and I will take the liberty of reading it, as it has been referred to by my hon. friend the Postmaster General. The quotations made in the resolution are only a few of many which I have under my hand, some of which have been made since the election of 1900, and in which exactly the same principles have been laid down by the right hon. leader of the government. What did my right hon. friend say in 1896 ? He said :

Now, when we find an officer in the civil service, however good a servant he may have been, however faithfully he may have discharged his duties, but who has been an active politician, who has taken part in the election, offensively and actively, and before the eyes of the whole community, that official has become a scandal in the eyes of the community, and I have no hesitation in saying that he cannot be trusted to render faithful service to this government Where there is a government officer, he may hold his opinions, I do not care what they are ; they may be Liberal or Conservative, I do not care ; he may go and vote, and I will not inquire how he voted, but when he is seen on a public platform, when he takes part in party processions and is actively and offensively prominent as regards party candidates, that man has taken his life in his hands, and no one can have a word to say if he is dismissed from the service.

My right hon. friend either meant that in 1896, or he did not mean it. If it is a good principle to be applied in 1896—and it was applied in that year and the following years—it is an equally good principle to be applied now, and to be applied in the province of Manitoba as well as in other parts of Canada. Then, the first lieutenant of my right hon. friend, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, used language even more emphatic when he said :

With members of the civil service eating the bread of both parties, and deliberately interfering in elections for the purpose of aiding one political party, if they so act they must be considered as taking their political lives in their hands, and they must accept the consequences of their own acts, and the good sense of the people of the country and their natural sense of equal justice will not merely justify, but demand at the hands of the government that they should make an example of them.

The resolution after having quoted these expressions proceeds as follows :

That other members of the government, during that session and subsequent sessions, expressed the same views.

As my right hon. friend's memory of these matters may not be very good, I would like to quote some further remarks made by himself and by his colleagues bearing on the same subject. The right hon. gentleman himself, on the 1st of September, 1896, said this :

I have no hesitation in saying at this time that if an officer in the service chooses to be a politician, he shall be given every opportunity by this government of being a politician. What is the cause of the abominable practice which has been stigmatized in the States, that to the victor belong the spoils ? Why was it that after every Presidential election attended by a change of parties in power, the whole civil service was cleared off, the whole body of servants of the government were forced to resign or be dismissed ? The reason is obvious, the reason is that every officer under the American system was an active politician, and being an active politician it was quite natural that when the opposite party came to power the man who had been an active politician could not be a trusted servant of the government whom he had opposed.

Then, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, dealing with the question of what is offensive partisanship, said :

There is not much difference, there may be a difference as to the definition of ' offensivenes.' I should be disposed to consider, and I think I said so at the time in accordance with the principle which the hon. gentleman lays down here, that a public servant went outside of his duty and was ' offensive,' using the word in a legal sense which might properly enough apply to him, if he became a member of the committee of a candidate, or if he were canvassing actively against a candidate, I think that would be stepping outside the limit which has been laid down by hon. gentleman on both sides of the House.

Then he proceeds to discuss the question, whether civil servants should not be altogether disfranchised, showing that he was not referring to Dominion elections alone, but was dealing with the general question whether civil servants should interfere in political contests at all. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce again said :

It is perfectly well known, because hon. gentlemen opposite are aware that the proposition now laid down has been stated over and over by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, that where a civil servant chooses, besides exercising his undoubted right to cast his vote as he pleases, to interfere actively in elections, he must of necessity take the consequences of his own act.

And my hon. friend as late as the year 1900, when discussing the case of a certain gentleman in connection with the federal election in Gaspé, said :

Both sides of the House will agree that officers of the government should not take part in

politics. There is something repugnant to fair-play when we see an officer of the government paid with public money, using his position amongst his friends and neighbours, where his connections may give him influence, for the purpose of favouring one political party.

My right hon. friend can see that there is in Manitoba the spectacle of a number of the officials of this government actively taking part in politics. My hon. friend the Postmaster General says that it is a provincial contest, but he admits that Dominion issues are, to a considerable extent, involved.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say because I did not know, but we may presume that they are.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood him to say that they were, but at all events there is no doubt that in Manitoba there is a contest going on in provincial politics between the two great parties of this country. Surely we are not to have the principle laid down that Dominion officials are to be at liberty to take an active part in provincial politics and that provincial officers are at liberty to become active partisans in Dominion politics. Every one of the cogent reasons advanced by the right hon. gentleman and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce applies equally to the public officers, whether they display their active partisanship in Dominion or in provincial contests, and I do not imagine that any hon. gentleman on the other side will undertake to draw a distinction of that kind. The resolution proposed by the hon. member for Marquette proceeds as follows :

The government, acting upon the principles and rules so laid down, have since dismissed a very large number of officers on the ground of alleged partisanship.

There is no question about that. Every one in this House knows that to be the case, and that it has been justified over and over in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite. Then the resolution proceeds as follows :

That an application of the principles and rules so laid own for the guidance of public officials would result in the dismissal of those officers of the government who have become 'a scandal in the eyes of the community'——

These are the right hon. gentleman's own words :

——by taking an active offensive and partisan part in the election campaign now being carried on in the province of Manitoba, and who, while 'eating the bread of both parties' 'are deliberately interfering in elections for the purpose of aiding one political party.' This House regrets that the government has not seen fit to deal with such officials in accordance with the declarations of principles so made and so often acted upon.

It seems to me that the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from Marquette is one which ought to commend itself to the government. There may be something in the use of the word 'regret' which implies a censure on the government. However, I have no doubt that my hon. friend from Marquette, if the government object to the use of that word and desire to affirm the principles laid down by the Prime Minister in 1896 and again in 1900, would use some other word which would not be offensive to the government, in asking it to declare that these principles still prevail. If we are to have a non-partisan civil service in this country, it will not do for the government to lay down in 1896 principles such as were then laid down by my right hon. friend and to act on those from 1896 to 1903, and then in the year 1903, when the officials of this government by the dozen are in Manitoba taking an active part in the elections, calmly hold its hands and shut its eyes and say that it knows nothing about it. My hon. friend the Postmaster General suggests rather than says that the government does not know anything about those officials.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I made a very positive statement on the subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The government knows about these officials just in the same way that it knew about the acts of the ex-Minister of Public Works. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister thought that statements published in the newspapers of speeches were sufficient to justify him in dismissing a minister of the Crown. Yet the hon. Postmaster General shuts his eyes to what is going on in the public press. He is blind to the fact that in Manitoba the names of these men are paraded from day to day in the public press of that province, on both sides of politics, and tells this House that the government have not had time to consider the question. What was denounced by the right hon. gentleman in 1896 can go on now, and the government seek to shrink responsibility by saying that they are absolutely surprised to learn that any of their officials in Manitoba are actively engaged in the political campaign going on in that province. No such pretense can save the government. The government know what is going on just as well as we do. They and their friends read the newspapers. These things are brought to their attention. They know every fact with regard to these men just as well as hon. gentlemen on this side. These are facts of public notoriety. They are scandals which have been talked about in Manitoba for the last four or five weeks, and during all that time this government, which has ben so zealous since 1896 that its civil service should be free from all partisanship, will not lift its finger to suppress political partisanship on the part of civil servants, but says it knows nothing at all about it. I do not believe that any evasion of that kind will stand the government in good stead. I am bound

to assume that they meant something by the declaration they laid down in 1896. I am bound to assume that these declarations were not mere cant, and if not, the government should have taken some action before this and have made some investigation into these matters published to the world in the press for weeks past, and should compel their public officers in Manitoba, who are paid by both parties, who are eating the bread of the people of this country, to refrain from taking a partisan part in the political affairs of this country. I think that the resolution of my hon. friend from Marquette is one it was his duty to make as a representative of the province of Manitoba, and one which should commend itself to every one who believes that the government, in laying down the principles it did in 1896, was sincerely and honestly expressing its convictions and not making a mere excuse for getting rid of its political opponents.

Mr. Wm. ROCHE (Halifax). I shall not venture to discuss the part taken by Dominion officials in the local elections of Manitoba, for that is the subject about which I know nothing. But when hon. gentlemen opposite declare that it is a horrible outrage that officials of this government should take part in the local elections on behalf of Liberal candidates, is it not as great an offence for officials of this government who are Tories to canvass and use every partisan means against the government which is now in power and which is their master ? Now, if that principle prevails in Manitoba it ought to prevail in Nova Scotia and every other province. With regard to the special incident mentioned by my hon. colleague the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) I do him the credit of saying that I do not think he knows anything personally of the circumstances. He speaks on the basis of what has been reported to him. But I think I know something personally on the subject, because I know the person and I have been present in the locality during several elections. In 1896 the Liberal Conservative party was in power. What the gentleman did during the election then I could excuse, because his patrons and friends were in power, and I do not think it is so great an offence for an official to work or use his influence for a government in power as it is for him to canvass against the government. This gentleman was petitioned against to me; the request was sent to me signed by a number of individuals that he should be dismissed. I said I could not recommend the dismissal on such grounds. The fact that an officer was a Tory, that he was opposed to the government, that he had voted against myself, was not a sufficient ground for dismissal. I was furnished with affidavits of three or four reputable people that this man had canvassed against the nominee of the present government, and that his house was headquarters for the Tory party in that district. On that ground I recommended his dismissal; and I take the liberty of saying that if I discover other postmasters of this government who are guilty of the same proceedings, I will recommend the government to dismiss them also. Now, in the county of Halifax—and I think the same is general throughout Nova Scotia—the postmasters and other government officials are largely Tories. So far as I am concerned, while they do their duty they can vote Tory if they please. They ought to support the government in power, but I shall not move hand or foot against them if they exercise their franchise and do not become partisans. But if they go out of their way to canvass voters, to use their influence against this government, when the matter is brought to my notice by responsible and reputable men, I shall probably move for their dismissal. On the same principle hon. gentlemen opposite have called for the reprobation of officials that work against the government in Manitoba.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, you will vote for this resolution ?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Oh, of course, you will vote with us too. I would like to say further that, at the time of an election, these postmasters in the county of Halifax are apt to keep literature sent out by the Liberal party for digestion at some future period, while all the Tory literature is very quickly circulated. I think a thing like that should meet with the reprehension of my hon. colleague (Mr. Borden, Halifax). No doubt his voice will be raised against it. But if I find a case of that kind and the facts are made known to me by reputable individuals supported with affidavits, I will take the liberty of moving the government to dismiss him. Every man, so far as I am concerned, shall be free to exercise his franchise according to his own ideas. But when an official of the government goes out of his way to arouse the prejudices of the people against the government and makes the post office the headquarters of the opposition party, I will move for his dismissal.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If my hon. friend (Mr. Roche, Marquette) who has moved this resolution were really in earnest, if this object was to have the principle he affirms put in practice, he will admit, on reflection, that he has selected the very best course that could be selected to prevent the adoption of his idea. He complained that certain officers of the government in Manitoba are interfering in the elections in that province, and the first thing he does to bring the matter to the attention of the government is a motion of censure. My hon. friend shakes his head. Well, what else has been done to bring the matter to the attention of the government ? He gave his answer

a moment ago to the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock). He says that a few days ago he put some questions as to whether the Postmaster General had been informed of such and such matters. But if my hon. friend the Postmaster General did not take that as an intimation that the object of the hon. gentleman was to bring it to his attention that these officers were openly violating the rule laid down by the government, the hon. gentleman has only himself to blame. It is impossible to admit the doctrine laid down by the leader of the opposition on this point. He stated that the government should have known, forsooth, that there were certain officers of theirs who were candidates and taking part in the election, as was a matter of public notoriety, and their names appeared in the newspapers. But does the hon. gentleman contend that when I read the 'Telegram' or the 'Free Press,' or any other Manitoba newspaper and see the name, for instance, of Thomas Young in the list of candidates, that I am to know that this Mr. Young is an officer of the government? Is it to be seriously said that, looking at the newspaper and without any other information, we should know that this candidate is one of our officers upon whom we should have our eye and should see to his withdrawal from the candidature. Surely it is only reasonable to expect that, if my hon. friend on the other side has fair reason to complain that certain officers of ours are not acting up to the rules which we have laid down with regard to official conduct, it would be their business to call the attention of the government to the matter in some other way than by a motion of censure. If he had done this we should have looked into the matter. But from the statement he has made to-day I am not prepared to say I would act upon the recommendation he has made. He has selected especially three instances, those of Mr. Martin Jerome, Mr. Jonasson, and Thomas Young. As to the first instance, that of Mr. Martin Jerome, the hon. gentleman ought to know himself, in fact he cannot but know, that Mr. Jerome does not come within the category of those upon whom he wishes to invoke the censure of the government, for he is not a member of the civil service. Mr. Jerome is sometimes employed by the government, but he is not in the regular service and does not receive his cheque every month as the members of the civil service do. He has been employed from time to time by the government as a bush-ranger or in some such capacity. The hon. gentleman knows that, under such circumstances, the government has no control over Mr. Jerome and cannot call upon him to desist from being a candidate; the government has no more power over him than it would have over my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) if he were a candidate, as he will be some time. Therefore, as to this first case, the hon. gentleman will find that it would have served a good purpose if, before bringing his motion in the way he has done, he had called the attention of the government to the alleged dereliction of duty on the part of Mr. Jerome.

Again, take the case of Mr. Jonasson. Mr. Jonasson, I understand, is one of our officers, I do not know in what capacity, but he is in the pay of the government. He ought not to take any part in any politics. I say deliberately that for my part I feel as strongly now, in 1903, as I did in 1896, that when a man has taken a position in the civil service, he should take no part whatever in politics. He becomes an officer of the public, receiving the pay of all parties, he owes his services alone to the position which he occupies. If he wants to vote let him vote, but let him exercise his franchise in a way that will not be offensive to anybody. I say now that whenever one of our officers has been guilty of dereliction of duty, and when his name and the circumstances have been called to our attention, we shall ask him to explain whether the charge is true or not. Some time ago Mr. Roblin, the premier of the province of Manitoba, called attention to this case. I have not heard his speech, only the summary of it given to us this afternoon by the hon. member for Marquette, and he stated that it was the duty of this man either to withdraw from the political field or to withdraw from the service. Well, we cannot dismiss him unless the matter is brought to our attention. As to the case of Mr. Jonasson I understand that he has taken part in politics, as stated by the hon. member for Marquette, and in his case we shall cause inquiry to be made. But I must say that the situation is very peculiar in the province of Manitoba. There is no province in the Dominion where the political axe has been so active as in Manitoba. We have just been told that 150 dismissals have been made in Manitoba between 1896 and 1900 by this government. Sir, I challenge the accuracy of that statement, I deny it in toto. I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman from Macdonald has been misinformed. It is a long list to go through, but we have already seen three or four instances where he was shown to have been led astray, and I am satisfied that if this whole matter were investigated he would be found to be astray in one-half his cases, even more than one-half. But I do not admit a single case where we have been derelict, either in Manitoba or elsewhere, I do not admit there has been a single dismissal except for cause. But in the province of Manitoba, unfortunately, there have been dismissals by wholesale. At this very moment when my hon. friend from Marquette, in a moment of exasperated virtue, asks us to call upon our officers to withdraw, to stay their hand—at this very moment I have information that officials of the local government are openly

taking part in elections. It may not be true, I hope it is not true; but I am inclined to believe there is some truth in it, according to a speech which we had this afternoon by the member from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). He gave the whole case away when he stated of his own party : We have made no pledges in that matter, we have no policy and no principle in that matter.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not say that, that we had no principle in the matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must be candid with my hon. friend, I am glad to hear that he repudiates the doctrine. But though he did not say that in so many words, he did say this : We have made no declaration on this point, but the government have made a declaration on this matter and they must be compelled to live up to it. Then by implication, if the Conservative party have made no declaration, therefore they are at liberty to do as they please. If my hon. friend does not admit that kind of logic, at least it is applicable to the case. But I am glad to accept his disclaimer, not only in words but in spirit also, that they have no principle in the matter. I believe that he wants us in the province of Manitoba to live up to our doctrine, and we shall take good care that his own side also shall live up to that doctrine, which seems to meet with his approval. I have only to say with regard to this motion that it is a vote of censure where no censure whatever has been incurred. With regard to the information which the hon. gentleman says he gave to the Postmaster General, my hon. friend has just given me the question which the hon. member for Marquette asked the minister a few days ago :

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. Is Mr. S. Jonasson an employee of the Department of the Interior, in the province of Manitoba, as forest-ranger or homestead inspector ?

2. If so, is the government aware that he is the Liberal candidate for the constituency of Gimli in the ensuing provincial elections ?

3. Will his services be continued by this government while he is engaged in party politics.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. Yes.

2. The government has no information that Mr. Jonasson is a candidate for Gimli.

3. If he is a candidate, he will not be continued as a salaried official of the department.

Mr. R. H. POPE (Compton). The Postmaster General seeks to obscure the evidence of dismissals that have taken place from time to time in various parts of Canada. These chickens will come home to roost, Mr. Speaker, and no doubt the hon. gentlemen will live to regret many times the action they have taken in many individual instances during the years they have been in power. When the statement is made that every dismissal of postmasters and others has been made for good cause, Sir, I take exception to that statement in so far as our district at least is concerned. I am not going to speak for the province of Manitoba, but for the section of country from which I come. There have been dismissals made without cause, without the slightest cause, and which do not redound to the credit of the Postmaster General or of this government. The Postmaster General is perfectly aware of the fact. I brought it to his attention at the time, that when Miss Angus was dismissed no cause whatever was alleged. That young lady kept a country post office, on her salary depended her own livelihood and that of her mother; and the government committed a cruelty in dismissing her which shall never be forgotten in that section of the country, or in this House, so long as I am here as the representative of that constituency. I am perfectly willing that this government or any other should enjoy the legitimate fruits of power. I do not object to that, I expect them to do it. I expect them to reward their friends. I do not object to that so long as they do not interfere with the public interest. But when they do, of course they must expect to be subjected to the criticism to which they are entitled. But, Sir, when they go out of their way to serve miserable, low, sectional, party interests, in some small communities that should be beneath the consideration of any department or any minister, when they descend to that depth, they must expect to be criticised and blamed for it. I would call the attention of the right hon. leader of the government to the fact that he only read one of the answers to those questions. It is peculiar that even in this House, where books are open and where more than one man can read, we should find the right hon. leader of the government forgetting himself and the high dignity of his position to such an extent as a partisan that he has failed in his effort to be fair. We find him reading one question put by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), the answer to which gave an opportunity of applause from the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him. The answer to that question was :

If he is a candidate, he will not be continued as a salaried official of the department.

Applause from hon. gentlemen behind. But, the other question is this :

1. Is the government aware that Mr. John Watson, postmaster at Nesbitt, Manitoba, is the president of the South Brandon Liberal Association ; and the Liberal candidate for that constituency in the ensuing elections in that province ?

2. Will his services be continued by this government while he is engaged in party politics?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The department has no information whatever as to whether Mr. John Watson is the president of the South Brandon Liberal Association or the Liberal candidate for that constituency in the ensuing elections in that province.

That does not say what is going to happen to him. If the right hon. gentleman had read that one would he have received that applause? I do not believe he would have received it. I would like to know from the hon. Postmaster General how much correspondence he has in regard to this man being a candidate. This was on the 8th of April, and it is now the 15th of May. It takes three or four days to communicate with that part of the country and the hon. Postmaster General has had five weeks in which to ascertain the facts. I would like to see the correspondence brought down and placed on the Table showing how much interest the hon. minister had taken in that question during the past five weeks. I will venture to say that he has taken none whatever. I am sure the hon. gentleman has never thought of it and never intended to think of it again if this debate had not been brought up. Now, the right hon. leader of the government says: You are in great haste. You should have prepared your resolution in other terms if you wished to win the object you seem to seek. There was a question asked in regard to Mr. Jerome in 1899, by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) and what was the answer to it? The right hon. gentleman says: We pay him spasmodically. We pay him when it suits our purpose. When we can have some excuse for rewarding this political tool we pay, but when it is inconvenient, when there is an election on hand, when we want to have our hands clean so that we can hold them up to high heaven and say: Look at the grand principles that were laid down by this government two or three years ago. When we want to stand in that sort of atmosphere we do not pay Mr. Jerome. We pass over thirty or sixty days and then we give him his back-pay because that gentleman receives, as bush-ranger, or forest-ranger, the pay which is good enough for any man. He is receiving a great deal more to-day than he would as a legislator of the country and he is under a far greater obligation to the political organization that creates this government than he is to his legislative duties so far as measuring it by dollars and cents is concerned. The hon. Postmaster General claimed great credit for the easy way in which he has disposed of the venerable ex-postmaster of Winnipeg. He seemed to think that he had got rid of that gentleman in most beautiful style, in a way that should have felt comfortable to the poor old man. He removed him because he was getting old. He was as strong and vigorous as he is to-day. Every man who goes to Winnipeg and sees him knows that he is one of the examples that is pointed out, and as we go there we are reminded of the great fight that took place for a whole year between Mr. McIntyre and Mr. Conklin as to who should get the position vacated by the postmaster. That was the question at issue. They would have dismissed the postmaster a year before they did if they could have arranged for his successor. That gentleman enjoyed his salary for a year longer than was intended. He would have been officially executed by the hon. Postmaster General twelve months previously and he would have been relieved of the pain and trouble that worried him so much. They worried him so that he remained in office for over seventeen years and is still alive and in good health. I wish the hon. Postmaster General would prescribe some such worry for me. In 1899 the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) asked:

1. Is Mr. Martin Jerome an employee of the Interior Department in the province of Manitoba as forest-ranger or in any other capacity?
2. If so, is he the same gentleman who is the Liberal candidate for the constituency of Carillon in the ensuing elections in that province?
3. Will his services be continued by the government while he is engaged in party politics?

This is the answer:

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Mr. Martin Jerome is an employee of the Interior in the province of Manitoba as forest-ranger. 2. Inquiry has elicited the fact that Mr. Jerome has been tendered but has not accepted a nomination for the legislature. 3. Should Mr. Jerome accept the nomination his employment in his present capacity will cease.

That was in 1899. Do you not see how they got out of that? It does not say anything about his being elected. If he were elected then he would become intensely useful to hon. gentlemen opposite, and they could not afford to get rid of him. Mr. Jerome was the gentleman who commanded the situation in this case—not the government. The government were bound to keep Mr. Jerome. If he had been defeated and driven from politics they possibly could have afforded to sacrifice him as they did that poor old gentleman who represented the splendid Liberal principles of Alexander Mackenzie's time, but who had to make way for Mr. McIntyre who wanted that office. I shall be pleased to read a letter to the right hon. gentleman which will interest him and I am sure it is one in which he will have some faith. It is addressed to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), and it reads as follows:

Premier's Office,
Winnipeg, May 4, 1903.

N. Boyd, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

My dear Boyd,—I have your letter of the 30th April and have noted its contents. Am pleased to see that the party purposes to compel the government to make a declaration as to the propriety of homestead inspectors, particularly in the country canvassing and using their positions as officials of the Dominion government to intimidate electors into voting against convictions and further charging up their expenses in connection with canvassing and organization meetings, as an expense in discharge of official duties. It certainly is the greatest outrage that has ever been perpetrated in this country and

I cannot believe that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who so far as I know him, is an honourable man, will permit this sort of thing to continue. There is no question about the facts, they are absolutely indisputable and therefore you and others can make as strong statements as you like, as to what they are doing. Only on Saturday an Icelander came in 40 miles to report to me a meeting that he attended when out north of St. Laurent at which Captain Jonasson was present and spoke, but would not allow a single representive of the government a moment of time in which to address the meeting and the burden of his cry was his ability to do them favours as homestead inspector. These are the reports that come to me by men that feel the effects of his presence. I have not yet seen Powers or Barrett, but I presume will in the course of a few days.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) R. P. ROBLIN.

Those are facts. Those facts can be ascertained by this government. Why, to say that this government know nothing of what is going on in Manitoba, to say that they have no interest in the election in Manitoba, when the hon. Postmaster General can stand up in this House and say that he is one of the members of the Liberal government that has no knowledge of what is going on in Manitoba, that he does not read the public press the same as other people in this country, is something that it is hard for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to accept. Why, Mr. Speaker, he reads it here half the time in our faces when we are talking to him. I believe the Postmaster General to be a great reader of newspapers. I have seen him spend hours reading them in this House when we wanted his attention. Surely he must read something besides the Toronto 'Globe' and the Toronto 'Star.' I feel positive that the Postmaster General made a mistake, and that if he ever gets an opportunity he will never make that speech of his over again in just the same way. He is a reading man. He knows that there is an election pending in Manitoba; he knows from the questions which were put to him by the hon. member for Marquette, and which he answered, that these gentlemen are candidates and employees of this government. He knows it from the letter which I have read to-night from the hon. Mr. Roblin. He knows that his friends behind him have made no defence to-night. True, they have said that we did the same thing, but two wrongs do not make a right, and that is no argument. He knows that his own supporters do not get up to defend him to-night, and he knows that they know that there is an election in Manitoba and that these men are candidates in that election. The minister must be franker with this House. Perhaps it is that they are sorry for the principle they have laid down. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that every time the Postmaster General attempts to tie himself up to high minded principle he is sorry for it, and the same thing applies to the Prime Minister, and to the other members of the cabinet. During their whole political life they have been trampling under their feet every principle that they had, whether in power or out of power. Sir, there is a sacred principle involved in this resolution, a principle set forth in the very words of the Prime Minister, and we ask him to enforce that principle, and to vindicate his words. I ask him for the sake of himself, for the sake of his government, and for the sake of the country to enforce that principle without hesitation, and not go back on his words again. If there is a word in that resolution that he would like to have struck out let him ask the hon. member (Mr. Roche) to strike it out, and my hon. friend will do so. But, above all, let the Prime Minister enforce his declared principle which is recorded in his own words in the pages of 'Hansard.' Let the right hon. gentleman enforce this principle, I say it again, and let him declare to the people of this country that the first duty of himself and his government is to represent the people of Canada, whether they be Liberals or Conservatives, or Grits or Tories.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. Roche of Marquette).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Birkett,	MacLaren (Perth),
Blain,	McIntosh,
Borden (Halifax),	Morin,
Boyd,	Pope,
Clancy,	Richardson,
Cochrane,	Robinson (Elgin),
Earle,	Roche (Marquette),
Hackett,	Sherritt,
Halliday,	Tolton,
Lancaster,	Vrooman,
LaRivière,	Wilson.—22.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Archambault,	Lavergne,
Bazinet,	Law,
Belcourt,	LeBlanc,
Bernier,	Loy,
Bickerdike, ,	Macdonald,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	MacKinnon,
Bourassa,	Macpherson,
Bourbonnais,	McCreary,
Brown,	McEwen,
Bureau,	McGugan,
Campbell,	Malouin,
Carroll,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Champagne,	Martineau,
Christie,	Mayrand,
Copp,	Mignault,
Costigan,	Mulock (Sir William),
Davis,	Paterson,
Delisle,	Préfontaine,
Demers (St. John),	Puttee,
Desjardins,	Reid (Restigouche),
Douglas,	Riley,
Erb,	Roche (Halifax),
Ethier,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Fielding,	Rousseau,
Fitzpatrick,	Russell,
Fortier,	Scott,
Gallery,	Stewart,

Geoffrion,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Gibson,	Talbot,
Gould,	Tolmie,
Heyd,	Tucker,
Holmes,	Turgeon,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Wade,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Wallace.—71.
Lang,	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Grant,	Bennett,
Harty,	Thomson (Grey),
Beith,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Dugas,	Hale,
Lemieux,	Sproule,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),	Lennox,
Mackie,	Rosamond,
Wright,	Lavell,
Ross (Ontario),	Reid (Grenville),
Tobin,	Ball,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Morrison,	Gourley,
Blair,	Henderson,
Fraser,	Bell,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
McColl,	Ward,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Cartwright, (Sir Richard),	Tupper, (Sir Charles Hibbert)
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Thompson (Haldimand),	Ingram,
Calvert,	Taylor,
Béland,	Alcorn,
Bruneau,	Avery,
Carbonneau,	Barker,
Cowan,	Brock,
Demers (Lévis),	Broder,
Farquharson,	Bruce,
Fisher,	Monk,
Gallery,	Cargill,
Gauvreau,	Carscallen,
German,	Casgrain,
Girard,	Clare,
Harwood,	Clarke,
Kendall,	Culbert,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Ganong,
Sifton,	Haggart,
Lovell,	Hughes (Victoria),
McCarthy,	Kaulbach,
McCool,	Kemp,
McIsaac,	Kendry,
McLennan,	Kidd,
Madore,	Léonard,
Marcil (Bagot),	Maclean,
Matheson,	McGowan,
Meigs,	Calvin,
Oliver,	Osler,
Parmelee,	Pringle,
Power,	Robinson (North),
Proulx,	Roddick,
Stephens,	Seagram,
Ross (Yukon),	Smith (Wentworth),
Schell,	Wilmot.

Amendment negatived, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman propose actually going on with supply at this hour of the night ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The night is quite young.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend's idea about the night are not very creditable to his habits. My ideas of it would lead me to take the very opposite view of the situation. As we have been sitting pretty late several nights this week, I do not think it is advisable to go on with the estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have been having very entertaining discussions, but we have not been doing very much work. I hope my hon. friend will now give us a chance to do some work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know what my hon. friend calls work. We have been discussing matters of great public interest, and I would like to remind him that the fact that last evening was wasted was due entirely——

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). To the teapot.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from Victoria cannot forget that teapot. I think he is really desirous that it should be brought here and placed on the Table in order that hon. gentlemen might enjoy the benefits thereof. If it is placed there, I am sure that it will be placed near my hon. friend from Victoria, and that he will have the first opportunity to test it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I think it would be well to place it in the museum.

Mr. BLAIN. Along with the hon. gentleman's certificate of superannuation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have been sitting very late, and I really think the hon. gentleman should not go on.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We might take a few items. It is only half-past ten o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The fact that my hon. friend cannot see exactly what time it is, is an indication——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am trusting to the opposition clock, which is perhaps unreliable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The opposition clock happens this time to agree with the government clock, which says it is twenty minutes to eleven.

Mr. FRASER. Go on ; we will have a holiday next week.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is the first time that I have known my hon. friend from Guysborough to be eager for work. I must ask, at any rate, that we should not do what we did last night—go back and do a lot of work over again.

Rivière Chateauguay—dredging, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was asked to let this item stand until I could give information as to what money had been spent on this work previously. The return shows that the work was commenced in 1875-6, and it has been continued

almost every year since, the total amount spent up to the present time being $47,142.

Mr. MORIN. Is that river navigable at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that it is.

Mr. MORIN. It may be navigable for Indian canoes, but that is about all. Is it navigable for any steamer or yawl boat or ships of any kind ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend is familiar with the locality, he will know that there is a line of steamers from Lachine to Beauharnois on that river. I judge from the various expenditures made from 1875 that this is a warrantable expenditure. The dredging has to be continued, as the channel is continually filling up.

Mr. MORIN. I may say to the hon. minister that I know nothing about that river, but I know a great deal about the country generally. From the landing to the St. Lawrence the distance is very short, and I cannot see how the river can be navigable except for small boats.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. MORIN. To what extent am I mistaken, will you please tell the House ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information is that steamers drawing six or seven feet of water are running daily on that route.

Mr. BROWN. The steamers run from Beauharnois to Chateauguay, from there to Lachine, and from there to Montreal, and return by the same route to Beauharnois.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if he has a report of the engineer with regard to this expenditure generally ? If so, what is the nature of the report ? Is it a report for work to be done during the present year, or does it cover the expenditure for several years ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is an estimate of the cost of the work for the coming year. There has been some expenditure almost every year. The information from the engineer is that the soil is sandy and the channel fills up, and so long as there is navigation on the river, the dredging will have to be done almost every season.

Mr. CLANCY. What engineer made the report ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer of the department.

Mr. CLANCY. What is his name ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Lafleur.

Mr. CLANCY. There was an expenditure of a considerable sum last year. Was there a separate report for that expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that he has a report every year regarding this work.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that report set out specifically each year the character of the work to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All the reports received from the resident engineers must show what work is necessary and where.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says that he has a report of all the work done last year, and another one of the work proposed to be done. Will the hon. gentleman lay those reports on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly, I shall only be too pleased.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this work one which has to be repeated every year ? Does the river fill up every year and have the materials to be removed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There appears to have been done almost every year some dredging on this river.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the sum voted actually used in dredging every year ? A few days ago we were told that money voted for the purpose of dredging had been actually used in the construction of roads.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall be very pleased to have all the particulars concerning any such case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That statement was made on the vote for dredging in the lower St. Lawrence. The ex-Minister of Public Works said he had found out too late that a certain portion of the vote had been expended in the construction of roads.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall inquire into that. The money voted now will be used for the exact purpose for which it is voted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is some increase over what was voted last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $3,000 were voted last year, and I am informed by the chief engineer that this amount is really necessary, as there is a great obstruction there to navigation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. This seems a considerable outlay for the purpose of accommodating one small steamer. Are there any other boats on the river and to what extent is the navigation of this river serviceable ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that there are other boats, but this is a regular line which runs daily.

Mr. MORIN. How far up the river do the boats go from the St. Lawrence ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About twelve miles.

Mr. MORIN. I thought it was a small river.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the character of the work is such as to require the same expenditure every year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I find that the amounts vary. In 1875-6 the amount was $1,680. In 1883-4 it was $4,290; in 1887-8, $3,214; in 1896, $757; in 1897-8, $5,242; in 1898-9, $4,725; in 1900, $3,700; in 1901-2, $3,530.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is this river utilized for any other purposes than to accommodate a small passenger steamer ? Is there any commerce on it of any kind ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that there is a very large trade done there with Montreal.

Mr. BOYD. The hon. gentleman should be able to give some information about what that trade is when he asks for a vote of this amount. What is the volume of the trade done ? When we are asked to spend $5,000 per year in dredging this river, we ought to know what trade there is to warrant this expenditure. We have rivers in the Northwest we would like to see improved, but we can scarcely get a dollar for that purpose. $4,000 or $5,000 per year is pretty nearly all we get for public works in the Territories. And on this little river, twelve miles long, we are spending $5,000 per year.

Mr. BROWN. During the summer months at Chateauguay and Ste. Philomène, there is so much freight that this boat cannot carry it all. Three years ago the water became so low that the people did not know what they were going to do, and were it not for the dredging every year, it would be impossible for boats to touch at that point. The boat from Beauharnois touches there every morning, and that is the only shipping point in that vicinity by which the people can send provisions to Montreal.

Mr. INGRAM. Who are L. Cohen & Son ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are the proprietors of the dredge doing the work.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that the Little Giant ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman tell us the capacity of the 'Little Giant' ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Six hundred yards.

Mr. INGRAM. What price does the government pay for a dredge of that capacity per hour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Eight dollars per hour.

Mr. CLANCY. Is not that a high price for a dredge of that capacity ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the price that has been paid for many years.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that include scows ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that includes the whole plant.

Mr. INGRAM. Where do they dump the sand taken out of the river ? As I understand it this must be dredged every year. Does that mean that the material is dumped at a place where it will be likely to get back again ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The sand is deposited in deep water in the river St. Lawrence.

Mr. INGRAM. At what distance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About three miles.

Mr. CLANCY. How long has the dredge been at work there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer is not able to give me that information exactly. It has been there for a good many years.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose this is a case of a gentleman having what is called a soft job. I notice that in 1901 there was a vote of $6,000 taken for that work; in 1902, $3,000, and now in 1903-4, $5,000 is being asked. These are the amounts in the main estimates, probably if I examined the supplementary estimates I should find other votes as well. Certainly the government ought to be able to show that there is very important traffic on that river. The keeping up of an expenditure of this kind year after year becomes a very serious question. Here we find an average of about $5,000 a year spent for three years. There should be very important traffic to warrant such important expenditure. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has pointed out that in the province of Manitoba, there are very pressing works there for which it does not seem possible to get a dollar, and I know of many urgent cases in Ontario. I am not trying now to raise any sectional issue. But, wherever such work is located, where so much is spent there ought to be urgent public reasons for it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) might go back to 1883, 1884, and 1885, if this is an undeserving work. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is an old member of the House, and he might go back ten or fifteen years, during which nearly the same amount of money was spent from time to time on this work. Of course, that is no justification, if the work is not a proper one, but I have heard no intimation that it is not. The chief engineer informs me that the reason we are asking this amount this year is that there

is a rocky shoal to be removed, which will lessen the future expenditure necessary. If that is correct, I hope the hon. gentleman will see that it is better to spend a little money and try to do the work properly than go on as we have been doing for the last twenty years, spending money and not doing any good. The chief engineer tells me that if this money is spent, the same expenditure which has gone on, the amounts which have previously been expended will not be required in the future.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the engineer will explain what was done with this $6,000 in 1901, when there is still this rock to be removed and $5,000 is being asked this year? I do not know whether that money was spent, but the vote was asked. Was it to remove part of this rock, or has the engineer discovered all of a sudden that there is this rock requiring an expenditure of $5,000 for its removal? My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is too good a business man, and too logical, when he thinks proper to be logical, to use as a justification for useless expenditures now, the statement that there were useless expenditures under the former government. I do not think we can afford to carry the mistakes of either the Liberal or the Conservative governments. We must judge our expenditures by the advantage they yield to the public. I hope the hon. gentleman will not lay down any contrary principle. Speaking for myself, I am not here to defend a single act, either deliberate or mistaken, with regard to previous expenditures in this country. It is our plain duty to see to it that the public money is expended only upon works necessary in the public interest. Now, if there is any traffic in this river, it would seem to be of a feeble character, for the hon. gentleman has not told us what it is as a justification of this expenditure. Even though the traffic is small, if this expenditure completed the work, it would be a different matter. But, if we are to go on with large expenditures year after year for no better reason than that advanced by the hon. gentleman, I venture the opinion that we have no real reason for the voting of this money at all. We have come to the time in Canada, when, so far as taking the public money for merely political purposes is concerned, we can afford to retrace our steps. If the former government has been guilty of expenditures of that kind, that is no reason why the Liberal party should pursue the same course, or why, pursuing it, they should cite the actions of their predecessors as justification for what they are doing. Our expenditures are becoming more pressing; new districts are opening up and demands are becoming greater than our revenues will meet. We have come to the time when both parties can afford to learn by the mistakes of the past. I am not making charges, but, I fear that neither side can hold themselves guiltless in this respect. I know there is always some difficulty in a government resisting pressure from the outside. I know that there are many cases that are meritorious probably while there are others in regard to which extreme pressure is brought to bear for the purpose of having an expenditure made that governments have to yield to.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said most emphatically that it was no justification for asking a vote to say that it was an improper expenditure in the past. I did not use that as an argument why the amount should be voted, but, the other night, when the subject was under discussion, I was asked by an hon. gentleman opposite how long this dredging had been done on this river, and in answering the question, I said I did not think it should be considered an improper work. I said that parliament had voted an appropriation for such a long time that it must be a justifiable work, not as the hon. member for Bothwell states, for improper or for political purposes. I may mention that the constituency was a Liberal constituency while the late Conservative government made this expenditure.

Mr. COCHRANE. Circumstances may have changed very materially.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) will say that this amount was spent for the purpose of influencing this constituency. The only argument I used was that this work, having been carried on, it was fair to assume that it was a necessary work. There has been no statement made in this House or out of it to indicate that there has been anything improper about it. I was acting on the advice of the chief engineer of the department in regard to it. I dare say that the former ministers must have asked for an appropriation for this work because they thought it was a desirable work.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works will readily conceive that circumstances may have changed. I am not talking about the political complexion of the constituency, because, in discussing these questions, we should take a broader view than that altogether. We can readily believe that in years gone by, that river was a more important means of communication for the people and their produce than it is to-day, from the fact that they may not have had railway facilities in the years gone by. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you will agree with me that the traffic cannot be very great on a river that only serves seven or eight miles of territory. We are spending $5,000 a year. I will venture, with assurance, to say that $5,000 will carry all the commodities raised on twelve miles of river to market by railway, and I understand there is a railway crossing that river and running to Montreal. This question should be looked into. I do

not know but that there was timber floating down that river in former years, for which it was important to have this dredging done. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that it was his business to have criticised the expenditures of the former administration, not ours. I venture the assertion that these expenditures were pretty severely criticised, because former governments were more severely criticised for their expenditures than the hon. gentleman and his department are by the present opposition to-day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the reason I assume the expenditure must have been all right, because, I suppose, it would have been criticised before if it had not been considered a proper expenditure.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I may say that twelve or fourteen years ago there were two steamers, the 'Filgate' and 'Chateauguay' plying between Beauharnois, Chateauguay, Lachine and Montreal. Since the building of the New York Central Railway there is a certain amount of traffic which finds its way to the railway station and goes by railway. Now, there is only one boat plying between Beauharnois, Chateauguay, Lachine and Montreal daily, carrying farmers' produce from Chateauguay and Lachine to Montreal. I may also say that the excursionists who come out to Lake St. Louis find it much more convenient to take the boat in the morning than to wait for the New York Central train which arrives at Montreal at 9.45 a.m. The boat often finds itself unable to take all the trade that is offered, and in fact it would almost pay to put another boat on the route.

Mr. INGRAM. Who owns the boat?

Mr. BROWN. It is owned by a company. I cannot tell you who are the owners. It is called the 'Chateauguay.'

Mr. INGRAM. Can you tell us the tonnage of the boat?

Mr. BROWN. I cannot tell you that.

Mr. INGRAM. Can you tell us the draft of the boat, or anything about it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That information has already been given.

Mr. INGRAM. It draws six feet of water, I am told. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brown) has told us that this steamboat is used for the purposes of certain citizens of Montreal in going up and down the river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, that was not the statement I made.

Mr. INGRAM. No, but that was the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brown).

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nor did my hon. friend (Mr. Brown) say so. He said that it was used by excursionists.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. member for Chateauguay make himself plain on that point?

Mr. BROWN. The steamboat 'Chateauguay' takes people from Chateauguay and St. Philippe. There is a large amount of produce shipped from these points. The New York Central will not place cars on their train to accommodate the people there, and they send their produce by this boat in the early morning. It is for the accommodation of the farmers, and the boat can hardly carry all the produce which is offered to it in the morning. Sometimes five or six loads of hay and 300 barrels of apples have to remain on the wharf for two or three days.

Mr. CLANCY. What class of produce is being sent from there now that so completely overtaxes the capacity of the boat?

Mr. BROWN. Hay, at this season of the year.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I may say that there are not only boats carrying passengers from these points. There are tow boats taking barges. There is a very great amount of hay shipped to Montreal from that locality. There are fruits, and there is a great amount of other trade taken from points which are not served by the railways. I am not so familiar with the locality as the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Brown), but I know for a fact that tug boats are going there, getting barges and taking them to Montreal loaded with grain and hay. The people of these parishes who are not served by the railways are obliged to bring their hay and load it on these barges. There is a large amount of freight coming out of this twelve miles of territory, not six miles, as some hon. gentleman has stated. There are twelve miles of that river that must be dredged, and if it is not dredged, we will have to close up the river, which would preclude the people of several parishes from sending their freight to the city of Montreal, for instance, fruit. Without a railroad these people could not ship their fruit. I think this is absolutely necessary. I suppose it must have been taken into consideration by the late government, and rightly so. That work must be done every year, or else the river must be closed to navigation, to the great detriment of these people.

Mr. MORIN. I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman has just said. But I want to repeat what I have always said in this House that the government are neglecting some other places. There is the New York Central Railway running from Montreal through that and other localities, and there is the other road called the Adirondacks, which goes up into that country.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is the same road.

Mr. MORIN. Well, if you don't know I do. Of course it is very handy to

have a railroad built through every parish, by every church door and to every farmer's house, I admit that. But why is it that in the county of Dorchester the government has never given one cent to build a railroad, the only road we have there is the Quebec Central. People have subscribed and given money and labour to build a road. I must tell you this much, that we have from fifty to seventy-five miles to go to the city of Quebec and we have to haul our stuff with horses. We have been asking ever since I have been in this parliament—nearly seven years—for help from this government to build not in the county of Dorchester, but in the county of Beauce, nine miles of road. This nine miles of road would serve over 19,000 people in the counties of Beauce, Dorchester and Bellechasse. Yet I have failed to obtain one cent of help from the government to accommodate the people of these three counties. The people of Bellechasse have to haul forty miles, the people of Beauce have to haul thirty or forty miles, and the people of Dorchester, thirty or thirty-five miles in order to get to a railroad. We have never asked the government for any help except to build that nine miles of road. There is not a bridge to be built on the route, it is an easy route to build upon, yet we are refused assistance. I have worked for this road ever since I came to this House. I have tried to get both members from the county of Beauce to work for it. I do not know whether they have or not, but they tell me they have. I say plainly to this House it is a shame for the government to treat one county better than another. We all help to support this government with our money, and we should be treated alike, if not alike, then as nearly so as possible. Now, I would like any one, young or old, rich or poor, to show me where or when this government has ever paid one cent or one dollar towards helping the people in the county of Dorchester. We built a court house, the county built it. A few years ago I asked the ex-Minister of Public Works to give us $200 for a county bridge; not one cent did I get.

Mr. BUREAU. Was it the Minister of Public Works for the Dominion or for the local House that you asked for assistance?

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Israel Tarte, the hon. member for Montreal, was the gentleman.

Mr. GEOFFRION. For a court-house in your county?

Mr. MORIN. No, for a bridge. I see there is an ice pier to be built at Richmond, well we will see about that soon. We have rivers running through my county as big as the St. Francis river at Richmond, logs are floated on that river, on both rivers. Neither one of them is navigable. Here is an item for a pier, but when I ask for $200 to build a county bridge, after four bridges had been washed away and the people got tired of building, I was refused. I suppose if I had been a Liberal I might have got it; but I was not, and I will not be.

Harbours and rivers, Quebec, chargeable to capital.—River St. Lawrence ship canal, $515,800.

Mr. INGRAM. I think, in view of the lateness of the hour, and that some representatives from Quebec who wished to discuss this item are absent, we had better adjourn.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps the proper thing to do would be to accede to the request of the hon. gentleman. At the same time, I think some little consideration should be shown to the minister. This is the fifth or sixth time this vote has been called and asked to stand on account of the absence of one or two members. While I would be willing always to wait for an absent member, I think there ought to be some reasonable consideration shown to the public business. I ask my hon. friend if it is not right, after the item has been postponed several times at the request of hon. gentlemen opposite, that at last we should get down to business.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am bound to agree with the hon. the minister to this extent, that I think perhaps there is too much of a habit on both sides of the House to spend only a small portion of Friday in Ottawa. The result of that habit, which is not peculiar to either one side or the other, and which has been in force for many years, is that we practically have only about three days in the week to do our work. I for one would be very glad if some change would be made in that respect, so that we should have five days to do the work.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I want to point out to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, that the delay in getting through with his estimates has been the result of matters requiring to be brought to the attention of the House with the perfectly fair object of having them discussed. For example, the day before yesterday we discussed the Treadgold concession, and although we may differ in opinion about it, no one will say that it was not a proper matter to be discussed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To-day we have been discussing an important matter brought before us by my hon. friend from Marquette. Yesterday the minister would have got into supply and probably substantial progress would have been made, were it not for a cause which was not in any way due to members on this side of the House, and on account of which the time was taken up with matters which were not very profit-

able to the country or to any of us. While I agree that there is some force in the hon. minister's remarks, still I want him to remember the circumstances which I have brought to his notice. It is a fair proposition that some day should be fixed for the discussion of these items, and that the House would be so notified. If he will communicate to me now, or at any later time, his views with regard to that, he will find us disposed to give him an opportunity to have the items discussed in the committee, and discussed in such a way that he will not be brought here from day to day; although as a matter of fact, I suppose we are entitled to his presence in the House during a considerable portion of the time. In any case, it is always a great pleasure to have the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree that it is my duty to be here all the time, and I am perfectly willing to discharge that duty. I think, however, that these gentlemen who asked for three or four adjournments should remain here as well as the rest of us. No doubt there ought to be given a reasonable time to discuss the estimates.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman who kept us all day yesterday discussing the teapot, has not been in the House to-night.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was the absence of one or two members who asked items to stand, that I spoke of. That is hardly fair to the rest of us. They are absent on their own pleasure or business and they should not prevent us from carrying on the business of the House. If I ask the House to sit a little late some night when these gentlemen are present, I hope no objection will be taken.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.30 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, May 18, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 177) respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—Mr. McIsaac.

BRITISH-COLONIAL PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question. In a notable speech made a day or two ago by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the following appears, according to a despatch in the Ottawa 'Citizen':

> The colonial secretary proceeded strongly to urge the necessity in order to preserve the great empire that the trade of the colonies should be secured. Canada had offered exceptional advantages, he said, which Great Britain did not dare accept because of the narrow interpretation of the doctrine of free trade, the policy of dictation, and interference by foreign powers, Mr. Chamberlain said he was justified by the belief that Great Britain was so wedded to its fiscal system that it could not defend its colonies. This was a position not intended by the pioneers of free trade who, if they were alive to-day would agree to a treaty of preference and reciprocity with the empire's children. The speaker said he believed that an entirely wrong interpretation had been placed upon the doctrine of free trade but that the country ought not to be bound by this and it should not hesitate to resort to retaliation if necessary wherever the interests between colonies and the home country were threatened.

The Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain refers to two things: first, that Canada had made very exceptional offers to England in regard to a mutual preferential trade; the other is that England desires to defend her colonies in case of their being attacked commercially by foreign countries. I wish to ask the government if they are prepared to lay a memorandum of these offers on the Table of the House or to take the Canadian parliament into their confidence, and give us information as to what these offers were? That I think we are entitled to. I also wish to ask whether any correspondence is being carried on with the imperial government with regard to the threatened action of Germany; and, if so, are the government prepared to give this House any information regarding it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In answer to the first portion of my hon. friend's question, I may say that we have already taken the House into our confidence on the subject, for the offer which was made to the British government of a further preference as between British and foreign manufactures, is published in the Conference Blue-book as an imperial paper, to which access is easily had, and the memo. was fully read by myself in the budget speech. My hon. friend will find in that speech the offer we made the imperial authorities at the colonial conference.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the only offer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. With regard to the second part of my hon. friend's question, we have had no recent correspondence with the imperial government on the action of Germany.

Mr. J. CHARLTON (North Norfolk). I would ask whether the attention of the government has been called to the alleged intention of the German government to unload upon this country a supply of ex-convicts? The action recently taken by the United States with regard to the deportation of criminals followed by this report that the German government intends sending this class of immigrants to Canada, impels me to ask whether the government are giving the subject any attention.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We have received no official information that the German authorities contemplate any such policy. If we found that the German authorities were attempting such a policy, we would take immediate action to repeal it. My impression is that we have sufficient power, under existing laws, to deal with such a question, but if our powers should not be adequate, we shall have no hesitation in asking parliament to supplement them.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NEW CANADIAN COMPANY, LIMITED.

House in committee on Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the New Canadian Company, Limited.—Mr. Lemieux.

On section 1,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the necessity of declaring that this work is for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The company intend establishing a steamship company whose steamers will ply between England and Gaspé.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Although this is said to be a foreign company, I do not see the necessity of our declaring that this work is for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have consulted the officers of the Department of Justice on that point. The Bill had already passed the House and was referred back, at the request of the hon. Minister of Justice, in order that some informalities might be remedied. The officers of the department gave No. 53 Vic., Chap. 104, and 84 Vic., Chap. 186, as precedents for this very clause, in the case of other English companies doing business in this country.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The declaration may be necessary to bring under the jurisdiction of the Dominion a work which would otherwise be purely local or provincial. But I do not think that it is at all necessary that we should assume all the jurisdictions and powers of a local government even to grant a charter to a corporation to do this particular kind of work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). There were two considerations that entered into the matter in connection with this declaration when the Bill was before the Railway Commission. In the first place, the company is given power to carry on an ocean steamship business to foreign ports, and it was thought that possibly a question might be raised as to the power of this parliament to pass such legislation. Therefore this clause was inserted. There is also a clause providing for the construction of tramways and other works, which come within the general definition of railways in the Railway Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are these supplementary to the powers the company has as a corporation in Great Britain? If I understand rightly, this Bill gives them all the powers they have as a corporated company in Great Britain, plus the large powers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it gives them all the powers they have obtained under the English Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As the clause read at first, they had all these powers, but these were restricted by the amendment.

On section 4,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The company seems to have two different entities—one in Great Britain, under which it has powers to issue bonds and debentures, and we are now giving it another set of powers in this Act. Under which entity is it to have existence here? In this Bill we do not do away with the power of the English corporation and give it entirely a new set.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. gentleman will read the second clause as it originally was, he will see that they would have special powers and also all the powers they had under their charter in England. But, under these amendments their powers are restricted and they have only the special powers which are enumerated in the Bill. And, of course, they cannot go beyond what they have in this charter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Under this Bill the company is 'declared a body politic and corporate within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada; and that this Act and the Company's Clauses Act shall apply to the company and its undertaking instead of said Company's Acts of Great Britain.' It is an entirely different entity in Great Britain. The law of Great Britain applies to it over there as to the issuing of bonds, debentures, &c. The company in Canada has its powers and the company in Great Britain has its powers. That is what I say.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONSOLIDATED TRUST CORPORATION.

House in committee on Bill (No. 121) to incorporate the Consolidated Trust Corporation.—Mr. McColl.

On section 12,

Mr. MONK. There is something strange about this clause. It enacts that the :

Moneys, properties and securities received or held by the corporations upon trust or as agent shall not be liable for the debts or obligations of the corporation.

Still, it would seem that one of the debts or obligations of the corporation is receiving money on trust. The clause worded in this way seems to be anomalous. We ought to add, at any rate, that the moneys received on trust by the corporation shall be liable for the payment of the trust.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The purpose is, whether it is clearly expressed or not, that these trust funds shall be liable to the trustees and not for the general purposes of the corporation. If they have not expressed that, I have no doubt that is what they intended.

On section 18,

Mr. MONK. Does the minister think that this is a very wise provision ? We provide in section 18 :

The powers and authority hereby granted to the corporation shall not have any force or effect in any province in any respect in which they are inconsistent with the laws of such province.

I am afraid there are a great many provisions in this Bill which are at variance with the ordinary law respecting trusts in our own province, but still, when we have a trustee I do not think we should put that limitation upon the company's powers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it will probably be understood to mean that inasmuch as the management of trusts is a matter coming under the authority of the provincial law this Act can affect only them in so far as the provincial law will permit it. We cannot regulate ordinary trustees. This happens to belong to the class of subjects in which there is both provincial and Dominion authority—provincial authority as to the regulation of the trust, and Dominion authority as to the regulation of the company. A trustee is only permitted under provincial authority to invest his money in certain directions, and this Bill could not change that authority. I think that is what they are particularly aiming at.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF WILLIAM FRANCIS SCHOOLEY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 128) for the relief of William Francis Schooley.—Mr. Boyd.

On the preamble,

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of opposing the reporting of this Bill. I notice that according to the allegations of the Bill the former wife of Mr. Schooley abandoned him fourteen years ago, that she obtained a decree of divorce in one of the American states eleven years ago and that she married in the state of Michigan five years ago. These statements, assuming them to be facts, and as such they appear upon the record, would entitle Mr. Schooley to a divorce beyond question, but I rise to point out the imperfection of our law in regard to the granting of decrees of divorce. Mr. Schooley lives in Manitoba. The business of prosecuting this suit in Ottawa is one that would involve very serious expense. If Mr. Schooley was entitled to relief under our laws he has been subjected to a hardship, and to a cost in this matter that would seem to be unjustifiable, and I rise to point out that in cases where the law provides a remedy, in cases where the circumstances warrant the granting of divorce some more speedy and less expensive method should be adopted. If Mr. Schooley had been permitted to appeal in this case to a judge in Manitoba near at hand, if this case had been tried before a divorce judge, and a court could be established without additional cost by merely putting that additional duty upon the judges there, he could have obtained his relief speedily and he could have obtained it at small cost. He has been debarred for five years from making this attempt which he is now making to get justice to which he is entitled. In all of these proceedings we are pursuing a course which is entirely unjustifiable, a course which is expensive and one which in many cases, I have no doubt, prevents people who are entitled to relief from obtaining that relief because of the difficulties attending this course of procedure, because of the expense of coming from a distant province to the capital of the country and of the attendant expense and worry of prosecuting this appeal.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BOYD moved :

That a message be sent to the Senate to return to that House the evidence, &c., taken before the Standing Committee of the Senate, to whom was referred the Bill No. 128 (letter B of the Senate), intituled : 'An Act for the relief of William Francis Schooley.'

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Speaker, I think, before that motion is put, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) having made some reference to the subject of divorce, it does seem to me that the law as it now stands is a rich man's law as against the poor man. I think where the case is such as the hon. gentleman has described, and as the evidence bears out a more rea-

sonable method ought to be adopted whereby a man might be placed in a position to secure a divorce at less cost than the applicant now before the House has been subjected to. I think the government ought to be in a position to make some kind of statement in reply to the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk. This is a very important question. I, for one, do not wish to encourage the granting of divorces, but at the same time a circumstance of this kind is one that should be considered and no undue hardship should be placed upon a man who has been so unfortunate as this man has been.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Mr. Speaker, I think this is a case that ought to appeal to the sense of the House. The very fact of a man having to come down to the Senate here all the way from Manitoba is evidence to the House that there should be some better way of dealing with divorces than exists in the Dominion at the present time. This case would be settled in about half a day by a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. I think that public opinion will in time compel the government to do something so that people will not be put to this expense. If this were a poor man he would have been obliged to exist without any redress all his lifetime, but because he is in good circumstances he is enabled to come down and seek redress through this—I was going to say—inhuman channel of obtaining it. In all cases if any British subject is aggrieved there should be some way of obtaining redress and that as quickly as possible.

Motion agreed to.

SAULT ST. LOUIS LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 113) to incorporate the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

On section 7,

Mr. SPROULE. You give them the right to do a great many things, some of which are necessary to carry on their undertaking, but others would be quite independent of the undertaking. You do not make any distinction. We seem to give them rights whether for the purpose of their undertaking or not. It seems to me we should not go so far as that.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. This is simply a copy of the Bill which you have been passing here for years in favour of similar companies. There is no change in the usual phraseology. If you give these powers to other companies, I suppose there is no reason why you should not give them to this company.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

ERIE, ONTARIO POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 134) to incorporate the Erie, Ontario Power Company.—Mr. German.

On section 15.

Mr. SPROULE. We put into another Bill a few minutes ago a clause to protect the rights of municipalities by imposing on the company the conditions laid down by the municipality in the by-law. If that was necessary in the other Bill, it should be here.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I beg to move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again, in order to amend that clause.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

CANADIAN NORTH-WEST IRRIGATION COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 143) respecting the Canadian North-west Irrigation Company.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 4,

Mr. CHARLTON. This covers a rather extensive area.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I can see no good reason why the area should not be as extensive as described here for the purposes of irrigation and canals and other useful works. If the work is useful, it will be useful throughout a large area.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is right. I do not think we should stop the Bill on account of the extent of the area unless it gives exclusive rights, which I do not think this does.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not wish to insist upon the point I have raised, asking for information, but it strikes me really that this is a very indefinite definition of the territory covered by this Bill, and of the powers of the company. It clearly covers one degree of latitude a distance of seventy miles, and all west of the one hundred and tenth degree of west longitude. This is an enormous area. They can operate through to the Pacific ocean if they desire to go so far. When we are granting powers of this indefinite and general character, we ought to have information as to the object of the company. I do not wish to obstruct the passage of the Bill, but I do not suppose it would interfere with its progress to have it lie over until we have more definite information.

Mr. McCARTHY. What does the minister say is meant by the expression here 'and other purposes'? It seems to go further than is necessary for an irrigation company.

This might turn out to be a waterworks company.

Mr. COCHRANE. The promoters of the Bill claimed that the object was to use the water for milling and other purposes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There cannot be an objection to allowing the water to be used for any purpose. If you are giving them the powers to make the canals and take the water, why not use it for fire purposes, for milling purposes or any other ?

Mr. COCHRANE. This matter was brought in question in the committee that considered this Bill. The river, in this case, I understand is Milk river. It flows through a section which this company intends to irrigate. But they might utilize the water so as to prevent it flowing on for the benefit of a part of the country which is now irrigated naturally by the river. This is arid so far as the production of cereals is concerned, but I understand that it is good grazing country. I think it is a very serious question whether we should allow one company to control all the water in the river, and, perhaps, so lessen the flow of the river as to deprive the settlers who have taken up the land for ranching purposes, of water for their cattle.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) would be right in his conclusions if his premises were sound.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would ask the hon. minister to tell me in what way they are not sound ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was just going to call attention to that point. In the first place, this Bill does not confer any exclusive right. It is open to parliament to incorporate as many irrigation companies as it pleases for that territory. We have not deprived ourselves of the jurisdiction merely because we give this company the right to construct these canals and irrigate a portion of the territory. Moreover, we do not give to this company the power to divert the waters of the rivers. The only way in which they can take property which they do not buy by private contract, is by availing themselves of the expropriation powers contained in the General Railway Act, and I cannot conceive of their expropriating a river. I know they would not get permission to divert a river or deflect it. That is not a supposable case.

Mr. COCHRANE. We are not supposing anything. But the understanding in the committee was that they had power under the Bill to take the water out of the river for the purposes of the company. If not, what use is the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have not the power to divert or deflect the river.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not say they had. But they might so diminish the quantity in the river that it might be useless for a part of the section of the country through which it flows.

Mr. CHARLTON. Under section 7, of the Act, it provides that 'The company may draw from rivers and other waters, the waters necessary for the purposes of the company.' That is rather unlimited power.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not read the whole Bill, and I think it did not come before the Railway Committee.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, it came before the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Railway Committee had a Bill of this kind before it a year or two ago, and I think we went into it pretty carefully, and provided what we thought were the necessary safeguards. I cannot answer for this Bill, for I had not seen the Bill until this moment. I can see that some of the clauses, as for instance, clause 6, would need to be materially altered. But I do not see any objection to the conferring of powers given under section 4.

On section 5,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This section has been amended so as to read as follows :

The company may acquire and dispose of lands in the district within which the company is authorized to operate, provided that the total quantity of land to be held by the company at any one time shall not exceed two thousand square miles.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it a land company as well ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not referring to the quantity of land—I do not know whether two thousand square miles would be deemed an excessive quantity or not—it is to be noted that this company asks to be incorporated for irrigation purposes and not to be created with the powers of a land company. But under this clause they would be authorized to deal in lands. Certainly, the section is defective in that way. It ought to be provided that the company may acquire the lands necessary for the purposes for which the company is authorized, and may dispose of lands which it does not require for those purposes. We always give such power.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would say to the minister that it goes a good deal further

than that, as I understand it. The promoters say that there are lands higher than the waters to be taken by the company would enable them to irrigate. They want to get control of all the lands; then, they could irrigate a certain portion of every lot—say fifteen, twenty or thirty acres for each two hundred acre lot—thus providing an area in which cereals and vegetables could be grown, but enabling them to sell the whole lot.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The Bill does not seem to grow less magnificent in conception as it is more carefully looked at. First, this is an irrigation company. Then they come with immense additional powers, asking to be allowed to buy and own any lands they please between two parallels of latitude. Then if you go further on to section 12:

The company may acquire the stock, shares, bonds or other evidences of indebtedness created by other companies and may distribute them amongst its shareholders.

That is, they can own companies, even railways, unless the Railway Act will prevent it. Finally, I think we are entitled to information from the hon. gentleman who has the Bill in charge, but who is not in the House. I have noticed that in the case of nearly all the Bills we had up to-day, the promoters were not present with the exception of two. I think that is all wrong, and contrary to practice. If there is any reason why we should grant anything like these powers, the hon. gentleman who represents the district and who has charge of the Bill should be here to give us some explanation. I move that the commitee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would say to my hon. friend that I think I understand the object of the Bill. It is for the purpose of irrigating a section of land which was granted to a railway company from Lethbridge to the boundary, of which Mr. Gault was the proprietor. A portion of that land was sold to the Mormon settlement near Milk river. They have irrigation works there which are a credit to the North-west Territories and a benefit to the people, and the land there is flourishing now in consequence. This company was formed to take over the rest of the land for the purpose of irrigating it and selling it to the actual settlers. The object of the company seems to be a bona fide one, and a worthy one, namely, the development of that section of the country. I cannot understand what objection there can be to the Bill. It is clear from what I understand, that the object of the Bill is to authorize the taking over of these lands which were granted to this coal company of which Mr. Gault was the president, an English company, for the purpose of irrigating that portion of the land and selling it to actual settlers. The land as it is now is entirely worthless, but when irrigated it will become valuable, and will be sold to settlers. As my hon. friend says, the promoter of the Bill ought to be here to explain it to us. We know nothing about it, and we have a right to explanations.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The promoter of the Bill (Mr. Oliver) is sick in hospital, and has been for some weeks.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In the absence of the promoter of the Bill, I think the committee had better rise.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Mutual Fire Insurance Company of the city of Montreal, and to change its name to 'The Montreal and Quebec Fire Insurance Company.'—Mr. LaRivière.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'The Niagara-Welland Power Company.'—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill No. 91) to incorporate the Dominion Gas Improvement Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'The Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—Mr. Bickerdike.

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE AT L'ASSOMPTION.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What are the dimensions of the site acquired by the government for the new post office at L'Assomption?
2. Who recommended the selection of said site to the government?
3. Were any other sites but the present one suggested to the government?
4. What is the estimated cost of the new building?

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

1. Sixty-seven feet by ninety feet.
2. Correspondence does not show.
3. Yes.
4. Contract price $10,150.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Who is the superintendent of works in connection with the construction of the new post office at L'Assomption, and what is his business?
2. What remuneration does he receive for his services.
3. What is the total amount paid to said superintendent to date?

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

1. (a) Louis Brouillet. (b) Do not know.
2. Seventy-five dollars per month.
3. One hundred and twelve dollars and fifty cents to 1st May, 1903.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. At what date did the government purchase from Vital Racette a portion of lot No. 165 on the official plan of L'Assomption ?
2. What price was paid for the lot so purchased ?
3. Is the government aware that it has paid for that portion of lot No. 165 the same price that had been paid, some time previously, for the entire lot ?
4. Is the government aware that the person who sold that portion of lot No. 165 secured a profit of $950 by the transaction ?
5. What is the name of the notary who carried out the transaction for the government and before whom the deeds were passed ?
6. To whom was the purchase price paid ?
7. Is there any correspondence in regard to this purchase and to the post office site, between the government and Vital Racette, Phineas Viger, Rodolphe Arbour, C. Laurier, M.P., Mr. Joseph Ed. Duhamel ?
8. Has the government received any petitions protesting against the choice made of a site for the post office ?

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

1. December 23rd, 1901.
2. One thousand one hundred and fifty dollars.
3. No.
4. No.
5. Joseph E. Duhamel.
6. The cheque in payment was made in favour of Vital Racette and J. E. Duhamel, the agent of the Department of Justice.
7. Yes, from Vital Racette and Joseph E. Duhamel.
8. Yes, one petition dated 21st March, 1903, recommending change of site.

A contract had, however, been made on the 1st December, 1902, for the construction of the building on site first selected.

RAILWAY ACCIDENT AT WEST LORNE.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been called to the verdict, or is the government aware of the fact, that the coroner's jury empanelled to inquire into the cause of the railway accident which occurred at West Lorne, Ontario, on the 29th day of April, 1903, as a result of which three trainmen were killed, have returned the following verdict :—' That Thomas Luton, John McNeil, and John Elgar, on the 29th day of April, at the unincorporated village of West Lorne, came to their deaths as a result of a rear end collision between two trains on the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway. And we find that the said collision was caused by the culpable neglect of the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company, in not adopting a proper system as to the running of their trains, and of not furnishing and supplying to their trainmen proper rules, so intelligible to their employees that no misunderstanding could arise as to the duties of their trainmen. We further recommend that semaphores be forthwith constructed on the said railway, at proper distances from the station.
2. In view of the foregoing verdict, is it the intention of the government to forthwith institute a full and exhaustive inquiry, on oath, into the causes which culminated in the accident above referred to ? And if it shall appear, after such inquiry, that the verdict of the said coroner's jury was justified by the facts, is it the intention of the government to proceed against, or to cause to be proceeded against, the responsible officials of the said company, who are declared to have been guilty of culpable neglect, as a result of which the three trainmen above named were killed ?
3. Has the government yet been able to find an individual possessing the precise qualifications that would enable him to act for and on behalf of the government, in conducting full and exhaustive inquiries and investigations into the causes of railway accidents which may occur in Canada from time to time ?
4. If no such individual has yet been found, what steps, if any, are the government taking to secure the services of such an individual ?
5. Were the rules under which the trains of the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company are operated in Canada, submitted to and approved by the government ; and if so, on what date were such rules authorized by the government ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The attention of the government has not been called to the verdict of the jury in the case mentioned, but if the facts are as stated in the question, it would appear to devolve upon the provincial authorities, as charged with the administration of criminal justice, to take any action which might be proper in the premises.

The government has not yet been able to select a person possessing the precise qualifications for taking charge of investigations in case of railway accidents, but are on the alert to secure just such a person as is required.

In the meantime a temporary appointment has been made, and an investigation held in the case of the Windsor Junction collision on the Intercolonial Railway.

I am informed that no rules were submitted by the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company for the approval of the government.

FRUIT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth)—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What value of fruit was shipped to Europe in cold storage in each of the calendar years 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902 ?
2. What value of fruit was shipped in cooled chambers to Europe in seasons 1901 and 1902, respectively ?
3. In what steamers, other than cold storage steamers, were thermographs placed by the agents of the government ; and in what compartments, other than cold storage compartments, if any, during the season of 1902 ?
4. How many thermograph readings have been taken and now in possession of the Department of Agriculture (a) of temperature in cold storage chambers ; (b) temperature in cooled chambers ; (c) temperature in ventilated chambers ; (d) temperature in other parts of vessels unventilated ; (e) temperature on deck of steamers ?
5. In what further steamers were cooling plants placed in the season of 1902, if any ?

6. In what further steamers were mechanical ventilating plants placed in season of 1902, if any ?

7. How much money has the government advanced to date as bonus, or subsidy, to steamship companies, to induce them to put in ventilating apparatus, to enable them to carry in better condition perishable cargo, since 1896 ?

8. How much to induce them to put in cooling plans, since 1896 ?

9. How much to induce them to put in cold storage plants, since 1896 ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It would be impossible to give at this time a satisfactory answer to this question so as to convey the information sought for. I would ask my hon. friend to move for a return.

CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES AND GUARANTEE COMPANIES.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Are the funds deducted from the salaries of civil service employees, for guarantee, accumulating with the government ; or are they paid over to guarante companies ?

2. If the funds are in the hands of the government, what do they now amount to ? And what was the amount in premiums paid in during the last fiscal year ?

3. If the funds are paid to guarantee companies, what are the names of such companies ; and what amount we paid to each such company during the last fiscal year ?

4. Have any claims arisen on the guarantee companies during the past fiscal year ; and if so, what is the amount of such claims ?

5. Are there any disputed claims ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I will give the answer as regards the Post Office Department :

Civil service employees in the Post Office Department are insured by the department direct under the assessment principle. The former guarantee system was bonds from guarantee companies or private citizens, the bonds of three different guarantee companies being accepted. Upon the establishment of the assessment system the department for a time maintained sub-insurance with these three companies, the amount of which, however, has gradually diminished. The total amount paid for such insurance for the last fiscal year was $151.75, the Guarantee Company of North America being the company in question. Nothing was paid to any other company. The total accumulations from assessments of civil service employees amounted on the 14th instant to $7,019. The total amount of such assessments for the last fiscal year was $1,913.30. No claims in respect of civil service employees have arisen against any guarantee company during the past fiscal year and no claims are in dispute.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). In regard to employees in the Custom service :

1. The funds deducted from the salaries of Customs' employees for guarantee, are paid over to guarantee companies half yearly at the end of June and December.

3. The names of the guarantee companies and the amounts paid to each for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1902, are as follows : Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, $1,650.30 ; Employers' Liability Assurance Corporation, Limited, $906.60 ; London Guarantee and Accident Company, Limited, $890.25 ; Guarantee Company of North America, $899.85.

4. The claims made on the guarantee companies during the past fiscal year (exclusive of any otherwise paid) were $2,264.27.

5. The guarantee companies have not disputed any claims.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). So far as relates to North-West Mounted Police :

1. Paid over to the guarantee companies.

2. Amount paid in premiums last fiscal year, $341.86.

3.

Guarantee Company of North America.. ..	$311 86	
Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Company....	30 00	
		$341 86

4. No.

5. No.

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. Does the deed of transfer by the Ursuline Nuns, of Quebec, to the government or to the city of Quebec, of the Plains of Abraham, contain a provision, in virtue of which the said plains may be used for military parades, reviews, manœuvres, &c.?

2. In the negative, has any other contract or agreement been entered into with the city of Quebec, providing for such use ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) :

1. No.

2. Yes.

BREAKWATER, SUMMERSIDE, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Has the government stopped the work on the breakwater at Summerside, Prince Edward Island ?

2. Who were the contractors for said work, and what was the contract price ?

3. How much of the work has been completed, and what amount has been expended therefor?

4. Have the plans and specifications for said work proved practical and satisfactory ; and have the contractors found them workable ?

5. Have the stone and other materials in the work now completed complied with the plans and specifications ?

6. Is it the intention of the government to complete this work ; and if not, why not ?

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

1. No.

2. (a) McDonald and Moffatt (b) $55,900.

3. The amount paid on account of work is to date, $3,110; the work done represents about 250 feet in length, this near shore end.

4. Yes, as far as department is concerned; the contractors have desired to suggest changes, there was nothing in writing, suggestions were verbal.

5. No, the stone has not.

6. The matter is receiving consideration.

LIGHTING OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA.

Mr. ROSAMOND—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. From whom does the government obtain the supply of electric current for lighting the public buildings in Ottawa?

2. From whom does the government obtain the supply of electric current for running certain elevators in certain of the public buildings in Ottawa?

3. Is there a contract for the supply of light? If so, with whom? What is the price paid? What is the date of the contract? And when does it expire?

4. Is there a contract for the supply of power? If so, with whom? What is the price paid? What is the date of the contract, and when does it expire?

5. Has a contract been entered into for supplying electric power required for the elevator being installed in the post office in Ottawa? If so, what is the price? What is the date of the contract, and when does it expire?

6. Has a contract been given for supply of electric current for Experimental Farm buildings? If so, what is the price paid; the date of contract; and when does it expire?

7. Were tenders invited for supplying power for the Ottawa post office elevator? If so, from whom?

8. Were tenders invited for supply of electric current for Experimental Farm buildings? If so, from whom?

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

1. Ottawa Electric Company.

2. Ottawa Electric Company.

3. Yes, with the Ottawa Electric Company. The price is $2.25 per lamp per annum, for the first 3,000 lamps and $2 per lamp for the balance, date of contract, 19th January, 1898, made for one year, renewable.

4. No, a fixed rate of $40 per annum per kilo watt, has been agreed upon with the Ottawa Electric Company by the chief architect.

5. Yes, $300 per annum, 24th April, 1903, during pleasure, which is considered by chief architect a low figure. Motor is twenty horse power.

6. Not by this department.

7. A tender was asked from the Ottawa Electric Company.

8. Same as No. six.

BRIGADE CAMP AT SUSSEX, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

Is it the intention of the government to hold a brigade camp at Sussex, N.B., this year? If so, will it be a summer or a fall camp? And what corps will be called out for drill?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). It is the intention of the government to hold a brigade camp at Sussex this fall. The list of corps to be called out will be published in due course.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS.

Copies of the correspondence exchanged between the Dominion government and that of the province of Quebec regarding the following claims produced by the latter:—

1. $1,425,855.00, being the share of the province of Quebec in the indemnity paid by the United States government as a compensation for the advantages accorded to American fishermen.

2. $490,000, indemnity due to the province of Quebec for leases and licenses granted by the federal government to fish in the interior and salt waters within the limits of the said province.—Mr. Lemieux.

Copy of all documents whatsoever relating to the commutation of the sentence of death pronounced against Joseph A. Mathurin; including therein the report of the judge who presided at the trial; the permission of the judge for the production of such report having been obtained.—Mr. Lavergne by Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure).

Copies of all papers, letters, telegrams or other documents, relating to the purchase of land for a drill shed in the town of Woodstock, N.B. And also, copies of all papers, letters, telegrams or other documents, relating to the construction of a drill shed on said land.—Mr. Hale, by Mr. Sproule.

Copy of receipt given for price of acquisition of site of new post office at L'Assomption; copies of all cheques issued in payment of any sums expended in connection with the purchase of site of said new post office, or expenses connected therewith.—Mr. Monk.

Copies of all letters addressed to the government by Rodolphe Arbour, Phineas Viger, Vital Racette, Joseph Ed. Duhamel, Charlemagne Laurier, M.P., and all answers thereto, in respect to a new post office for the town of L'Assomption, in regard to the contract for the acquisition of a post office site. Also a copy of the contract of sale; copies of tenders for building said post office, and of all reports sent in by the architect, in reference to said site and new building.—Mr. Monk.

Statement setting forth:—

1. The quantity of refined sugar imported into Canada from the 1st of January to the 31st December, 1902.

2. The quantity of raw sugar imported during the same period; and giving the name of the country whence such sugar was imported.—Mr. Madore by Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure).

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, 1900—AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 15) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—Mr. Clancy.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I wish to substitute the following for section 1 of the Bill:

1. Section 112 of the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 12, of the statutes of 1900, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor :

112. Every one who, directly or indirectly by himself or by any other person on his behalf, makes use of, or threatens to make use of, any force, violence, or restraint, or inflicts, or threatens the infliction by himself, or by or through any other person, of any injury, damage, harm or loss, or in any manner practices intimidation upon or against any person, in order to induce or compel such person to vote for any candidate, or to refrain from voting, or on account of such person having voted for any candidate or refrained from voting, at an election, or who by abduction, duress, or any false or fradulent pretense, device or contrivance, impedes, prevents or otherwise interferes with, the free exercise of the franchise of any voter, or thereby compels, or induces or prevails upon, any voter either to vote for any candidate or to refrain from voting at an election, shall be deemed to have committed the offence of undue influence, and is guilty of an indictable offence, and shall in addition to any penalty thereby incurred, forfeit the sum of $200 to any person who sues therefor, with costs.

2. It shall be deemed a false pretense within the meaning of this section to represent to a voter, directly or indirectly, that the ballot to be used, or the mode of voting at the election is not secret.'

I think that carries out the intention of my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy).

Mr. CLANCY. I think that meets my view.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 39) to make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to animals, and to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—Mr. Brock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I did not happen to be present when this Bill was called the other day, and I understand that the matter was referred to by the Minister of Justice, who, I presume, would be looking at the questions involved purely from a legal standpoint. It appears to me that some of the provisions of the Bill would have a prejudicial bearing in respect to railway traffic. I shall call his attention to one or two considerations which perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) would think it worth considering before proceeding with the Bill further. The hon. gentleman desires that the word 'animal' should have a wider interpretation than it now has in the Criminal Code, and that it shall not only include cattle and other animals, but domestic animals, such as cats and dogs. It would not be practicable to do that. The general law does not contemplate the extension of the meaning of the word animal to such an extent as to embrace cats, dogs and other domestic animals. It would make these provisions of the present Criminal Code comparatively unworkable, and would not fit the case, under the general scope of the Bill after it had been amended as the hon. gentleman proposes. Its bearing on the railways is, first, in this direction. Certain provisions are to be found in the sections which the hon. gentleman proposes by a sub-clause to amend, which appear to go as far in the way of requiring cattle to be looked after while in transit as parliament at the time thought it was expedient to go, so as to ensure their being made as comfortable as possible, watered and fed, and when unladen, provided with fresh hay and straw for bedding. In actual experience it has transpired that there is really more hazard in requiring that the cars should be provided with bedding of this description, by reason of the danger of fire, than there is of advantage to the railways which at present have discretion in the matter, and which do not provide bedding of that character. It is said that hay and straw, for a while after it is put in, until it has become saturated or moistened, is very likely to take fire ; and occasions of this kind have occurred. We have therefore to reflect whether or not we would do well to impose on the railway companies the obligation proposed by these clauses of my hon. friend's Bill, when it would be attended with these possible difficulties and dangers. Then, my hon. friend would have the law so changed as to require certain constructions to be provided in the car whereby animals would be kept separate in a particular way. What actually happens now on most of the railways, is this. The railway companies put up loose boards in such a way as to keep the animals apart at the start, but after the train is on its way these are removed because they say they do more harm than good. But my hon. friend would have these partitions put up as fixtures. That would entail a good deal of work and injure the cars, and could be only of use a very short time. The objection to section one, is that it makes the expression 'animal' include all animals, which is contrary to the general tenor of the Criminal Code. The objection to section two is that it would apply to dogs and cats as well as to sheep and hogs. Another objection is that, no matter how short the distance these animals have to be carried, whenever a stoppage takes place, fresh bedding must be put in. Perhaps it it might only be a few hours before the cars would be unladen again. For instance, when cattle are carried from Montreal to Halifax, after they reach Moncton, they are driven out watered and fed, and it is only a very few hours when they get to Halifax. To impose on the shipper the expense of furnishing fresh bedding in such a case would be subjecting him to an unnecessary additional charge. I quite see the object my hon. friend has in view, and it is one which appeals to our humanity, but we should consider the circumstances. On most of our routes the cattle are not kept

very long in the car. Under no circumstances are they kept over thirty hours without being let out and watered and fed and given an opportunity to move around. Even if they had to lie down on the bare floor, that would not hurt them, and the railway companies have found from actual experience that to put in fresh bedding increases the liability to fire, which it is very important to avoid. I do not know what suggestion to offer my hon. friend as I have not reached any conclusion, but he may be able to make some suggestions.

Mr. BROCK. Straw need not necessarily be employed, but some other less inflammable material, such as tan-bark or sawdust or sand. The main object of this Bill is to have the animals kept separate, so that the smaller animals may not be ill-treated by the larger ones. This Bill would not apply to nineteen-twentieths of our cars as not more than that proportion are used for carrying animals of various or assorted classes. The other day my attention was drawn in Toronto to the fact that some cattle shipped from Owen Sound had trampled under foot a number of small animals, such as sheep and in some cases hogs. A kind of stampede took place, the cattle rushed about, and the big animals crushed the smaller ones to death. It would be a very trifling matter for a railway company to put up some scantling divisions, strong enough to prevent the cattle from breaking through. If that were done, it would meet the object of this Bill. I am not speaking of cattle shipped over a short distance, say from Montreal to Moncton, but of those shipped a long way west of Winnipeg and which come through to the sea coast. In such cases, whenever a car is emptied, it should be cleaned out. The condition those cars get into in a day or two is something terrible, and the Bill provides that such cars should be cleaned out. The cost of supplying tan-bark, sawdust or other material not inflammable would be so infinitesimal that the companies or shippers would not object to paying it. The other day I passed a car with two dead cattle in it from the North-west. The car was not very far from Ottawa, and no doubt those animals had been trampled upon by heavier cattle, and the flooring of the cars was so slippery with slush that it was difficult for the cattle to keep their feet. The hon minister objects to railway companies being obliged to put up these heavy partitions in a great many cars, but they will be required in only a very few cars from a very few points. People do not ship lambs and smaller cattle in large quantities from great distances. There is very seldom a whole car load of lambs. They are usually put in with other cattle and they should be partitioned off from the larger animals. The objection raised about cats, dogs, &c., does not apply to this Bill. We do not ask that cats and dogs and canaries should be partitioned off from other animals, but when driven to town in a farmers wagon, they should be under some kind of supervision and not subjected to the extreme cruelty of being packed closely in a crate so that they can scarcely move. I have seen a package of game sent in such a state that no one who saw them would want them on his table. I am promoting this Bill at the instance of the Toronto Humane Society, which gets no public grants and no civic grants, and is supported entirely by the people of Toronto and Ontario. I am glad to see that this society is spreading in the province of Quebec. This society is doing good work without any pecuniary reward, and I submit that the government should endeavour to meet its views as much as possible. But, if they cannot let the Bill pass exactly as it is, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways might get such a Bill framed as they think in fairness they could ask the railways to submit to, and that would be acceptable to the House and the country. We are not demanding every particular in the Bill, but we should like a Bill framed by the Minister of Justice to meet the case as far as possible and to go as far as would be acceptable to the Minister of Railways.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems that part of this Bill is already provided for under the Criminal Code, in subsection 5 of section 514, which provides :

> Where cattle are unladen from cars for the purpose of receiving food, water and rest, the railway company then having charge of the cars in which they have been transported shall, except during a period of frost, clear the floors of such cars, and litter the same properly with clean sawdust or sand before reloading them with live stock.

Thus, there is no provision in the Criminal Code for littering the floors of cars at first, but it is provided that this must be done when the cattle are taken out, before they are again put upon the car.

Mr. LENNOX. I think there may be some difficulty in framing this Bill, but, at the same time, it is probably required, and, with the assistance of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways, I think we can put it in shape so as to be an improvement on the present law. With reference to the question of danger from fire, also the question of cost and matters of that kind, I think we should be able to get over the difficulties. It appears to me that there would be no great danger from fire in cattle cars, except that fire might be communicated from some external cause for these cars are not likely to be very inflammable. But, at all events, and as the Minister of Railways has said, the difficulty exists only for a short time, and would only exist with regard to certain materials, such as hay and straw. It is a very easy matter, if the railway companies find there is actual

danger of fire from this cause, to dampen the hay or straw before it is put in the cars, so as to overcome the danger. We cannot in any way improve the law without giving some apparent ground for an argument on the other side. But we must look to the preponderance of benefit, and it seems clear to me that the advantage would be in the enactment of such a law as this. As to the cost, I understand the minister to say that it would be unfair to the railways if this were required with regard to short distances. The necessity for littering or bedding the cars hardly exists in the case of short distances, and if you take this Bill in the spirit in which the promoter brings it before the committee, feeling at liberty to make alterations where it may be necessary, we can surely modify the Bill so as to provide that this shall apply only where animals are to be carried for a long distance. As to the separation of animals, I think the promoter of the Bill has said all that need to be said, and I think he has shown that this is a very necessary amendment for the safe carriage of animals. I do not think the hon. Minister of Railways followed carefully the wording of the subsection 5A of section 2 of the Bill. It provides that:

No smaller animal shall be confined or carried in the same car, van or vessel with any larger animals of different species, unless a suitable and substantial partition——

—and so on. It does not apply to the difference in size of the animals as such, but to a difference of size and species.

Mr. MONK. In the city of Montreal we see a great deal of the abuses which this Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) is intended to remove. We have a very large number of cattle arriving there, and I have myself seen instances of cruelty. I understand the difficulty which the Minister of Railways has referred to. But I would point out to the minister that the only change which this Bill makes in the law is that contained in subsection 5A, for, as my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has shown, the amendment to subsection 5 of section 514 is substantially what is contained in the existing law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not compulsory now.

Mr. MONK. I think it is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only where the cars are stopped to unload the cattle. The subsection provides:

Where cattle are unladen from cars for the purpose of receiving food, water and rest, the railway company then having charge of the cars in which they have been transported shall, except during a period of frost, clear the floors of such cars, and litter the same properly with clean sawdust or sand before reloading them with live stock.

There is nothing to say that the cars shall be littered prior to the time of their being unloaded for the purpose of feeding, watering or resting the cattle.

Mr. MONK. I think, that in that respect the change is, perhaps, a wise one. The necessity for the change here proposed of prohibiting the crowding of small animals with large animals of a different species is one of which I have seen examples. If it were possible to embody this provision in the law, I think it would be a very great advantage.

Mr. SPROULE. The trouble is that the cattlemen send mixed cars of cattle and hogs, or sometimes cattle and sheep, because it reduces the cost of transportation, a larger number being put in the car. I thought there was a provision in the law prohibiting this, but I do not see it. I think this is a provision which should be made. When the cars are crowded in this way it results in the death of many animals, and, even where the animals are not killed they are left in such a condition that, when they are slaughtered, their flesh is not in as good condition for eating as if the animals had been kept separate.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are some sections of this Bill which concern exclusively the transportation companies, and ought to be dealt with by an amendment to the Railway Act. My difficulty commences with the first section, which purports to amend section 3 of the Criminal Code. The difficulty there is very serious, because we are asked to amend section 3 of the Criminal Code by adding thereto the paragraph (ff). We are met with this anomaly, that in subsection d of section 3 of the Code, the word 'cattle' is to be found, and is defined, and it includes a large number of animals that it is intended to describe by subsection (ff). So you would have two different descriptions of the same word in the same section of the Criminal Code. This form of amendment is quite inartistic, to say the least of it. Now we have to deal with the expression 'animal.'

The expression animal includes any horse, mare, gelding, bull, ox, cow, heifer, steer, calf, mule, ass, sheep, lamb, goat, pig, hog, sow, dog, cat, and every other domestic animal, fowl, or bird, or wild animal, cow, or bird captured, tamed or domesticated.

Just fancy incorporating that clause in the Criminal Code and making the word 'cattle,' where it is found in the Code applicable to such a clause as that. Why, you might even fine a man if he carries a canary bird in a cage that is not properly littered. Section 514 of the Code is to be amended. The whole of that section has reference to cattle, so you see the real word defined is 'animal.' So you have to reconstruct the whole articles of the Criminal Code which have reference to this. One does at first sight see how the economy of the statute may be entirely upset by such a

definition as this. So with reference to section 3, for instance. My hon. friend provides that the right of entry provided for in section 515 of the Criminal Code may be exercised in or upon any car, van, truck, vehicle or cockpit. That would, by implication, legalize the keeping of a cockpit. I do not know if there are any gentlemen in this House interested in these things, but if there are, they would be interested to know that, though section 513 makes it illegal to keep a cockpit, here the effect of this section would be to legalize entry into a cockpit. I think there are inconveniences, to say the least of it, in this Bill if it is allowed to go through.

I suggested the other day to my hon. friend that perhaps this Bill might be considered by the draughtsman of the department, who is in the habit of drawing amendments and suggesting amendments to the Criminal Code. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) has not met Mr. Fraser, who I asked to call on him, and he did call, but in all probability they did not come together on account of the absence of my hon. friend. I would suggest that with respect to the first and third clauses, he should allow me to send Mr. Fraser to him for the purpose of seeing whether they cannot agree upon some amendment that would carry out the laudable objects that he has in view. With respect to the second section, I am afraid I must leave him to the tender mercies of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. INGRAM. I would point out with respect to section 2 that bedding of hay and straw is used in certain box cars in which stock is shipped on the railways now. But this would apply to what is known as slat-cars. At the end of the journey there would probably be no stock in the car at all by reason of being set on fire from the sparks of the engine.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I understand that my hon. friend in charge of the Bill is not wedded to this particular form, and I quite agree with the Minister of Justice that it would be almost impossible to pass the Bill in its present shape on account of difficulties in the present form of the Criminal Code. But I see no reason why it could not be changed, if it is considered advisable to make some changes. Especially do I think there ought to be a strong attempt to compel railway companies to carry animals of different species separately. We must also keep in view the question of the cost of transportation. The competition in the carriage of animals is very keen. Therefore the producer and the transportation company are the two classes most affected by this Bill. I think it is proper to compel the company to divide their car into compartments for the different species of animals, because it is too bad to see sheep and hogs and big cattle huddled together in the same car, and there ought to be some way to prevent it at the least possible cost. It has been suggested that the animals should be specified by name that are to be thus carried, but, from what the Minister of Justice says, that would be difficult to work out. Then as to the right of search as set forth in the Bill, that also is a matter that would require consideration. It seems to me that the Department of Justice is bound to see that this Bill is properly constructed, and if there are difficulties in the Bill in its present form, the Department of Justice should devise some amendments to overcome those difficulties.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will be necessary to drop the first clause altogether because you could not give any such interpretation to the word 'animal' as has been proposed here. As to the second clause, if it is the sense of the committee that it would be a proper thing to require that all cars carrying cattle shall be bedded in this description with straw, hay, sawdust, sand, tan bark, shavings or such other dry material. I think the better plan would be to reinsert the word 'cattle' in place of 'animals.' The word 'cattle' is defined in the Bill and it would be only in reference to cattle that any such provision as this would apply. If you insert the word 'cattle' for the word 'animals' in both parts of this section that would include all such animals as require to be bedded. But, before adopting this Bill, I think we ought to hear what the people have to say who have had the largest experience in regard to the carriage of cattle. Whether we agree with them or not I think it is wise for us to know what their views are upon the subject and see how this legislation is going to affect the cattle shipping business. It would not be desirable under any circumstances to pass even that section as it now stands. Then, I would say in regard to the next subsection that 'cattle' has been defined in the original Act to include sheep, goats and swine. No smaller cattle, such as sheep, goats or swine, shall be confined or carried in the same car unless such and such precautions are taken—that would cover the ground the hon. gentleman desires to see covered. I could not recommend the committee to adopt a clause such as this until we hear more on the subject and perhaps the hon. gentleman would consent to the committee rising and reporting progress.

Mr. BROCK. I am quite well aware that the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) are very anxious to promote this Bill in such a way that it will be of some use and that it will have something good in it. There is no use in the Bill going through in such a way that it will not carry out the object of the society

I represent, and which has in view particularly to stop the practice of animals of various sizes and species being indiscriminately crowded into one car; that is driving in a drove of cattle first of all, and then driving in sheep and hogs and filling up every foot of space under these cattle. We want to put a stop to that. Another object is that where two species of animals are placed in the same car there shall be a partition between them. We had a case the other day, as some hon. gentleman are no doubt aware, where three or four calves were placed in a car with a drove of hogs, there being a very light partition between them. They arrived at the station but the smaller animals were dead. The calves had been eaten up by the hogs in the car. These hogs were afterwards used for human food and I want to avoid any abominable thing of that kind taking place. I do not think we should leave it to the experience of the cattle men.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not either, but I would like to hear what they have to say.

Mr. BROCK. Decidedly, but I think we should be protected against their opinions if they are adverse to the adoption of reasonable and humane methods in carrying on this traffic. I am quite well aware that the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals are as anxious as I am that a Bill that will deal with the cases I speak of should be passed and therefore I am willing to leave it to be amended in such a way as will make it satisfactory to the country generally. I move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

STANDARD MILK CAN.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Campbell for the second reading of Bill (No. 20) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

Mr. MONK. I think we would require some explanation of this Bill. It affects a great many interests in the vicinity of the city of Montreal. I am not in a position to say to what extent it affects these interests, but I think it would be desirable that we should know why this new measure is introduced.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I explained the objects of this Bill the other day when it was before the House, but the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was not present, I think. The Bill is intended to apply more particularly to the province of Ontario. It has become the custom in the province of Ontario to sell milk by the can. In the city of Toronto there are about 3,000 cans of milk per day sold. These are purchased from the farmers all around within twenty, thirty or forty miles of the city. When the plan which has been in vogue for a good many years was first adopted, cans were all made to hold eight gallons, but there is nothing on the statute-book to-day, I believe, to say what the can shall be, whether it shall be eight gallons, or ten gallons, or whatever it may be, but there was an unwritten law that eight gallons should constitute a can of milk. However, as time went on, the cans made by the dealers in the city have been constantly enlarged, first to eight and one-quarter gallons and eight and one-half gallons, and on until to-day there are none less than eight and one-half gallons, while a great many hold nine gallons of milk. The farmers are obliged to fill these cans. After carrying the milk eight or ten miles it would not be good for it if the cans were not full. They are obliged to fill the cans and as a consequence they lose half a gallon or more on every can of milk they sell. That amounts to a very large sum in the aggregate and the Bill simply provides that when a person sells a can of milk that means eight gallons and that a half a can is four gallons. By arrangement with the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) it was agreed that the second reading of this Bill should take place and that it should then be referred to a special committee. I am prepared to leave it to a special committee if the House sees fit to grant the second reading of the Bill. I am sure that this Bill is a step in the right direction. It affects nobody; it is going to injure nobody.

Mr. COCHRANE. What good is it then?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It prevents the farmer who sells his milk from being obliged to supply half a gallon for every can more than he gets paid for.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) states that the object of this motion is to have the Bill referred to a special committee and for my part I have no objection. I do not think that the custom which the hon. gentleman says exists in Ontario obtains in Quebec and it was in the section about the application of this new measure to the province of Quebec that I saw some difficulty, but if it is going to be referred to a committee I have no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have a letter—I have not it by me at the present moment—from Mr. Ness, President of the Milk Producers' Association in Montreal, highly approving of this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved :

That Bill (No. 20) be referred to a special committee composed of Messrs. Cowan, Holmes, Henderson, Kemp, Maclaren (Perth), Wright and the mover ; with power to send for persons and papers and to report back to the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. The complexion of that committee should certainly be changed, because these are all Ontario members, and this law will be applicable to the whole Dominion. There should be representatives from each of the provinces.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) could find a place on that committee for some representatives from the province of Quebec. Mr. Léonard represents a constituency which sends a great deal of milk to the city of Montreal, and he would, I believe, be in a position to render useful service to that committee.

Mr. KEMP. I certainly think that cities like Montreal, Winnipeg, St. John and Halifax should be represented on that committee. I may mention that in Winnipeg the size of milk cans is different from what it is in Ontario.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved :

That the following names do compose the committee :—Mesrs. Cowan, Holmes, Henderson, Kemp, Maclaren (Perth), Wright, Demers (St. John and Iberville), Léonard, Monk, Bickerdike and Campbell.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE moved second reading of Bill (No. 74) to amend the Railway Act.

The PRIME MINISTER. Explain.

Mr. GUTHRIE. This is the same Bill which I had the honour of introducing last session regarding the rights of railroad employees. I explained the Bill on the first reading. Its object is to place railroad employees in the same position as ordinary citizens in regard to accidents occurring on railroads. At the present time some railroads seem to contract themselves out of their common law liability for such accidents.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Mr. Guthrie, the Bill was referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.

INSOLVENCY ACT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Monk : That Bill (No. 53) respecting Insolvency be now read a second time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Minister of Justice is not in his seat, as he would be prepared to discuss this Bill. I may state that the government do not feel disposed to accept the Bill at the present time. It requires some consideration, and the matter is now undergoing the consideration of the Department of Justice. I will not say that the government will be prepared next session to introduce legislation on this subject ; but since the matter has been brought to the attention of the House, most of the provinces have amended their laws with regard to insolvent estates, and I understand that these are now pretty satisfactory except in one or two provinces. It is to be hoped that the provinces themselves will attend to this kind of legislation, and adopt laws of such a character as to be acceptable. In regard to the hon gentleman's Bill, I understand from the Minister of Justice that the principle of it is perhaps acceptable, though the government are not prepared to accept all of its provisions. Under these circumstances, if my hon. friend persists in his motion, I must ask the House to reject it.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I was induced to bring this measure to the notice of the House because of the general desire which exists through the country, particularly among the commercial classes, that we should have uniform legislation on the subject of insolvency throughout the whole Dominion of Canada. I know for a fact that such is the desire of all the commercial bodies in the Dominion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that having already spoken on the question, he has not the right to speak again.

Mr. MONK. I thought I had the right to sum up the discussion on my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. No. When a member moves an order of the day, he has the right to speak only once. So, when a Bill stands for a second reading, the member who moves the Bill has a right to speak once when he makes the motion, but he has no right to reply.

Mr. MONK. Well, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, and with the indulgence of the House, I may perhaps be allowed to mention that I have received from the Secretary of the Montreal Board of Trade a letter in which he urges strongly that this Bill should receive the immediate attention

of the House. I have also received a letter from the secretary of the Chambre de Commerce, conveying the same information; and I may perhaps read to the House a resolution which was adopted on the first of April, in respect to this law. This is the resolution:

The Chamber of Commerce of the District of Montreal.

Report of the Committee on Legislation, adopted at the meeting of April 1, 1903, Insolvency Act.

The progress of Canada, the expansion of its trade and industries, its treaties with foreign nations, the influx within its borders, of immigrants and foreign capital, all the conditions of a rapidly developing country, make it necessary that some efficient means of protection be provided forthwith in behalf of those (whatever their origin), who by engrossing its trade, contribute in such a large measure to the wealth and greatness of its people.

Such a measure of protection as will give a new impetus to commerce by restoring confidence among dealers, shielding worthy though unsuccessful merchants and setting right business transactions, can be secured only be means of an Act applicable to the whole country and making uniform the system of distribution of the assets of the parties who failed.

While this Chamber recognizes that special needs, worthy no doubt of consideration, may have heretofore prevented the various governments anxious to enact some such law, from taking any such action, nevertheless, reasons of a superior order make it more imperative than ever that trade should not be subjected to unnecessary risks, and that the good name of the country should be kept above suspicion.

Therefore, confiding in the wisdom of our rulers and of the members of parliament, this Chamber, having on all occasions urged the adoption of a new Insolvency Act, and having last year given its approval to the Fortin Bill, hopes that, all difficulties having now been removed, the said Bill will be allowed to become law in the course of this session, after due consideration has been given to certain suggestions submitted by this Chamber and various public bodies.

The whole respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) H. A. A. BRAULT,
Chairman, Committee on Legislation.

(True Copy.)
The Secretary,
(Sgd.) JOS. HAYNES.

There is also a report of some length from the same committee concerning the passing of this Bill. Under the circumstances, I do not think I would be justified in abandoning the Bill at this stage.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I did not intend to say anything on this Bill, and would not have done so but for the fact that the right hon. the premier has intimated his disposition not to allow it to go any further at the present time. It has been my opinion for a good many years that an insolvent law for Canada was very much needed, and that fact has been impressed on the attention of parliament from various sources times almost without number, whenever an insolvent law was proposed. Letters have been sent to members of this House urging that some kind of insolvent law be adopted. But of late years the commercial element of the country seems to have despaired of the prospect of parliament passing an insolvent law; and for that reason perhaps more than any other, there has not been of late so much interest taken in the subject. The premier says that each province has its own law for the distribution of estates, which seems to give fair satisfaction. It may give fair satisfaction so far as the creditor is concerned; but the unfortunate insolvent is left out of the question entirely, and no matter how honest or how unfortunate he may have been, he is debarred from ever starting business again.

I have known of many instances of intelligent and well-meaning business men who failed in business through influences and circumstances over which they had little or no control. They were valuable citizens and would have been valuable additions to the commercial class provided they could have started again, but owing to the fact that there was no insolvent law and they could get no relief to enable them to start again, they had to choose between going into service and eking out whatever kind of existence that might give, or leave the country and begin life again in a foreign land. The latter has been the usual course adopted. I know from personal knowledge of many worthy men who have thus left our country during the past ten or fifteen years, who otherwise would have remained in Canada and been to-day doing a profitable business in their own country. Surely we ought to provide some law for the relief of those people who have failed through no fault of their own. Surely the country ought to provide some means for enabling these people to provide for themselves and their families without being compelled to try their fortunes in any other land. While the distribution of assets may be fair to-day to the creditors in Canada, it is altogether unfair to other creditors. Many of our merchants import largely from the old country, and over and over again I have read letters, especially from the commercial element in England, complaining that we had no insolvency law and that there was therefore no protection to them when they sold goods to Canadians, because, in the event of failure, the Canadian creditors gobbled up the estate and there was practically nothing left for anybody else. This makes it difficult for merchants in the old country to do business at all in Canada. A good many years ago I was opposed to an insolvency law and spoke against it on several occasions, but the experience of time and observation has convinced me that I was wrong and that an insolvency law would be in the interests of Canada. True, many of the evils which developed under the old

law created a prejudice against an insolvency law, but surely we are equal to the task of eliminating these evils and providing a law that would not be open to the objections raised against the last one. I have not looked over the Bill now before us except in a very cursory manner, but it seems to have many valuable features not to be found in some of the Bills introduced some years ago. The government ought to take up this question themselves, but, as far as I am concerned, I am in favour of this Bill being proceeded with, and I am confident that we are equal to the task of making it such a measure as will work in the interests of the commercial community as a whole and do justice both to Canadian and foreign creditors.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). I am heartily in favour of the principle of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, but I agree with my right hon. friend the First Minister that a measure so important to the citizens in Canada in general should be referred to the Department of Justice before being submitted to the consideration of this House. In my opinion, an insolvency law is one of these things which we must provide in the very near future for the commercial classes of Canada. In the passage of such a law our national credit is, to a certain extent, involved. The only question which presents itself to my mind is this : Is the Bill broad enough in its application ? There was a Bill introduced some years ago by the late Sir John Abbott, which was broad in its application, but the application of which was not sufficiently clearly defined, and looking at clause three of the measure before us, I think that the same objection may be taken to it. If we are to have an insolvency law which is to be general in its application, clause three of this Bill should be more definite. In my opinion, farmers should be included with commercial traders. There are some other minor points in the Bill which will require very serious consideration, and therefore I think it will be well to refer it to the Department of Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not allow the Bill to be read the second time and thus affirm the principle, even if it goes no further this session ?

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). I did not quite catch what the right hon. gentleman the First Minister said, but I have no doubt that the trend of his remarks was in the line indicated by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. There is a feeling in the country, and a well-founded feeling, that it is time Canada had an insolvent law applicable to all parts of the Dominion. In my opinion, the present administration is blamable for not having introduced this measure themselves, but I cannot overlook the fact that the party I am supporting had also opportunities of remedying the difficulties we are labouring under, but failed to provide any redress. But whilst it was no doubt the duty of the late government of Canada to introduce a measure of this kind, yet we realize that with the vast expansion of trade and general industry which obtains in Canada, and is likely to increase in the future, there is a much greater necessity for an insolvency law than there was when the late administration had office. I would have been very glad indeed had the government seen fit to introduce a measure this session which would have had the prospect of becoming law that usually attaches to government measures, but since the government has failed to do so, I can see no good reason why we should not go on with the Bill before us and bring to its consideration the best and most experienced minds on both sides of the House. I am not, perhaps, able to appreciate fully the difficulties suggested as reasons for referring this matter to the Justice Department, and for not referring it to a committee, as we ordinarily do; but, for the present, it appears to me there are so many matters of general experience and discussion with reference to these subjects, matters that come within the knowledge of the members of this House, that there are good and cogent reasons why this Bill should be referred to a committee in the ordinary way, there to be discussed with such amendments as may appear, upon the whole, advisable to the members of the committee. Some hon. members will say that we have had a great deal of discussion with reference to insolvency law. That may be the case, but I doubt if this House, having regard to the importance of the subject, has given as much attention to this as to other matters that have come before the House. We had an insolvency law in 1869, the result of the appointment of a Select Committee of the House of Commons, and it applied to four provinces. Although it was found to contain some defects, I believe that, as a matter of experience, it worked reasonably well. The Act of 1875 was probably an improvement, and although it was made the subject of complaint and amendment, it proved fairly useful in practice. Probably that Act was not of sufficiently wide application. It applied to companies and trading co-partnerships, but it did not apply to incorporated banks, insurance, railway or telegraph companies. We have reached an era now when railways, insurance and telegraph companies occupy a very important position in reference to all our great commercial enterprises, and it would be a matter for consideration whether or not it would be advisable now to have the provisions of the law enlarged in this regard. The House will remember that, since 1880, we have had no Insolvent Act, and no very great effort has been made since, I believe, the repeal of the Insolvent Act in 1880, except, perhaps, the introduction of a Bill,

substantially the same as that now before us, in 1898 or 1900. One of the serious difficulties that have been suggested with reference to this matter is the class of persons to whom it shall apply—whether it shall apply to traders only or to non-traders as well. I submit that when we get into committee on a Bill of this kind, we can devise a clause that will meet the case—probably it might be something between the two. I have been thinking over this question of insolvency, and put some questions upon the Order Paper in the early part of the session to learn whether the government proposed to introduce an insolvency law or not. It appears to me that, having regard to the extent of farming operations at the present time, particularly the large farming operations that now exist and that are looming up in the North-west, we must cease to regard the farmers in the same light as heretofore, and must regard them as engaged in commerce to a degree, and in a way that was not characteristic of them some years ago. Therefore, I would be very much in favour of wording this Bill in such a way that farmers engaged in the large and various transactions that some of them engage in should have the advantage of coming in under the Act if they thought fit, or, perhaps, whether they thought fit or not. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that, under the name of farmers we have men engaged in large commercial concerns, some of the largest in the country. Now, as a suggestion, it occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that something of this kind be done—that we might have a registration class, that is, to say that a person about to engage in large operations of any kind, although he may not be prima facie subject to the insolvency law, could register himself as a trader, and so it could be known to the community who dealt with this man that they were dealing with a person who was subject to the provisions of the insolvency law, and might ultimately get the benefits of that law. It is sometimes said—or was said—that if you allow hitherto classes of men not regarded as traders to get the benefit of a discharge it would be a hardship to the community. But that is not what would result. There would be a middle class who, by registration, would announce themselves as engaged in transactions commercial in their nature, and who would be subject to the restrictions and entitled to the benefits arising under the insolvency law.

There is also the question of preference. That has been the subject of a good deal of discussion and it is one of the reasons why prejudice exists with reference to this law. For my part, I feel that the less preference we have the better, that the more we exclude the system of giving to certain creditors a preference over others, by making the whole assets of the insolvent liable for debts, on a basis of equal distribution so far as may be, the better for the country, and the more likely is it to be productive of satisfaction to the people generally. That, however, is a mater of detail.

Another formidable objection, or at least one tht has been formidably put forward is the question of the discharge of the debtor. A certain class of persons urge that the question of discharge should be a matter for the consideration of the judge alone, while others think that it should be entirely in the hands of the creditors. But after all, this is a matter of detail, a question of jurisdiction only. Perhaps the truth lies between the two extremes and is to be found in the method announced in this Bill, subject to some modifications. We could have the discharge of the unfortunate debtor where he has paid a certain percentage of the liabilities provided for—say the fifty cents on the dollar mentioned in the Bill—and we could have this controlled to a certain extent by the creditors or by a committee appointed by the creditors. A certain proportion in value and number of creditors should be necessary to obtain a discharge, and in addition, the sanction of the judge should be obtained. After all, does it not come down to this—will the judge grant the discharge to an insolvent if he has not, within the wording of this Act, or within the wording of the English Act, become entitled to it; has not so conducted himself that, if he is not blameless, he is, at all events to be excused? This is a matter of detail that can easily be worked out; and in connection with it I cannot perhaps do better than endeavour to emphasize what was said by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in reference to tying the hands of those who have been unfortunate rather than fraudulent. There is in this country, there is in every country where men are active, energetic, progressive and hopeful, a tendency to launch out and to go beyond what the best judgment would dictate. In such cases it is unfortunate for the man who has failed and unfortunate for the country—just as unfortunate for the country as it is for the individual—that the subsequent efforts of that man should be paralyzed because through misfortune or too large a measure of hope, he has failed and thus be unable to retrieve himself. Let us in every case endeavour to obtain such an Insolvency Act as, whilst it will not allow any man to succeed who has fraudulently entered into any scheme to do injustice to his creditors, yet will secure justice to every honest but unfortunate debtor who has surrendered the whole of his estate by providing for a discharge at the discretion of his creditors, or a portion of them, with the consent of the judge.

Now in reference to the provincial Acts which were referred to by the First Minister, whilst I recognize that in several provinces, at all events, perhaps in all, there is legislation to secure a distribution of the moneys of the debtor to his creditors, yet

there not being uniform legislation, and it being well known in Britain, the country with which we wish to do the largest measure of trade, that there is no uniform law and that the outside creditor, whether of Britain or of any other country, has to become acquainted with several different systems of legislation in order to know what remedy he has, is seriously hampering, and has hampered our commerce and our business relations in the past. As I said before, having regard to the fact that we are rapidly expanding, having regard to the fact that by the energy, and industry, and hope, and ambition of the people of Canada, we are likely, whether there comes a wave of depression or not, to reach out still further in the future, and this at a rapid rate, I think it is the bounden duty of every member of parliament to bring his experience and his wisdom to bear upon this matter; and it being especially one of the subjects relegated to this House by the British North America Act, to exercise our functions in this regard, and not relegate to the provinces, to work at random and with uncertainty, a matter upon which we should work for the whole Dominion.

It has been said that there are some prejudice by farmers against an Insolvency Act. I do not know whether that is so or not, I have not found that it is so. I have already referred to the fact, that the farming community and the industrial classes generally who launch out into large enterprises, should have the benefit of the provisions of an Insolvency Act. I have not found any prejudice among farmers against the passage of such an Act. Representing a distinctly rural constituency, I am prepared to take the responsibility as such representative, and say that I will at all events take all the onus that can be cast upon me by advocating what I believe to be in the interest, not especially of the commercial classes, not especially in the interest of the rural classes, but in the broad general interest of the Dominion. Believing that to be the effect, I am prepared to give this measure my support, and to work to bring it into the best possible form in the general interests of the whole of Canada.

Mr. MONK. I would ask the Prime Minister if the government would not take this Bill out of my hands completely and adopt it as a government measure, so that it might become law this session. I would be quite willing to give up the Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, but I am not prepared at this moment to accept the gift proffered by my hon. friend. It is a matter that requires some consideration. The government is not prepared to say that it would be advisable to introduce such legislation. All I can say at this moment is that the question is engaging our consideration.

House divided on motion (Mr. Monk).

Mr. LENNOX.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Henderson,
Avery,	Hughes (Victoria),
Barker,	Kemp,
Birkett,	Lancaster,
Blain,	Lavell,
Boyd,	Lennox,
Brock,	McIntosh,
Broder,	Monk,
Bruce,	Morin,
Cargill,	Porter,
Casgrain,	Robinson (Elgin),
Clancy,	Roche (Marquette),
Clare,	Rosamond,
Clarke,	Sherritt,
Cochrane,	Smith (Wentworth),
Earle,	Sproule,
Fowler,	Taylor,
Gilmour,	Thomson (Grey),
Hackett,	Tolton,
Hale,	Vrooman,
Halliday,	Wilson.—42.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Lemieux,
Bazinet,	Logan,
Belcourt,	Loy,
Bernier,	Macdonald,
Bickerdike,	Mackie,
Blair,	MacKinnon,
Bourassa,	MacLaren (Huntingdon)
Brown,	Macpherson,
Bruneau,	McCarthy,
Bureau,	McCreary,
Calvert,	McEwen,
Campbell,	McGugan,
Christie,	Marcil (Bagot),
Copp,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Davis,	Meigs,
Desjardins,	Monet,
Douglas,	Mulock (Sir William),
Emmerson,	Parmelee,
Erb,	Paterson,
Ethier,	Préfontaine,
Fitzpatrick,	Puttee,
Fortier,	Reid (Restigouche),
Geoffrion,	Riley,
Gibson,	Ross (Ontario),
Girard,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Grant,	Russell,
Heyd,	Schell,
Holmes,	Scott,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Stewart,
Hyman,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Talbot,
Lang,	Tolmie,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tucker,
Laurier (L'Assomption)	Turgeon,
Lavergne,	Wade,
Law,	Wallace,
LeBlanc,	Wright.—74.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Thompson Haldimand),	Ingram,
Cartwright	Tupper
(Sir Richard),	(Sir Charles Hibbert)
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Morrison,	Gourley,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Farquharson,	Osler,
McLennan,	McGowan,
Beith,	Bennett,
Sifton,	MacLaren (Perth),
McIsaac,	Kendry,

Oliver,	Maclean,
Cowan,	Calvin,
Gould,	Pringle,
Harty,	Culbert,
Mignault,	Léonard,
McCool,	Kidd,
Archambault,	Richardson,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Dyment,	McCormick,
McColl,	Ward,
Fraser,	Bell,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Tobin,	Ball,
Costigan,	LaRivière,
Fielding,	Haggart,
Stephens,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Kendall,	Kaulbach,
Borden (Sir F. W.),	Borden (Halifax),
Roche (Halifax),	Ganong,
Matheson,	Pope,
German,	Carscallen,
Tarte,	Wilmot,
Galliher,	Reid (Grenville),
Dugas,	Robinson (North'd),
Harwood,	Roddick,
Ross (Yukon),	Seagram,

Motion negatived.

FRUIT MARKS ACT, 1901, AMENDMENT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Smith (Wentworth), for the second reading of Bill (No. 86) to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Smith) if he would kindly not press his Bill this evening. The hon. minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has just returned to the city to-day, and I will take the opportunity to see that this Bill is taken into consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

Order allowed to stand.

INCORPORATED COMPANIES.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 94) respecting incorporated companies. He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is intended to stop, if possible, men running to this House and the other House to get charters for the purpose of selling them. I have stated in the Bill that charters shall be void if not taken advantage of in two years. Some hon. members have thought this too short a time. I have no objection to changing the time. There are one or two amendments that have come from the Montreal board of trade, and if the House will agree to them I will suggest that they be put into the Bill. One proposes to amend clause 1, by inserting after the word 'commence' or the words 'or causes to be commenced,' that is to say while a company may not operate under its charter it may sell its charter to some other company and this other company may operate under it.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Would that amendment cover the case of the Dominion Telegraph Company? I may say that I have had a communication respecting the effect of this Bill if passed in its present shape on the Dominion Telegraph Company and Montreal Telegraph Company, whose lines have been for many years operated by the Great North-western Telegraph Company.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. That will not affect them if they are going on under another name or under another company.

Mr. CLARKE. Their lines are being operated by another company.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Quite so.

Mr. CLARKE. You are perfectly clear on that point?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If they are being operated the Bill does not affect them. We might pass the second reading and submit it to the Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am somewhat embarrassed about giving my consent that this Bill should go to committee because I do not understand its provisions. If I understood the Bill I could give my reasons for objecting to it, but I really cannot understand what my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) means by this Bill. In answer to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) the introducer said it would not affect the Dominion Telegraph Company. I have a letter from one of the officials connected with the Montreal Telegraph Company in which he says that the Montreal Telegraph Company, leased, after many years' working, to the Great North-western Telegraph Company and now worked by it, would be wiped out if this Bill goes through. The Dominion Coal Company, leased to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, and worked by the latter, would also be affected by this Bill. This letter is received from a gentleman in Montreal connected with the Montreal Telegraph Company, and if it be a fact, as he says, that that would be the result of his Bill, I cannot help objecting to it. I cannot understand what my hon. friend is driving at, what purpose he has in view, what his object is in this legislation, and not knowing what the object of the Bill is, I am sorry that I cannot agree to the House going into committee upon it.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I think that this Bill will affect a great many other companies in addition to the Dominion Telegraph Company, and I think we should pause before passing such sweeping legislation as that. There are many companies in Quebec that still exist for some purpose, but which are not at present exercising their corporate powers. I think this legislation is very sweeping, the public has had no notice of it. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) had better drop the Bill this session.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). Mr. Speaker, I want to point out, too, that it will be utterly impossible to adopt clause 1 which I gather from what the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike) has said, contains the principal feature of the Bill. It says :

If any company incorporated by the parliament of Canada, or under an Act of that parliament, fails to commence active operations within two years after incorporation, or fails to use any of its corporate powers during two consecutive years, such unused powers, except so far as is necessary for winding up the company, shall be forfeited.

It is well known that many companies are incorporated with several powers to be exercised by them. A company might be incorporated and might comply with the terms of its incorporation if it put into operation one or more of its powers while some other power contained in the Bill might, for some good reason, not be put into operation for some time. The result would be that though certain powers were used the unused powers, the operation of which for some good reason might be deferred to a later date, would be destroyed. I do not see how we could possibly adopt the principle involved in section 1. It seems to me that that objection is an insuperable one.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. As it is quite evident that the leaders on both sides of the House are opposed to my Bill I ask to be permitted to withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn.

CONCILIATION ACT, 1900.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Puttee, for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) to amend the Conciliation Act, 1900.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, when this Bill was before the House on a former occasion, I explained it pretty thoroughly, and I do not think it is necessary to go into it again at this stage.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). There are same provisions of this Bill that the government can accept and there are some that they cannot. I have no objection to the Bill going into committee with the understanding that the adoption of the second reading does not commit the House to the provisions of the Bill. The second paragraph purports to authorize the appointment of a board of arbitrators without the consent of the parties. That is contrary to the principles of the Conciliation Act. However desirable such a provision may be, I hardly think that the public are educated to that standard yet, and therefore it would be in advance of public opinion. It is true that principle is incorporated in the Bill before the House respecting railways in extreme cases, but we cannot consent to that principle in regard to ordinary industrial troubles. Sections 3 and 6 of the Bill with certain modifications might be passed so far as the government is concerned. My hon. friend (Mr. Puttee) desires to have the Bill referred to the committee so that it may be dealt with in detail, there will be no objection.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 1,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Conciliation Act provides that a board of conciliation may be appointed on the application of the employers or the employees interested. This section provides that the board may be appointed without the application of either party. That is a material difference. Under the amendment the board may be appointed without either party applying, whereas under the present law application must be made by one or other party to the dispute.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot see the effect of introducing this amendment to the present Act.

Mr. PUTTEE. Does the minister accept this amendment ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. PUTTEE. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will find there is a great difference between the amendment and the provision in the present Act. The amendment makes it the duty of the Labour Department to appoint a conciliator without application at all. Suppose the parties are now willing to conciliate, then when this officer is appointed he will be an investigator and will ascertain all the facts and report. It is very much the same principle that was put in the Railway Disputes Bill, and it will insure that there shall be an impartial investigation into any dispute even although the parties are not willing at that time to ask for conciliation or investigation. I believe that this amendment will have a great deal to do with putting the Act into force more frequently than formerly. I am afraid that in the future the number of strikes will increase, and some strengthening provision like this in the Conciliation Act is very desirable.

Section agreed to.

On section 2,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That paragraph cannot be accepted. It proposes to appoint arbitrators without the consent of both parties. The first clause which was assented to, appoints a conciliator who would take evidence and make an award, but this second paragraph would force arbitration on unwilling parties, and I move that it be stricken out.

Clause struck out.

On section 3,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I move to amend this section by striking out the words 'arbitrator to take evidence under oath regarding the matter in dispute; also to strike out the figure '5' in the first line and substitute therefor the figure '7,' so as to make it amend section 7 of the Conciliation Act instead of section 5. It will amend section 7, which deals with conciliation and provides for the conciliators making their report and the publication of the report.

Mr. MONK. Would it not be better to require a statement of that kind to be published in the 'Official Gazette'? I have no doubt that it would also be published in the 'Labour Gazette'; but everybody does not take the 'Labour Gazette,' and I think the statement should be published in the general official publication of the country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the 'Labour Gazette' would reach a good many more people than the 'Official Gazette.' Its circulation is considerable now, and it may be treated as the official gazette of the government in labour matters.

Mr. MONK. This is the first time we have made this kind of enactment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it is also referred to in the Bill which I have before the House respecting labour disputes on railways.

Mr. PUTTEE. It is also referred to in section ten of the original Act.

Mr. HENDERSON. I scarcely see the importance of this amendment. What effect will it have? Is it along the line of compulsory arbitration? It does not seem to me that it is. If we are going to legislate any further on these questions, I think we had better go to the bottom of the whole matter at once and deal with it in such a way that we can bring about a settlement of labour disputes. To my mind this is only trifling with the matter. It does not touch the kernel at all. It is proposed from the standpoint of some trades and labour council who simply keep this matter alive before the workingmen of the country with the pretense that they are doing something for the workingmen, while as a matter of fact accomplishing nothing. I think it is about time that we were doing something, and if labour disputes are to be brought to a termination within a reasonable time without sacrificing the interests of the working men, or the interests of the employers, I think the time has come when we should take into consideration legislation which will compel both parties to agree to any reasonable settlement that may be suggested by those who are constituted for the purpose of bringing about a settlement. That is my opinion on the whole matter. I do not think this legislation is going to amount to anything.

Mr. BROCK. If this Bill were simply dealing with a local organization, I would be very well inclined to agree with it; but why should this country be so much concerned about protecting the interests of an international organization, which is not under the laws of this country, which does not recognize anything we do in this parliament except in so far as it will suit its own interests? I contend that the labour organizations of this country should be manly enough to stand on their own feet and submit to the laws of Canada, and not be dictated to by organizations on the other side of the line. If they are not dictated to by these organizations, as some gentlemen in this House have said, then why is this word 'international' introduced in this Bill? Why should we allow ourselves to be dictated to by antagonistic organizations on the other side of the line? I contend that this House should throw out any legislation of an international kind that comes before it. It is only an attempt to hold up the manufacturing and other industrial interests of this country. We have had the farmers of this country antagonised, and their freight held up at the dictation of international organizations. I contend that this country will not put up with this sort of thing, and therefore I urge the government to throw out anything that purports to legislate for any country but Canada. I notice that this Bill provides:

> In no case shall a conciliator or arbitrator stipulate, nor shall it be stipulated in any agreement promoted or recommended by a conciliator, or arbitrator, that any employee shall relinquish his membership in any local, national or international trades union or labour association.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is not the section we are at.

Mr. BROCK. This whole Act is moving in a certain direction, and it culminates by stipulating that anything we do here should have no effect.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell me what Bill he is reading?

Mr. BROCK. Bill ninety-five. If the chairman reads it over, he will find that my remarks are perfectly in order. I do not care which clause of this Bill you take, it is not one that should be considered by this House, because we are attempting to legislate beyond our powers for an international arrangement which we cannot control. If the chairman says I am out of order, and have no right to speak, I will resume my seat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not say the hon. gentleman is not in order, but the Bill I have does not appear to be the same as the one the hon. gentleman is reading.

Mr. BROCK. That is the difficulty in connection with this whole matter. There

is an attempt to make people believe that we are passing Canadian legislation whereas we are legislating in connection with a foreign organization.

Mr. PUTTEE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. Surely he must know that this Bill can only affect Canadian unions and Canadian employers. There is no intention to go outside the jurisdiction of this parliament and we could not. It would be absurd to introduce a Bill to affect any international organization not under our control. This Bill is not intended to affect trade unions but to try and arbitrate disputes that will arise between Canadian employers and workmen. Whether the attempt be successful or not, it is worth our consideration, and we should approach the matter without prejudice or bias one way or the other. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken and deplore equally with him the fact that there is not more force in the Act. I believe that if my amendment were accepted, making arbitration possible on the application of one party, that would extend the principle as far as it can go without encroaching on compulsory arbitration. Although I am not opposed to compulsory arbitration, the majority of members here are. I am afraid that disputes will not be adjusted until we have some reasonable method of dealing with them by compulsory arbitration, and the section thrown out of the Bill, although it provided for arbitration on the request of one of the parties, did not make the award binding on either. It simply left it to the force of public opinion, on an investigation being made and an award declared by a disinterested party.

Mr. CLARKE. Suppose you had compulsory arbitration, how could you enforce it ? Would you put these people in jail ?

Mr. PUTTEE. I am afraid it would not be of any use our entering into a discussion on the features of compulsory arbitration at present. In New Zealand they are getting awards observed and enforced under compulsory arbitration. In the Australian commonwealth, they are doing the same thing. The only objection to it in Canada is that the people are not ready for it. But I protest against this introduction of the question of internationalism and foreign agitators and all the rest, being brought into the subject before us. The Bill and amendment are purely along the lines of conciliation, in order to do away as much as possible with disputes of a minor character that often grow into larger ones. I believe that a conciliation Act can smoothe out some of the troubles of a minor character, but so far it has not affected any of the larger evils.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would ask hon. gentlemen to confine themselves to the discussion of clause three. On clause four, we will come to what the hon. gentleman is now discussing.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the government allowed section three to go ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. MONK. What is there to be done by section three which is not already provided for in the Conciliation Act ? Section three provides that a conciliator shall look into the facts and suggest a settlement. Is not that already in the Conciliation Act ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it is, but there seems to exist a doubt in the mind of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), and I have no objection to remove it. Besides this provides that the basis of settlement shall be published in the 'Labour Gazette.' That is not to be found in the Conciliation Act.

Mr. PUTTEE. The word used in the amendment is 'arbitrator' instead of 'conciliator.'

Mr. CLARKE. He is no longer a conciliator but an arbitrator.

On section 4,

4. The said Act is further amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 6 :—

6a. In no case shall a conciliator or arbitrator stipulate, nor shall it be stipulated in any agreement promoted or recommended by a conciliator or arbitrator, that any employee shall relinquish his membership in any local, national or international trades union or labour association ; nor shall an agreement subject any employee to a penalty on account of such membership.

Mr. PUTTEE. It has been suggested that this should be made an amendment to section eight instead of section six, to which I have no objection. I would move that 'six' be struck out and 'eight' be substituted.

The intent of this amendment is to commend this principle of conciliation to the employees. At present the employees keep away as much as possible from conciliation or arbitration because there has been rather a mischievous principle introduced into the awards of some arbitrators or conciliators, believing that they had power to take the by-laws or constitutions of an organization into their judgment and alter them as they saw fit. As a matter of fact, the policy is laid down by almost all associations that they will not put their constitution and by-laws to arbitration, and they are perfectly right. A clause of this kind will do a good deal to commend the principle of this Bill to the parties interested.

Mr. CLARKE. Have the words 'local, national or international' any force whatever ?

Mr. PUTTEE. No, it seems to me that the words 'any trade union,' would be sufficient.

Mr. CLARKE. It seems to me that the clause would be just as strong if we left the words 'local, national or international' out and made it read 'any trade union or local association.'

Mr. PUTTEE. I was about to suggest the same thing. These words might just as well be left out, if there is any objection to them.

Mr. BROCK. As the labour representatives in this House are beginning to see the thing very much in the way I see it, I withdraw any objection I have to anything else, if they will withdraw the word 'international.' I therefore move that the words 'or international' be struck out.

Mr. McCARTHY. Why not leave it 'any trades union'?

Mr. BROCK. I am in favour of trades unions in this country, subject to the laws of this country; but this Bill would bring in international unions that are not subject to the laws of this country. Why need the word 'international' be used? Why do we send to Philadelphia, New York, Boston, or any other large American city for international interviewers, and organizers to come to this country? We should do everything to make it thoroughly understood that the Canadian parliament is able and willing to legislate for this country and will insist upon its rights to do so. I do not care what bylaws and rules the local organizations may have, they have a perfect right to have them; but when these local laws have to be referred to agitators from the other side of the line, that is something that we should fight against. These Canadian organizations, I am in favour of, and am anxious to support in every possible way, notwithstanding what may have been said. But I do not wish to support, nor do I think this country will support, agitations and organizations, the mainspring of which is on the other side of the line. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) is willing that the word 'international' be struck out, I am willing to let it pass.

Mr. PUTTEE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) asks why organizations send across the line for men. I do not know why his organizations do so, but I know as a matter of fact they do. The Toronto Manufacturers' Association sent across the line to bring in American agitators from Dayton, Ohio, and the Metal Working Manufacturers' Association did the same thing. I do not pretend to know why these organizations did these things. I know why an ordinary trade union sends across the line, but I do not see why it is necessary to discuss this at the present time. I notice that when we have railway Bills before the House, these hon. gentlemen do not ask why the capital comes from other countries, or why the promoters are men who owe no allegiance to Canada; and when a friendly society is to be incorporated they do not ask why it is that the headquarters of that society are in another land. They know perfectly well that we are dealing with our own subjects and that, even if the societies to which they belong are affiliated with outside organizations, that does not affect this provision, for it can control the citizens of Canada only. I am perfectly willing that all the words, 'local, national or international,' should be struck out.

Mr. INGRAM. It is not necessary to strike out 'local' or 'national,' I take it that the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) has no objection to Canadians belonging to local organizations.

Mr. BROCK. Certainly not.

Mr. INGRAM. But the hon. gentleman does not want to be misrepresented on that point. I understand that the hon. gentleman is willing that all these organizations should enjoy all the rights they have in Canada, and does not desire to deprive them of any of those rights. If the section is amended as the hon. gentleman suggests, it will meet his views and will help to remove the ground for the contention of some hon. gentlemen that labour organizations are controlled by men on the other side of the line. Personally, I understand that many organizations in Canada are affiliated with the international associations, and that the strength they thus gain is a benefit to the organization. I have no objection to the amendment the hon. gentleman suggests, seeing that it will meet what seems to me the paltry objection that he raised.

Mr. HOLMES. I agree with the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) and the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) that, in so far as this phrase is concerned, it is a term that the House should guard against. But, if you strike out the words 'local, national, or international' you make it, in effect the same as now. I think the word 'international' should be struck out, and that would meet the object the House has in view. There is a feeling, undoubtedly, that a good many of the strikes carried on by the trades unions are due to the work of the agitators from the other side of the line. If that feeling could be removed it would strengthen the labour element with public opinion on this side of the line.

Mr. MONK. This is another clause, it seems to me, which my hon. friend (Mr. Puttee) might have left out. I do not think the arbitrator or conciliator—for it is only the conciliator we are dealing with here—ought to be told by legislation that he shuts out any class in any suggested arrangement, or prevents any employee from belonging to a trades union. I am not aware that any conciliator or any body else has made such a

suggestion. Why should we legislate in this sense ? What the conciliator is supposed to do is to suggest a basis of arrangement between the parties, and I think it unwise for my hon. friend to raise the question by this useless piece of legislation. I cannot bring myself to agree completely with my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). There are a great many trades unions in the city of Montreal that find it useful—for what reason I cannot exactly say—to be affiliated with American organizations or organizations of other countries. I cannot say here without having examined the question more fully that they are in the wrong. With regard to international unions being an irritating cause of strikes, I am not prepared to admit that either. What strikes and labour difficulties we have had in the city of Montreal have not been suggested by agitators from the other side. That I say from my own knowledge. I am not absolutely acquainted with the by-laws of our trades unions ; but I think it is especially provided that, before having recourse to a strike, the matter must have been fully considered by the local trades union and decided by them without any outside interference whatever. After the strike has been decided upon, then, and then only, is the question of the wisdom of striking submitted to the central council wherever that may be ; the central council—international or whatever may be its character—intervenes, as I understand it, expressly for the purpose of preventing a strike. That is what I have found out, at any rate among the working men of Montreal. These men, very far from being urged to strike, find that the central council acts the part of a conciliator. And, if after all these efforts have failed and a strike takes place, then the man whom my hon. friend from Centre Toronto regards as an agitator comes in. But, as I understand it, he is rather a man having experience in labour matters, who comes independent of all parties for the purpose of smoothing over the difficulty if possible. Under these circumstances, and upon general principles, if a workman belonging to a labour union finds it useful and for the benefit of his own association to have that association linked with one with similar aims in another country, having great power and resources, I do not see why he should not have that power. I know that in Montreal these trades unions feel that they gain power, that they can work better if they are united with similar trade unions in other countries. As some hon. gentleman has remarked, we admit foreign capital, we allow foreign capital to make combinations with our own capital. I cannot, for my part, see why we should not allow labourers to coalesce, provided they do it properly, and not in violation of any law. I really think this section is useless. My hon. friend must see that it has brought up a discussion on a matter of very grave import which is not, strictly speaking, in question here, and he has offered to withdraw the word 'international.' But, for my part, I would like to consider the matter further before saying that I disapprove of such combinations.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has given us a piece of refreshing coolness in the remarks he has just made to the House with regard to disinterested and philanthropic efforts of the labour agitators on the other side, whose sole and only object in coming over here is to avert strikes and settle labour disputes amicably. Perhaps the hon. gentleman believes that is the case ; if he does, I certainly do not. I believe that the operations of these emissaries, in nine cases out of ten, are in the line of promoting and fomenting difficulties. I agree with the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock) in his demand that this word 'international' should be expunged from this section. I know myself of cases where agitators, labour emissaries from the United States, have come in here and have promoted strikes, have been the cause of strikes.

An hon. MEMBER. Where ?

Mr. CHARLTON. At Smith's Falls, for instance. The operation of a large manufacturer there was suspended and the men went out on strike. A labour union was formed, the men were coerced into joining that union, were compelled to do so. Two-thirds of the men who joined that union did so reluctantly and against their wishes. But the terrorism, and the influences that these men know so well how to use, were brought into play there, and the result was that the men went out on strike and the business of that concern was suspended. Three-fourths of their orders fortunately were filled, and the firm said : Very well, gentlemen, if you do not wish to work, if you decide to dictate to us how we shall carry on our business, we will simply suspend operations. They did suspend operations, and after the strike had continued a month the men came back to work, and three-fourths of the men that came back, I am told, were opposed to having gone out on a strike. It seems to me we are largely engaged here in performing the operation of a tail to the kite of the labour unions, we are playing second fiddle to John Mitchell in the legislation which we are adopting in this House. We are dealing with this labour question in the interest of the unions ; we do not take into consideration the interests of the great mass of labourers who do not desire to join the unions, the men who want to sell their labour, who want to be at liberty to make a bargain for their labour without being told by officers of the labour union whether they shall have the privileges of a citizen in making such a contract or not. The weapon of the greater portion

of the strikes in the United States has been the terrorism that has been exercised by the trade unions in preventing men from working who desired to work, who were satisfied to work, who were satisfied with the wages that they were receiving, and who desired to go on earning those wages. But they have been prevented from doing so, have been compelled to cease labour at the dictation of a tyrannical organization, an organization which, if it has the power, will exercise a tyranny greater than has ever been exercised in this country.

Mr. MONK. Is the hon. gentleman opposed to trades unions ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not opposed to trades unions when they are operated within legitimate and proper limits, but I am opposed to trades unions that usurp to themselves authority to command the entire labour interests of the country, and to coerce and compel men in every direction to join the unions whether they wish to do so or not, and who, if they do not wish to join the unions, will resort to violence, to murder and to arson, in order to carry out their purposes. Now, Sir, I propose to offer an amendment to this subsection 6, or subsection 8, as it will be. The section reads now as follows :—

In no case shall a conciliator or arbitrator stipulate, nor shall it be stipulated in any agreement promoted or recommended by a conciliator or arbitrator, that any employee shall relinquish his membership in any local, national or international trades union or labour association ; nor shall an agreement subject any employee to a penalty on account of such membership.

I propose to add these words :

Or discriminate against persons who are not members of trades unions or labour associations.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I venture to think that if the Minister of Labour had drawn a clause it would not be worded as this clause 6a. I would have thought it was unnecessary for any member of this House to express himself with regard to trades unions in discussing a measure such as this, which is a simple piece of legislation. But as others have so expressed themselves, in order that by my silence I may not be misunderstood, I desire to say that I sympathize as much as any member in this House with the desire of the labouring classes to promote their interests by forming themselves into labour associations. The question before this House is whether this particular clause, 6a, is, under the circumstances, a reasonable and proper clause, and if adopted by this House, will it be a reasonable piece of legislation. Now, when we consider that the Act which is being amended is not an arbitration Act at all, but a conciliation Act, when we find that the conciliator has no power to bind either the employer or the employee, I venture to say that this is, I was going to say, a monstrous thing.

Mr. PUTTEE. In what way ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. The arbitrator has no power to bind the party. You may call him the conciliator or an arbitrator, but it comes down to the same result, that he has no power to bind the parties. Now, if an arbitrator had power to bind the employer or the employee, and if there were machinery to enforce his decision, then I could understand the propriety of such a clause as this. But when the conciliator or arbitrator has no power to bind the parties, I venture to say that it is a most extraordinary piece of legislation to forbid him even to make a suggestion.

Mr. INGRAM. Supposing both parties agreed to abide by his proposition ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. If they left the matter to the arbitrator to decide for them, he could not put this particular clause in, even if it were a proper clause. I am not saying that the case might not arise when it would be proper for the conciliator to insert any such clause as this, but it is conceivable.

Mr. INGRAM. Supposing in the longshoremen's strike in Montreal an agreement was entered into by a third party that the workmen should drop their membership in a labour organization, would that agreement be affected by this clause ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Practically it would make a difference, for this reason, if this clause were passed the conciliator or arbitrator would not be allowed to put in such a clause as is forbidden here, but if this clause does not pass, and if the conciliator or arbitrator did insert such a clause without having any machinery to enforce it, nobody would be bound by it. I would like to ask my hon. friend in turn if this is a reasonable clause, and I want to go further ; if it is proper to say that no conciliator or arbitrator shall say that no employee shall relinquish his membership in any association. I would go further and say that no employer should relinquish his membership in any association. If it is fair for one side, why not make it reciprocal, and apply it to the other side as well ?

Mr. INGRAM. I do not suppose they would have any objection to that.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I do not say that they would. But I think that if it is a good thing for one it should be good for all. I am not advocating that principle; I am rather advocating another principle because it seems to me we are doing a wholly unnecessary act in putting a clause on the statute-book which will not result in any good. The clause seems to assume that under no possible circumstances, no matter what the provocation might be, could the friends of the union go so far astray that a conciliator might be justified in saying that a man should leave the union. I do not know that

they will go so far astray that an honest impartial conciliator would adopt this principle, but if they have gone so far astray it seems to me rather hard that in any conciliation effort he should be deprived of making that suggestion. Therefore, I think this should be reciprocal; if it is applied to one it should be applied to the other, and secondly, because it would be faulty legislation I would be inclined to oppose the clause.

Mr. INGRAM. Every one who knows anything about labour disputes knows perfectly well that there is no instance he could name where any labour organizations have taken objection to a manufacturer simply because he belongs to the Manufacturers' Association. We all know that perfectly well, and we who have watched these disputes also know that there never has been a labour dispute between organized labour and organized capital in which the question of membership in the labour organization was not the real point of the contention as between the two parties. It is true that the wage difficulty arises very frequently, but oftener the difficulty is by reason of men belonging to labour organizations. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) finds fault with these tyrannical organizations which commit murder and violence. There is not a man who belongs to a labour organization in Canada that I know of who wants to commit murder or exercise tyranny or anything of that kind. These men simply want to associate themselves together for mutual benefit and protection. I hold that any man who asks that privilege is entitled to it.

Mr. CHARLTON. My remark in regard to violence and intimidation on the part of members connected with labour organizations referred to the operations of labour unions in the United States, and not to Canadian organizations at all, and it was made in connection with this matter of international unions.

Mr. INGRAM. Then what was the object in bringing that question into this discussion ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I referred to international affiliations.

Mr. INGRAM. We know perfectly well that in Chicago and other cities in the United States they have gone altogether too far. They have committed tyranny, and they have committed murder in many cases. I do not know a single instance in Canada where they uphold conduct of that kind. I am quite sure they do not.

Mr.. BROCK. Why was it necessary for the authorities in Montreal to call out the troops ?

Mr. MONK. The troops were called out because we had not sufficient police in Montreal.

Mr. BROCK. What for ?

Mr. MONK. There was no conflict; they were literally called out in place of the police.

Mr. BROCK. Called out because a conflict was threatened.

Mr. INGRAM. During all the discussion that took place in this House about longshoremen's strike not a single instance of violence was brought to the notice of the House.

Mr. BROCK. Why, was not the calling out of the troops a most extraordinary evidence of fear on the part of the authorities in Montreal that violence was going to be committed ? Otherwise they were absolutely wrong in calling out the troops.

Mr. INGRAM. I might refer to an instance in the hon. gentleman's own city of Toronto. No one will charge the students of the different colleges with being tyrannical or wishing to commit murder or violence ; yet the troops were called out to take charge of these young men.

Mr. BROCK. Certainly.

Mr. INGRAM. I take it that the circumstances in Montreal and in Toronto were on the same lines. It was not so much the fault of the students as a certain class of people who take advantage of a procession of that kind in order to create violence.

Mr. BROCK. Show me your company and I will tell you what you are.

Mr. INGRAM. If I were to judge all the students by that I am afraid I would have to say that they were in bad company that night. I think if the disturbers who usually accompany these processions had not been there, there would not have been so much done about that Toronto affair as really was done. In respect to this measure I do not see why a man has not the right to belong to a labour organization if he sees fit. Most of these disputes hinge largely on the question of men belonging to a labour organization or retaining membership in an organization. I cannot see why they should be deprived of that privilege. I am not one of those who uphold labour organizations in depriving other men of the privileges of obtaining employment because they are not members of the organization. Possibly some go a little farther than they should. I think that they have a right to be organized and that they are entitled to exercise all the privileges of their organizations. They are entitled to the right to organize just as much as manufacturers are, as legal gentlemen are, as medical gentlemen are, or as any other bodies of men are.

Mr. PUTTEE. I think it is to be regretted that in the discussion of this Bill hon. gentlemen should have thought it necessary to

refer to some of the things that they have referred to; for instance, to injurious labour organizations, red-headed agitators and so on—bogies which have been deliberately planted in the public mind. I think it would have been a great deal better to have discussed this Bill which is intended to be a conciliation Bill. The question that was brought up by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) is a very material point in reference in this subject, it is that after all the one thing that is the pith and heart of the labour dispute is the question that is called recognition. Half the troubles that are on to-day might be settled to-morrow if it were not for the question of recognition. I have often said that I believed in compulsory arbitration. Compulsory arbitration recognizes that a dispute must be between two parties and not between an organization of capital and any individual employees. It will only deal with organizations on both sides. Then, it is possible for you to get men into a frame of mind to see that there are two strong sides which are brought together by the conciliation process. Compulsory arbitration brings labour disputes up to date. It is no good discussing the labour question as if labour organizations will be put to one side. They will not be put to one side. They are growing stronger just as organizations of capital are growing stronger, and any movement that is going to affect arbitration or conciliation has got to recognize that fact. After all, this clause it not so hurriedly or awkwardly drawn as some suppose. It is not a clause that has been got together especially for this Act. It is one that is beginning to appear in the Conciliation Acts of different countries. There is a good principle in it, and I will explain why. When an award is made to settle a dispute, there is this one thing that makes that award of no effect whatever, and that is anything that prevents the affiliation of employees with the union that has been in the dispute. Why, because if they have not got that organization at their back under which they struck, their settlement is no good. The employer accepts the settlement and immediately disregards it, because there is no other side to enforce the settlement. I say that in any proposition that is made by disinterested parties it is wise that they should leave this question where they found it; leave it to be settled between the men themselves, but do not take the dispute away from the organization, and do not fine any man for his affiliation with a union. If you do that, you will immediately destroy all confidence in conciliation. There is not much confidence in conciliation in this country at the present time, and it is because of the actual experience that this has been attempted and some times has been successfully done in perfectly well meant conciliations. In bringing in a disinterested party, you bring in a person who does not understand the organization of labour or the organization of capital, and it appears quite reasonable to such a one that these parties should work together as individuals, as he has the notion they used to do in the past. It is no use attempting to conciliate on the basis of individuals working with an employer—the whole thing now is two strong parties, necessarily antagonists for the time being, perhaps antagonistic all through ; the interest of the country is to bring them together. That is the idea of this Conciliation Act. It seems to me regrettable that in discussing this matter we should in any way appeal to passion or to ideas that are at all events out of date.

Mr. CLARKE. As the Minister of Labour has taken this Bill under his fatherly consideration, we have the right to ask him what is his opinion of the amendment suggested by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) ? The minister's opinion would no doubt have a beneficial effect in enabling us to reach a wise decision as to whether we should adopt this amendment or not. I am glad we have cleared the atmosphere a good deal by the discussion that has taken place this evening. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) has put himself right. The attempt had been made to show that he is opposed to the organization of Canadian workmen into unions. He has told us that he is not opposed to that. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was charged here with saying that he had referred to labour unions in this country as containing men who would commit murder.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not wish to be misrepresented——

Mr. CLARKE. I am trying to put the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) right as well as my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). I say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) was charged here with saying that Canadian unions contained men, some of whom were prepared to commit murder. The hon. gentleman has repudiated that, and he says he refers to American unions. The only difference of opinion between the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock) and some other gentlemen who are in favour of labour organizations is as to what is meant by an international union. The Canadian labour unions are affiliated with these international bodies, because in union there is strength. The Canadian unions do not affiliate for any improper purpose. They are bound to support each other, but they are not united to injure any one. That is the principle on which they amalgamate. They do not lose any of their rights by amalgamating with labour organizations on the other side of the line; they rather strengthen the union organization. I am not satisfied yet, Mr. Chairman, that it has been proven that any person has come from the American side for the purpose of organizing our men into unions so as to

compel them to strike to the detriment of their own interests. I am open to argument, and I invite and challenge any hon. member on either side of this committee to-night to make good the allegation that men have come here to organize Canadians into unions and to compel them to strike. I say that statement cannot be made good, and it is not fair that such a statement should be made and that hon. members who do not know anything about union men, should be misled and deceived by such a statement. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) strikes out the words 'local, national or international,' I cannot see what objection can be raised to that amendment. It seems to cover the whole case. We are only legislating here, after all, for our own unions; we cannot legislate for unions on the other side, except to punish them if they come over here to commit a crime.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In answer to my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), I do not think it should be the part of any board of conciliators or arbitrators to interfere with the freedom of any citizen to do whatever it is lawful for him to do, whether he choses to belong to a union or not to belong to a union.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that to do otherwise would be an act of tyranny. You might as well stipulate that a man must not belong to a particular church or to a particular political party. I think that it would be entirely improper for us to interfere with the freedom of our citizens, and therefore I quite approve of a man's rights being preserved, and if necessary that we should do so by legislation. I may say that but for this Bill I would not have thought that any conciliator would have attempted in a proposed basis of settlement, to deprive a party to a labour dispute of his right either to belong or not to belong to a union as he sees fit. In taking that general view, I believe that it is just as proper that we should protect 'non-union' as 'union' labour.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Therefore, I would have no objection to the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk, which is that we should not discriminate against non-union labour. The same principle would apply, I suppose.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be well for the minister to prepare an amendment that would meet that case ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member (Mr. Clarke) has suggested to strike out these qualifying words.

Mr. PUTTEE. I agree to accept the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk. His amendment is a great deal more reasonable than his speech.

Mr. CLARKE.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUTTEE. I would like to persuade him (Mr. Charlton) if I can, that there are two reasonable men in the House, if he considers he is one. I move to strike out the words : 'Local, international, or national.'

Mr. BROCK. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) spoke to us of not objecting to foreign capital coming into our country. I think foreign capital means foreign cash. What does international labour mean ? It can do a certain amount of harm, but is it anything that can be attacked ? Foreign capital coming to this country is under Canadian laws, and if it does damage to any individual in this country there is a means of getting justice, and collecting damages. But organized labour such as has been threatened here; what does it bring ? It brings with it of necessity the calling out of the troops of this country to protect, not foreign capital, but Canadian capital from damage and from loss. We have seen in the last few days in the public press where 4,000 labourers—I do not say they are members of labour unions, but it shows you the company that labour unions bring in its train in this country; it shows that all the scruff of this country come out to assist them and to protect them to derail cars, to destroy property, to stone people, who are engaged in their lawful calling. I do not mean to say that this is done by organized labour, but this is the affiliation; this is the company they keep; this is the kind of sympathy they bring out; not the sympathy of people whose opinions are worth having, but the very worst elements of the whole country are brought out to sympathize with and to back up these strikes brought about by organized labour.

Then they defy us to bring forward evidences of these men being invited to come to this country. If this House will give me a committee, I shall have no difficulty in proving not only that they have come here, but that they have been asked to come here. Nobody, under these circumstances, can invest capital in this country with any degree of safety, because they know that they are liable to be held up by what is called organized labour. The labour organizations of this country are not in favour of strikes. Give them a chance to vote by ballot, and they will not vote for strikes. But men do not want to be called scabs on the streets ; they do not want their children coming from school to be hooted at ; they do not want their wives to be insulted on the streets. But ten men in a hundred can bring about a strike, and there is no means of getting at them. These people can shoot from behind a hedge, and then run away, and there is no way of reaching them. This is a kind of thing which men who have respect for themselves despise. If the matter were left to a vote by ballot, I know the way that vote would go. I have been in

Toronto in the last few days, and I know the feeling among the labour men there, and they are not in favour of strikes. Only 10 per cent of the workers in Toronto are labour union men. I do not see why this country should be terrorized by them. I am prepared to meet the labouring people anywhere, and to convince any honest, reasonable man that there are two sides to this question. Labour has no right to terrorize over capital. I am prepared to protect organized labour, organized under Canadian law, and responsible for any harm it does to capital, and I am prepared to make capital responsible for any harm it does to labour. I wish to place myself right on this matter. My battle is with international organizations. If we stamp them out in this country we can deal with our own people, who, I believe, are quite reasonable. I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). You need only pick up the papers to see how true his statement is, that these people do not stop even at murder. No less than twelve people were murdered yesterday, not by organized labour, but by the scruff of the country which they have in their train.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (Wellington South). Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say a word on this question; but after having listened to the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), I think it is due to myself and due to those whom I represent to say that my views on this labour problem are diametrically the opposite of his. That hon. gentleman has referred to those men who have organized as a labour party as men who will shoot at you from behind a hedge. I deny it; it is not true; and if the hon. member can give an instance of that, it is probable we may be in a position——

Mr. BROCK. The hon. gentleman must be intentionally obtuse——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BROCK. I suggested the possibility of a labour party being such as would do that kind of thing. I did not accuse any labour man of doing it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Then I say that unless the hon. member for Centre Toronto produces some facts upon which this House can form an opinion, he has no right to make that wholesale statement.

Mr. BROCK. I have made it, and I stick to it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I know the hon. member has made it, and that is the objection I take to it—that statements of that kind are made absolutely without foundation. Now, we know that the hon. member is the head of many industrial concerns in this country, including several large manufacturing concerns. He has had strikes; he has had labour difficulties; but will the hon. member rise in his place and say that as a result of a single strike or a single labour difficulty which he has experienced, there has been one single act of violence or one single act of unjust treatment? I say he cannot. The hon. gentleman contends that men have no right to organize under an international union. I submit that they have that right. They have a right to organize just as they see fit, whether the union be national or international. The difficulty in organizing a national union to-day is that workmen can be imported from the United States to take the place of men who think they have been wronged and have gone on strike; and the force of an international union is that men cannot be imported in that way, because they will not come when they are invited. I say that so far the unions in Canada have acted within the law, and have acted in a most reasonable way. Never yet, so far as I know, has there been an unreasonable or criminal act committed by a single union man who has been on strike. I believe that the principle of this Bill should be adopted by this House. Conciliation is what we all aim at. Conciliation is the means that will bring about the best results both to labour and capital; and speeches like that delivered to-night by the hon. member for Centre Toronto only serve to augment any difficulty which may exist between labour and capital. I believe Sir, that the course adopted by the Minister of Labour is the best means for bringing labour and capital together in Canada; and if the hon. minister will continue to pursue the course he has undertaken, he will do more to bring about a better understanding between labour and capital than any arbitrary measure that this House can adopt, while the speech of the hon. member for Centre Toronto only augments the furore.

Mr. BROCK. Before the hon. gentleman sits down, will he kindly name any strike that has occurred in any company with which I have been connected?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Yes, I will mention the strike which occurred two weeks ago in the Hespeler Woollen Mills, of which the hon. gentleman is president, and which employees 500 hands.

Mr. BROCK. How long did it last?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not know.

Mr. BROCK. You should know. It was settled inside of twelve hours. They did not lose a day's pay. There was no international union connected with it. We dealt with the men directly.

Mr. GUTHRIE. They may not have lost a day's pay, and I congratulate the hon. gentleman on that fact. If the demands of men were considered in that spirit, and their reasonable demands granted, there would be far fewer strikes. I say the principle of the Bill is right, and it ought to be adopted. The principle of this Bill was adopted when

this government came into power, and when the Minister of Labour took control of labour troubles in this country. While the name of Sir William Mulock may go down to posterity, it will not only go down as the Postmaster General, but it will also go down as Minister of Labour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 4, as amended by striking out the words 'local, national or international,' be adopted?

Mr. LOGAN. I wish to call the attention of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) to the fact that if this amendment should carry, it implies the recognition of not only local, national or international unions, but of unions which may not even be international. The amendment includes not only local, national and international, but even foreign labour organizations. I am in favour of the amendment, but it does not meet the point raised by the hon. member for Centre Toronto. I do not believe myself that a man should be required to relinquish his membership in any organization. We have discussed this matter to-night widely and brought a good deal into the discussion not to be found within the confines of the Bill, but, as my hon. friend from West Toronto has said, it is as well probably to clear the air. In my opinion it would be better if the labour organizations of this country were purely Canadian. I think that we should endeavour to make everything in this country more Canadian; and when we have foreign presidents and officers of our labour organizations, we are not encouraging that sentiment. But while it would no doubt be better to have Canadian officers for Canadian unions, the very worst way to endeavour to bring that about would be to try to coerce the labouring men into adopting that opinion. The very worst way to bring about a sentiment of that kind is to talk of labour organizations as cowardly organizations and unmanly. So long as we find hon. members holding out the red rag to the bull, so to speak, we are not going to reach the end desired of making these organizations thoroughly Canadian, officered by Canadian men. The other evening, in speaking on this Bill, I said that I thought it would be well to have an inquiry into the labour question of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. While the questions of the tariff, public works and railway transportation are great questions, that which is going to be the most important within the next ten years is the question of labour and capital. Every morning we read in the press of new labour difficulties, of new strikes, declared in various parts of Canada, and if the wave of prosperity should recede at any time, these labour troubles will be accentuated. No doubt the question often occurs to the capitalist, not in this country alone, but in every country to-day, whether he should invest his money in manufacturing enterprises for fear that the demands of labour will destroy the fruits of his industry, and we should seriously consider whether there is not some way of arranging matters between labour and capital on a more satisfactory basis. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), in referring to labour organizations, said that he was willing that men should vote by ballot. Well, there is not a labouring organization in Canada in which the vote is not taken by ballot when a strike is proposed, and before foreigners are called in. We have no right to refer to the leaders of our labouring men as agitators. If our men in Canada are willing to serve under the leadership of Americans in their councils and unions, it is not in good taste to refer to these leaders whom they have chosen as agitators. Let me repeat that, even with a foreign president and officers at the head of these labour organizations, no strike can be declared in the Dominion without a secret ballot first being taken. Not until the men have declared by secret ballot in favour of a strike can a strike be declared, or any of the foreign officers of the union be called in. While it would be more Canadian and national if our labour unions were officered by Canadians, still you cannot coerce the labouring men. Let us therefore endeavour, on more amiable and conciliatory lines, to cultivate among our labouring people the opinion that it will be more in their interest in every way to have their organizations and unions officered by men of their own nationality.

Mr. HOLMES. In discussing this clause I will endeavour to confine my remarks to the clause itself. I would ask if it is in order to discuss on this clause the various phases of the labour question?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The discussion has been quite irregular, and I would ask hon. members of the committee to come back to the provision before us.

Mr. BOYD. It seems to me that the discussion has not only gone beyond the provisions of this Bill, but that we have been taking up the time of this House in considering legislation which we will have no power to make any practical use of. After we have adopted this measure, we will have no means of compelling either one side or the other to be governed by it or to accept any award which it may enable us to make. It seems to me that the only object of this Bill—the only effect it has had or can possibly have—is to enable those who represent the labour unions and professional sympathizers with labour to spread themselves and speak to the gallery. It has certainly been taken advantage of to-night for this purpose, and in this connection to attribute opinions to the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), to which I am sure the majority of this House will agree with me in saying, he never gave

expression when speaking on this Bill. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House spoke about flaunting the red rag to the bull and agitators, and all that kind of thing. I do not know what sort of a constituency the hon. gentleman represents, but I do not believe that my hon. friend for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) would make use of any expressions calculated to create the impression that he is opposed to the labour of this country. Why, everybody knows that he employs a great many men, everybody knows that he furnishes work and money for many more men—in all probability for one thousand men to every one employed by the hon. gentleman who has taken this opportunity to indulge in this very paltry attack. How many of these men, I may ask, employ labourers? How many of the lawyers who have found it necessary to spread themselves and wave their arms here to-night are employing one hundred, or twenty-five, or ten men—or even one, unless it be an underpaid clerk? Mr. Chairman, the fact is this, that without capital, labour is of very little use; and it is when labour is at its highest and when men are drawing probably the highest wages they have drawn for ten years, at a time when they can afford to waste time, that they turn a willing ear to the agitator, and the agitator is always there ready to take advantage of the opportunity. And I have no hesitation in saying—and I have watched this question with considerable interest—that just such Acts as we have listened to to-night are what very frequently leave the labourer without his hire. For the capitalist is not obliged to put his money out in precarious undertakings; and when the labourer becomes so exacting as he is becoming in Canada to-day and throughout the United States, capital draws in and says, Well, we don't have to continue those worring misunderstandings. We can get along very satisfactorily by keeping our money in the savings banks, and we know which side suffers then. But we have so many men in Canada and in the United States who are so anxious to stand well with this labouring element that as I have said before, in order to win this vote, they are ready to assent to things that do harm both to labour and to capital, but the greatest harm to the men they pretend to serve.

Amendment (Mr. Puttee) adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the amendment moved by Mr. Charlton be adopted?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What is the meaning of that amendment?

Mr. CHARLTON. That persons not members of labour associations or trades unions shall not be discriminated against in the settlement of labour disputes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) think that this accomplishes the object he has in view?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think so.

Amendment (Mr. Charlton) adopted.

Bill, as amended, reported.

IMPORTATION OF ALIENS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Charlton: that Bill (No. 106) to amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens, be now read a second time.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to make a very few remarks upon this Bill——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) has already spoken.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Ross) who moves the motion to adjourn the debate, seconded the motion for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. If permitted to speak on the motion to adjourn the debate——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think I am able to put the motion to adjourn the debate, because the hon. member who moved it himself seconded the motion for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) this afternoon had extended to him the courtesy of three or four minutes——

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no motion before the Chair, except the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. LOGAN. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. CHARLTON. I presume the motion will carry. I am under great obligation to my hon. friend who has kindly come to my rescue, and I think his motion will stand as a motion and probably be acted upon by the House in the affirmative. However. I desire to say a few words with reference to the Bill that is now under consideration of this House. The Alien Labour Law of 1897, in section five, chapter eleven, provided that new industries established for the first time in Canada might employ skilled labour brought from abroad in cases where such labour was unobtainable in Canada. This provision did not apply to industries already in existence. The Bill I have the honour to offer to the House proposes to expunge the words 'in or upon any new industries not at present established in Canada,' and to provide that skilled labour may be employed upon industries in Canada

provided such skilled labour is not obtainable in this country. Now, I am unable to understand why any discrimination should under the provisions of this Act of 1897, have been made against the established industries of this country, why, this provision should have been made to apply only to new industries being established here for the first time. I venture to think that in no other country in the world has such a provision been adopted or is such a provision in force.

The Alien Labour Law, of which this provision is a part, was, in my opinion, founded altogether upon false principles. It was adopted—perhaps I am not entitled to say avowedly—but it was adopted as we all know in retaliation for a similar law of the United States, a most unjust and abused law, passed by congress and enforced in that country. Now, this American law, absurd in its operations, was one that we copied in the provision made in this chapter eleven of the statutes of 1897, and it is a law that has not been enforced in the United States against Canada, it is so manifestly abused that public opinion there does not require its enforcement. To-day hundreds of persons cross from Windsor to Detroit every morning and engage in operations in that city, every one of whom could be turned back if the Alien Law were enforced. The same is being done at Buffalo and a number of other towns on the frontier. Labour from the Canadian side passes over unimpeded and in violation of the provisions of the Alien Labour Law; yet we have a law on the statute-book here which, in so far as these provisions about skilled labour is concerned is, if not rigidly enforced, is so much of an impediment to the manufacturers as to be found by them very oppressive in its operation, and very detrimental to their interests.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman name one manufacturer who has suffered on account of this law.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, I will name myself; and I can procure for the hon. gentleman many names of manufacturers. This Bill was put into my hands by the Manufacturers' Association with a representation that the operaton of this Bill was very detrimental to their interests. Now, in this age, there is a keen competition between manufacturing nations. The manufacturing interests of Great Britain, the manufacturing interests of Germany, and of Russia, and of the United States for that matter, are keenly alive to the importance of adopting new and improved machinery; and in all these nations anything that is invented that lessens the cost of production is at once seized upon by active and progressive manufacturers. The invention of new machinery has in the United States given that country the lead in the boot and shoe trade, in various other lines of business. The boot and shoe trade machinery in the United States, machinery for the production of pig iron, for the manipulation of steel, and various other lines of manufacture, are imported into Germany, into Great Britain, into Russia, and with this machinery it becomes necessary in most cases to send skilled labour from the country where the machinery is invented to the country where it is to be put into operation. Now, under this law a Canadian manufacturer is unable to avail himself of the advantages that will be conferred upon the country by the introduction of new and improved machinery that is calculated to reduce the cost of production in his particular line of business, because he is prohibited by law from importing the labour that is necessary to put that machinery into operation, to run it and to teach Canadian operators how to run it.

The labour unions, I suppose, are unfavourable to this provision. I think they stand in their own light in this matter, and fail to understand the scope of the operation of this measure. If there was no impediment in the way of introducing new machinery to give the manufacturers the facilities that they think necessary to put that improved machinery into operation. The law is utterly absurd. The law does not propose to give to the manufacturers the right to employ skilled labour or to bring in skilled labour that is obtainable in Canada. The Bill simply provides that those provisions regarding skilled labour should be applied to all manufacturing interests; that the skilled labour can be imported for carrying on these manufacturing operations if that skilled labour is not obtainable in this country. Well, who can object to that? What possible objection can there be to the permission given to manufacturers to improve their methods of production and bring in the most modern and up-to-date machinery to enable them to compete with their rivals in the United States and other countries? They have got to do it if they are going to hold their place in the race. But this law which prohibit them from obtaining artisans and experts that can put that machinery up, and run it, and teach others to run it, is a law detrimental to the manufacturing industries of Canada. Certainly we ought to afford to the manufacturing interests reasonable protection, reasonable advantages, reasonable privileges. We ought not to debar them from the introduction of methods, and means, and machinery that will permit them to reduce the cost of production, to increase the effectiveness of their staff, and to bring them into competition with other manufacturing interests that have all these appliances. The provision that prohibits the employment or the introduction of skilled labour if it is obtainable in Canada will protect the interest of skilled labour here, and will prevent any abuse. The manufacturer is not going to import skilled

labour at a high cost or bring it from abroad if he can get it in Canada, and if he can get it fifty or sixty per cent cheaper. In no case will the manufacturer import skilled labour that is obtainable in this country, and in that fact is a safeguard against abuse in reference to this matter. I therefore beg to move the second reading of this Bill, which eliminates the provision with regard to established industries and permits any manufacturing industry in Canada to import skilled labour where that labour is not obtainable in this country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). My hon. friend suggests that the necessity for this amendment arises from the fact that occasionally there is a change of machinery in old established industries, and that there is no labour in Canada capable of working the new machinery. Perhaps such a state of affairs from time to time does exist. But I would rather think that in the introduction of new machinery to-day there is quite enough ingenuity amongst the workmen engaged in our industries to enable them in a short time, and with proper educational advantages afforded them, to learn how to make use of this new machinery. I recollect one instance in point. I remember quite well what was supposed to be an intricate new piece of machinery, having been introduced by an established industry, and there were no skilled labourers in Canada capable of working that machinery. The employer came to me and asked me what he ought to do. It was not for me to guide him but I intimated to him a very simple method by which he might get over the difficulty. Instead of importing an army of skilled workmen to work the machines I suggested that he might get some one to teach the men in his employ to use these machines. He did so and in a short time he had these men, Canadians, working these machines. Such a course as this might get over many of the difficulties to which my hon. friend alludes. To make the amendment we perhaps would open the door to an abuse of the Act, which my hon. friend knows was placed on the statute-book not from choice but from necessity. Therefore, I would favour the amendment of the hon. member for Cumberland Mr. Logan) that the debate stand adjourned.

Amendment (Mr. Logan) agreed to, and debate adjourned.

FRUIT MARKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HENDERSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 130) to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad if the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) would follow the example of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) and allow his Bill to stand until the next day, so that it may have the personal attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would be very glad to meet the wishes of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) in his absence, if I could have any assurance that this Bill will again be reached during the session.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then I shall accede to the request.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. Minister of Agriculture arrived in Ottawa this evening, and will be able to give the Bill his personal attention on the next day when public Bills are taken up.

Mr. HENDERSON. Next Monday will be a holiday, and it will be two weeks from to-day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There will be another day. I will give my hon. friend that assurance.

Order allowed to stand.

PROHIBITION OF THE IMPORTATION, MANUFACTURE, OR SALE OF CIGARETTES.

Mr. BICKERDIKE moved the second reading of Bill (No. 133) to prohibit the importation, manufacture, or sale of cigarettes.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have to declare in regard to this Bill that I do not consider it has been properly introduced, and for the following reasons: When this Bill was introduced the other day, I did not then have the opportunity of reading it over before its introduction, and I was then unable to declare whether it should have originated in committee of the whole House, or whether it should have been introduced on a motion for leave. I see now that the Bill has for its object to prohibit the manufacture and sale of any cigarette or cigarette papers, and the Bill also provides that no cigarette or cigarette papers shall be imported into the country. It was suggested the other day, when the Bill was introduced, that such a measure could only be brought in by a member of the administration, and not by a private member, because it affects the revenue. The contention concerned was an erroneous construction of our parliamentary law, because according to our rule 86, which governs the point raised the other day, it is provided that the House cannot provide any vote for the apportioning of any part of the public revenue, and cannot impose any tax or impost that has not been first recommended to the House by the Governor. This Bill, though dealing with the question of tariff, does not impose any tax or impost, and it can then be introduced by a private member. But when introduced by a private member, the proposition should

be first considered in a committee of the whole House. A Bill relating to trade and to alteration of the laws concerning trade should originate in committee of the whole House. By section 41, of our rules, it is provided as follows :

No Bill relating to trade, or alteration of the laws concerning trade is to be brought into the House until the proposition shall have been first considered in the Committee of the Whole House, and agreed unto by the House.

This enactment has generally been followed in the Commons of Great Britain, as in the legislative assembly of the colonies having constitutional government, though they have not in England, as in some of the colonies, a rule as formally expressed as it is in our procedure, as you may see by Bourinot, pages 591 and 592. We have in England as well as in this country certain precedents on the matter. I will not undertake to quote them all, but I would be permitted to refer to a precedent of 1883, which is to be found in the 'Commons Journal,' page 377, where a Bill to regulate the sale of or prohibit the traffic in intoxicating liquors originated in committee. In 1885 a Bill to amend certain portions of the License Act, of 1883 was initiated in committee. In 1880 and 1885, a Bill regulating the sale of fertilizers originated also in committee, and in 1886, a Bill regulating the manufacture and sale of oleo-margarine and butterine also originated in committee. I then come to the conclusion that this Bill was not properly introduced in the House, and the fact of presenting it on motion for leave would be a departure from the usage which has been adhered to in numerous instances and precedents. I declare the motion for its second reading as being irregular and out of order.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Whilst I shall bow respectfully to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I would draw your attention to the fact that I was going to move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole. I would refer you to the decision of Mr. Speaker Cockburn, given in 1868, which is as follows:

The procedure on a Bill which ought to have originated in Committee of the Whole, but which has been read a first time by leave of the House, can be proceeded with when the House has subsequently resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, and adopted the resolution on which the Bill is based.

Mr. SPEAKER. That has not been followed in this case. In the case quoted by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) the resolution had been adopted in Committee of the Whole when the second reading of the Bill came up for discussion. In this instance the same procedure has not been followed.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I would move that the rule be suspended, and that we go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPEAKER. That motion has to be made with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have no doubt that the House will consent, because we have to have a discussion of this Bill at some time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think that section 31, of the rules and orders require that two day's notice must be given.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, the motion has to be made with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Speaker, could you say why the objections were not taken when the Bill was first introduced, in order to save time ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Because, as I explained a minute ago, I had not seen the Bill then, and I could not decide whether the Bill was for the purpose I have indicated or not.

Mr. MONK. I think it is fair to ask, in view of the vote given on the resolution introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike), if the government will take any steps to cure this difficulty, which is, after all, only a technical difficulty ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is nothing in the circumstances which requires the government to intervene. Mr. Speaker has explained that this Bill may be brought up again by way of resolution. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) has only to give notice of his resolution in the usual way, and proceed in committee in order that this Bill may be introduced. It does not require any action upon the part of the government.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Will the government give me an opportunity to go on with the Bill if this is done ? It will probably be a little late for this session.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That can be considered later on. In the meantime the hon. gentleman had better proceed in the ordinary way as pointed out by Mr. Speaker.

Bill withdrawn.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT, 1898—AMENDMENT.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY (North Simcoe) moved second reading of Bill (No. 136) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898. He said : This Bill proposes to alleviate certain grievances which the National Association of Marine Engineers of Canada labour under. This body has addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) and to other members of the House, circulars in which they have set out their grievances under seven heads. The first three of these are as follows :

1. That every vessel coming under the Steamboat Inspection Act of Canada of whatever ca-

pacity be required to carry certificated engineers.

2. That all temporary certificates be abolished.

3. That engineers holding 4th class certificates be allowed to take charge of boats from 5 N. H. P. single cylinder, up to 10 N. H. P. of compound type.

The Bill which I now propose will remove the grievances specified under these three different heads. As regards the other four sub-heads of the complaint of the marine engineers of Canada, I do not think they can be reached by a Bill of this kind, because they are regulated by Order in Council passed by the Governor General in Council upon the recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. These four subheads are as follows :

4. Candidate for the fourth-class certificate must have 36 months' service in a machine shop on the making and repairing of steam engines, also 12 months' service in the engine room as an oiler or fireman, or in lieu of above service, he must serve 48 months as fireman or oiler on the watch.

5. That all candidates before going up for examination for certificates have their credentials or recommendations examined by the subordinate council of the National Association of Marine Engineers in the locality in which they reside for verification.

6. That owing to confliction often arising between the engineers and the deck officers, re the use and care of deck hose on steamboats, such hose being used in the dual capacity of fire and deck hose, and which hose is used exclusively by the deck officers. Therefore, we, the engineers of Canada request, that the law be amended so that after said hose is put in proper order and passes the scrutiny of the inspector, that all responsibility for the proper care of such deck or fire hose be transferred from the engineer to the deck officers for the remainder of the season.

7. That the Order in Council permitting vessels to ply in Canadian waters, irrespective of Canadian laws, or inspection and manned by uncertificated engineers is a detriment to the marine interests of Canada in competing with Canadian built vessels, and also an injustice to men holding certificates of competency under the Canadian law. We ask that said order be rescinded and that all vessels plying in Canadian waters be subject to the laws governing Canadian built vessels.

Every hon. gentleman will see at a glance what is proposed by the Bill which I now introduce, and it will not be necessary therefore for me to dwell at length upon its different sections until the Bill reaches committee. I desire, however, to point out to the hon. the Minister of Marine that should he desire to provide a remedy for the four last subsections of the grievances complained of, he will have to amend the Order in Council now existing and in order to meet the desire of the National Association of Marine Engineers of Canada, I would sugest to the minister the advisability of amending part 5 of the regulations, section 112, subsection 'B,' which now reads as follows :

Engineers shall keep the fire pump and hose and their connections in perfect condition ready for immediate use and when found unfit for use from age or other cause shall report their condition to the inspector of hulls by whom the steamer was last inspected.

This section should be amended by substituting the word 'put' for the word 'keep' in the first line thereof and striking out the words 'or other cause' in the fourth line thereof and substituting the words 'or defects,' and by adding the following paragraph to the section :

And after the granting of the certificates under the Steamboat Inspection Act, the said hose and their connections, shall be in charge of the deck officers of the said steamboat who shall be responsible therefor, and if at any time they are found unfit for use from age, or other cause, they shall report their condition to the inspector of hulls by whom the steamer was last inspected.

I would also suggest to the hon. minister the following amendments to part 6 of his regulations, subsections 'B,' 'C,' 'D,' and 'F' of section 1 should be repealed and the following substituted :

(b) He shall have served an apprenticeship of not less than thirty-six months in a steam-engine shop and being employed on the making and repairing of steam engines, and have served twelve months in the engine room as an oiler or fireman of a steamboat—or, if he has not served such apprenticeship he shall have been employed for not less than thirty-six months as a journeyman mechanic in some workshop on the making and repairing of steam engines and have served twelve months in the engine room of a steamboat as oiler or fireman ;—or

(c) He shall have served at least thirty-six months in an engine room of a steamboat on the watch, and twelve months in the engine room of a steamboat as oiler or foreman ;—or

(d) He shall have served not less than thirty-six months as oiler on the watch in the engine room of a steamer of not less than thirty nominal horse power, and twelve months in the engine room of a steamboat as oiler or fireman ;—or,

(e) He shall have served not less than forty-eight months as fireman on the watch in the fire hold of a steamboat of not less than thirty nominal horse power ;—

(f) And in any of the above cases of service twelve (12) months service in a boiler shop on the making and repairing of steam boilers may be accepted in lieu of twelve months of the service named, provided however, that he shall in all cases have served at least twelve (12) months in the engine room of a steamboat as oiler or fireman.

The marine engineers think that these amendments will alleviate the grievance referred to in the six subsections of their complaint.

I may say that the main basis of the grievances of these gentlemen seems to be that an applicant may apply to the department and obtain a certificate enabling him to act as an engineer upon the different steamboats plying on Canadian waters. They allege that this authority has been granted and that certificates have been granted to various engineers when there was no necessity for such certificates being granted, the result being to deprive certified engineers of employment. These gentlemen tell

me that there is really no necessity for granting these certificates to non-certified engineers who have applied in previous years. I do not vouch for that because I have no personal knowledge thereof, but I do think that their contention is logical when they say that employment should be found for engineers holding certificates before another applicant should be given a certificate. If the department provides for amendments in the present regulations in the line of those suggested by the Marine Engineers' Association of Canada, it will go far to remove the difficulties which they now complain of. This association, I may say, is a large and representative body in Canada. They have held meetings at various places, and the circular which is addressed to me comes from St. John, N.B. I believe that every member of the House has received a copy of this circular, and that most, if not all, the members, have heard from the grand president of the association, who has spent some days in Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I have no objection to the Bill being read a second time, and being referred to the Committee of the Whole, and progress being reported, for the reason that up to the present time, I have been unable to get a full report on the subject from the officers of the department. As regards the merits of the Bill, I think there are some very good suggestions in it; there are others that may not be so good; and before discussing the Bill as it should be discussed, I would like to get from the officers of my department the necessary information.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). May I ask the minister whether the officers of this organization to which reference has been made by the hon. member for North Simcoe, did not appear before him recently?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were before me, and I have asked the department for a report which I have been unable to get as yet, owing to the opening of navigation and nearly all the officers being away.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I would like to ask if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has heard more than one side of this question. It is, as the hon. gentleman knows, a very large question, and the Bill involves probably more than appears on the surface. I am not going to give opposition to the Bill, but I do think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be more apt to do justice to all parties concerned if he has this Bill printed and distributed, and gives the country a chance to see what it contains before it is crystallized into law. And I hope the hon. gentleman will not take simply one side of the case, and assume that there is no other.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). I have not had time to give this Bill the consideration I ought to give to it; but I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to take into consideration the lakes situated in the west where it is somewhat difficult to get engineers to comply with what this Act calls for. On lake Winnipeg there are ten or fifteen boats used to haul nets to the frames. There are also one or two small tugs plying between Selkirk and Norway House. There are also one or two steamers on Lake Winnipegoosis. I have heard the owners of these boats complain of the difficulty of getting competent engineers up there, and it seems to me that if this Bill passes it will be almost impossible to get certificated engineers to go up for the short season, and the remuneration asked by them will be almost prohibitive. I do not want to object to the Bill, but I merely ask the minister to take into consideration these lakes before he allows it to pass this session.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (Victoria). This engineer business is a matter of very serious importance. I know that a committee in Toronto is searching for a gentleman named Cap. Sullivan, and he is drifting because an engineer cannot be got for the tug. This engineer question is a very serious one.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I confess I have been considerably surprised to see a Bill of this character introduced by a private member instead of emanating from the government. I do not know why the hon. member for North Simcoe has brought forward this Bill. I do not know whether he has undertaken this duty without consulting the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but I certainly think that legislation of this kind should emanate from the minister who is responsible for such legislation, surrounded as he is by officers who should be able to give him every kind of information necessary to enable him to draft a proper Bill. I am sure the House would receive such a Bill with a great deal more confidence than one introduced by a private member, because we would have the assurance that those best qualified to deal with the matter had given the Bill their very careful judgment. I have looked at one or two clauses of this Bill, and I fail altogether to see any reason why the amendments proposed should be adopted. It would almost seem to me as if there were some other motive behind it than the public good—possibly a means of some particular person or class of persons securing a position, which, with a Bill emanating from the government, would not be permitted at all. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should look carefully into this matter, and, if he intends to maintain the dignity

of the high and honourable position which he occupies, I would hardly think that he would permit even a supporter of his to forestall him by introducing important legislation of this character. I regard the whole Bill regarding steamboat inspection as one of the very greatest importance. Having in view the protection of life and property, it is a Bill that should be drafted with the very greatest care, and with all the safeguards that can possibly be thrown around it by the best qualified officers we have in the country to deal with the matter. It would be dangerous to allow a a Bill of this kind to go simply through a Committee of the House, which has not the advantage of the experience and skill of the gentlemen who ought first to pronounce on a Bill of this kind. I trust that the minister will take the matter into consideration, and guard the interests of the country by first bringing to bear upon the Bill all the information that is possessed by the officers of his department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). I do not think there is much in the objections of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). The association at whose instance no doubt my hon. friend brought this Bill before the House, is a very large, important, influential and intelligent class of people, and its representations have no doubt been made to the minister and to the department and to the members of this House from year to year. I think the hon. member for North Simcoe is quite within his right, as any member would be, in introducing legislation of this class, and I think it is a very good way to bring the matter to the attention of the House and the country. One hon. member suggested that the Bill might be printed and distributed among those who should have an opportunity of studying the views of the association in regard to the proposed legislation. With regard to the criticism of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the remarks he has made show that his department are taking a deep interest in this subject, with a view to protecting the public interest, and he has informed the House that the delay which he is now asking for is necessary because he has not yet received a report from the technical officers of his department on these matters. I am inclined to think myself that some of the amendments asked for by this association are just and defensible, in the public interest; with regard to others there may be a difference of opinion; and in that respect, I agree with the hon. member for Halton that those interested in these matters should be asked to report to the minister and the House, and give us the benefit of their experience. At the same time, I think my hon. friend is doing his duty to a large class of people and to the public in bringing this matter before the House, as he has done, because it is difficult for one not well versed in all these matters to understand the representations made to them by the parties so much interested.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman taken into consideration the fact that there is a very large number of men in this country who have never passed examinations, who have never belonged to an association, who are advanced in years and who are yet very efficient men, owing to their long experience. That class of men would be entirely cut out if this Bill became law.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That being the case, no doubt the House will be particular about passing legislation that would do injustice to a large class of men. We all know that there are many men capable of doing work of this description, who perhaps could not pass a technical examination, and that is one of the great difficulties we have in legislating on matters of this kind. But that objection could be guarded against no doubt by the officers of the department whose special duty it is to deal with these matters. We have to think first of the public who use the boats, and then we have to see that no injustice is done to the class just mentioned. But I think we may by means of legislation bring about a gradual improvement in the class of men who are taking up this business.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time.

INSPECTION OF TEXTILE FABRICS.

Mr. W. SCOTT (West Assiniboia) moved second reading of the Bill (No. 137) to regulate the sale and provide for the inspection of textile fabrics. He said: The purpose of this measure is fairly well set out in its title. The main intent of the Bill is contained in the third clause, which reads as follows.

3. Every manufacturer of textile fabrics shall mark, label or tag such goods in plain printed letters or figures which cannot be detached except by design; and the mark, label or tag shall state accurately the constituent fibres of every material of which such goods are composed and their relative proportions.

As I said when introducing this measure, it is one of considerable importance to the public in general, the wool raisers of the country in particular, and incidentally to the woollen manufacturers. I may state that the measure was prepared by the Sheepgrowers' Association of the North-west Territories, at whose instance I am introducing the Bill. The conditions of the wool trade in the North-west Territories, as throughout Canada generally, have been for a long time past very depressed. It must be within the knowledge of every hon. member that notwithstanding the great prosperity which prevails generally, the prices of wool remain depressed, not only in this country, but in the world over. In England many of the

woollen manufacturers have been driven out of business within recent years. In France many of the woollen factories have been turned into cotton factories, and in Canada there is really no profit in raising and selling wool. Especially in the Northwest Territories is this depression felt, so that sheep are raised there now only for the purpose of being sold as meat, there being no profit in the raising and selling of wool. It is thought by the sheep men of the Northwest Territories that perhaps legislation such as I am submitting will have a beneficial effect. In those territories there are great possibilities for the sheep industry, if we had favourable conditions. The natural conditions are very favourable. There is a large tract in the southern and western portions much better fitted for sheep than for cattle. There is a portion of country extending probably over ten million acres, bounded on the north, roughly speaking, by the Canadian Pacific Railway main line, and of which the centre of the north boundary would be at a point near Swift Current. There is there, south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, an area of nearly ten million acres in extent, much better fitted for sheep than for cattle. The condition in all countries has led to very general alarm on the part of sheep raisers and, to some extent, on the part of woollen manufacturers. No doubt many hon. members are aware that last summer, about the time of the imperial conference, there was another conference held in London, at which were representatives from practically every colony which has a sheep industry, and this alarm to which I have referred, found expression at that conference. The reason given for the depressed condition of the sheep trade was the fact that in the manufacture of the textile fabrics referred to in this Bill there has grown up a very large custom of substitution, and that, to a very great extent, cottons are used in the fabric of materials going to the public as pure woollens. And all authorities I have had the advantage of coming in contact with agree that the principal cause of the depression I speak of is the adulteration of woollen goods. That depression cannot be charged against overproduction, because the increase of production of woollens and worsteds has not kept pace with the general growth of population in the various countries. One chief cause, as stated by the authorities, is the increased use of cotton where wool was formerly the material required. And this was made possible, as I have indicated, by the advance in the art of colouring and designing cotton fabrics. The increased use of shoddy is another cause of depression. The following statement is from the proceedings of the International Live Stock Convention held at Chicago :—

> There are several classes of shoddy. The best is made from the sweepings of tailors' shops and the emptying of rag-bags in civilized countries. The worst which constitutes the greater part used in America, is from the rotten, cast-off rags of beggars and the lazar and pest houses of Europe, having in them all kinds of filth and disease. These are gathered by rag-pickers from the slums and alleys and sent to America by shiploads, where they are purchased by a certain class of manufacturers, who, in order to take the curse off the name, term the stuff 'reused wool fibre.' It must be remembered, however, that in most instances, when tearing this shoddy to pieces preparatory to again weaving into cloth, it is found to be so rotten and dead that nothing is produced but dust, and in order to get two ends, so that it can be spun, a minimum portion of wool or cotton is mixed with it in order that it may be held together. The next step after weaving carries it to unscrupulous dealers, who sell this production to labouring men—and, in fact, all classes of society—for 'pure wool,' thus getting for a suit worth but three or four dollars more than three times this amount. To encourage such a fraud is simply putting the lousy rags of European paupers in competition with the sheep and wool-growers of America and elsewhere, and robbing the consumers who wear woollen garments by selling them the stuff under a misrepresentation.

If these statements are facts—and it is hardly likely that a body like the American Live Stock Association would state them if they were not—it will be seen that, apart from the fraud and misrepresentation in the matter, there is considerable danger to the public infection, and it would seem well, therefore, that legislation should be framed to guard against this danger.

The need for the protection of retail buyers in the purity of the articles they buy is becoming recognized in all lines of trade. In the primitive stages of society this protection was not needed, because each man or family prepared with their own hands everything they required. But the development of commerce due to the progress of civilization has made it necessary, and is making it more necessary every day, that purchasers shall be protected in the articles they wish to buy. Thus, we have in all our communities daily inspection of milk. The people are protected also with regard to butter; we have a law prohibiting the sale of oleomargerine as butter. Then, in recent years this parliament has provided for the inspection of fruits. In many articles there is still no inspection of this kind, but in regard to many important articles of daily use we have now provided for the protection of the public, regular systems of inspection. And I think we all agree that protection with regard to many of these things is essential if it can be given. I think the facts I have stated will go to show that the protection of the public in the matter of these textile fabrics is a necessary protection if it can be given. The use of shoddy, as I have said, has been increasing. It is fast increasing in Great Britain. It is stated that to-day shoddy is used to the extent of 130,000,000 pounds in a total output of wool

of 500,000,000 pounds, and, in the United States, even against the enormous duties, levied against the importation of rags, the use of shoddy in one year amounted to 34,-500,000 pounds in a total output of 400,000,-000 pounds. It is stated that within thirty miles of the manufacturing city of Bradford there are scores of mills in which for every bale of wool used ten bales of shoddy, mungo, cotton, &c., are used, and, in some factories of so-called woollen goods there is not a pound of wool used in a year. I have here a statement made by the Hon. George W. Wallace, of Santa Fe, New Mexico, a prominent wool-grower, to the effect that ninety per cent of woollen goods sold in the United States contain cotton and that in forty-five per cent the proportion of cotton is over three-quarters. Now, admitting the advantage to buyers of being able to buy cotton goods with 10 or 15 per cent of wool, we still cannot get away from the fraud of disposing of materials as 'all wool,' or 'pure wool,' which contain less than 50 per cent of wool. This fraud the public have a right to be protected from, if protection in this sphere is possible. Upon this point of practicability I may say——

Mr. HENDERSON. I rise to a point of order. I submit that this Bill is not regularly before the House. This is a Bill affecting trade and has not been introduced first by resolution. Following the decision you gave, Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, I fail to see any difference between the present Bill and the Bill of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike); and if you are going to rule that Bills of this kind must be introduced by resolution, I do not see that there is any object, at this late hour, in continuing the discussion. I ask for your ruling.

Mr. SCOTT. If my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) will defer his point of order for three minutes, I will state the other point I wish to call to the attention of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that when the whole question of the introduction of Bills has been so thoroughly considered and the similarity of the two Bills is so complete, there should be no difficulty in arriving at the decision at once as to whether this Bill is in order or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that the point of order taken by the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) is well founded. The same question came up some years ago. I find that the Bills respecting the inspection of staple articles of Canadian produce have generally been founded on resolutions. If I mistake not this Bill provides for certain inspection. Now, we have decisions in similar cases. It was decided that a Bill respecting the culling and measurement of timber should originate in Committee of the Whole; also a Bill regulating the sale and disposal of butter did not pass its second reading because it was not commenced in Committee of the Whole. I think this last decision applies to the Bill of the hon. gentleman, and I do not hink the motion for the second reading would be in order.

DRY DOCKS CONSTRUCTION—GOVERNMENT AID.

Resolution respecting the payment of a subsidy for the construction of a dry dock, read the second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 178) respecting the encouragement of the construction of dry docks.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 19, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SAFETY OF SHIPS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 179) to amend the Act respecting safety of ships.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is simply to make the Canadian law the same as the English law regarding deck loads. It is purely a technical matter.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to bring to the attention of the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister, a telegram which I have received from Dawson : 'Official organ says committee has been appointed to investigate Treadgold,' and the inquiry is made as to whether or not this statement is correct. Would the right hon. gentleman inform the House ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The statement is premature, but the commission will go in a very few days.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 17) to aid in the settlement of railway labour disputes.—Sir William Mulock.

SUPPLY—ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. C. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I do not rise for the purpose of opposing this motion, but of drawing attention to something of great interest to the county I have the honour to represent. Two years ago a subsidy was granted the Atlantic and Superior Company for thirty miles of road. In the subsidy Act I find this clause :

The Governor in Council may grant a subsidy of $3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated which shall not cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway not exceeeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of $3,200 per mile of 50 per cent on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as is in excess of $15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of $6,400 per mile.

The subsidy was voted for thirty miles from Caplin to Paspebiac and amounted to $96,000. I understand that an application is before the Minister of Railways for another $96,000, an additional or double subsidy. By the law as it now stands, I am precluded from discussing the merits of this second application, because I understand that, by an Order in Council, that subsidy will be voted and paid over. The House will remember that this company which was formed in 1893, transferred this road in 1900 to trustees, and late in 1900 they gave additional powers to the trustees. These trustees have built about three miles of road within the last two years. I am free to say that the work from New Carlisle to Paspebiac has been done almost exclusively out of the Dominion subsidy. This vote of $96,000 was divided into three portions. One, of $35,000, was allotted to the Hamilton Bridge Works Company, for four bridges out of which $33,000 has been paid. Another portion of the subsidy was to be used for the completion of the roadbed and the works incidental thereto. I understand that under the second item, $35,000 has been paid, and $10,000 is still due. Now, the third portion of $16,000 was reserved for the payment of overdue balances for material, labour, boarding house claims and supplies furnished in connection with the construction of the said section of railway. For the purpose of getting at the facts with regard to the third subsection of the subsidy, the Minister of Railways at my request, issued last December, a circular which was distributed throughout the county of Bonaventure inviting those who had claims for labour, material, board, &c., to send in their claims in the form of affidavits. These have been received, and the aggregate for thirty miles of road is $226,276.88. We are now placed in this position—we have to distribute $16,000 among creditors to the extent of over $226,000. The proportion is so small that I am going to ask the government to change this last clause of the subsidy so as to begin to pay the labourers who are still in possession of their time checks, the labourers who have not sold their claim on the road, so that we may pay them at least fifty cents on the dollar if not more. But I wish to go further and ask the government, when they will take up the new claims of the Atlantic and Lake Superior to remember that these trustees, represented by Mr. Joquin Galindey, advanced money to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway and the guarantee that they have since 1900 been in possession of one hundred miles of railway which they are working for their own advantage and benefit, whereas the men who built the road, the farmers who gave the right of way, the men who supplied the material and the men who boarded the employees remain unpaid; so that if any money leaves the Dominion exchequer for this Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway or the trustees thereof, the government should take upon itself to pay the men who built the line and not pay the trustees who have taken possession of the road, and thus guaranteed their own advances. I believe that I need say no more, except that I wish to thank the right hon. the premier (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) for the great trouble they have gone to in the effort to bring order out of chaos in the affairs of this road. And, before I resume my seat I very humbly request the government, before granting this additional application of the trustees of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway :

1. That the Department of Railways and Canals ascertain by means of a public circular the amount due on the Baie des Chaleurs and Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway from Metapedia to Caplin, for right of way, labour, board, material, damage, &c.

2. That all circular payments to the trustees of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway be withheld until their line of railway has been placed in a proper condition, that suitable fences have been erected on the whole road and that the section from New Carlisle to Paspebiac has been completed and is operated and that the road-bed is improved, unsafe wooden bridges and trestles replaced by proper constructions.

3. That any additional subsidy granted this railway besides that of $3,200 per mile for thirty miles from Caplin to Paspebiac authorized by chapter 7, Ed. VII., be applied by the government itself to the payment of debts due on the railway for right of way, board, material, construction and operation; that the trustees of these bondholders being in possession of the road and being therefore guaranteed for their advances and benefitting by its operation and by

the work of unpaid labour, material, &c., of other creditors should not share in this additional subsidy.

4. That if a double subsidy of $6,400 per mile on the thirty miles of road amounting to $96,000 be granted on the application by Joquin Galindey and of the trustees or any other of said trustees, or of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company, or any sum or part thereof, that said sum be applied by the Department of Railways and Canals to the payment of the unsecured creditors mentioned above.

5. That the trustees or the company itself have no right to claim additional subsidies for work which has not been paid by them and which according to the sworn claims produced with the Department of Railways and Canals exceed $220,000 for thirty miles of the line only.

6. That legislation be asked for by the Government during the present session if necessary to authorize the Department of Railways and Canals to pay to the unsecured creditors any subsidy granted to this road in addition to that of $3,200 per mile mentioned in section 9 chapter 7, 1 Ed. VII.

7. That the balance of the original subsidy of $96,000 voted in section 9, chapter 7, 1 Ed. VII, not already paid or reserved for payment of labour, board and material be withheld until the line of railway has been put into proper condition as indicated above.

I believe both sides of the House will agree with me that what I ask in most reasonable. These claims are due to poor people, for the most part labourers and farmers who have suffered through the construction of this Baie des Chaleurs Railway to such an extent that it has become a by-word in the railway history of the Dominion. During the last fifteen or sixteen years, the county of Bonaventure has gone through a crisis probably unparelleled in Canada; and I hope that before any more money leaves the Dominion exchequer for the purposes of this road, the government will see to it that the people who have built this road shall be first paid before any other payments are made by the Crown or by the department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I assure my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure) that the matter shall have consideration.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I wish to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if it is his intention to lay on the Table the evidence that will be taken in the investigation held into the cause of the accident at Windsor Junction on the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had not thought of it, but if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) desires it, I shall be very glad to do so.

CLASSIFICATION OF FREIGHT.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I would like to inquire from the Minister of Railways if the new classification of freight known as the Canadian Freight Classification No. 12, has been authorized, as is customary, by Order in Council ? The same came into affect on May 1st.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I could not answer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) offhand, I have no recollection of any recent order passing that had reference to any classification of freight. This may possibly have received sanction some months ago, though it only came into effect this month. I will ascertain and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. KEMP. To explain, I may say that the last classification was authorized by Order in Council in 1899 ? I hardly expect that the minister would have authorized another classification on the eve of the appointment of a commission. There are some very radical departures in this new classification. I will read the rule, which has never been applied to any other classification :

> When articles are shipped under false names, in order to deceive the carrier, or to avoid this classification, agents at destination will collect charges according to proper classification, plus fifty per cent in addition to the rate which would have been charged had the property been correctly described.

There are 3,000 different items in this classification, perhaps more, and there is great confusion and misunderstanding between the shippers and the railway. This rule, if carried out, means that the company's view of the case in all instances must be the correct one, that they must be the judge, jury and court of appeal, and if goods upon which the freight would amount to $100, were not, according to their opinion, in accordance with this classification, one in which the public have nothing to say, if they consider that the goods are not properly described under this classification, which as I say contains 3,000 items, then they have a right to charge $50 extra on freight which would be $100, and to exact that as a fine from the shipper before the goods will be handed over to the consignee at the other end. I just draw the minister's attention to this matter in view of the appointment of a commission. There are other rules, new rules, in the new classification which are just as radical, and although all the merchandise of the country has been shipped under that classification, at this moment I am almost inclined to believe that the same has not been authorized by Order in Council according to law. If it had been authorized by Order in Council, it would be noted on the classification the same as on former classifications, by number 11, which was authorized on December 19, 1899.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I would suggest that the hon. member put his question on the Paper, and I will have the matter looked into. I do not recollect now that any

recent Order in Council has passed on that subject.

THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the motion is put, I would like to inquire of the government whether it is proposed to submit to the House the terms of the proposed commission to investigate matters concerning the Treadgold concession, and whether any and what precautions are to be taken to preserve the interests of the public by having them safeguarded by counsel. In other words, is it to be a thorough investigation, or is it simply to be a departmental investigation in which the public may possibly have no rights whatever, and in which the facts may not be so thoroughly investigated as might seem to be rendered necessary by newspaper comments and comments elsewhere with regard to these concessions. The Prime Minister is not here, and perhaps my hon. friend may not be able to give an answer to my inquiry at once. In the absence of the right hon. gentleman, I am giving this intimation rather in the shape of a notice of what will probably be demanded at an early day, and at somewhat greater length, in regard to this matter. I would also like to know whether the proposed investigation respecting the Treadgold concession is to be confined to that alone, or is it to deal also with other concessions in the Yukon which have, in that part of the country at least, caused almost as much comment as the Treadgold concession itself. I think it right at the earliest moment to ascertain the intentions of the government. I shall bring the matter again to the attention of the government, and I now intimate that the proposed commission will no doubt be discussed. At the earliest possible moment the intentions of the government with regard thereto will certainly be asked in this House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). In answer to the hon. gentleman I have to say that it is not possible for me to-day to answer in detail his various questions. But I may say that the government is now engaged in formulating the instructions that will accompany the commission. The commission will be comprehensive and far reaching in its work. It will apply not only to any existing concessions, but it will deal with the hydraulic needs of the district in connection with the development of the mines.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it the intention of the government to lay the composition of the commission and the instructions to the commission on the Table in order that they may be discussed before finally being sent out; in other words, will the House have any opportunity of discussing the terms of the commission before it is finally signed and sent forward?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That point has not been discussed, I will make it known to the government. No doubt, as soon as the commission is ready all the terms will be submitted to the House, but whether that will be before or after the adoption of the terms of the commission, I am not able at this moment to say. If the hon. gentleman desires to renew this question on this subject to-morrow, I will perhaps be able to give him an answer. In the meantime I may say that the commission will not only deal with the existing conditions as to the outcome of any grants, but it will endeavour in a comprehensive way to deal with the needs of the country. For that reason one of the commissioners at least will be an expert, competent to deal with the important question to be investigated by the commission.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I may be pardoned another word to the hon. gentleman, I may say that it would not perhaps be of any use to submit the commission and the instructions to the House after the terms have once been settled and gone forward. It is within the bounds of possibility that some suggestions might be made from this side of the House which would be of use to the government and to the country with regard to the terms of the proposed commission, and it is in that view that I have made the remarks to the hon. gentleman which I did. It seemed to me, speaking of course with every deference, that there might be very good reason, seeing that this matter has been under public discussion, and a subject of considerable comment in the country, why the government should observe the course which has been taken in some cases, and submit to the House the terms of the proposed commission and the instructions to the commission before the commission has been fairly settled and sent forward.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As I have already mentioned to the hon. gentleman, I will make his observations known to the government, and perhaps I may be able to answer him to-morrow.

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

Harbours and rivers, Quebec—River St. Lawrence ship channel, $515,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). This vote of $515,800 is to continue the widening and deepening and improvement of the St. Lawrence channel between Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. MONK. Would the hon. minister give us some more details as to the expenditure of this large sum?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A large amount of this vote is for the work of dredging. There are seven dredges employed. It is estimated that $340,000 of

this amount will be spent in the working of the dredges, $26,800 for shipyards, supplies, &c. New dredging plant, scows and repairs to dredges, $113,000, surveys, $25,000, and inspection and superintendence, $15,000, making a total of $515,800.

Mr. MORIN. Would the hon. minister be kind enough to tell the committee at what places it is proposed to dredge the river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This dredging is all to be done on what is known as the channel between Montreal and Quebec. There are about sixty-five miles out of 100 that will be widened and deepened, the dredges will be set at work at different places, and they will continue the work that has been going on for the past two years.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that there are 100 miles to be dredged ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I do not say that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How many miles does the hon. gentleman say ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About sixty miles.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We cannot hear the hon. gentleman at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not my fault if the hon. gentlemen do not hear. I am speaking a great deal louder than is necessary. The estimate of the department is that about sixty miles of dredging is to be done on this channel.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not think that my hon. friend, if he allows me, is right in saying there are sixty miles to be dredged now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that either. I was asked a question as to the amount of dredging that was to be done, and as to what distance of this channel was to be improved. I said that the officers of the department estimated about sixty miles. According to their estimate about half the work is done, or about twenty-eight miles out of the sixty have been completed to a width of 450 feet, and to a depth of thirty feet.

Mr. MACLEAN. What is the estimated expenditure on the whole work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $1,500,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. How much has been spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On this channel already there has been spent about $6,000,000. A great deal of that was spent by the Harbour Commissioners, but on this work which is under consideration now and which is to be continued, there has been an expenditure of about $4,000,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. And when completed, that will give a channel of what depth ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About thirty feet.

Mr. MORIN. What width would the channel be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Four hundred and fifty feet.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the minister under consideration the question of continuing this work to Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the chief engineer of the department tells me that the work of the department goes only to Longue Pointe, and that the balance of the work is under the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. INGRAM. What are the names of the dredges that are employed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will be kind enough to turn to page 152, of the Report of the Minister of Public Works, for the year 1902, he will find the names of the dredges. They are the 'Lady Aberdeen,' the 'Lady Minto,' the 'Laurier,' the 'Laval,' the 'Lafontaine,' Dredge No. 8, the 'Baldwin,' the 'J. Israel Tarte' and spoon dredge No. 6. This dredge No. 6, I think, has been abandoned.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In this vote of $515,000, is there any sum for the construction of dredges, and if so, where will these dredges be built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there is no sum estimated here for the construction of dredges. There is a sum for the purpose of building some scows and improvements and repairs to dredges.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I received a communication from Sorel the other day concerning the title to the property that the government has at present for its works and docks. I would like to ask the hon. minister from whom the government purchased the site of the Sorel works or docks, and what price was paid for this property ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would be very much more convenient if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) would defer his question until we reach the item in connection with the works in Sorel, and which will be probably reached to-day.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Chairman said it had been passed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, he made a mistake. The item stood for the purpose of bringing down some information, and I will be prepared to give the information which the hon. gentleman asks when that item is under consideration.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. These docks are not on the same side of the river as the gov-

ernment shipyards. The docks are on the south side of the river and the shipyards are on the north side. They have no connection whatever.

Mr. MONK. At what particular places between Montreal and Quebec is this dredging to be done, and what proportion of dredging is to be done in each place ? Will it give us a channel from Montreal to Quebec 450 feet wide and thirty-five feet deep at low water ? Has the large and costly dredge which we purchased two years ago been working satisfactorily ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The distance requiring deepening and widening was estimated by the engineers to be about sixty miles, and about twenty-eight miles of that is already completed, leaving thirty-two miles still to be done.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this sixty miles altogether, or is it at different points ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is at different spots. As to the large dredge, the 'J. Israel Tarte,' I am informed that during the latter part of the season this dredge did very excellent work. It was a new piece of mechanism, the first of its kind in this country, and there were some delays.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How many yards of sand, of clay, and of rock have yet to be taken out ? What did this new dredge cost us per yard ? I am anxious to know that because a promise was given last session that this dredge could work at considerably less than one cent a yard.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know what our experience might be next year, but the report of the department last year shows that the cost was two and one-half cents a yard. I am informed by the engineer that there is no more rock dredging to be done.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I may say that the dredge that bears my name cannot work in heavy clay, and especially in rock. Mr. Robinson invented a rotary cutter which is attached at the end of the pipe and that enables the dredge to work in pretty hard material. The American dredges in the past were supplied with injectors which forced out water to soften the material, but this did not enable them to work in as hard a material as our dredge does with the rotary cutter. The work of the dredge cannot be judged by our operations last year, but nevertheless I am informed that in the last month in which it worked, October, I think, she dredged the enormous quantity of over 600,000 yards. It is hoped by those who designed the dredge that she will turn out 1,000,000 yards a month. Her working capacity is 2,000 yards an hour and in my presence I saw her do that, but of course there will be accidents and perhaps delays. The estimated cost of the dredging by this dredge is half a cent a yard when everything goes right, but even if it should cost one cent a yard it is pretty cheap indeed.

Mr. COCHRANE. Has the attention of the minister been called to the fact that some of the curves in that channel are too short ? I am informed by an eminent engineer and by some captains who navigated that river that a curve which was sufficient ten years ago is altogether insufficient today, because the vessels now are much longer than they were then. This engineer stated that if the curves were too short they had a tendency to run the vessel aground on the other side, and that the deepening of the channel where the curves were short was rather an impediment, because the increased depth caused a stronger current in the channel and made the navigation more difficult. This gentleman's idea was that if the money was spent in straightening the curves rather than in deepening the channel it would be a more useful expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a good deal in the representations made in regard to these curves and we are trying to improve them. The chief engineer tells me that between Longue Point and Verchères there were eleven curves at one time, but now they have been reduced to three. That is receiving the attention of the engineers on the work, and the curves are being reduced to a minimum.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the minister whether, when this work is completed, we shall have a perfect channel 450 feet wide from Montreal to Quebec, and also whether or not he has any map showing that portion of the channel upon which the dredging operations are being conducted ? If so, I think it should be laid on the Table of the House while we are discussing this item, so that we may be enabled better to understand what we are really voting this money for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The result of this work will be to make the channel between Montreal and Quebec 450 feet wide and 30 feet deep. I think there is a plan, which I shall be glad to lay upon the Table, showing in detail where these improvements will be made.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The maps have been changed year by year as the works have been proceeded with, and I believe these maps are available. The House would be under a very wrong impression to suppose that we have been only proceeding with the dredging of the river. Along with the deepening of the channel the work of straightening and cleaning the river has been proceeded with. When we first took up the work there were numerous curves and other difficulties. The part of the work which has

been completed has been carried out thoroughly and well. In a few months the works between Lake St. Peter and Montreal will be fully completed, and in such a manner that both day navigation and night navigation will be not only possible, but easy in that part of the river.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What arrangements have been made for night navigation?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has erected, especially during last year, very fine lighthouses along the channel. There is some little work yet to be completed, which, I understand, will be completed within a few weeks, and it will then be easy for the largest steamers to travel night and day between Sorel and Montreal. This part of the work, I suppose, will be pretty far advanced when this season closes, and the balance completed within two years. The 65 miles of dredging that was to be done three or four years ago will be thoroughly completed to a depth of 30 feet and a width of at least 450 feet, in the straight parts, and more in the curves. When we speak of a depth of 30 feet, we of course refer to the depth at the lowest water, which is only for about two months of the year. During the other months there is plenty of water, and the largest boats can navigate the river without any trouble. When the Department of Marine and Fisheries complete their part of the work, the channel between Montreal and Quebec will then be one of the safest channels in the world ; I say that without hesitation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What about the accident to the 'Carrigan Head' ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That vessel was grounded between two buoys, simply because one of the buoys was not located. At this time of the year, as my hon. friend from Gaspé knows, there is plenty of water in the channel of the St. Lawrence. The draught of the vessel was 26 feet ; but even if it had been 30 feet, there was plenty of water. The inquiry showed that the grounding of the boat was an accident.

Mr. MONK. I think we should have a map showing where this work is going to be done this year. The hon. minister has admitted the usefulness of that, and I for my part do not like to vote such a large sum of money without seeing exactly what it is proposed to do this year and where. This work is a splendid one, and one in which we are very much interested, and I think we ought to be informed how far it is expected to go towards the completion of these 32 miles this year. The dredge which bears the name of the ex-Minister of Public Works, I understand, dredged 600,000 yards in one month last year ; and we are told there are six other dredges at work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. They cannot all do as much.

Mr. MONK. They cannot all do as much, but they can do something. We ought to advance very materially towards the completion of these works during the present season. Under the circumstances, I would like to know where the work is to be done this year. No man would think of spending so large an amount of money as this without having that information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend is perfectly correct, and he has indicated what information he would like. We all hope this work will go on. How much will be done will depend largely, as the hon. member for St. Mary's says, on the working condition of each dredge. If the dredge turns out as we expected, with the improvement and changes made during the winter, there will be a wonderful difference in the amount of work done in the coming season. It is estimated that with this dredge and the others, there will be at least eight or nine miles dredged during the season, perhaps more.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That will only be a quarter of the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be over a third of the work because it is the heaviest portion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How many hundred yards must be excavated in order to finish these thirty-two miles ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not estimated the number of yards.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. An estimate should be made every week in the department. What sort of an engineering department is that which does not make a weekly estimate ?

Mr. SPROULE. Last year or the year before an approximate estimate was given.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The approximate estimate of the number of yards to be removed is something like 32,000,000. If my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) will look up page 152 of the report of the Public Works Department, he will find the information which he requires.

Mr. BENNETT. In this half million dollars are the wages of the shops of Sorel included ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the expenditure of the shops there last year ? It seems to me that it alone ran up to $175,000. What is the estimated expenditure this year in the shops as against $175,000 last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Just about the same for labour and material.

Mr. BLAIN. How much would it cost to fit up the 'J. Israel Tarte' dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost of the dredge is $300,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What does that include ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Everything.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount did the furnishings cost ? I find there some pretty large items, for instance, one leather box lounge, $85.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were some $30,000 spent during the past season, which of course, will not be given in detail in the Auditor General's Report, until next year, but that was altogether for improvements and changes in machinery.

Mr. MONK. Is not the cost nearer $400,000 than $300,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The figures given me by the officers of my department are $307,000, including the improvements done during the past season.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That dredge was built by the Polson Iron Works and the plan prepared by Mr. Robinson. It was found that some pieces of machinery were a little off. Any one who has had experience in new machinery knows that there are always breakages incident to any new work. The piping had been located in a wrong way. It was beneath the deck where the engineers could not reach it easily and it had to be changed. Before I left office I made a thorough investigation in company of Mr. Robinson and we found that some changes had to be made. Those changes have cost some money, but we have now a dredge which will give a good account of itself.

Mr. BLAIN. How many miles does the hon. minister expect to dredge of Lake St. Peter this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About seven miles.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I thought so. The estimate given us a minute ago, I knew, applied to the 'Tarte' dredge, and the other dredges should dredge as much as the 'Tarte' dredge should do in Lake St. Peter. I should expect that this year about fourteen or fifteen miles would be dredged. There remains about thirty miles of dredging in round figures, a little less, but let us say about thirty miles. So, if the dredge 'Tarte' carries out the expectations we have formed of her and does between seven and eight miles and the others do as much, there will remain only fifteen to eighteen miles to do another year. The fleet of dredges is now completed. These are all new dredges. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has at his disposal a very fine fleet of dredges, tugs, stone lifters, &c., and his department is in a position to carry out work with a great deal of delight, if I may use that expression. But let me add immediately that a good deal depends upon the crew. The officers of the department will tell my hon. friend that we had a good deal of trouble in keeping all the officers at their posts at times. The dredge 'Tarte' especially has to be manned with a great deal of care—it is a very complicated piece of machinery, very complicated indeed, and requires all the officers on board all the time, otherwise there will be accidents and the work will not be carried out as the department has a right to expect it to be carried out. I hope my hon. friend will take advantage of the first holiday we give him to make a personal inspection of that dredge and of all the dredges. He will find that if he goes himself—if he will allow me to suggest it—his presence will give encouragement to the men, and his supervision will add to the quantity of the work, I am sure.

Mr. MONK. I think the hon. gentleman will have to take me along with him if he wishes me to understand the work. The reference he has given me does not exactly answer my questions—in fact does not answer them at all. Where are our dredges to be placed ? I see that the dredge 'Laurier' last year excavated over 400,000 yards, while the dredge 'Tarte'—probably because it got to work very late—only excavated 93,000 cubic yards.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In what month ? That is the work of her first month.

Mr. MONK. I know the dredge is capable of doing a great deal more than that. But I do not find in the document which the hon. gentleman has referred me the information I wanted. I wished to find the capacity of each dredge by the year or by the month, the cost of operation of each dredge, the place where each dredge is to be located and the portions of dredging that will be completed this year. The minister a moment ago mentioned seven or eight miles, while the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says that we shall have accomplished fifteen miles. So, we seem to be a little in the dark.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will see that I can hardly give him in detail the cost for next year. But the reference I have given him shows the cost per cubic yard for each dredge last year, and it is fair to assume that it will be the same with all the dredges, except the 'J. Israel Tarte,' next year. As I explained, if the improvements made during the winter turn out all that we hope, the 'J. Israel Tarte' will do as good work as she did the last month of last year, in fact we hope for a great deal more work and at a lower rate.

Mr. BLAIN. How many days did the 'J. Israel Tarte' work last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Altogether one hundred and twenty-seven days. The ex-Minister of Public Works probably explained, that as might be expected, when the dredge was first set to work there was a good deal of delay and loss of time. Though the first month's work was estimated to cost something like 8 cents a yard, the last month's work cost only 1½ cents per yard.

Mr. BENNETT. As to this expenditure for workmen, as I understand the hon. minister, it will cost $175,000 to pay the wages of the men employed in this shipyard at Sorel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is for men and material, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. BENNETT. It would seem to have run to $175,000 last year for wages alone.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The officers of the department advise me differently. The amount given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) includes wages and material. They seem to keep the books so as to show both items under one head. I am not able to separate the payments for wages.

Mr. BENNETT. I have the document under my hand. If the hon. minister will turn to the Auditor General's Report, page V—35, and continuing to page V—46, he will find the total charges there of $175,000 for last year, and, glancing over it page by page, it seems quite clear that every dollar of that is referable to wages alone.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. As I have taken a deep interest in the shipyard at Sorel, I may be allowed to say, for the information of the House, that a good deal of the wages are paid for repairs. In a large fleet of dredges, tugs, scows, &c., such as that which the department has at its disposal, there are always breakages calling for repairs. A good many of the dredges are working in hard material. Heavy pressure is brought on the machinery and there are breakages every day. To carry on the necessary repairs, the department must always keep in hand a pretty large supply of parts and materials. So, there were also new scows and boats and other equipment of all kinds to be built. In point of fact there is a quantity of work that the ordinary layman cannot understand unless he goes to inspect these works. I would be very glad indeed if members of parliament on both sides of the House, when opportunity offers, would visit these shipyards.

Mr. MONK. Quite right.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) went once, and did not find them in such bad shape that he has much to say about them. These are very interesting shipyards. They are the only shipyards the government has and perhaps may be a kind of experiment. I would like very much indeed if members of the House, on both sides, when they pass by the thriving town of Sorel, would call and visit the shipyards of the government.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Perhaps the minister would give us an excursion there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) I would say that if he will read the explanatory foot note, given by the Auditor General as to the wages, he will see that they are taken out of other votes as well as this. For instance the building of the new dredge for the maritime provinces and the new dredge for Ontario come under this heading.

Mr. MONK. Is a new dredge being built for the maritime provinces ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the minister if there is no special account kept of the repairs on these boats. All I want to know is how we stand. This is a very large amount that we pay out at Sorel, though, of course, these yards are extremely useful. But we would like to know a little about the details. These dredges must have cost a good deal in repairs. What, for instance, is the cost for repairs on these seven dredges which we maintain in the St. Lawrence ? The minister will understand that there is reason for inquiring about that $177,000 for wages. What part of that was chargeable for repairs on these dredges ? Surely there must be a separate account for repairing each dredge. Again, is not my hon. friend mistaken when he speaks of the construction there of a dredge for the maritime provinces ? I think I have seen a special item in the estimates for a dredge for the maritime provinces.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The wages paid out at Sorel include other items. The chief engineer informs me, that under the system of bookkeeping at Sorel they could give detailed information with regard to the amount spent on each dredge. I will be pleased to have a copy made of the accounts, showing the amount of repairs put on each dredge. But I wished to explain to my hon. friend that the amount of wages paid out there is not altogether in connection with this vote, but on other works as well.

Mr. BENNETT. It means that $175,000 is to be expended by the department next year at Sorel. That is evident from the discussion in reference to repairs to be effected on barges, tugs and other craft owned by the department. I would like to call the attention of the minister to this, that it means the employment of about 250 men every day in the year at $2 per day,

making repairs on boats. It means that out of this vote of $500,000 there will be at least $175,000 spent in wages for repairs. I turn to the account of the material supplied last year, commencing on page V—23 of the Auditor General's Report, and ending on page V—42, where it would appear that about $425,000 was spent for materials. Assuming the new dredge, the 'Tarte,' cost $300,000, that leaves about $125,000 for sundry material. May I ask the minister how much it is estimated will be spent the coming year for material or work to be done at the shops ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken as to the amount spent at Sorel. The 'J. Israel Tarte' was not built at Sorel.

Mr. BENNETT. The expenditure is $425,000, and in that is included an expenditure for the 'Tarte.' So deducting $300,000, which in round figures was the amount, spent on the 'Tarte,' that would leave a balance of $125,000 spent at Sorel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I was saying, the 'J. Israel Tarte' was not built at Sorel, and the expenditure of $300,000 was not made at Sorel.

Mr. BENNETT. Referring to the Auditor General's Report, he will find that the total expenditure on material was $425,000, and in that is included $300,000 for the 'Tarte.' Then the balance of $125,000 must have been in respect to other material that was used at Sorel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was a great deal more than that. They are building a dredge there costing nearly double as much as the 'Tarte.'

Mr. BENNETT. That was not last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and the material purchased for that dredge alone must have cost a great deal more than that. I was trying to explain that this $175,000 in wages is not for repairs alone at Sorel. It is for building, wages paid out in connection with these different boats, on barges, scows and tugs that are being built, and are charged to the different votes. If the hon. gentleman will look more closely into the Auditor General's Report he will see them shown in detail.

Mr. BENNETT. Where are they being built, if not at Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The 'J. Israel Tarte' was built at Toronto.

Mr. BENNETT. That was the subject of a contract. Now, starting at page V—23 and continuing on you find an expenditure amounting to $425,000. Included in that are a lot of large expenditures in respect of this dredge, the 'Tarte.' I notice one of $137,000 and another of $45,000, and others amounting in the aggregate to $300,000. If you deduct that $300,000 from the $425,000, it seems plain that there were $125,000 spent for material which was used at Sorel and probably in connection with these different dredges that were on the work, tugs, &c. Would the minister say how much money will be required out of this grant of $515,000, for material to be used by these workmen, whether on repairs or on new work at Sorel this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That expenditure was in connection with the repairs on these dredges that are on this channel work, in construction of the large dredge for the maritime provinces, of the dredge for the province of Ontario, and for scows and tugs in connection with the work. As I have said, I would be pleased to have a statement made from the books in Sorel showing in detail how much was spent on repairs of each dredge.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I may be permitted to explain what expenditures are taken from that sum under discussion now, $550,000. First, the department has to pay for the working of all the dredges that are in commission on the St. Lawrence. This is a special item for the River St. Lawrence ship channel, we have seven dredges. We have ten or twelve dredges, perhaps more than that. We have the hydrographic survey, which I do not think will be transferred to the Department of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But last year the survey of that work was taken from this item. Now there is inspection work, all these working expenses have to be taken out of this item. Then there are repairs, building new scows and boats and all the implements that are necessary for dredging operations.

Mr. MONK. Can the hon. gentleman say about what that amounts to ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I cannot say this year. But my hon. friend perhaps will be in a position to tell us how much he expects each dredge will spend this year. Last year one of the dredges was not supplied with electric light. These dredges are working night and day. The department has to pay double crews and it costs a large amount of money. There is a pretty large amount of money spent in repairs and there is a very large amount spent at Sorel, because there are other works which are not carried on under this item. For instance, there is the large dredge for the maritime provinces which is being built there, and which has nothing to do with the St. Lawrence ship channel. In other words, to pay wages, to pay for the maintenance of the stone lifters, the inspection boats, and the hydrographic survey it costs a pretty large amount of money. This work will be completed within the year as it is very far advanced. The hydrographic survey costs about $20,000 or $25,000 a year. That item covers the ground I have just described.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, it would seem clear, that, if last year it cost $125,000 for supplies and $175,000 for these works at Sorel making a total of $300,000, there is left out of this vote $215,000 to be spent on dredging. After that money is spent amongst the different dredges for wages and the keep of the men, you get your return for the work done in dredging, so that, of the total vote of $500,000 for the St. Lawrence ship channel over $300,000 is for work at Sorel and supplies furnished for the boats.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Out of that amount pretty large sums of money have also been taken to equip the shipyards and to complete buildings. In the shipyards there are always new implements required as any one who is familiar with mills and machinery knows. Out of that amount all these things have had to be bought in the past and I suppose this year the hon. Minister of Public Works will be also obliged to buy new implements. There is always something required in connection with a big work of that kind.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We hope that the dredge 'J. Israel Tarte' will work satisfactorily as the result of the changes and if so we expect to reverse the figures and that at least $350,000 will be spent on dredging.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not understand what the hon. gentleman means, because the improvements will not give any more capacity to the dredge. There are only some piping and wheels to be changed. That will not add to the capacity of the dredge at all. If the hon. minister will give some attention to the subject he will find that the changes have nothing to do with the question. If the dredge 'Tarte' does a million yards a month it will be so much the better, but the wages of the crew are the same whether the dredge does a large amount of work or does a less amount of work. The wages were the same last year. Unfortunately some of the machinery broke down, but the wages had always to be paid, so that it does not affect the expenditure at all. The expenditure will be the same whether the dredge works well or not, but what the hon. minister means, I suppose is, that if the dredge answers our expectations a much larger amount of work will be done, and the dredging will cost less, but the expenditure will be the same.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I made both statements and I think I am strictly correct. If the dredge works satisfactorily we will accomplish a great deal more work. If the dredge works five or six months instead of 100 days it will cost more money, as the 'Tarte' consumes forty tons of coal per day, but we will get more work.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is an item that I would like a little explanation on :

A. W. Robinson, consulting engineer, four days time at Ottawa, consultation, $40 per day..	$160 00
Journey to maritime provinces, to examine conditions under which proposed dredging will be done, and report on same, four days at $40 ; fare $40.50 ; sundry outlay, $25.25..	225 75
One day at Sorel on shipyard improvements, $40; expenses, $4, April 2, 1900.	44 00
One day's time at Sorel, consultation..	40 00

It seems to me that this is a very large amount to pay—$40 per day—for a consulting engineer. Perhaps the hon. minister can give us some explanation of that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only explanation I can give is that the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) saw fit to engage a gentleman of talent and experience and probably had to pay him for his services.

Mr. BLAIN. Is he in the employ of the department all the time or is he specially employed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, he has been the consulting engineer to the department.

Mr. MONK. Who is he ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Robinson.

Mr. MONK. What are his qualifications ?

Mr. BLAIN. He is from Montreal.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year of the $500,000 voted something like one-half of it was to be expended in this way : To build a tug, $25,000; two large dump scows, $26,000; completion of one scow, $4,000; construction of one flat scow with boiler. $7,000; construction of one saw-mill, $15,000; construction of equipment of marine railway, workshops and shipyard, $20,000 ; refitting shipyard, $5,000; rebuilding wharf, $3,000; and unforeseen expenses, $30,000. Take these items from the $500,000 voted last year and you will get what the hon. gentleman would expend in dredging during the past year. The year previous there were about sixty miles of channel to be dredged and ten miles of that was dredged out of the $500,000 vote of last year. Now, the hon. minister has increased the vote from $500,000 to $515,000. What I want to know is if all the works that the money was voted for last year have been completed. If they are, the hon. gentleman will have a much larger sum this year for the purpose of dredging.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The expectation is that we will be able to spend a very much larger sum on the dredging out of this total estimate—$340,000 or $350,000 we think will be spent. Some of these works the hon. gentleman has mentioned are completed and some are under construction.

Mr. INGRAM. I asked the hon. gentleman the names of the dredges. In answer

to another question the hon. gentleman said that dredging cost per yard something like two cents and a fraction. We have a dredge here which does the work at one cent a yard and others which do it at three or four cents a yard. What is the cost per yard of each of the dredges.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That, of course, altogether depends on what kind of material the dredges are working in. Some work costs less than three cents a yard, and in some other cases it would run nearly up to seven cents a yard. In the case of this dredge the first month the average cost was as high as eight cents a yard and the last month she worked it was a little less than one and one-half cents a yard, giving an average cost of two and one-quarter cents.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In spite of the fact that the dredge 'J. Israel Tarte' was new and did not work all the time, what amount of dredging did she do last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One million nine hundred and sixty-one thousand two hundred and fifty yards.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. So that the House may understand the great improvement that this dredge is, would the minister say what amount was done by all the other dredges ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The other dredges altogether turned out a little over 2,500,000 yards. If the dredge 'Tarte' is in good working order this season it ought to handle as much material as the other six, or about 2,500,000 yards.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Of course, this does not prove that the other dredges are not good; they are simply of a different pattern. The 'Tarte' is a suction dredge destined to work in sand or in light clay while the other dredges are elevator dredges with buckets, and are intended for heavier dredging. I have seen one of the other dredges working for hours and hours at a piece of rock which afterwards we had to remove with a stone lifter. These other elevator dredges are fine dredges indeed; they are about the best of the kind on the continent of America, but their capacity cannot be estimated by the capacity of the 'Tarte,' which is a different kind of dredge altogether. The dredge which we are building for the maritime provinces will be both a suction dredge and an elevator dredge combined.

Mr. SPROULE. To get any fair idea of the capacity of the different dredges we would have to know what amount of work each one would do working in the same kind of material.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is so.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The average capacity of these dredges is between 5,000 and 6,000 yards a day, or about 8,000 yards night and day.

Mr. ROSAMOND. What is the cost of one thousand yards of dredging done by the government dredges as compared with the cost of one thousand yards done by the contract dredges ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would be about two-thirds less by the government dredges.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand that the construction of dredges is practically done now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. INGRAM. What dredges are not completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are building a large dredge for the maritime provinces. Are you referring to the dredges that are working on this channel ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are all completed.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it expected that this dredging will remain with the Department of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. When these items were being discussed before, we heard a great deal about the division of the departments; are all the dredges on the St. Lawrence to continue under the management of the Department of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. What dredges, if any, have been taken out of the Department of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. None that I know of.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not catch the number of cubic yards which the hon. gentleman said would have to be dredged.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid I cannot give the hon. gentleman a complete estimate.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood there was a statement last year that 24,000,000 cubic yards would be taken out of the whole channel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer estimates that in Lake St. Peter alone 10,000,000 yards will be removed.

Mr. INGRAM. We have contradictory statements as to that. Last year we were told that the quantity was 90,000,000 yards, and we were also told that the total was 24,000,000 yards. If the hon. gentleman looks up 'Hansard,' he will see these contradictory statements.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it must be some mistake. The information I gave the committee is from the chief engineer of the department. I asked him to give me an approximate estimate of the quantity, and he said it would be something like 22,000,000 yards.

Mr. BENNETT. As it is contemplated in the coming year to spend $125,000 for material and $175,000 for labour at Sorel, does the minister think it good policy to expend so large an amount of money without calling for tenders for the work to be done ? I assume that during the coming year some scows and probably some tugs will be built there. Is that in contemplation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is in contemplation to build one spare dump scow of 200 yards capacity ; reconstruction of the upper part of the 'Laval' ; additional accommodation on the 'Laurier' for the night crew, at a cost of $2,000 ; a winch scow, with boiler and winch ; a flat scow, with derrick ; changing the buckets on the 'Aberdeen' and the 'Minto,' to make them suitable for working in hard material ; a new coal barge, at an estimated cost of $15,000 ; and completion of tug No. 9.

Mr. BENNETT. Surely the amount of work which the minister has outlined is not going to keep 250 men employed every day in the year at Sorel—for that is what it amounts to--at an average of $2 a day, though many of them are not paid that much. I think it would be in the interest of the country to call for tenders for the construction of that new coal barge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The $175,000 is not paid out of this vote, though a portion of it may be. There have been at least 400 men working at Sorel in the past, if there is not that number there now.

Mr. BENNETT. I have searched the Auditor General's Report, and I can only find one expenditure respecting the employment of men at Sorel, and it totals up to $175,000. Where is the rest of the expenditure, if it is not all included in that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have explained that that was not paid out of this vote. For instance, there was a special vote for building a dredge for the maritime provinces, and there are other special votes. So that if the hon. gentleman would deduct the amounts of these special votes from the amount paid in wages, the balance would be something less than $100,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would my hon. friend allow me to make the matter clear, if I can ? Would my hon. friend tell us how much he expects to have to pay for the crews of his dredges on the St. Lawrence ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that the $340,000 which I referred to includes the pay of the crews and the cost of the coal. I have not the amounts separated.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much does my hon. friend expect to pay in wages at Sorel out of this item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Out of this vote, $125,000 is expected to be paid in material and wages, and the accounts are not kept in such a way that I can give the amount for each. Perhaps it will be about one half.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The material, I understand, is for the building of a scow and a coal barge ? Is that all the department intends to build this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Does my hon. friend intend to build that barge in steel or in wood ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In wood.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What kind of wood, may I ask ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that it is British Columbia fir.

Mr. BENNETT. According to the Auditor General's Report there were $175,000 spent, not for material, but for wages to workmen who were employed in the shops at Sorel. If the report of the Auditor General is wrong, we will have to amend it. The hon. minister says that in the coming season he does not expect that $175,000 will be spent in Sorel for wages, but that $125,000 will cover all the money expended there, including materials for work to be done in that place. We will have to wait until next year and see if he is effecting a saving between $175,000 for labour alone and $125,000 for labour and material.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is quite mistaken, I was explaining what amount would be spent out of this vote at Sorel, but there are four or five hundred men working there on other work not provided for in this vote, and their wages will be paid out of these other votes. The Auditor General however, has made out the account in such a way as to make it clear that it all comes out of this vote, which causes the misunderstanding.

Mr. BENNETT. Then it is expected that there will be $125,000 spent in wages at Sorel in the coming year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is right. It is estimated that the total amount paid for wages will be about the same as last year.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. gentleman consider it good policy to build by

day labour and purchase the material, I presume, without tender, for a barge worth $15,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that we have to utilize these shops for repairs and for the building of these scows and tugs, it is good policy to have that work done by day labour at Sorel.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the hon. minister any returns showing the work turned out during the past year and expected to be turned out during the coming year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just read that. I have read four or five times over a list of the scows, &c., intended to be built at Sorel and estimated to cost $113,000. There is a large dredge for the maritime provinces which will cost $150,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the half a million dollar dredge being built by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. Then of course there are in addition the general repairs of the whole fleet of barges, scows and tugs.

Mr. BENNETT. Here we have the other departments calling for tenders where much smaller expenditure is involved. Take the Postmaster General's Department, tenders are called for carrying the mail bags a distance of ten miles, involving an expenditure of some $60 per year, yet in the case of an expenditure of $150,000 for a dredge, no tenders are called for and the work is done by day labour by a horde of officials, numbering some 400, paid top wages and hired on political grounds, and the material bought, I presume, without tenders. Are tenders called for to supply the material required for this new dreuge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I understand that tenders were asked for.

Mr. COCHRANE. Did the lowest tenderer get the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that it was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. INGRAM. When was that tender awarded ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not say that there was a tender for the dredge, I understood the question to be whether tenders were called for to supply the material.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that this is a dredge which was to cost $500,000. Last year it was estimated to cost only $300,000. What is the cause of the difference ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimated cost, if I remember rightly was $520,000, and I gave the details.

Mr. BENNETT.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When the department was under my direction, the work was started in Sorel, and I believe that the plans have been since changed. I believe that this is right. I believe that it is a dredge which is more complicated than any we have yet built, and I think that the first estimate of Mr. Robinson was not so high.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The first estimate by my hon. friend was some $300,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What was the cause of the difference ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that there are any particular changes, but the estimate given by my hon. friend must have been too low. There can be no question about the accuracy of the estimate now as so much of the material and machinery have been purchased, and so much work done. I gave the details when the item was under consideration.

Mr. INGRAM. The fact is that the cost has gone up from $300,000 to $500,000. The hon. gentleman tells us that a part of the material was bought under contract, after tenders had been asked for. Whether the additional cost was in labour or in material not contracted for, it does not seem clear how the hon. minister can say that there has been no particular change.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been no change at all. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, as I understand it, says it was a very large work and that the change has been made under his direction on the advice of his engineer.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When I asked Mr. Robinson's advice, he placed an estimate before me, and, if I remember aright that estimate was about $300,000. I concluded to go on with the work. Now, the government has a shipyard at Sorel which cost a pretty large amount of money, so we started building that dredge by day labour, just as a contractor would build it. For, in a matter of this kind, the department is in the position of an ordinary contractor, having its own shipyard. I found that shipyard in existence when I took office, and it had been in existence for years. Such an institution is necessary to the carrying on of the work on the St. Lawrence under the system in use. If the work on the St. Lawrence had, in the beginning, been given out by contract, it would have been a different matter. But when the present government took office, the work of dredging the St. Lawrence was in progress, and the shipyard was in existence. We had only to continue the work then under way. The shipyard was in a very dilapidated condition. The men were working in the rain and snow. I improved the shipyard, thinking it was the best policy, for otherwise we could not carry on there any work of very great magnitude. Moreover, I thought it

good policy for the government to have a shipyard of its own. In the past the government has imported its dredges from Scotland and elsewhere, and I made up my mind that it was better to have Canadian workmen build these dredges here. With the consent and hearty co-operation of my colleagues, I began the erection of these works in Sorel, and also began building dredges and so on. Well, the government, having that shipyard, went on with the work of building this dredge, the estimate placed before me being, as I have said, about $300,000. It is six months since I left office, and I am not responsible for what has been done during that time. I suppose that everything is going on all right but I am not responsible and it is not for me to answer.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to give me one piece of information.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Certainly.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the estimate was $300,000, and this was submitted to the hon. gentleman by Mr. Robinson and the officers of the department while he was Minister of Public Works ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I cannot remember the exact figure, but it was in the neighbourhood of $300,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Are we to understand that, before leaving office, the hon. gentleman changed the plans of that dredge ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I did not change the plans of that dredge, but I believe that some changes—some slight changes, not very important—have been made in the plans.

Mr. INGRAM. Well, then, if there are no important changes made in the plans, I do not think the explanation satisfactorily accounts for this additional expenditure beyond $300,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) wish me to say ? Does he wish me to say that the dredge will not cost $520,000 ?

Mr. INGRAM. No, what I want is to have the hon. minister give us an explanation of why there is this difference between $300,000 and $500,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) no doubt has explained that thoroughly to the satisfaction of my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram).

Mr. INGRAM. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Whatever the estimate was, I found there had been expended for the expenditure made or arranged to be made up to June 30 next, was $321,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much will be spent up to July 1 next ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Up to January 1 last there was spent, in round figures, $300,000, and there will be spent up to June 30, $321,955.

Mr. BENNETT. Would that include the engine ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That would include everything.

Mr. CLARE. There were $300,000 spent up to January 1 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and an estimate in the department that $21,000 more would be spent in the present fiscal year.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is it possible that there is $200,000 more work on that dredge ? I cannot believe it. There must be some explanation of that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) must have got the information on the vote for the dredge when it was passed. We spent hours upon it. I have no objection to taking it up again, even in this fashion, out of order as it is, to give information that any hon. gentleman may desire. But I think that no hon. gentleman, even on the other side, would support such an extreme departure from the existing rule as to commence anew the discussion of an item passed some weeks ago after being discussed in such detail. I appeal to my hon. friends that that is beyond the limits of reason and an unjustifiable departure from the rule. The vote asked for $200,000 for the completion of the work. I believe that, perhaps, this dredge cost more than it would have cost if it had been built at a well-equipped factory. At the same time, if it turns out as we expect, it will be one of the best dredges in the country, even though, perhaps, it cost a great deal more than the value of it, judged by the cost of a similar work done under contract.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When the hon. minister says that it would have cost less if it had been built in a well-equipped factory, I would ask him if he has visited the ship works at Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I have.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, surely the hon. minister will not say that these are not well-equipped shipyards. I have visited nearly all the shipyards on this continent, and I say that the shipyards at Sorel are well equipped. I do not say that they are complete, of course, none are complete.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend will allow me, I would say, that to have this item which has already been discussed——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. But if the hon. minister will allow me, I cannot permit him to say merely as a matter by the way that I have made a big mistake and that that mis-

take was due to the fact that the shipyard at Sorel was not well equipped. He is wrong on that point.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps one word, if the hon. gentleman will allow me, will settle the whole matter. He knows that the shipyard is not in a position to make machinery and all that sort of thing in connection with a work like this.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I differ with the hon. minister entirely. The shipyard in Sorel is quite capable of building engines and everything——

Mr. BENNETT. Boilers ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, boilers and everything needed in connection with such work. At times, we have not been able to complete certain works, but only because we have had too much to do. But the shipyard is perfectly equipped to carry out any kind of work though we have been compelled to go outside sometimes because of having too much to do. That is the reason why when the 'Tarte' was built we went outside—though at that time the shipyard was not so well equipped as it is now. We have been equipping it gradually and now it is a very fine shipyard. I do not think the Polson Iron Works are as well equipped—certainly they are not better. And there are hon. gentlemen here who know that those works are a very well-equipped shipyard. I am glad to say that the shipyard in Sorel is better equipped than that at Collingwood. I have visited them, the shipyard in Sorel is well equipped, and the reason why the work has not been carried out as quickly as it might have been, is not the one that is given now. I do not blame my hon. friend in any way, but it is only fair for me to state that the reason he has assigned is not the proper one.

Mr. INGRAM. Am I to understand that, supposing a dredge is to be built at Sorel, for which the hon. gentleman asks $300,000 in his estimates, we are to be told the following year that that dredge is to cost $500,000, and that the money has already been expended on it ? When we ask what that dredge is to cost, I think the officials at Sorel ought to be in a position to tell us as nearly as possible. The difference between $300,000 and $500,000 on the cost of a dredge is altogether too much. I do not think the minister has given us a satisfactory answer.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appears to me now, getting right down to business, that the minister should be in a position to tell us within a radius of $200,000 what the dredge is going to cost. Common sense would tell me that his department should be in a position to give us some kind of a fair estimate, and if he has not any officials capable of deciding a question like that, he ought to call in somebody else. I agree with the ex-minister when he places the government in the position of a manufacturer. To a certain extent they can assume that position. But when you come to get into details, there is a very wide departure from the course a manufacturer would adopt in getting his material. It appears to me that any business man, if he wanted a certain amount of material, would ask for tenders, there would be no political consideration in connection with it. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works or any other minister, can they free themselves from all the political influences that surround them ? I do not care what party is in power. The same trouble existed when we were in power, but it is very much worse now, because we can readily understand how hungry the Liberal party was to get a little money when they got into power. All these influences are now at work. Is it possible in human nature that any minister can free himself from the political influences surrounding him ? Can he ask for tenders and get material supplied without any consideration from party friends at all ? Enormous sums have been expended in connection with these works. I don't care for what the money was expended; when I know that every dollar of the public money is honestly expended, I don't care where it is expended. Now we don't want any such erroneous statements made in this House, telling us last session that the dredge was going to cost $300,000 and now telling us it is going to cost $500,000. Why, will any man tell me that any business concern in the Dominion of Canada would be as wide of the mark as $200,000 in the construction of a dredge ? I don't believe it. It appears to me there must be something radically wrong when there is $200,000 of a difference between the supposed cost of the dredge and the actual amount it is going to cost. I do not say that we were always right when we were in power; but is it any justification to say, every time we bring up this question : Oh, you did it. Why, Mr. Chairman, I recollect the time when we could hardly go out to get a breath that our friends opposite did not demand that we should do it under contract. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) used to make the House ring with his denunciations, even when a member of the government went out to breathe, if he didn't do it under contract. Now he and his friends sit complacently and see all these expenditures of money, and not one dollar under contract. They swallow all their professions, and when we make any complaint they reply to us : Oh, this is great Babylon that we have built, these are growing times. Well, Sir, I am here to tell you that it will be good policy for this government, instead of frittering away the public money, $200,000 here, $60,000 there, and nothing to show for it—for them to reduce

the debt of this country, the growing debt, they used to talk so much about when we were in power. There is the Minister of Customs sleeping so complacently. I would give a great deal if I could sleep. It is a sad illustration of how human nature can degenerate. That hon. gentleman used to talk to us so loudly about extravagance that his constituency away up in Brantford could almost hear him when he was denouncing the extravagance of the Tory government. Now he can sit there complacently.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There was a time to speak then.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, but it is no time to speak now, because you are getting the emoulments of office, you are getting $2,000 more than your predecessor, in an office, too, that you said there was no need of. You said the country did not require that office, and you supported by your vote a resolution condemning it. You said that office should not have been created, that there were too many ministers, and now you sit there—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. COCHRANE. I say the other hon. gentlemen opposite did the same, they supported by their vote a motion declaring the office was unnecessary. And, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you, perhaps it would not be out of the way, that I can even remember your musical voice—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am talking about the $200,000.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will keep to the subject before the Chair.

Mr. COCHRANE. I was at the subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am in the judgment of the House if I was not trying to speak about that $200,000 that was not expended under contract; and I went back in memory and listened to your musical voice, along with other opponents of the Conservative government. I was referring also to the Minister of Customs when he used to denounce the old government for extravagance. But now he can sleep, and it is all right. Things have changed, say they, we are getting the emoluments of office, and the other fellows are out of office, and that is all the difference.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. MONK. No, Mr. Chairman. I think the minister ought to have come down with information. If he had done so he would get his items through quicker. I think he should be able to give us more information with regard to the output. It has been mentioned here this afternoon that the expenditure at Sorel was something enormous. When we pay out over $177,000 for wages, we want to know what it is for. I am in favour of continuing the establishment at that town, but I think we are entitled to know what we get for the money we spend. The minister should have foreseen that this afternoon we would inquire as to the cost of each one of these dredges, and the maintenance of each one. He has no information upon that point at all. He could have got it by giving half an hour's notice to the employees of his department. We do not know the capacity of these dredges, nor where they are going to be located during the summer. We have no information as to what they are expected to do this summer. If the hon. gentleman had taken the precaution to get us that information he would have saved an hour and a half time on this item. I think, in his department, he could get that information and if he had done so he would not have spent an hour, or an hour and a half, upon this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend has asked first, the names of the dredges, second as to the capacity of the dredges, and thirdly as to the amount of work that has been done. I have given that information over and over again to the committee to-day.

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister is mistaken.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not mistaken. I have given this information in its various details.

Mr. MONK. Let me ask the hon. gentleman what is the capacity of the dredge 'Laurier,' and the cost of maintenance. He has not mentioned that this afternoon.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have answered that question over and over again. Hon. gentlemen talk about getting the vote through. We have discussed for at least an hour and a half an item which has no more to do with this vote than something in connection with the Department of Agriculture or with Japan or any other place, but with the desire to give the fullest information in regard to all these details, I have answered all the questions which hon. gentlemen have asked: yet, we have an hon. gentleman getting up and accusing me of an unwillingness to bring down the information. I would submit to this committee if the discussion which has been in progress for the last hour, or hour and a half, is not completely out of order.

Mr. INGRAM. I object to that altogether. The questions that I asked the hon. gentleman were perfectly pertinent to the subject under discussion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never said the hon. gentleman's questions were out of order. I said that this dis-

cussion of the expenditure on the dredge 'Fielding,' which comes out of another vote altogether, and not one cent of the expenditure upon which is taken out of the vote now before the committee, is out of order. How can it be in order to discuss a work for which we are not asking any appropriation? From my desire to give the fullest possible information in every detail, I did not take the point that the discussion was out of order.

Mr. MONK. No point of order could be taken. This discussion is quite pertinent. Surely, when we are discussing the maintenance of seven dredges and we find that one dredge which is being built in a shipyard where these dredges are being repaired, and is going to cost $200,000 more than we anticipated it would cost, the hon. gentleman is not going to say that the discussion is out of order.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Surely the hon. gentleman who is a great lawyer would not say, that, while we are considering an appropriation for a certain work because there are other works going on at the shops at Sorel, he would ask for information in regard to something that has no connection with the vote whatever. It would be just as reasonable to say that if you were taking a vote for building a piece of roadway in Ottawa every other item of expenditure in Ottawa should come up for discussion. On every item that the hon. gentleman has mentioned I have given the information over and over again. If there is any other information that he wants I will be only too anxious to bring it down. If the department had been lax in bringing down any information asked for it would only be right that the discussion should be continued, or that the item should be held over until this information had been brought down. But, in this instance all the information has been given.

Mr. MONK. I must take exception to what the hon. minister says. I have been very moderate in my questions. He has not answered a single one of these questions. He has not told us where these dredges are going to be located during the summer because he does not know.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do know.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman has not stated where they are to be located.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did give that information. I gave the list of the dredges and I laid a plan on the Table that showed where the work was to be done.

Mr. MONK. I followed the discussion carefully. The hon. gentleman has not given that information nor has he put upon the Table any plan which shows where these dredges would be located during the summer. When the hon. gentleman says that he has given an answer to all the questions asked, I would remind him that I have asked as to the cost of the maintenance of these dredges. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that he has not given that information, nor has he given the capacity of these dredges, nor the results which he expects during the coming season. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that when this discussion began this afternoon he did not know the distance that these dredges were going to excavate during the summer. When the discussion began this afternoon he spoke about a channel sixty-five miles long and finally the hon. gentleman spoke about seven miles of a channel to be excavated during the summer, and which seemed so preposterous that eventually he brought it up to fourteen or fifteen miles. These are details which the hon. gentleman might have known that we would ask for. It might have been expected, in connection with the work of preparing these dredges that the discovery of an extra $200,000 in regard to a dredge to be built in the maritime provinces would give rise to a discussion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not under this vote.

Mr. MONK. It is true that the dredge is not built out of this vote, but there is this reference to dredges and are we going to be to told when we discover that there is an extra of $200,000 for a dredge which was intended to cost $300,000, that because we are discussing the channel of the St. Lawrence we cannot get information as to the cost of that dredge or discuss that point? It does seem to put a limitation upon the committee which the rules never intended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This item was under discussion at a previous sitting of the House and all the information was given in regard to it. That is one of the reasons why I think I should not be found fault with and lectured. We have spent an hour or two discussing an item which was discussed for two or three hours on a previous occasion. I am in the judgment of the committee as to whether this is not an unjust criticism of me. The hon. gentleman asks for details as to two matters, and although I have given that information over and over again to-day, rather than he should be disappointed or have an excuse for saying that this information has not been brought down in detail, if the hon. gentleman will allow me I will give it again. The first question the hon. gentleman asked was as to the capacity of the different dredges. The capacity of the dredge 'Laurier' is 1,700 cubic yards. It is almost impossible to give a proper idea of the capacity of a dredge without stating the class of material the dredge is working in. This is in hard clay.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that working nine hours a day or ten hours a day ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is twenty hours a day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The 'Lady Aberdeen' does 2,000 yards and in ordinary earth 4,000, and the 'Laval' 400 yards a day.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. She has a greater capacity than that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is in rocks.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Oh, yes ; but that does not indicate its capacity. She does not work in rocks all the time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must give the information in that way. I know it is unreasonable information to ask for, except in a general way.

Mr. MONK. I asked in a general way, and that is the first answer I got.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps my hon. friend did not understand me, or he may have been out of the House.

Mr. MONK. I have been in the House all the afternoon.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to the point at which these dredges will work, I may say that the 'Lady Aberdeen' will be in Lake St. Peter and the 'Tarte' will be in Lake St. Peter. Of course, they will have to work over nine or ten miles of ground.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will the 'Tarte' start from the point where she left off last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And the 'Lady Aberdeen' will start from the lower part of the lake, going up ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is it not expected that the Lake St. Peter dredging will be completed this year with these two dredges at work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineers do not think they will be able to complete that work this season.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How many miles will the 'Lady Aberdeen' be expected to cover ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The 'Lady Aberdeen' is sent there to prepare the work where the 'Tarte' is located.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will they both work on the same spot ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not at the same time. The engineer tells me that they will put the 'Lady Aberdeen' there to make a depth for the 'Tarte' to work on.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not understand that at all. I have been at that place many times, and they did not do that last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer informs me that we are doing exactly the same as we have done last year.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is the crew on board the 'Tarte' the same as last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as I know. I am informed that the crew is practically the same. It has not come under my notice, but the chief engineer informs me that it is practically the same. The officers are the same.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I did not speak of the men ; I was referring to the officers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The officers are the same.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I hope they will all stand by the dredge and remain on board, and see that the men work all the time. How many dredges are now at work on the ship channel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Six. The only dredge not at work now is the 'Tarte.'

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Where are the other dredges at work now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Contrecoeur, and Varennes, and Verchères.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has the coal for the dredges this year been bought ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. We advertised for the coal, and the tenders are in now.

Mr. INGRAM. I want the minister to point out what the opposition has referred to that is not in keeping with this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am perfectly willing to go on and discuss the item. It will, I think, be admitted that the discussion should be confined to the object for which the money is used, and not one cent of this appropriation will be used in connection with the dredge 'W. S. Fielding.'

Hon. Mr. TARTE. As the cost of that work comes out of this item, I would like to inquire further when my hon. friend expects it to be completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that the estimate is that it will be finished this season.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would my hon. friend oblige me by saying if the projects which were under preparation when I left office for the part of the work that was to be done have been completed since ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must ask my hon. friend to allow me an opportunity to look into that, and I will let him know.

Mr. MONK. We had occasion this afternoon to discuss this item of $340,000, and reference was made to the large amount of wages paid at Sorel, part of which enters into this item. My hon. friend from Simcoe discussed that also, and the minister informed my hon. friend that there were other very important works proceeding there, amongst others the building of this dredge 'Fielding.' It was then that my hon. friend stated, what was news to many members of this House, that that dredge was to cost over $100,000. That is the way that question came up, so that the remarks made on this side of the House were in order. Let me ask my hon. friend, if he does not think me too insistent, to give us the cost of the maintenance of each of these dredges, the three principal items of which would be wages, coal and repairs. This was one of the first questions I asked this afternoon. Let me ask what it cost for the maintenance of the 'Lady Aberdeen.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In round figures, about $30,000. I must apologize if I gave too much information this afternoon, and brought up this subject; it was not with a desire to prolong the discussion. I certainly did not hear or notice the question which my hon. friend says he asked, in regard to the cost of maintenance of each dredge.

Mr. MONK. I claim a little merit, because I asked this question at the very beginning, but did not get any answer. I suppose the $30,000 which the hon. minister has mentioned, includes wages, coal repairs, and everything necessary to keep the dredge going during the season?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is what I am informed.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When I left office, the department was discussing the propriety of buying a piece of land adjoining the yards there. I do not know whether my hon. friend's attention has been called to the importance of securing that piece of land.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think we have bought one piece. I will bring down the information.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The officers will understand me. It is a square piece of land behind one of the yards.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister informs me that it is the Beauchemin property.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. One more question. I do not ask questions for the purpose of creating embarrassment; but we had a good many projects in hand when I left office, and I would like to know what is being done in regard to them. The Department of the Interior transferred to the Department of Public Works the point there; the title was ours when I left office, and we had some intention of building a slip there for the accommodation of dredges that were to be repaired. I do not know whether my hon. friend's attention has been called to that slip.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That matter will receive attention this season.

Mr. MONK. Will my hon. friend be kind enough to let us have the names of the parties who tendered for the coal for these dredges, or state whether the order was given without any tenders?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Tenders were asked for, and after the tenders are opened and the contract awarded, I will bring them down.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Quebec harbour improvements, $100,000.

Mr. MONK. I am not aware that the item we were on before recess was passed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I declared the item passed and the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) then asked what would be the next item after recess.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am in the hands of the committee, and if the committee want to debate the item further I shall not raise any further objection, but I was under the impression that the item had passed, which impression is borne out by what Mr. Deputy Speaker has just said. If any further information be required, I would have no objection to give it on another item.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Personally I have not the slightest objection to the item being declared passed, but I did not understand that it was passed before recess.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier should accept the offer I have made and that we should submit to the Chairman's ruling.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will the hon. gentleman explain the item now submitted?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for additional berth room for deep draught sea going vessels along the river front. Here is the plan, which hon. gentlemen may examine for themselves. Representations were made by the harbour board of Quebec urging the necessity for more berth room, and I asked the engineers of the

department to prepare for an extension, as shown on the plan laid on the Table, of 462 feet long and 40 feet wide at the base. I advertised for tenders and several were received, and the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderers, Messrs Dusseault and Lemieux, or Lévis, for $198,700. The contract was awarded to them on the 8th of May.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to suggest that it was at the request of the harbour commissioners that the plans were changed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was on the representations made by the harbour board that the plan now on the Table was prepared.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. This is not an answer, and I must insist on a clear answer. The plans on which I advertised for public tenders were prepared by the department with the co-operation of the harbour commissioners at Quebec. These gentlemen came to Ottawa with the board of trade and interviewed the right hon. gentleman and myself, and the government decided to go on with the work. Money was asked and voted by the House. During the last session of parliament I laid on the Table of the House the plans on which these tenders were to be asked, and I say again that these plans, after being prepared by the department were submitted to the harbour board and approved by them. So I understand the hon. minister to say that these large plans—for the plans for which I advertised were for much larger works than those now proposed to be carried out—were abandoned at the request of the Quebec harbour board.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What reasons may have influenced them I do not know, but when I took office the representation made by the harbour board to me was that the plan at present submitted was the one they wished carried out. I am not seeking to avoid the hon. gentleman's question, but simply to say that representations made both in writing and personally by the president, engineers and other representatives of the harbour board were in favour of these plans. I am not prepared to say whether the harbour board had a meeting or not, and formally decided to ask to have these new plans substituted for the other, but they did ask that this plan be adopted at the present time, and they also made suggestions to me which I will explain when the plans they have suggested and which are a little different from the original plan are discussed.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What surprises me is the statement that the harbour board suggested smaller works, after they had approved of the plans on which tenders were asked. Of course, I have not one word more to say. But I have asked for the correspondence and I do not know whether it has been brought down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that the correspondence has been brought down.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I understand that the minister is doing this preliminary work, and that later on further provision will be made, if the trade requires it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Are further works in contemplation in the port of Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, no other representations have been made to me, nor any other plans submitted.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Because, there was some difficulty about that work. Other parties wanted the work to be made elsewhere. But I am fully satisfied with the explanation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No further representations were made to me. The change in the larger plan as suggested by the harbour board was to extend four or five hundred feet or perhaps further to deep water before turning.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In fact only part of the larger works that would have been carried on are applied for this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is all.

Mr. KEMP. Is there any request from Quebec looking to the deepening of the harbour ? I understood that the water was not quite deep enough for some of the larger vessels that come into the St. Lawrence ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No representations have been made, unless they were made some time ago. Nothing of that kind has been brought to my notice.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I suppose what my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr Kemp) refers to is the Louise basin ? It is very difficult to dredge deeper there, because the wharfs are built in such a way that if you dredge deeper they will tumble.

Mr. KEMP. I was told by a gentleman who comes from Quebec that there is a difficulty about docking. That is why I asked the question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will give them about forty or fifty feet of water. Outside of the basin I think they have about thirty feet. The matter has not been brought to my attention.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. minister kindly tell me how many tenderers there were and from whom, if he has the information at hand ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot speak with certainty from memory, but I believe there were five or six tenders, including one from M. P. Davis, or Davis Bros., the Connollys, Poupore—almost all the large contractors who have a plant.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much additional space would these improvements give ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In round figures, 500 feet. The actual wharf is 460 feet.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is in one direction. How long is it in the other ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is straight out to deep water. It is left so that in the future, if we decide, we can either go further or return as by the plans formerly made.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How many feet of water will be inside the works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The figures are given on the plan. It is shallow water.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The dredging will not be carried out now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not at present.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. So, there will be only one berth wharf for a large ship ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as I am concerned, the question with the department is whether we should extend this from 400 to 600 feet and then return.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The plans formerly decided on gave a large basin, and three berths. These reduced plans, will be a good improvement, however, though not quite so useful as the others would have been.

Mr. MONK. I remember seeing last year in 'Le Soleil,' the government organ in Quebec, that very extensive improvements had been formally decided upon in the harbour there, to cost several hundred thousand dollars, that the improvements had been approved of, the plans sanctioned and work to begin immediately. I believe the names of the successful tenderers were mentioned. The recollection I have is that these improvements had been solicited a long time by the people of Quebec, that they were absolutely necessary, and were to cost over a million ultimately. Now am I to understand that the harbour commissioners of Quebec approve of these improvements which have been decided on by the government, and to which reference has been made here to-night, and am I to understand that they have gone back upon their decision and are now satisfied with this vote of $100,000 and these diminished improvements ? Has the minister any authentic declaration to that effect ? And are these the only improvements which this year will be executed in and around the city of Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as the matter has received the attention of the department, these are the immediate improvements that will be undertaken this season. It is perfectly true that, as the trade of the port increases, these plans will have to be extended, and it is expected that it will cost over a million dollars to complete improvements that will accommodate vessels of deep draught at the port of Quebec. Probably this is the work the papers referred to. After representations had been made to the harbour board, they decided to go on with this part of the work, and to advertise for tenders ; and I have just read the amount of the contract that was entered into.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The harbour commissioners and the board of trade of Quebec petitioned the government over and over again, and I submitted the whole thing to my colleagues. The Prime Minister and myself received a deputation, the whole question was discussed carefully, plans were prepared, which I laid on the Table of the House. I stated to the House last year that I was asking for only $100,000 then, but that those works would probably cost in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000. Tenders were received, some of them were irregular. I reported to Council, but before the report was adopted I went out of office. The hon. gentleman states now that the harbour commissioners have approved of the new plans. Well, so far as that goes, I have not a word to say. But I may add that the reason we decided to go on with those large works last year was that we expected that within a short time the fast line would be established, and as the port of Quebec was the natural port for these big ships, we thought it was necessary to provide for them.

Mr. MONK. Did the minister say that these new plans had been formally approved by the harbour commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. Further than that, I say that it was on their representations and suggestions that I carried out these plans. After they were prepared in the department they were sent down to the harbour commissioners to examine and to make any further representations which they wished.

Mr. MONK. Had any tenders been accepted for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, a tender was accepted and the contract let. The contractors are Dusseault & Lemieux, of Lévis. The contract calls for the completion of the work inside of two years.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What kind of timber is going to be used ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Spruce, and either elm or oak. I think if we can get good rock elm it is as good as oak. The engineer of the harbour board of Quebec, who has had considerable experience, consulted with my officials in regard to that. The plans have been approved by the chief engineer. The timber used is below water.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would it not be advisable, in cases such as this, to make sure that the timber contracted for will be the right kind ? If hemlock does as well, would it not be just as well to give a contract for hemlock instead of spruce, inasmuch as hemlock sometimes finds its way into the quantity supplied ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That matter was under discussion, and the officers of the department did not seem to think that hemlock is equal to hardwood. We are using concrete where it has to support a heavy weight. Hemlock might last under water for ages, but this work has to carry a very heavy weight.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would urge my hon. friend to use concrete as much as he can. The ordinary life of timber is not over eight or ten years, and I would advise my hon. friend not to be afraid of the additional expense of concrete. I think he has made a mistake in saying that correspondence has been brought down. The Clerk of the House tells me it has not been brought down. I shall wait for it. I do not object to the item because the correspondence is not brought down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend must have misunderstood the clerk, because the correspondence was prepared, and I ordered it to be sent over. I will see that a copy is brought down again.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the minister putting concrete upon the piling ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is not piling, this is cribwork. The concrete is above low water mark. I am pleased to say that the improved methods of making concrete makes the difference in cost between concrete and timber very little now.

Harbours and rivers, Ontario—Port Arthur, dredging, $50,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. gentleman explain where he intends doing that dredging at Port Arthur ? Perhaps he has not the plans by him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the plan. This is in the channel. My hon. friend is no doubt familiar with the locality there.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, I have been there several times.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are the channels leading to the docks there through which the vesselmen have found so much trouble in getting their boats. This is to continue the dredging that I think was started a few years ago. Many representations have been made but more dredging is required to allow large boats to get in. The idea is to make this channel twenty-one feet deep.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What channel ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In view of the great improvement in the trade of Port Arthur and of the importance which that port will assume in the near future, has the hon. minister given his attention to the possibility of extending the breakwater ? The breakwater is a very short affair, not over half a mile long, and I think it should be extended to make the harbour what the demands there would require it to be.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) that I had some representations made to me that the breakwater was long enough to protect the present docks. With an extension of the work there I dare say it would be necessary to extend the breakwater.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like to know exactly where the hon. minister intends to carry out the dredging. There are two elevators in Port Arthur. There is the Canadian Northern elevator. There is also the King elevator. Dredging has been done at both elevators, but dredging is also required to deepen the channel. I would like to know exactly what the hon. minister intends doing. He has a plan prepared, I am sure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, but it has not been customary to lay plans on the Table.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not ask the plans to be brought here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to do dredging from the entrance of the breakwater up to the docks which the hon. gentleman has named, the Canadian Northern dock and King's dock.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has just said a word about the breakwater. I was there in August last year and I made an examination of the works. That breakwater which cost a large amount of money, will be destroyed if the hon. Minister of Public Works does not repair it now. It is in very bad condition. I would invite his attention to the necessity of repairing it without delay. It is being destroyed now. It is a work of large importance. It is necessary work, yet, if it is not repaired, it will not be worth anything. I think it will cost quite a large amount of money, but all the same repairs are necessary.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is just a question whether the breakwater is not too close in towards the docks. At the time it was constructed the vessels that are now plying on the lakes were not built. Vessels of many thousands tons burden enter the harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William. They find that the sea room inside of the breakwater is rather contracted. I am not finding fault but I merely want to give the

hon. minister a suggestion. In case it should be found that the breakwater needs extensive repairing, or in case that a new breakwater would be constructed and extended in a line south-westerly from the present breakwater, it will be well to place it further out and give more sea room inside of the present breakwater there. As the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) suggests, something will require to be done, and at an early date, or the present breakwater will fall to pieces.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think we all recognize the importance of the great trade that is growing up at that port and which is likely to grow very fast. We hope so at any rate. The improvements to the breakwater and the dredging will have to be continued. This vote in the main estimates is especially for dredging to carry out urgent work. In fact, I have taken the responsibility, in view of the telegrams received and the representations made as to the urgency of this work, of giving instructions that the dredging shall go on as soon as this vote is passed. The further improvements which are required there will be carefully considered in connection with the supplementary estimates for 1903-4. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) refers to the necessity of repairing the breakwater. There is no doubt that is urgent and when the estimates are brought down we will see that the work is undertaken.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. minister is dredging a twenty-one foot channel. Would he be good enough to tell us in what way he is carrying out that work ? Is he carrying out the old arrangement that was made formerly ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I am at present just carrying out the arrangement.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is it with the same company ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With the Great Lakes Dredging Company.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is it the same company ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. At the same price—fifteen cents a yard?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fifteen cents a yard.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. You cannot do better.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that an item of $35,000 was passed last year partly for the extension of the breakwater and partly for dredging. When that item was up for discussion the then hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) made the statement that $35,000 would complete the work. Could the hon. Minister of Public Works say whether that did complete the work, and if this is new dredging that he proposes to do ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be very much surprised to see that the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works said that $35,000 would complete the work at Port Arthur. I do not think that he said that. He may have said that it would complete that season's dredging or some special piece of work that he had under consideration at the time.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not remember very well what I said last year. Of course, it depends. There is plenty to be done there.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You made liberal promises.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. As usual.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is right.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think this country should not hesitate for one minute to equip Port Arthur and Fort William and all the other important ports on the lakes. We have lost a great deal of time. These ports should be equipped as well as money can do it, and they should be equipped now and not wait till we are all dead and buried and in heaven.

Mr. BLAIN. This is the statement that was made :

We expect to spend $35,000 this year to complete the dredging necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No doubt the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works referred to the work that was pressing at that time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Vessels this fall drawing only eight feet of water grounded in Port Arthur and there was considerable trouble as a result. This increases the rates of insurance on these vessels, and I am satisfied that no one would object to every dollar being expended that is absolutely necessary to place this harbour in a proper condition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is quite correct that vessels have grounded in this port, because I was at Port Arthur in the latter part of October, and I saw a vessel which had been aground for two or three days. Dredging work is undoubtedly necessary at that place and I entirely agree that such dredging should be done as to make it a safe port to enter. It is increasing in importance in proportion as the grain trade of the Northwest is increasing. That is true of Port Arthur as well as Fort William. I think the money could not be put to better use than to spend it in making Fort William and Port Arthur safe harbours for large boats to enter.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When I went to Port Arthur in August, I found that orders had been given for dredging to eighteen feet

deep, and I immediately instructed the officers to dredge to twenty-one feet. Is there only one dredge at work there now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are three dredges at work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Belonging to the same company ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. Two belong to the company and one to Mr. Booth.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The three are at Port Arthur, and they are at the same price of fifteen cents a yard ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. What part of this $35,000 voted last year was expended for dredging, and what part on the breakwater ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was all expended for dredging.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The United States government and the various parties interested, have spent millions of dollars in making splendid harbours at Duluth and West Superior. At a little place called Two Harbours there has been upwards of $2,000,000 spent in giving shipping facilities. Canada has ports at Port Arthur and Fort William undoubtedly far superior to Duluth and West Superior, and I am satisfied that the Canadian government could make no wiser expenditure of a large sum of money than to equip Fort William and Port Arthur with harbours sufficient to meet the great demands that will be undoubtedly made on them in the near future. I believe that the minister could double and quadruple this amount and expend it on these harbours with profit to the whole country.

Mr. McCREARY. I cannot agree with the member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) when he says that Port Arthur and Fort William are better natural harbours than Duluth and West Superior. I am informed by those who know that these two latter harbours are the best on the American continent. I believe that we should not discuss this question here and now, but that we should wait until the transportation commission brings down their report, and one of the most important things this commission will have to consider will be to provide facilities for the shipping of grain from the head of Lake Superior. Sixty-five vessels stayed at Duluth this winter, and they were able to move grain out this spring at the rate of two cents a bushel. I learn from the grain shippers that Port Arthur is very badly equipped ; the breakwater does not go out far enough, and dredging requires to be done. At Fort William the river is too narrow, and I am told by men who know, that it will require an expenditure of half a million dollars, and not $95,000, to put these harbours in anything like as good shape as the harbour at Duluth and West Superior. We cannot expect that the minister will provide this large sum in the estimates now.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Why not ?

Mr. McCREARY. Because he is not acquainted with all the facts, and because it will be the duty of the transportation commission to inquire from all parties interested as to what are the actual needs at that point. There is no doubt that with the encouragement given to Canadian owners of lake vessels by the removal of the harbour dues and one thing and another, there will be a Canadian fleet put on these lakes able to handle all our grain. If that be so it will be the duty of the government to spend there half a million, or a million if necessary, for widening the Kaministiquia river and the two small rivers that flow into that point, and deepening the harbour at Port Arthur and extending the breakwater. When the question about the transportation commission is brought up, I intend to give the figures of the expenditures for the past twenty years on West Superior and Duluth ; these figures having been supplied me by a gentleman who is well acquainted with the subject. I urge on the Minister of Public Works the importance of doing something to increase the facilities at these harbours.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is what Col. Hughes did and you contradicted him.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I did not use the term 'natural harbour' in connection with Port Arthur and Fort William, nor can the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) use the term 'natural harbour' in connection with Duluth, because it is a created harbour. Not very many years ago what is now the great harbour of Duluth was simply a bog and it had to be dredged out. I have not the slightest doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) inclines towards favouring the harbour of Duluth. It is not so many years since the Liberal party in Manitoba endeavoured to tie up this country to a scheme to run a railway to Duluth, but owing to the policy of the Conservative party that road was diverted to Port Arthur and in consequence Port Arthur is a growing Canadian town and a credit to the Dominion of Canada. I do not know whether my friends from Manitoba of the Liberal cult have gotten over their discomfiture at the success of the scheme which was promoted by the Conservative party of making this an all-Canadian route. When my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was in the government, I was pleased to find him following the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party in developing our Canadian lake ports of Port Arthur and Fort William. I trust that my good friend (Mr. McCreary) will fall in line now. If one-half the money is spent on our own Canadian ports that has been spent on Duluth and West Superior,

we need not fear the rivalry of the American ports.

Mr. McCREARY. It ill becomes the member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) to accuse me of disloyalty when a moment ago I asked the government to spend half a million dollars and not $95,000. What I pointed out to the House was that unless we made Port Arthur and Fort William somewhat equal to Duluth and West Superior we might possibly lose the trade that should come through Canadian ports. The estimate quoted to me shortly before I left Winnipeg was that it would take $1,000,000 to put Port Arthur and Fort William in as good shape as Duluth and West Superior. With regard to loyalty, I do not think the hon. gentleman should say anything to me. Had I done what some of his friends did about twenty years ago, I would have stopped in Dakota or Minnesota instead of going on and settling as a pioneer in Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Let us try not to make party politics of these broad questions, but discuss them from a broad standpoint. Duluth and West Superior are very fine harbours; they are practically one harbour. Both have cost a very large amount of money. The harbour of Duluth has natural advantages, which have been improved. I think the dredging alone inside of that harbour has cost in the neighbourhood of $2,000,000. There is a splendid breakwater to protect the harbour, and there are practically two harbours, an outside one and an inside one. We can make at Fort William and Port Arthur a very fine harbour. Port Arthur is a good harbour, though it has this disadvantage, that it closes about fifteen days earlier than Fort William. There is an island at the right hand of the port on which the ice jams, so that the entrance to Port Arthur is closed practically two weeks earlier in the fall than the entrance to Fort William. The first improvement that should in my humble opinion be carried on there is the dredging of Mission river, which would give an additional entrance to Fort William, and prevent the ice forming there so early in the fall and ensure it moving out earlier in the spring. This I think would give three weeks more navigation, and it would not cost a large amount of money. After I took a trip up there I instructed Mr. Coste, a very experienced engineer, to have a plan ensemble—a general plan—made of those harbours. I do not know whether that instruction has been carried out; if not, I think my hon. friend should lose no time in having such a plan prepared. I am sure that the House would be very ready to vote any sum necessary to make of these two harbours a really national harbour. My hon. friend is perfectly right when he says that Duluth offers advantages which these harbours do not offer. Duluth has one of the best elevators in the world. We are having a large elevator capacity built at Port Arthur and Fort William by the two railway companies; but it seems to me that it is the duty of this government and of parliament to help private companies to do what the United States government does, that is, to equip the harbours. That should be done without any delay. If we expect to get the trade to which we are entitled, we must spend the money necessary to achieve that end.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. minister able to state the amount spent on Port Arthur harbour since confederation?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total expenditure is $550,332.42.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the amount is comparatively small when you consider the importance of the harbour. It is the only outlet for the great wheat fields of the west, where the two railways come together, and it should be made as fine a harbour as there is on the lakes. I think the government would be justified in doubling the expenditure on that harbour during the next year so long as they used the money wisely. If the government does less than make adequate provision for the shipping there, they will be criticised.

Mr. MONK. Is there any general plan of the improvements prepared?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have several plans and several reports. I said before, and I say again, that this vote is for carrying on urgent work which is under way at the present time. The whole matter is now receiving the attention of the department. I fully recognize its importance, and should be pleased to have the support of both sides of the House in doing what may be necessary under the circumstances. I shall be pleased to bring down a report on the subject.

Mr. MONK. Is the minister able to say what further expenditure would be entailed under the proposed plan for improvement?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Discussing in a general way a few days ago of the improvement of the Mission river, which the ex-minister has referred to, I obtained a rough estimate that it would cost about $200,000. I do not say that would make the harbour equal to very large ports, on which millions have been spent; but that is my recollection of the discussion we had a few days ago, when some representatives from Port Arthur and Fort William were here.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Kaministiquia river is wide enough to make one of the finest harbours in the world when the work is completed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think it would be desirable for the government to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as soon as possible, that is, to have a general plan made of the harbour at Port Arthur and

the Kaministiquia river. That harbour impresses one with the possibilities of the future. I understood from those who were on the spot that the river alone could be utilized for about twelve miles and that the banks would afford available sites for elevators and docks for the shipping of grain. The river is very peculiar in being more like a natural canal than anything else. It is deep and of great width and with firm banks on both sides, capable of affording strong foundations for elevators. There would hardly seem to be any place which could afford better facilities than that harbour and especially the river I have alluded to. I do not think that this House would begrudge any money for the dredging of the river and harbour in the best possible way. But we should not spend any money in a fragmentary manner. We should have a general plan of improving the harbour and river after obtaining the best possible advice, and if necessary expert assistance from outside, so that there may be no obstacle to our securing the traffic which is developing so rapidly in the Northwest.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I might point out that in the near future Port Arthur and Fort William will be iron ore shipping centres, the same as Duluth and West Superior. I would like to endorse the opinion of my leader and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in support of some general plan being carried out. In addition the Kaministiquia river has a delta of three mouths which could be utilized very readily in case of necessity. Then the stream far above this is navigable several miles for vessels drawing fifteen to eighteen feet of water, and with a little dredging the river could be made of great importance. It requires a turning basin.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is a good turning basin there now.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is far above that. The Mission river is one of the mouths of the Kaministiquia. Far above that are the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators, and vessels have to back down from the elevators, which is a drawback. I might point out that the old Chicago river was not as large as the MacIntyre and Neebing. The old Chicago creek, which developed the largest inland city on the American continent was not as large as any of the mouths of the Kaministiquia, Neebing or MacIntyre rivers.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard a suggestion made which might be valuable, and that is for the construction of an iceboat to break up the ice. That would make navigation two or three weeks earlier. The gentleman who made that suggestion told me that in the straits of Makinaw they have boats which break up the ice without trouble.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have had my attention drawn to the necessity of having an iceboat there, but our first duty would be to improve the harbour. This matter is receiving serious consideration, and I am glad to know that if we can bring down a plan which will meet the approval of the House, the House will not hesitate voting the money.

Mr. SPROULE. An ice breaking boat would not conflict with any improvements going on in the harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No doubt, but at the same time it is questionable whether an iceboat would be necessary. There seems to be a great deal of difference of opinion on that point. But the suggestion is worthy of consideration.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If the Mission river is dredged, it will not be necessary to use any iceboats, because the dredging will permit the vessels to avoid the ice which forms on the island and blocks the entrance of Port Arthur.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that is another phase of the question.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The boats then would simply go by the new channel.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That seemed to be the universal opinion of those to whom I spoke. The Mission river cannot be used for large vessels, and the idea was that if it were deepened so as to admit large boats, that would lengthen the season by two or three weeks.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have been listening to the remarks regarding the advisability of a large amount being expended on the enlarging and deepening of Port Arthur and Fort William, but what guarantee have we that we could thus prevent the diversion of the trade down to Buffalo and other American ports? Can the hon. minister give us an idea what quantity of grain goes to American ports and what portion to Canadian ports? I am afraid that they are expending a large amount of money for the advantage of American ports instead of our own, and neglecting perhaps the channels through Canadian territory, through which grain could be carried to our own seaports.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that there is any doubt that with proper exertions we will be able to maintain a Canadian route for the grain from the west. I have not these statistics at hand just now, but I am in sympathy with the view that by means of proper harbour improvements and storage facilities we will be able to return a large portion of the trade for our Canadian routes.

Mr. CLARKE. I see that we have spent last year some $20,000 at Port Arthur on the extension of the breakwater and dredges, and some $11,000 were paid the Duluth Dock

and Dredge Company for dredging at the rate of fifteen and a half cents per cubic yard. Was this done by tender or otherwise ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I doubt whether it was done by tender, as the difficulty is to get dredges. The price paid is the regular price.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Does the hon. minister not think that we are making a great mistake in spending large amounts at Port Arthur and Fort William and neglecting the ports in the east ? We should spend money first in improving channels from the sea to these ports instead of commencing at the back and coming forward, only to find that the channels to the sea are not of a sufficient depth to enable us to send the exports that come from Port Arthur and Fort William out through a Canadian seaport.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The dredging in this case seems to cost fifteen cents per cubic yard. Of course, I know nothing about what that cost should be. But it has been represented in the discussion in the committee that in the St. Lawrence the price can be reduced to two cents and even less than that with first-class dredges. If I am right in my understanding of what has been said on that point, it would seem important, if these operations have to be carried on upon an extensive scale at Port Arthur and Fort William, that the government should take into consideration this very high rate that we are paying and should endeavour to approximate the work as closely as may be to the conditions that prevail in the St. Lawrence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer of the department informs me that a dredge such as the 'J. Israel Tarte,' which is a suction dredge, could not handle the material there. The price depends a great deal on the conditions, the class of material and the kind of dredge that is doing the work. I think the rates that we have been paying are lower than those paid on the other side of the line. The dredges are threatening to take contracts from the Americans, where, they say, they receive higher rates. Some material we cannot get removed for less than twenty cents at least. The question of building or buying dredges is well worthy of consideration, and it is a matter to which the department is giving a great deal of attention, making comparisons between the work done by the dredges of the department and those working under contract.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There are no dredges available on the Canadian side of the lakes. I know them all. They are good dredges, but not modern ; they are spoon dredges. But there is no doubt that, with an elevator dredge, the Kaministiquia and the Mission river and Port Arthur could be dredged at a rate of two or three cents a yard. In former days, there was a government dredge, No. 6 I think it was, which carried on dredging at two cents a yard at Fort William, and I make bold to say that if one of our dredges on the St. Lawrence could be sent up there—of course, it cannot be done—the dredging could be done there for less than two cents a yard. There is no possible doubt about that. I know that the department require spoon dredges to dredge near the wharfs, but the modern elevator dredges can work elsewhere. The department, in my humble opinion, could equip itself with one or two of these spoon dredges also. But in such dredging as that in the Kaministiquia or the Mission river, one elevator dredge could do more work than three or four of these dredges for which we pay fifteen cents a yard. That is the whole story in two words. But they are not available, so the minister cannot help himself.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the dredging in the Kaministiquia. I understood it was only soft material brought down the river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a good deal of soft stuff in the Kaministiquia, but there is hard material below it. If we had a large suction dredge, I understand it could do the work in the Mission river.

Mr. MONK. How much would an elevator dredge cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In round figures—$100,000 or $125,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It depends on the size.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The trouble is to get dredges. Some of the dredges that were under commission last year at the present rate told us that they could get better rates on the other side of the line, and we are in a position where we must make the best possible bargain. We have arranged at present to continue under the old arrangement.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does not all this prove that what we require is a broad, comprehensive plan and also a modern equipment ? There is only one way to do this thing, and that is to do it. The country will be quite willing to bear the expense. It is far better to have improved dredges and get the work done, than to fritter away the money of the people on a small and imperfect plan. Why should not the government take the responsibility of coming down with a plan for the improvement of these harbours, and, if necessary, provide the government dredges to carry out the work ? The result of this would be that we should actually get harbours improved and the work would be done at the lowest cost.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) must not lose sight of the fact that the work on the St. Lawrence

ship channel will soon be completed. On a visit I paid to the lakes and harbours last year, I instructed Mr. Coste to prepare a general plan for the improvement of the harbours, and the rivers as well, from a Canadian standpoint. My intention was to come before the House with a report showing what, in my humble opinion and in the opinion of the officers of the department were the most pressing works to be carried out. The completion of the works on the St. Lawrence will set free a powerful fleet of dredges, and these dredges can work on the lakes. So, perhaps, we should not hurry too much in building new dredges. But, for the time being, it seems to me that the thing to be done is to prepare a careful plan not only covering Port Arthur and Fort William, but covering the whole system because it will be of no use if we carry out improvements at the head of the lake only. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) said that a great deal of our trade is diverted to American ports. The reason is obvious—these American ports are splendidly equipped. Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago, West Superior, Buffalo are all magnificently equipped, while we have on the great lakes not one single harbour which can be called properly equipped. We have only the beginning of an equipment on any harbour on the lakes. We must equip the port of Montreal and all the harbours if we expect trade to be carried through them. It is all very well to say: Let us have improvements in the west; let us have more railways. I altogether share the views of my hon. friend from Lunenburg. Unless we equip our harbours on the lakes, the Canadian trade will not go through Canadian channels. Nobody who knows anything about the carriage of trade can fail to understand that the time will never come when an all-rail route will supersede the waterway. That is out of the question. So I cannot too strongly urge upon the Minister of Public Works to give his personal and immediate attention to the important question of equipping our waterways and our harbours on the lakes and on the St. Lawrence. That is a national question.

Mr. CLARE. When does the Minister of Public Works expect this dredge to be completed? When the vote was asked for, it was supposed $300,000 would complete this dredge, but the Minister of Public Works tells us to-day that it is going to cost $500,000, and at the same time he tells us that from the last of December to the 1st of June there has been expended $20,000 on it. At that rate it will take twenty-five years to finish this dredge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is mistaken. But I would say to him that we have fully discussed this question, and he can look up the report and see what was said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would ask members of the committee not to diverge from the general question of transportation.

Mr. MONK. What was the amount paid per cubic yard last year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fifteen and fifteen and a half cents.

Mr. MONK. At that rate the contractors must have made a fair profit. I suppose it is understood that we are not going to pay any more than fifteen or fifteen and a half cents a yard this year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not if we can make a contract at that price.

Mr. SPROULE. I was up the St. Mary's river last year and inquired what was being paid for dredging, and my information was that it cost thirteen cents.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That may be quite correct. A dredge may make more money at thirteen cents in some localities than at forty cents in others.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Who is the engineer on these works, and who are the inspectors?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Temple is the engineer. I cannot give the names of the inspectors.

St. Andrews Rapids improvements, Red river, $100,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to carry on works under contract at St. Andrews rapids. I find on investigation that the progress is rather slow. On the contract itself something like $28,000 or $30,000 only has been spent.

Mr. PUTTEE. Has not the life of that contract nearly expired? Practically the work has not started yet. This is practically all a revote of the item of last year. I hope the minister will tell us what course he is going to follow to secure the early completion of that work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount of the contract is $469,000. The cost of the land, engineering and that sort of thing, is put down at $47,000. The time for the completion of the contract will expire during this summer. There has probably been good reason for the delay.

Mr. PUTTEE. What are the reasons?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations were made asking for a change in the contract. I think my hon. friend will remember that the first year there was high water, floods had something to do with the delay. I have been looking over the matter, but have not come to a decision yet to recommend a change in the contract. I think they first started work in 1901-2.

Mr. MONK. What were the changes they asked for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I remember right, they asked to have concrete work changed to stonework. Representations were made that solid concrete work would not stand so well as stone work in that climate subject to extremes of heat and frost. I have asked for a report from the engineers on this subject.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The true reason why that work has not proceeded more rapidly is because the contractor took it at too low a price. I do not know what may have induced him to take that contract at the price he named. His tender was a regular one, he made a deposit and I signed the contract. He had been a contractor on the Canadian Pacific Railway on a large scale, and he made a deposit in the neighbourhood of $50,000, so I had nothing else to do than to sign the contract. But all the same, the price was too low, and it was not long before he asked to change the concrete to stone work. When my hon. friend has been Minister of Public Works for a longer time, he will find that whenever a contractor takes a contract at too low a price, it will not be long before he will ask for changes. The Messrs. Kelly, very able contractors, asked for changes. They stated that in their opinion it was better to have stone than concrete. Of course anybody who knows anything about works of that kind is aware that concrete is better than stone in that climate. I declined to make the change. I said to Mr. Kelly, I will do everything I can to help you out, I will not be unduly hard with you, but I cannot consent to that change. The hon. Minister of Public Works has just said that perhaps the demand for these changes has been a cause of delay, but I gave him a very clear answer, on the report of the officers of the department, of course, and other engineers with whom I consulted, that the changes could not possible be made, that I could not take upon myself to recommend to my colleagues that these changes should be made which would have increased the cost by a quarter of a million dollars. I could not possibly have entertained that suggestion for one minute. I said: If you want to give up your contract, I will ask my colleagues to give you back your deposit, although, in the ordinary course of business, we should confiscate it. That contractor cannot possibly carry out this work without a great loss of money.

Mr. KEMP. Has he done any work?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. He has done very little work indeed. If parliament will insist upon a contractor losing money it has a right to do so. We have a right to exact from him that he will carry out his contract. We should say to him: You must either carry out your work or give it up. He did not carry out the work and he did not give it up. He waited but I declined to make the changes. I told him that I could not possibly recommend these changes. But, if I had a good word to say on behalf of the contractors, I would not hesitate in stating that they have very foolishly taken up that contract. Their price is too low by far, it is too low by at least $75,000 and perhaps more. It is a great pity indeed because I suppose these men acted in perfect good faith. These are facts, and if I were allowed, I would recommend these contractors to the mercy of the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Mr. SPROULE. Have any changes been made or allowed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No changes have been made by the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works or allowed by me. There have been some representations made by the city and by others as to having water power there. In view of the statement made by the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, I have been making some inquiries of the chief engineer, and he says that this contract is very much below his estimate.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Am I mistaken in saying that it is $75,000 below the estimate?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $100,000. That is one of the misfortunes in connection with public works of this kind. I do not advocate it, but if you were to give the minister latitude to say that he would not accept the lowest tender you might avoid a great deal of difficulty, because, when you let a contract under those circumstances in the face of the report of the officials of the department that the work cannot be done for the amount stipulated it only leads to difficulty. In view of the suggestion made by the hon. ex-minister I will take the matter up and be prepared to make a report in regard to it and to ascertain if the contractors are able to go on with the work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. These contractors cannot carry out the work for the price. They must have spent $20,000 but they have practically done no work.

Mr. MONK. If the contractors stand to lose $75,000, I for my part, would be in favour of relieving them. I do not think we should insist upon the carrying out of works where it is clearly evident that the contractors are going to lose such a large amount as that. I do not think we should countenance any change from the original specifications. Works of this kind are much better done in concrete than stone and one can very easily understand why the contractors are in favour of making the substitution. I am not in favour of that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works will never consent to this change.

Mr. McCREARY. I would like to say a few words in reference to this matter. If hon. gentlemen will look up the first pub-

lished report of the Winnipeg board of trade printed in 1879, they will ascertain from that report that a delegation was sent down to the government in 1879 asking for the improvement of St. Andrew's rapids. That delegation was promised that the work would be commenced within one year and this was about twenty-four years ago. The matter was urged upon the department each year until 1884, when Sir Hector Langevin visited Winnipeg, and although I am not supposed to be a very strong Conservative, I attended a banquet given to that hon. gentleman in Winnipeg that year because we united on both sides of politics to entertain that hon. gentleman in the hope that he would let a contract for this work. Notwithstanding that we gave him one of the best banquets that ever had been given in the city of Winnipeg, that we fed him well, that we dined him and wined him and sent him away rejoicing, not one step was taken in the direction of proceeding with this work. Matters remained in that form until this government came into power and we hoped that this government would do something. I submit that they have done something. They have made a beginning, but they have made little more than a beginning. As the hon. Minister of Public Works has said, the great mistake that was made was in letting this work by contract at all. I believe this work should have been done by day's labour. It is a work that one man can grasp and he could easily have looked after the whole thing. It is not like a railway which extends several miles away but it is a work that could be kept under the individual supervision of one man. However, a contract was let to the lowest tenderer and it has been pointed out, that the tender was $100,000 below what the work was worth. If it was $100,000 below what the work was worth at that time with the advance in the cost of material and labour which has taken place since, the work is worth $100,000 more now than it was then, and therefore, the tender is $200,000 lower than the work is worth to complete. Unfortunately, while these contractors were most energetic contractors, while they had been contractors in the city of Winnipeg for twenty years and had built the greater portion of the sewer system of that city, they seemed to have hard luck in the year they undertook this work. The first thing they did after getting the contract was to build a spur line from the Selkirk branch of the main line down to the works and the water became so high that the track was submerged. For twenty-one years I have been passing up and down that railway and never until that year had I seen the railway line submerged at four different places. Last year it was almost the same. The work has been hampered in every shape and form. They have done about $30,000 worth of work, they have machinery on the ground and 6,000 yards of sand and they will be out about $30,000 or $40,000. The matter is in a very unsatisfactory condition, but there is no use of crying over spilt milk. The best way for the hon. minister to do in my opinion is to try and grapple with the subject. If it is possible to get the contractors to give up the work then I would have them do so. On the first of July the three years term is up, but as the plans were not prepared until the 1st of October, the contractors claim that extra time, as they say they were not able to go on with the work. During the last six months the citizens of Winnipeg have been clamouring for water power. They find that cheaper power will have to be supplied to the city of Winnipeg and they have submitted a basis upon which tenders will be received for the supply of that power. The nearest source of power on the Winnipeg river is about sixty miles from the city, but it is believed that between 3,000 and 5,000 horse power might be developed at these rapids. The municipalities of St. Paul, St. Andrews, Kildonan and St. Clements, believe that if they could get a bridge across the river at some point there it would be greatly to their advantage and they are willing to contribute a share of the cost. The local government would also contribute. As I understand it, all that would be necessary for the municipalities to do would be to build abutments from the end of the dam to the shore on both sides. I am also informed that some of the railways would like to cross the river at about this point, and probably the bridge erected there might be made suitable for vehicular and passenger traffic as well as for steam railways and electric railways. I have been informed by a gentleman recently, that the electric railway company which is running a line to Winnipeg Beach, would be willing to share in the cost of the bridge if they were allowed to cross the river at this point. In view of all these facts, I think the minister should ask his engineers to report on what changes would be necessary to carry out the conditions which I have enumerated. I believe that the feeling of the people of Winnipeg is along this line. If 3,000 or 4,000 horse power can be developed there it would be a great benefit to the city. I would ask the minister to give this matter serious consideration within the next two or three weeks, and probably when the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) returns, the matter can be discussed at greater length.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Last year my hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) estimated that the contractors would do $250,000 worth of work this year.

Mr. McCREARY. I hoped so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If they have only done $30,000 worth of work in the last three years, their attempt to perform the contract does not amount to very much. Is there any difficulty about dealing with this matter? Does not this contract con-

tain the usual provision that if the contractors do not make satisfactory progress the work can be taken over by the government. I would be the last one to suggest that any harsh measures should be taken with contractors who made a mistake in the amount of their estimate, but at the same time I do not see any sense in waiting for these gentlemen to find that at the end of three years they have only accomplished $30,000 worth of work. At that rate it would take, I suppose, fifteen years to finish the contract. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) speaks of floods delaying the work, but I would hardly think that the floods have been so continuous for three years that only $30,000 worth of work could be done. When did the contractors come to the conclusion that this was a losing work and have they made any representations to the department? I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) when he says that the government should deal with this work efficiently and expeditiously. I do not know whether the scheme which he mentions is a scheme which the government should embark in, but certainly something should be done one way or the other. I agree with those gentlemen who say that the government ought to treat the contractors fairly, and perhaps release them from their contract on equitable terms if they are not in a position to carry it on. I agree also as to the inadvisability of making any such change in material as has been suggested, because there is no information before the House from the minister or from his officers which would justify it. In any event it would involve the necessity of a new contract being let, so that everybody in the Dominion who wished to do so would be at liberty to tender for this work. Perhaps the minister would inform us whether this contract contains the usual clause, and whether the contractors have made any excuse for allowing three years to elapse without doing any more than what may be fairly considered as trifling.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is only fair to the contractors to say that the contract was entered into in July, 1900, the price being $469,000. If, as the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says, the price was too low, then it must be still lower now considering the increased cost of wages and material in the meantime. The plans were not placed in the hands of the contractors until the fall of 1900, so that they have not been three years at the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I admit that; it is three years next October.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations were then made asking for a change, but these representations were refused and that caused further delay. It was my intention to ask the chief engineer to go there and make a personal report, but with the various works going on and his attendance here in parliament, it has been found impossible for him to get away. It is also true that the secretary of the Canadian Pacific Railway has made an official proposition to the department, that if a change could be made in the work they would contribute to the cost. It may be of not only local but national interest that such a change should be made. I think the best thing for me to do is to ask the chief engineer to go there and make a full report on all these matters. We have also received a petition from the board of trade or the city council of Winnipeg, I forget which, with regard to the development of water power at these rapids. I do not believe myself, that this would increase the cost, but if it did we would have to consider whether such an income could be derived as would compensate us for that increased cost. At any rate, in view of the representations made to us by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, it would be well worth while to see how much of the cost they would be willing to contribute if the proposed change were made. I understand from the officers of the department that the representations as to changing from concrete to stone were made by a petition from the citizens of that district. There is a difference of opinion among the engineers, both of the Public Works Department and the Department of Railways and Canals, in regard to the matter. My own opinion is that good concrete properly put up is under most conditions better than stone; in other cases stone is better. To overcome the effect of great changes of temperature, I think the concrete should be made in blocks so as to allow for contraction and expansion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I observe that some criticism was offered last year in regard to the quality of the stone. I know nothing about that; but I think the minister has this matter entirely in his own hands. The contract in question must contain the provision which is in all government contracts, giving the government power to take over the work if it is not proceeded with, in the opinion of the engineer, with sufficient expedition to ensure its completion within the time fixed by the contract. We know that it has not been proceeded with with any such expedition; it has not been proceeded with at all, except so far as $30,000 may be compared with $469,000. This power which the government has is not, of course, to be exercised harshly or tyrannically; but it is to be exercised in such a way as to protect the public interest by enabling the work to be done within the time fixed by the contract. The department may take the work out of the hands of the contractors, and if they do, they should deal with the contractors fairly under the circumstances.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I may say, in answer to the hon. leader of the opposition, that the

reason I did not exercise the right which the government undoubtedly have to take the contract from the Messrs. Kelly Brothers, was that every time we wrote to them and warned them that they were not carrying out the work, they invariably answered that they would go on with it. They were men of reputation, who had carried out very large works elsewhere, and it was pretty difficult for the department to say to such men : We have no confidence in you. The last time I told them very firmly that I could not grant the changes which they asked for, and I added that if they would not go on with the work I would cancel the contract immediately. Then Mr. Kelly told me that even if he lost $100,000, he would carry out the work. His words to me were : 'I have never failed to carry out a contract yet, and I will carry out this one.' The hon. minister says that since I left office the department has received an intimation from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that they will contribute towards the work if certain changes are made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have a proposition in writing.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I understand that if that proposition is accepted by the government, new tenders will be asked, because it will be a new work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. As to changing from concrete to stone, I do not know whether I correctly understood the hon. minister to say that there was a difference of opinion on the subject in the Department of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said among the engineers. The hon. gentleman must know from his experience that engineers differ in opinion as between stone and concrete ; but I said that in my own experience good concrete, if properly put in, was better under certain conditions than stone.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not think that any engineer will say that stone is better than concrete ; it cannot be maintained. I know the way in which petitions are got up. The truth is, the contractor is in a hole, and if my hon. friend can arrange with him by paying him what he has spent, say $25,000 or $30,000, and ask for new tenders on the new proposition which he has before him, I suppose it would be the best thing that could be done. That work is of great importance. If the department obliges the contractor to go on, it will take him years to do the work, and he will be losing money all the time. Therefore, I think it will be better to arrange with him. The minister has in the department engineers in whom I have full confidence, and when he has a report signed by his engineers I have no fear.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that this item is in a very unsatisfactory position. When we approached it this evening, I understood the minister to say that it was intended to go on with this work. But unless we act very harshly with these contractors, we are not going to force them to execute their contract. I think it is evident that we are not going to hold the contractors to the execution of their contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that it was not my intention to make them carry out the contract.

Mr. MONK. When the item was first broached, the minister said that it was in order to carry out these works, that there was a contract, but that not much progress had been made, because difficulties had arisen. But I do not think there is any doubt that we are not going to force these contractors to carry out the work as undertaken. The remarks of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), have led me to believe, since the government had the proposition of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company before them, and it would be possible to construct these works in such a way as to make them of assistance in developing power for the city of Winnipeg, that it would be desirable to construct them that way. For my part, if that were done, and if the arrangement proposed by these parties were put into shape, I would have much more pleasure in supporting this item. We are now voting more or less in the dark, because it is evident that these men are not going to be held to their contract, unless they are allowed to substitute inferior material, and the whole affair is in a state of uncertainty.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman has just stated that he will not allow any change any more than I did. His information is that the contractors are not going on with the work and he will try to arrange with them by paying them just what is due, and then ask for new tenders, owing to the proposition which was submitted to him by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I had no intention of doing anything else than go on with the contract as it is, but in view of the statements made here and the proposition submitted by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the department, hon. gentlemen will admit that it is quite proper to ask the engineers of the department to make a report.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would once more suggest that the hon. minister should try to arrange with the contractor as soon as possible so that before the session is over, a vote may be put in the estimates and new tenders asked for, and the work done as soon as possible.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer cannot go himself, but

we have gentlemen in the department who might take up all the propositions and make a report in a week or two.. Then I could ask the contractor either to go on with the work or, if any change is proposed, to come to some reasonable arrangement.

Mr. MONK. I did not suggest that the contractors should be paid, but that they should be relieved from this prospective loss of a very large amount.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is what I understood.

Mr. MONK. Have the contractors themselves made any proposition to be relieved from the performance of their contract without, of course, receiving any additional indemnity ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have received no proposition. The last action of the department was notifying them of their delay and urging them to go on with their contract.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If the contractors do not go on with their contract, as it is, new tenders will be asked ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. PUTTEE. We are in the same position to-night as we were in last year when this item was up, and I am afraid that we will be in the same position next year. It looks as if the contractors had never made an honest attempt to complete the work. Why there should be a mistake, I cannot understand, because tenders were called for twice, and when they found they could not do the work, without even making a fair start at it, there must have been something more than a mistake. As regards the changing from concrete to stone, the hon. minister says that petitions came from Winnipeg for that change, but these were based on the fact that there is native stone available, and the petitioners asked the department to decide whether a change could be made without detriment to the work. What the city of Winnipeg wants is not that the specification should be changed, but that the work should be proceeded with. They do not want to injure the contractor, but the work should not be held back when he is altogether in fault.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only promise I can make is that one I have made. I will take the best talent I have in the department and have a report made before the session closes.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that there is an offer from the Canadian Pacific Railway and the city as well, and I would suggest that this power should not be allowed to fall into the hands of a private individual or even the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The proposition of the Canadian Pacific Railway is not to get the power, but propose that if certain changes are made, they will contribute to the cost.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In answer to the hon. member for Winnipeg, I may say that I never hinted that a mistake was made. I only said that the Kelly's had tendered too low. They never said that they had made a mistake in their specifications or in any part of their tender.

Mr. LENNOX. It appears to me that it would be better to settle with the contractors in default before undertaking the larger scheme. If you send out an engineer and have it understood that you are abandoning the original scheme, then you will find that the government, instead of the contractor, will be in the position of having made default. The contractor will then say : I have expended $30,000, and I have a large quantity of plant and material on the ground, and if the government is going to take this matter out of my hands, I will be entitled to compensation. The minister should at once notify these men to proceed with their contract and put them in default before entertaining any of these larger propositions suggested by the hon. member for Selkirk and others. Otherwise they will find that, great as is the difficulty, we are in at present, still greater difficulties will surround us.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. minister will find when he visits Winnipeg that the question of improving the Red river to overcome the obstruction at St. Andrew's Rapids is a very live question. The object is to allow boats to go up into Lake Winnipeg and the tributaries of the lake and other water courses, and in that way improve transportation and allow supplies to come down at reasonable freight rates.

An hon. MEMBER. And fuel.

Mr. KEMP. Yes. The people of Winnipeg feel it is a serious matter that the work has not been gone on with. They have even gone so far as to say that the railways were, to some extent, responsible for the delay in carying out this work. I am not responsible for that statement, but I have heard it made. These contractors, it has been said, will neither give up their contract nor go on with the work. Is not the contract with the government the same as a contract with a private individual or an ordinary corporation ? Surely the government has the means of forcing them to do one thing or the other. It has been said that materials have advanced very much since the contract has been made and the contracts could not be made now at as low a price as at the time the contract was entered into. Have the government agreed to let the contractors off ? I do not see why the government should act as

philanthrophists in dealing with these contractors who are now in default. At any rate, I hope the minister will see that this matter is settled at an early day, and that in some way the works are gone on with. Even if this work is not heard so much of here, the hon. minister will find when he visits Winnipeg that this question is one of the liveliest questions in the west, and the work one of the most important in the country. I hope that next session, whoever has the honour of occupying the position of Minister of Public Works, will be able to tell us that the thing has been cleaned up and that the work is proceeding as fast as possible.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall make every effort to gain that end.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any sureties ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only surety is the deposit of $50,000. That is the usual way of letting these contracts.

Transportation facilities—Montreal harbour (lower division) — improvements below St. Mary's current, $243,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the work under contract.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When does the hon. minister expect that the contractor will be through his work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are taking a vote for the full amount necessary to complete the work. It is expected that the work will be completed before the end of the next fiscal year.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The contractor is a little behind time, of course.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The work was to have been completed by July or August, if I remember aright.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. According to the contract, it was to be completed on the 25th December last.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And it will not be completed before the beginning of next season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the opinion of the chief engineer.

Mr. MONK. Was not some change made in regard to the material to be used ? Was not one kind of wood substituted for another with the consent of the department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. The chief engineer tells me that the only change made was that the contractor was allowed to use a certain amount of hemlock instead of spruce in the foundations —under water.

Mr. MONK. How many thousand feet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between two and three hundred thousand feet. The specifications, as I understand it, call for spruce, and hemlock is allowed to be used.

Mr. MONK. Was it not more than five hundred thousand feet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that it was between two and three hundred thousand feet.

Mr. MONK. Was there any change in the price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer and the department did not consider there was any difference in the value.

Mr. MONK. The question did not come up at all then ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was before my time. I take the information given by the chief engineer, who tells me that the report made to the minister was that the price was the same.

Mr. MONK. Is it true that hemlock was substituted for spruce for all the work under water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that it was not.

Mr. MONK. Is there any report in the department on that point ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think there is.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, there is.

Mr. MONK. There is a report ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that he does not remember any report, but I will make a memorandum of it, and if there are reports, they will be brought down.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am responsible for the change the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) refers to. The contractor came to the department and stated that it was impossible for him to obtain all the spruce that was necessary to carry on the work. I consulted the resident engineer and he made the report to me that hemlock was just as good as spruce. I consulted the chief engineer and he told me the same thing. I do not remember whether there is a written report from him, but I think there is. If my hon. friend will be good enough to look, he will find that there is one report at least. The change was made only for the interior of the foundation, what I may call the cross section. As hemlock was just as good as spruce and as we were anxious to get the work proceeded with as speedily as possible, I allowed the change. But there is certainly a report.

Mr. MONK. If the hon. minister will allow us to have the report, I shall be glad. I understand that in these works there are very heavy blocks of concrete over the hemlock foundation. Is that the case ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the minister, in connection with this item if anything has been decided with regard to the dry dock in the vicinity of where this pier is being built, or is that matter still in the same condition as it was a year or two ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No decision has been come to with regard to that matter.

Mr. KIDD. May I ask the minister what is the difference between the price of spruce timber and hemlock ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say from my personal knowledge, but I am told that at Montreal there is no difference in price.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have a subject matter I would like to bring up that is allied to this transportation question; I refer to the improvements in Summerside harbour that were started some three or four years ago.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid we cannot take up Summerside harbour.

Mr. LEFURGEY. But there is no other item in the estimates on which I could bring it up.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be an item, and my hon. friend will have an opportunity of discussing Summerside harbour when I will be in a better position to give him information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is perfectly in order for my hon. friend to discuss the absence of an item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was suggesting that I would be in a much better position to give him information when the supplementaries come down. I know what he refers to, it is one of these unfortunate contracts.

Mr. LEFURGEY. At an earlier period of the session the minister promised to bring down the correspondence in connection with this matter; I do not think it has been tabled yet. I would like to have that correspondence down before the item comes up in the supplementaries.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The correspondence I have promised is being prepared, and will be laid on the Table perhaps to-morrow.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Did I understand the minister to say that there will be an item in the supplementary estimates for Summerside breakwater ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is my intention.

Port Colborne—harbour improvements, $142,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This sum is to complete the work under contract at Port Colborne.

Mr. BENNETT. When the work is completed what will be its length and width ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be fifty feet wide and 5,700 feet long, including a head block 100 feet by 60 feet.

Mr. BENNETT. In the original contract, was the width of the structure to be twenty-five feet or fifty feet ? And if there was a change from twenty-five to fifty feet, was that the subject of extras, or was there a new contract for the additional work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The original specifications were for a width of twenty-five feet. It was found that the work would be too light, and it was made fifty feet. No new tenders were asked for. The price was arranged with the present contractor.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the cost of the additional twenty-five feet in width ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In round numbers, $100,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand, then, that when it was decided to widen it to an additional twenty-five feet, no tenders were asked for. Was that work performed by the original contractor, and how and upon what terms was the basis of payment arrived at ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. An agreement was entered into between the department and the original contractors.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the additional work crib or pile work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was crib work, simply widened to fifty feet. The chief engineer informs me that it was the same kind of work, only made double width. The original contract price was $395,000; after the widening was called for the price was $495,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the original work done for a lump sum, or was it done for so much per yard or so much per foot ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The tender was for a lump sum.

Mr. BENNETT. Upon what basis was the widening part of the work done ? Was it so much per yard or so much per foot ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that the extra amount of

cribwork was to be done pro rata the price of the original work.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems to me that was a very unfair computation so far as the interests of the public were concerned. As I understand it, the structure for twenty-five feet width had been completed, and after that work had been performed, the minister, without asking for tenders, gave an additional contract for widening the work twenty-five feet more, and the price for the addition was at the same rate as the original contract. As I understand it, this breakwater was to be 5,000 feet in length, running out into the lake. It must be patent that it would cost the contractor a great deal more to build 5,000 feet with a width of twenty-five feet than it would to build an additional twenty-five feet after the first original part of the work was completed. He had all the disadvantages in the first instance of placing his plant in the lake, of driving his piles and sinking his cribs; and in the second instance, he had every facility afforded by having prepared a dock upon which to work. I think the minister himself must give us a better explanation why no tenders were called for, and why the contractor was allowed to exact the same price for the additional twenty-five feet as for the first twenty-five feet.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Let me explain that, my hon. friend the minister is in no way responsible except as being one of my colleagues then. When I was in France, the first contract was signed. Before I left Canada plans had been prepared for a breakwater fifty feet wide. When I was away the plans were reduced to thirty feet wide. If I remember right, four or five hundred feet of that work was performed. When I came back Mr. Coste, represented to me, and the engineers of the department joined with him, that the work would be carried away like a straw if an additional width was not added. We had to make the work solid with stone and all sorts of material. The contractors were not responsible for the plans. They were carrying out the plans upon which they had been invited to tender, but these plans were not the original plans which I had sanctioned before I left here. The plans were reduced to a dangerous degree. My hon. friends, when they go there, will only have to look at the works to find that they have been distorted. They were very nearly being carried away. Parliament was not then sitting. It was not possible for us to ask for tenders because we were in expectation of the works being carried away. I immediately made an arrangement with the contractors as they were the only parties that could carry out the work quickly because they were on the spot with all their plant to do the work that was necessary. Any business man would do what I was obliged to do. It was a case of necessity as there is no doubt that the works would have been carried away. In point of fact the works as they are now will scarcely be able to resist the pressure of the waves. We have been obliged to pay a little more to the contractors than the price of their first contract, but it was a case of necessity. The trouble is that the plans were reduced with the view of economy when they should not have been reduced.

Mr. BENNETT. If I understand the hon. minister correctly a total length of 5,000 feet by a total width of 50 feet is now completed, and if not, will this $142,000 ensure the completion of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This $142,000 is intended to complete the work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has the hon. minister's attention been called to the necessity of having another breakwater on the other side of the canal entrance constructed ? The present breakwater and the works of the Department of Railways and Canals will be of no use—I make that statement here and I know I am right—unless there is another breakwater on the other side. The entrance will not be protected and ships will not be able to find anchor there. In point of fact the works of the Department of Railways and Canals have not been proceeded with because the breakwater was not built and the waves are so strong that the works of the Department of Railways and Canals could not stand the pressure from them. Perhaps, before the session is over, the hon. Minister of Public Works might inquire and he will find that what I say now is perfectly right. We want to equip the entrance of our Canadian system of canals. We have, I suppose, received a pretty good lesson. We are not handling very much freight through our canals and unless Port Colborne is equipped it is no use relying on any exchange of trade there, because boats cannot have shelter unless these breakwater works are built, and that without delay. The present breakwater must be considered only as the beginning of the work that has to be carried out.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works what is the depth of water at this 5,000 feet face of dock, and furthermore if any applications have been made by any parties for any use of the breakwater there, or has any use been made of that part of the work which has been completed up to date ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is only intended for a breakwater. I do not know that any application has been made for any use of it.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the depth of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From twenty feet down to twelve feet.

Mr. BENNETT. When this work was first launched a few years ago, involving, I think, an outlay between the Department of Public Works and the Department of Railways and Canals, of a sum exceeding very considerably $500,000, it was anticipated that as soon as it was completed applications would be made by private parties for permission to erect elevators on this proposed esplanade or breakwater.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Railways and Canals. It does not apply to this work at all. This is purely a breakwater built by the Department of Public Works and the amount spent there already, I think, is more than the amount mentioned by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett). I have not the amount spent by the Department of Railways and Canals, but the grain elevators are proposed to be built on the piers to be constructed by the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. BENNETT. Are the piers that are being built by the Department of Railways and Canals opposite this or in a line from it in one direction or another? Unfortunately I have not been at Port Colborne and I am not familiar with the situation there.

Mr. GERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) says that the cost of improving the harbour at Port Colborne, including the work done by the Department of Railways and Canals, would probably exceed $500,000. My recollection is that the statement was made to parliament when these works at Port Colborne were launched was that the cost would be very nearly $2,000,000, and I think before Port Colborne harbour is fully completed, as it must be if the money already expended is to be of any public utility, there will have to be a sum in the neighbourhood of $1,500,000 expended there. The breakwater which is under construction at the present time and which is nearly completed, is a fairly good breakwater. I am not, I may say, absolutely in love with it. There was a mistake made at its inception by starting out to build a breakwater absolutely too narrow to withstand the strain of the waves coming down the whole length of Lake Erie. However, that was remedied by doubling the width. The breakwater now as originally contemplated is nearly completed. As has been said by the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) it will not afford the facilities which will be necessary for a complete harbour at Port Colborne until another breakwater is constructed to the east shutting off the waves coming from the eastern part of Lake Erie. The piers which are under construction by the Department of Railways and Canals on which to erect elevators are inside the breakwater, which is already constructed and so far as westerly winds are concerned the present harbour is sheltered and it makes an excellent harbour of refuge from western or south-western storms.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask which direction the breakwater runs in—east and west or north and south?

Mr. GERMAN. The breakwater runs from Sugar Loaf Point out into the lake in a south-easterly direction. The piers which are under construction by the Department of Railways and Canals run directly south, starting from the shore line which is 2,500 or 3,000 feet inside the breakwater. The Canadian Transportation and Storage Company which is asking for incorporation this session, has already applied to the Department of Railways and Canals for the right to construct two elevators each having a capacity of 2,000,000 bushels. The promotors of this company are men of ample means, and they will have at least one elevator constructed at the opening of navigation next spring. The Wolvin Syndicate which is called in Canada the St. Lawrence Terminal Company, has also applied for terminal facilities at Port Colborne. I believe that the expenditure of money at Port Colborne in connection with the completion of our waterways will be a very valuable national expenditure indeed. I think that without a doubt, you will see from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 bushels of the wheat of the west carried to the seaboard next year by way of Port Colborne and the Welland and St. Lawrence canals. That will not be half or perhaps one-quarter of what will eventually go through our Canadian transportation routes. Large quantities will go from Depot Harbour and Midland, and I submit that if we expend $1,500,000 or even $2,000,000 at Port Colborne it will be an expenditure for the general good of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT. The subject is interesting and perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) could tell us the length and width of those piers, and to what extent the work has progressed.

Mr. GERMAN. The piers are each 600 feet long by 200 feet wide. They were constructed by laying concrete walls on each side and the intention was to fill in the vacancy with loose stone that was dredged from the bottom of the harbour; the harbour being deepened from 14 or 18 feet to 21 feet. It has been stated by experts in elevator building that this loose stone would not make a satisfactory foundation for an elevator, and I am told by the Minister of Railways and Canals that he has instructed the contractors to not put any more loose stone in there, and it will be decided very shortly what kind of foundation will be laid in order to allow of the erection of elevators on the piers.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the depth of water at these piers?

Mr. GERMAN. When the work is finished the depth will be 21 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. You have not 21 feet there now ?

Mr. GERMAN. The piers are built on the solid rock. The rock alongside of the piers is blasted and taken out by the dredge. It would be useless to build concrete where the rock is, because the rock is as good a foundation as the concrete. They are building the piers on the rock foundation and all around the piers is deepened to 21 feet or 22 feet.

Mr. BENNETT. What would be the width of the basin formed between these piers and the opposite breakwater ?

Mr. GERMAN. Between the outer end of the piers and the breakwater is 2,500 feet or 3,000 feet which leaves ample room for the largest boats to turn in the basin provided the proper depth of water is afforded.

Mr. SHERRITT. Is it the intention of the government to do any work this year at Grand Bend on the Lake Huron shore ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That matter is under consideration. I can hardly tell the hon. gentleman what may be in the supplementary estimates, but it is under the consideration of the department.

Mr. SHERRITT. Will the minister tell us why this item has been dropped from the estimates ? In 1900, at the time of the election, the government engineer went up there and made a survey and in the estimates for 1901, there was an item of $5,700 inserted for this work. Since that, this item has been dropped out of the estimates altogether, and perhaps the minister can tell us why it has been dropped. I might state that this work would be very useful indeed. The fishermen for ten miles around come and fish at that point as it seems to be the best place for fishing in the district, and the completion of this work would be a great advantage to the fishing community.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only reason the item was dropped was, that in preparing the main estimates for 1903-4, only estimates were included for works under way. I think you will find that there are no new works provided for in these estimates at all, and as this work was not under contract it was left over for consideration the same as all other items of a similar nature.

Mr. SHERRITT. Has it been considered?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is under consideration now.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). In view of what the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has said, might I ask what is the intention of the government with regard to constructing another breakwater at Port Colborne ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is quite impossible for me to make any promise as to what may be done until council decides what shall be put in the estimates.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is it under the consideration of the department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Sorel deep water wharf, $47,000.

Mr. MORIN. Is this wharf built for the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, or is it built for the public generally ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information is that it was built for the general public.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The object of this vote, as explained on a previous occasion, seems to have been to create an ocean port at Sorel for the purpose of doing a large export business. I understood, from the remarks of the Prime Minister on this subject last year, that the expenditure was very largely based on the fact that a considerable railway system had been developed in the vicinity of Sorel. Would the hon. Minister of Public Works tell us what the railway situation there is at the present time and to what extent it warrants a very large expenditure at this particular point for the purpose indicated.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no doubt that the building of this wharf was to provide deep water accommodation at that port. I believe the depth of water at this point is now thirty feet. I understand that the railway system on which Sorel depended so much has been somewhat unfortunate; but I am informed that it is under operation again. As to what the volume of trade will be, I am quite unable to say. I suppose there could not have been any tonnage there previous to this accommodation being furnished. Whether it will meet the expectation of those who advocate it, I am unable to say.

Mr. KEMP. It looks as though from a very small beginning, we were in for a pretty large expenditure on this matter. Last year, in answer to some inquiries which I made in regard to it, the Prime Minister stated that $25,000 was first voted for this work. The papers which have been brought down and laid on the Table of the House, show that the engineer of the department estimated that it would take $935,000 to carry out the various works for which petitions had been handed to the government. The Prime Minister stated that the appropriation had been decided upon when the Minister of Public Works was absent from the city. As the amount voted was not sufficient, $100,000 was asked for and voted, and the Prime Minister stated that it would doubtless cost $150,000 or $175,000 to complete this work. He said :

But railways are taking the place of waterways, and two railways are now converging at Sorel, the South Shore which has been constructed from Montreal to Sorel and beyond Sorel to Nicolet, and will be completed this year probably to Lotbinière. There is the United Counties Railway also, which became the Rutland Railway, and which I believe now belongs to the New York Central, and it comes from the New York Central Railway system at Lake Champlain to the town of Sorel.

The papers which have been brought down show that the petitioners who were influential in getting the government to start this work were the United Counties Railway and the bank of St. Hyacinthe. The petition of the United Counties Railway in one place says :

Your government will readily understand that, in order to induce steamers to dock at Sorel, large inducements will have to be given to them by the line of railway carrying the freight to that point, which will be a heavy charge upon this railway, and for this reason, among others, your petitioners confidently appeal to your government for support in their undertaking.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will the hon. gentleman tell me the date of that petition ?

Mr. KEMP. The letter transmitting it is dated Montreal, December 22, 1899, and is signed by Mr. J. N. Greenshields. The petition further says :

This road's plans are entirely contingent upon the completion of the dock, elevator and opening of the channel, and the building of several miles of railway leading to the docks, on or before the month of June of next year, and this company is prepared to complete such work as it may be properly expected to assume on or before that date, and confidently expects that your government, in the general interests of the country, and the development of its carrying trade, will accede to the requests of the present memorial.

The acting chief engineer of the department, Mr. Eugene D. Lafleur, made a report on the subject, which I will read in order that we may have an intelligent idea of what is before us :

Department of Public Works of Canada,
Chief Engineer's Office,
Ottawa, January 10, 1900.

Sir,—With reference to file No. 208,734, being an application from Mr. J. N. Greenshields, on behalf of the United Counties Railway, for the construction of deep water terminal facilities at Sorel, I have the honour to state that a certain portion of the ground to be occupied by the improvements in question has already been surveyed by Mr. Assistant Engineer F. W. Cowie, and that judging from the estimate of the cost of the works then proposed, which only consisted of 1,000 feet of wharfing instead of the 2,000 feet applied for, the estimated cost of the works now required cannot be placed at a less figure than $935,000, as follows :—

Dredging an area 800 feet wide by 25,000 feet in length, an average depth of 18 feet to 27½ feet at extreme low water..	$255,000
Cribwork and sheds..	430,000
Elevator of 1,000,000 bushels capacity..	250,000

If the department decides to undertake this work it will of course be necessary to have a complete survey made, in order that the above estimate may be revised, especially as far as the dredging is concerned.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) EUGENE D. LAFLEUR,
Acting Chief Engineer.

The Secretary,
Department of Public Works.

Then, there is a petition from the city council of St. Hyacinthe and a petition from the Bank of St. Hyacinthe. There is a further report from the acting engineer, dated Ottawa, April 23, 1900, going into the matter more minutely. For, the dock at Sorel, which cost within about $5,000 of the estimate made by Mr. Lafleur, it suggests three sites. The site which he recommends would cost $260,330. There is nothing in these reports with reference to elevator facilities or dredging a channel to the dock; but it must be assumed that if the government built the dock, they would have to provide a channel which would enable deep water steamers to reach the dock. So that what I said at the outset is apparently, that we are in for a tremendous expenditure for this work; and for my part, I do not see what benefit it will be to the country. When this matter was up before, it was said that these three railways converged at Sorel. But one of them only runs occasionally and sometimes does not run at all, and the statement of the Prime Minister about one of them becoming a part of the New York Central Railway was rather mythical and visionary; nothing has come of it. We have spent a good deal of money there, but I do not see what is the use of going on with the work. Sorel will never be able to compete as an ocean port with Quebec or Montreal. It is a river port and should have been left as such, and for my part I do not see why it should be necessary to throw away the resources of the country in an attempt to make it an ocean port.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will see that the total cost is $273,500, and the work is almost complete. What I am asking now is for $40,000 to pay the balance of the contract in full, so that whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the value of the work, it is now nearly completed and we have to pay for it.

Mr. MONK. Is this for a wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. GALLERY. Will the hon. minister tell us whether, after all the money we have spent to improve the St. Lawrence route, the insurance rates have been reduced ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say whether any reduction has been made.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The rates have been very much decreased this year. The Canadian Pacific Railway fleet have obtained rates just as good as those in any other American port.

Mr. GALLERY. And how is it that the Grand Trunk Railway can ship grain from Portland, 300 miles further than from Montreal, and cheaper than they can send it down the St. Lawrence ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. One reason is that we have no proper equipment in Montreal. The Grand Trunk Railway Company has an old elevator there and the Canadian Pacific Railway has two, but they are not modern elevators. The harbour commissioners are now building an elevator. Not only had we no modern elevators, but we had not handling facilities, and in fact we were not in it at all. I think that the rates this year will be as favourable as those at American ports. My hon. friend must not forget that perhaps competition was not as keen as it might have been between the different companies, but now that the Canadian Pacific Railway can make cheap rates from west to east, other companies will follow suit. We must not forget also that grain is only a small portion of a steamer's cargo. A steamer takes as a rule about 50,000 bushels, so that if there are other competing trades as well, navigation companies will be in a condition to give better rates.

Mr. GALLERY. When we have thirty feet in the channel from Montreal to Quebec, how is it that there are so many accidents ? Is the pilotage system bad or what is wrong ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman will find that last season there were very few accidents between Quebec and Montreal. The most of them were below Quebec. An accident happened to a man-of-war, but that ship grounded at a spot where the channel was 1,500 feet wide with fifty feet depth of water through a mistake of the pilot. Accidents of that kind will occur, but you cannot charge them against the St. Lawrence route. A week or two ago there was an accident because the buoys were either misplaced or displaced, and the pilot going between two buoys thought he was perfectly safe. Accidents like that cannot be explained, but there were no accidents last year between Quebec and Montreal worth mentioning. The channel is in good shape now. We have thirty feet of water all along the route at this period of the year, but after the 15th of September, when the water is low, there will not be that depth. In a year or two, however, we will have that depth all through the season, and the ship channel is in better shape than it ever was—better buoys and better lighted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Hon. gentlemen are wandering away from the item which is for the construction of a wharf at Sorel.

Mr. KEMP. This item speaks of a wharf, but I understood the hon. minister to say that it includes the dredging of the channel Is it for both ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract is for the erection of a wharf but it includes dredging of the approach to the wharf.

Mr. KEMP. The report of the engineer of the department contemplates an expenditure of $935,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is all wrong. The total cost is $273,000, and this is to pay $47,000 which is the balance due to contractors.

Mr. KEMP. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to build a wharf 700 feet long, forty-six feet high, and forty feet wide at the base, and with thirty feet of water at low tide, together with 600 feet of trestle work.

Mr. KEMP. This report contemplates an expenditure of $935,000, and the intention was to make Sorel an ocean port. Will this expenditure, which the hon. minister has mentioned, make Sorel a port for ocean vessels of the capacity of those which go to Montreal ? If that be the case, how can the minister account for this estimate of $935,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never heard before of that estimate. We have to deal with the plan adopted and not with estimates which often vary.

Mr. KEMP. According to this report, the work should cost $900,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is an old report and was never acted upon.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. gentleman will not say that when the money is expended and the contract completed, we shall have an ocean port for large vessels.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see that there is any doubt about it. There will be thirty feet of water and probably the largest vessels can stop there. I am told that when this is finished, there will be 1,300 feet of wharfage, which will give facilities for two of the largest boats.

Mr. KEMP. Who will build the elevator referred to in the report ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is another question.

Mr. KEMP. Are there any prospects of using the port for ocean vessels and utilizing the railways that were referred to ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The local people seem to think that trade will come there.

Mr. KEMP. What does the hon. minister think ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The minister may be like my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) perhaps, not a very good authority, but optimistic, with great confidence in Canada and with great hope that all these ports will be successful in the near future.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No doubt, when this matter was put before the House by the Prime Minister last session it was represented to be in somewhat different shape from that in which the Minister of Public Works finds it to-night. The Prime Minister said :

Now, the intention is to make Sorel an ocean port.

And, at the conclusion of his remarks he says :

This——

That is, this expenditure——

—is not only for Sorel but it is part of the system to equip the harbours of Montreal, Three Rivers and Quebec. I am sure that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) has no doubt whatever that before many years there will be enough trade coming from Ontario and the west to supply all those harbours, of which Sorel is one.

Does the hon. Minister of Public Works desire to commit us to a scheme of that kind to-night ? Is it not plain that Montreal and Quebec are not getting one-tenth of the trade they ought to have; and, while that state of affairs exists, are we to equip this third ocean port on the St. Lawrence without the slightest probability so far as any one can see of its being of any use for the purpose within the lifetime of any of us ? This vote may be to pay the contractors, but what is the intention of the government with regard to the project itself? My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) reasonably asks : Who is going to build the elevator, which must be built if Sorel is to do the trade of the west along with or instead of Montreal or Quebec ? Does the government commit itself to the project of establishing Sorel as a port to do the grain business of the west ? One would suppose that that was so absolutely visionary that the hon. minister would not commit himself to it. Or, perhaps, he will do so. This extensive work that is being done seems altogether too large for local traffic, but entirely inadequate, without additional enormous expenditure in the future, for doing any of this proposed grain business from the west. This whole expenditure of a quarter of a million of dollars seems based upon the theory that these railways are to be part of a very important system, but that portion of the scheme seems to have absolutely broken down. In any case, the railway system with which it is proposed to connect Sorel, from what I can gather from the debate of last year, would direct the grain trade toward New York instead of Sorel. Of course, I do not speak by the book with regard to that. I think that before we pass this item the Minister of Public Works ought to be frank with the House and tell us whether he thinks it is a justifiable expenditure for the purposes of local traffic; or, if there is something more than that, and, if as the Prime Minister stated last year, this is to be an ocean port to take the grain trade of the west, where is our expenditure to stop, and what reasonable prospect is there in the mind of any of us that Sorel can ever compete with Montreal or Quebec, and what reason is there it should be required to do so ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a considerable expenditure for a wharf for local trade. But, of course, it has created an ocean port, if that is the term to apply to a port where you have a depth of thirty feet of water. As to the expectations formed, as my hon. friend has pointed out, that a great railway system, as was represented by the government, would do so much, it seems to have met with some mishap and the prospect is not so bright for the grain trade as it appeared at that time. The contract was entered into on June 25, 1901, and the work has been almost completed. No matter what my views may be as to the future prospects of Sorel, I think that there can be no doubt that we are called upon to pay the contractors the amount due. I am not in position to say what the future of this railway system, concerning which such representations were made to the government, may be. But, of course, we hope for the best.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to amount to this—that the hon. minister thinks there is not very much in this, but we are committed to it to the extent of $240,000, and we must pay a debt which the government contracted without very much justification. I am very sorry indeed that the right hon. the Prime Minister is not able to be here to-night. I am not complaining of that, because I know we cannot expect him to be here always. But I do think the hon. Minister of Public Works had better let the item stand until the Prime Minister is here, and we can then have some explanation from him, for, no doubt, he is more familiar with the matter than the Minister of Public Works is. I think it must be pretty apparent that the position the right hon. Prime Minister took last year is not a very strong one, to say the least. But he may be able to give us some explanation which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works does seem to be able to give. But I think it is not unreasonable to ask that the item be allowed to stand in the meantime. Of course, if we are to say that every place on the St. Lawrence where you get thirty feet of water is to be equipped as an ocean port, and a quarter

of a million, or a million or two million dollars must be spent there, we will all agree that that is a pretty plain proposition, but I do not know how far the Minister of Public Works would commend it as a sensible or a reasonable proposition. And there does not seem to be much in the proposition with regard to Sorel, that goes beyond that. I am willing to expend public money on Sorel, or anywhere else, if it is in the interest of the country to do so. But to expend a quarter of a million dollars there under present circumstances is really too absurd for us to discuss. We have got to decide what are to be the great ocean ports for our grain trade from the west, and it is our duty to equip them in order to keep that trade of our own country for the ports of our own country. But it seems to me that we are only handicapping our interests if, while leaving Montreal and Quebec and other ports which have a prospect of getting this trade, comparatively unequipped, we are to spend money in projects of this kind which have not any reasonable foundation, and which depend for any possibility of success upon schemes with regard to railways which have not had any success at all, and which have no probability or possibility of success except in the minds of certain railway promoters. I do not want to put this matter too strongly; but I have not heard anything from my hon. friend which convinces me that my view is a wrong one. It seems to me this sum is altogether too large to be expended at this place, unless you propose to equip it as an ocean port; and how can you justify the project of equipping it as an ocean port for the grain trade of the west, in view of the situation as it has developed there? Under these circumstances does the Minister of Public Works not think that some better explanation is due to the House before we should be called upon to vote this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps the proposition of the leader of the opposition is a reasonable one. I have only to say that we have spent a great deal of the time of the session discussing this question on various occasions. Perhaps the Prime Minister will make a statement and answer any question in regard to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We know that the hon. gentleman has had a good deal of discussion over his estimates, but I want to remind him that to-night we have been voting money at the rate of $5,000 a minute, according to a calculation I made a short time ago. So, for once in his life, he ought to be satisfied with the progress which has been made. Perhaps the views which I have presented to him may strike him as reasonable.

Mr. MONK. Before we leave that item, I would like to ask the minister if he would state the amounts that have been paid to these contractors since they signed that contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amounts paid up to the 30th of September, were $178,788.81. The total amount that will be paid up to the 30th of June will be $226,500. There remains a balance of $47,000. Does the leader of the opposition want this item to stand?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want to interfere with any discussion that might affect the disposal of the item. If any hon. gentleman has anything to say about the item he might go on and say it. But I would like it to stand eventually in order that we may get some explanation from the Prime Minister of the situation from his standpoint.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let it stand.

Item allowed to stand.

St. Joseph, Lake Huron—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. McEWEN. Is it the intention of the minister to spend that money on this wharf this year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the item is voted and we undertake to complete the work, it will probably be expended this year. The question to be decided is whether the work should be abandoned or whether the $5,000 now asked for should be voted and spent. The ex-Minister of Public Works mentioned the other night, when some objection was taken to the item, that he would look into the matter and that he had recommended the work to be gone on with. But now some exception is taken as to the value of the work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When the item came before the House last year I pledged myself not to go on with the work without being there. In my absence, during the Paris exposition, some gentlemen from Montreal and St. Joseph came to Ottawa on a deputation to the Prime Minister, who promised them to look carefully into this question. He ordered a survey, as he was replacing me to a large extent in the department, so far as the province of Quebec was concerned. A survey had been made when I came back. I also pledged myself to look into the question and I did so. After the session was over last year I went to St. Joseph and found out what perhaps I might have found by looking at the map, that between Goderich and Sarnia there are thirty miles of coast without any wharf, except at Bayfield, around which there is scarcely any water. This is a wharf that has not been used very much in the past because there has been no available depth of water. But, having ascertained these facts I made up my mind that the work would be a most useful one, not to St. Joseph alone, but to the surrounding population that would be put in a position to trade with that point. There are different interests, I know, which are opposed to the building of this work. Those who have interests in the villages

behind are naturally opposed to the building of a wharf there. Human nature is the same everywhere in the world. I know some of our friends have stores and interests at the station and they are opposed to the building of a wharf. A Minister of the Crown has not to look at these small interests. He has to look at the general interests. I made up my mind that it would be a good thing to have a wharf between Sarnia and Goderich. I ordered a survey, Mr. Corriveau, a well known and energetic engineer, made the survey. His report is in the department and it has been confirmed by Mr. Roy, who was then inspector general of public works. The work was to cost a little over $5,000. Under these conditions I ordered the work to be proceeded with. I am very much surprised to hear that it will cost $15,000. I understand there have been accidents. I entrusted the work to Mr. Sing, one of the most experienced engineers in the service of the department. I do not exactly remember the name of the foreman, but Mr. Sing was in charge. I understand that the work, not being completed, was partly carried away by the waves. That, of course has contributed to the increased cost of the work. St. Joseph is a little French village. It is a little French spot. There have always been little French spots over this Canadian land of ours. There are some industries already there. It is not a large village, but it is a very nice place, very picturesque and very nicely located indeed. I think that the building of a wharf would be a source of development and progress. It will serve not only the village of St. Joseph, but the population around. I would be sorry to see the work abandoned. It has cost a great deal more than I expected it would cost, because the estimate which was in my hands when the work was started was that the cost would be a little over $5,000. Part of the money is spent and it seems to me that the work should be carried out. Of course my hon. friend has now charge of the Department of Public Works, and if he believes the work should be abandoned it is his right to abandon it.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the government to allow this matter to stand over for another year. You have heard what the late Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has said about this village. These men who have this village in charge talk very large; in fact, very much larger than they will ever do. I do not wish to say anything against them but I would like this item to be left over for another year to see if they will carry out their undertakings. They have not yet established a manufactory of any kind or any other thing that would require a wharf. I would be the first one to assist them in getting it if there was any necessity for it, but there is not a single commodity of product there to be brought in or sent out. There is not a manufactory of any kind that is running. They have a sawmill and a number of other buildings. It is true that they have a hotel building 150 feet by 150 feet, but it is there high and dry and there is nothing for it to do. As to the wharf there has been $10,000 spent and I am very sorry to say that the money has been unwisely spent. There are seven or eight cribs on the shore and one crib in two or three feet of water and that is the whole result of the expenditure of $10,000. I know whereof I speak, as I have been there and have seen it. When I was there Mr. Cantin, the promoter of the village, told me that there had been 200 or 300 cords of stone gathered up along the shore but when I looked along the shore I could see no stone gathered up. There is a quantity of timber which has not been fixed up. In the meantime I think the government should allow the matter to remain in abeyance for another year so as to see if the promoters of this village will go on with their undertakings. If they do so, and if they show that they mean business I will be the first one to help them. But, under the present circumstances, I could not approve of this expenditure because nine out of ten of my constituents believe that the money has been unwisely expended.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Public Works will allow me to say that there has been a strong company formed to purchase the different properties and works that were initiated a couple of years ago by Mr. Cantin. I know the men in Montreal who are in this company and they are very substantial men. One of them is at the head of the very well known firm of Lamontagne & Company, one of the very largest firms in Montreal. The company that has been formed to develop the little village that was started two or three years, is a substantial company.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it not an American company?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, it is a Canadian company, mostly composed of French Canadians.

Mr. SCOTT. That is a work of encouragement?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is no reason why they should not be encouraged. They are good people when they are working for the development of the country, and it seems to me that the province of Ontario which has been losing population should not prevent French Canadians from settling there. I think if I appeal on this ground to my hon. friends on both sides of the House my voice will be heard with a certain amount of sympathy. I would appeal to the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McEwen). These people will become his best electors. I would invite him to withdraw his objection to the work. He says that he will wait and

see what these people will do. The way to help them is to give them a wharf. If you do not give them the means of communication they might not carry out as successfully as they expect the work they have undertaken. The work has been undertaken. An accident has happened. This is not the first wharf in a difficult place where an accident has happened. Other works have been carried away but have been built all the same. Under the circumstances, I think that my hon. friend (Mr. McEwen) would be wise in withdrawing his objection. Of course the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is responsible for the administration of his department, but I am giving my advice to the best of my knowledge, and it seems to me that the House should feel kindly towards those who have invested their money there. A big hotel was built there at a cost of $250,000 I am told, but it was a failure. There are two or three small factories, but I grant they are not big.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the bricks they were to manufacture, and that they were to ship to Chicago.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. They are manufacturing bricks there now.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they sending them to Chicago ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. They will when they have a wharf. There is no wharf between Sarnia and Goderich, a distance of thirty miles, except at Bayfield, where there is no water. It seems to me that the House should not hesitate to spend this small sum of money.

Mr. McEWEN. I would have raised my voice against this vote last year, only I never dreamt, and no one in that part of the country ever dreamt, that when the Hon. Mr. Tarte went up there and saw the place he would spend the money. The hon. gentleman promised to come my way and we would go out together and see it, but instead of that he went by way of Parkhill and he was there only two hours and we never saw a sight of him. The great majority of even the French people who are there never asked for this money. It is true that the people who put money into that scheme have lost their money and will never see a cent of it again. Mr. Cantin has a peculiar way with him and he seems to succeed in making people give their money to put into enterprises that could never produce a cent. What surprises me is that a man of his kind should be able to mislead this government into spending money where there is no need for it at the present time or for years to come, any more than there is any need of building a wharf on the top of a mountain. If this wharf is built it will be built at the foot of a hill where there is no way to get at it unless you buy land from some one, unless there will be a road built through a gulch that is a very hard place to get at. In the meantime they make the road through somebody's land, and they get around to it in that way, but where this dock is being built there is a hill about fifty feet high. It is not quite straight up, but nearly so, and it will be very hard to get at it suppose the dock is built. With all due regard to the engineers, $5,000 is not worth anything to build a wharf there.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. So far as the hill is concerned my hon. friend (Mr. McEwen) knows that it is an easy thing to have a slanting road there. I went down the hill myself and there is already a road there. My hon. friend has reproached me for not having called on him when I went there.

Mr. McEWEN. You promised to.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I will tell my reason frankly to the House.

Mr. McEWEN. I want to hear it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend (Mr. McEwen) showed himself very favourable to the work when he was talking to these men.

Mr. McEWEN. To what men.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, to Mr. Cantin and others and my hon. friend (Mr. McEwen) had written to me that he was not favourable to it. I always deal straight with men.

Mr. McEWEN. Did you deal straight with me when you did not come to see me as you promised ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend (Mr. McEwen) had written to me that he did not like the work while he had said to other people that he was favourable to the work, and under those circumstances I made up my mind to judge for myself, what any other minister would have done. Let us deal frankly and fairly between man and man. I fully made up my mind to judge for myself. My hon. friend (Mr. McEwen) moreover, had been elected as an independent member of the House against Mr. MacMillan, an old Liberal that we all respected here. My hon. friend (Mr. McEwen) was not looked upon as a straight supporter of the government. He was an independent member of parliament, having been elected against a strong Liberal, who sat for years in this House. Under the circumstances I thought that without meaning offence to the hon. gentleman, I was justified in going there as I had pledged myself to the House I would, and see for myself. The site of the wharf has been chosen with the greatest care, and it is easy indeed to get access to it. A big storm has carried away part of the work and it has increased the cost. I repeat that a strong company has been formed ; the little village has been divided into lots; there are two or three small

factories; there is a brick factory; there is a pipe organ factory; I grant it is not a large place, but we have built wharfs in other parts of the country in places that were not very large.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This man is no doubt a good deal of the character the hon. gentleman (Mr. McEwen) spoke of. He seems to be able to live by his wits and to induce people to put money in schemes that have little foundation. I do not know him myself or anything about him except what I have heard in connection with this matter. He deceived a great many people into putting money into this scheme. It is stated now that a good many substantial people have taken hold of the work, and I think we might probably take the vote and spend it on the conditions as to whether they are going on to develop this place and the work will help to do so. Now that we have spent so much money we might go on.

Mr. SPROULE. And aid him to deceive others.

Mr. McEWEN. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says that I was elected as an independent. I wish to deny that statement in toto. I wish to say that the speech which I made at Seaforth the day of the nomination did not say anything to the effect that I was an independent. I have a copy of my speeches at home and I can produce them at any time, and they will show that the Hon. Mr. Tarte is not well informed about that. So far as the spending of the money is concerned, you can go on and spend the money if you like, but you will not do it with my consent. I voice the opinion of nine out of ten people, not only in my riding, but in the whole county, and I think my representations should have some attention paid to them.

Mr. TAYLOR. You seem to be an independent.

Mr. SHERRITT. This is an extraordinary state of affairs when we find the government going into the riding of a member who supports them and spending money there contrary to his wishes. It does seem to me that there is not a precedent for this to be found in the Dominion of Canada. I have listened with considerable interest to what was said by the hon. member (Mr. McEwen) and also what was said by the ex-minister who has referred to there being a French settlement at that place. I am very glad to be able to say that there is a small French settlement there, and I wish there were more of the same kind of people. They are an intelligent and industrious people, and I can assure the hon. minister that they are no more in favour of throwing away money in this way than the rest of us. It is news to me, as the hon. ex-minister told us to-night, that there was $10,000 spent last year at that point, because, if I remember rightly, $5,000 was the amount placed in the estimates last year, and from what I have heard of the amount of work done there, and the way it was done, I think the people of that part of the country considered that $5,000, or even a much less sum, spent on that work, was very improperly spent. I have not visited the place; but when listening to the discussion to-night, it occurred to me that as there is a hill there, it is a pity the wharf was not built on the top of the hill; for it would have served as useful a purpose as it does now, and the government would have been in a much better position to move it away and utilize it in some other part of the country. The ex-Minister of Public Works said there were men of capital behind this scheme. I can tell him that there were, and they have not now as much capital as they had before. I do not wish to make this statement to hurt the feelings of the man who was the chief mover in this work; but one of our wealthiest men lost his money in that enterprise, and died, I will not say a pauper, but very much poorer than he would have been if he had not met the gentleman who was pushing that scheme. I am stating not merely my own opinion, but the opinion of every intelligent man, whether Liberal or Conservative, who knows what the St. Joseph wharf is, when I say that when this expenditure is mentioned, it is looked upon as a ridiculous expenditure. I do not wish to say this in the way of criticising the government, because if that wharf were going to be of any benefit to that part of the country, I am sure that my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McEwen) and myself would be the last men to stand up in this House and ask that the item be dropped, because it is in a part of the country in which we are both much interested. As for any enterprise going forward at that point, there has not been any and there will not be any. I do not think the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works will stand up here and say that an expenditure of $15,000 or $20,000 will build a wharf at that place. Bayfield is a natural harbour, where work could be carried on, but St. Joseph is on an open beach, at about as exposed a place on the Lake Huron shore as it would be possible to find. I think all hon. members will agree with me that $15,000 or $20,000 is of no use to build a harbour there; and even if a harbour were built, I can assure you that it would serve no purpose. I am sorry the item was ever placed in the estimates. The money already spent there has been thrown away, and if the government spend any more there, it will be thrown away also. I can do nothing less than to move that the item be struck out.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Public Works will tell the House how much money has been spent at Bayfield. My hon. friend (Mr. Sherritt) should not forget that there is no harbour there. He knows that between Sarnia and Goderich

for a distance of thirty miles, there is no harbour. I know he has been voting side by side with my hon. friend from South Huron (McEwen) against that wharf; I knew they were a unit against it. There are not many parts of the country in such an important portion of Canada as that district is where there is a coast of thirty miles without a wharf. My hon. friend knows that as well as I do; but still, because the place is called St. Joseph, my hon. friends are dead against it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, I express my views as I believe them to be. I really believe it, because I call the attention of the House and the country to this fact, that in a distance of thirty miles there is not a wharf available, and there is a large population of about 30,000 people in that district who will use that wharf later on. There is a large trade there. But there are two reasons why the wharf is opposed: First, because the little place is called St. Joseph; and, second, because there are interests at the station and at Hensall and Zurich which are opposed to that wharf, because they think it will drive business from them. These are the interests that have raised opposition to this little work, about which I think there should not be so much fuss.

Mr. McEWEN. I am sorry that our hon. friend the late Minister of Public Works seems to think that we are opposed to this work because the people there are French. I wish to inform him and the House that there is nothing in that, and I am sorry that my hon. friend, I was going to say, was foolish enough to say so. The people who were imported there by Mr. Cantin are waiting to get their money back from him. Whether in municipal elections or in other elections these people have been my very best friends. With regard to the position of Hensall and Zurich, I cannot speak for Zurich, but I am sure that the people of Hensall never thought of opposing this wharf because it would take business from them. That idea never entered into the question at all. There might be some opposition to a railroad on that account; but so far as the lake is concerned, $15,000 or $20,000 will build no wharf at that point that will be worth ten cents to any vessel that may come there. It is on the open lake, where there is a sweep of about 200 miles from the Northwest and about sixty miles from the west, and a single pier running out 200 or 300 feet in shallow water is not worth ten cents for any boat to come to. No sailing vessel will come there except at the very finest time of the year, and no steam barge will come there, because it is so close to the shore. As regards opposition to these French people, there is nothing in it and that charge is an absurd falsehood. These people are our best friends and there are none we would sooner help, but in that regard there is nothing to be done at present. In fact there is nothing doing there. I am aware that there is one man who makes pipe organs for the churches, and he is a very decent fellow who works all the time and apart from that industry, there is a small brick and tile works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that there is a great deal of difference of opinion with regard to this.

Mr. SHERRITT. Not in Huron.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been over $10,000 expended on the work, but I am perfectly willing, if the item passes, to have an inquiry into all the circumstances, and if this work is not in the public interest, I will not finish it. The chief engineer of the department says that there are ten or eleven feet of water there, and I cannot understand how he could have made such a report if there is none.

Mr. McEWEN. As far as I am personally concerned, if the hon. minister will go up there and see for himself, I am willing to let the item drop.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman thinks that I should go instead of the chief engineer, I am quite willing to do so.

Mr. SHERRITT. Before the item passes, I want to put myself right. The ex-Minister of Public Works has said that I am opposed to this expenditure because the place is called St. Joseph. That sort of thing may make an impression in this House, but he would have considerable difficulty in getting the people of that locality to take any stock in it. The hon. gentleman is a little short of the distance because it is longer than he makes it out, between Goderich and Sarnia, but there is a place, some six or seven miles below that, for which an appropriation was made in 1891, and which is an old place of considerable importance, where there are mills and considerable business done, and where besides the municipality have spent $20,000 in straightening the river. I refer to Grand Bend. There was an item of $5,700 put into the estimates of 1901 for the purpose of dredging the river there, but that item has been dropped. I can assure the hon. minister that that is a work the people consider necessary, as the place is a fishing point which would be very valuable if proper accommodation were furnished. Besides, there is a good sawmill running there and considerable timber, and it is a very extensive summer resort. That is a place where work should be done, and I am glad that the hon. minister has promised to consider the advisability of putting in an item in the supplementaries for that purpose. We are further from market there than at St. Joseph, and it is a much easier place to build a breakwater and a harbour. I am satisfied that if the hon. minister will go

there and will look into the matter carefully, he will see that it is a place where an expenditure would be a good investment.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am perfectly willing to go up there and consult the hon. members of the riding before anything further is done.

Item voted.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Postmaster General, House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 20, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 180) to incorporate the Prince Edward Island Ferry Company.—Mr. Emmerson—by Mr. Fraser.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 181) to amend the General Railway Act of 1888.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) please state briefly the purport of the Bill ?

Mr. GERMAN. The object of the Bill is to put the law in such a condition that persons owning property adjoining a line of railway, which property is injured or destroyed by fire resulting from the operation of the railway, will be able to secure compensation for damages more readily than under the law as it now stands. The present law makes it incumbent on owners of property injured or destroyed by fire from a railway to prove negligence on the part of the railway company. Practical experience has demonstrated that this is always difficult, and very frequently impossible. The evidence to prove negligence must be secured from the railway itself. It is quite evident that most of the locomotive engines at present on our Canadian lines of railway are equipped with screens of sufficient fineness to prevent the discharge of sparks and cinders that would be likely to set fire to the property adjoining the line of railway. But the difficulty is that the engine driver with a heavy train, coming to a piece of track on which is anything like a heavy grade, will immediately throw open the screen, the result being that large cinders, as large as an ordinary sized bird's egg will be discharged from the locomotive and carried upon property adjoining the railway. As the law stands at present, if the fire originates on the right of way and extends to property adjoining, the railway company have been held by the courts to be prima facie guilty of negligence. But if the fire originates on the adjoining property it is incumbent on the owner to prove negligence on the part of the railway company before he can recover damages. This, in many cases is impossible. For instance, a farmer has a large part of a crop of grain or hay destroyed by fire from a locomotive and sustains a loss of forty or fifty dollars. In order to prove negligence on the part of the railway company he has to ascertain in the first place, the number of the engine. That is a difficulty in itself. Then he has to go himself or send experts to examine the engine to see whether it is equipped with a proper screen. Let us suppose that on examination the engine is found to be properly equipped in this respect. Then, in order to prove negligence on the part of the railway company the farmer must call the engine driver to prove, if possible, that that engine driver had opened the screen allowing the free exit of sparks and cinders, which otherwise would not have escaped from the engine. We all know that when you have to prove your case with adverse witnesses you have great difficulty. The proposed amendment will absolutely overcome that. It will put the onus of proof on the railway company ; they will be compelled to prove that there was no negligence on their part. The Bill provides that if it is shown that the fire originated from sparks, cinders, or other burning substance which has escaped or has been discharged from a locomotive engine operated or being run on the line of railway, that is sufficient to fix upon the company the liability for the loss which has been sustained, unless they can show on their part some good reason why it should not be fixed upon them. I think that the amendment is certainly in the interest of the people who own property adjoining a line of railway, and it is an amendment which fills a long-felt want throughout the country districts. I most sincerely trust it will be allowed to carry.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC PRINTING AND STATIONERY.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 182) to amend chapter 27, of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) please explain the object of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). In 1893 parliament authorized the printing for the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Rail-

way to be done in the maritime provinces as it was found to be more convenient to do it there than in Ottawa. There is a provision in the Bill to the following effect:

That the cost is not to exceed what would be charged at the bureau in Ottawa.

Now the King's Printer always certifies bills for printing as fair and reasonable; ever since 1893 that has been the certificate put upon these bills. However, the Auditor General has decided that the certificate is not sufficient, that the terms of the statute must be carried out. Now the Order in Council is to change the law so as to authorize bills to be paid on condition that the cost does not exceed customary and fair commercial rates for similar work and for supplies of similar quantities. That is the intention of the statute, that is to say it is to give effect to what has been done since 1893; but I must admit that what has been done since 1893 is to some extent a departure from the terms of the statute.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE DESJARDINS CANAL.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 183) respecting the Desjardins canal. He said: The object of the Bill is to confirm a discharge given by the governement to certain landowners within the limits of the city of Hamilton of a mortgage which was on their property. Those who are from that part of the country will remember that in 1832, Sir Allan McNab, who was then president of the Desjardins Canal Company, borrowed money from the then government, acting through the receiver general, to the extent of £5,000 to aid in the construction of that canal. To secure this money, Mr. Peter Hamilton gave a mortgage on some property which he then owned and which is now within the limits of the city of Hamilton. That property has since been subdivided and is now vested in a certain number of private individuals. The original mortgage has been lost. After having examined the question, a year ago or thereabouts, we came to the conclusion that it was possible that prescription might be invoked against the government if we endeavoured to enforce the claim when a case was brought against the different property holders, and it was then alleged that no money had ever passed in connection with this original transaction. As no money had ever been paid over to Mr. Hamilton, and considering that during all these years we have not sought to enforce that mortgage against any one of the holders who had improved the property and who now were in possession of it, we decided not to enforce our claim. The discharge of the old mortgage was given to the persons interested. I have personally some doubts as to the rights of the government to give a discharge of a claim of that sort. In order to set that doubt at rest we think proper now to come to parliament and get the sanction of parliament for what we did.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). I desire to say a word or two in support of the Bill. As a resident of Hamilton, I am aware of the circumstances which the Minister of Justice referred to. The land covered by this mortgage is owned by hundreds of people, poor people and wealthy people; and it would be exceedingly difficult, even supposing that it was possible, to maintain at the present day that anything was due on this mortgage from each of these people who may have been primarily liable. The amount of costs that would follow any attempt to enforce this mortgage would be something enormous. There is a grave doubt indeed whether there ever was any liability under it. Members of the legal profession fifty and sixty years ago, who were familiar with all the facts at the time regarding this mortgage, treated it as an unexisting security, as something that had no claim behind it; and for sixty years at least this document which was again brought into existence apparently about a year ago, was treated as an absolute nullity. So that it would be a most unfortunate thing for many unfortunate poor people who own small portions of the property in the city of Hamilton, if any attempt were now made to enforce it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

PETITION OF SHIPPERS OF FROZEN FISH.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. Has the government received a petition, during the year 1903, from the shippers of frozen fish and other perishable goods, from the province of Prince Edward Island, asking for compensation for losses sustained, owing to the failure of the government to provide communication from the island to the mainland, during last winter?
2. What is the intention of the government with regard to this petition?
3. Will they make good the loss sustained by the shippers? And if not, why not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine):

1. Yes.
2 and 3. Under consideration.

PURCHASES PREVIOUS TO GERMAN SURTAX.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked:

1. Has the following report been communicated to the honourable the Minister of Customs:—

Winnipeg, May 12, 1903.

To the President and Members of the
Council of the Winnipeg Board of Trade.

Gentlemen,—Your committee, appointed on the 11th May to report upon the German surtax, beg to submit the following :—

1. That the date fixed by the government, viz., July 1, 1903, before which German goods, to escape the surtax, must be entered for consumption, and duty paid, will not allow sufficient time for Canadian importers to receive goods for which bona fide orders were placed before April 16th last. A large quantity of such purchases are for fall and winter delivery ; and in some cases importers have sold these goods on the old tariff. And we would, therefore, suggest that the board should strongly urge upon the government the necessity for an extension of the time to September 30, 1903, in which bona fide purchases may be entered for consumption in this country at the old rate of duty.

2. That as Winnipeg and other western points are situated at long distances from the seaboard (transportation taking from two to six weeks from Montreal and other eastern Canadian ports), legislation providing for a uniform date of entry would greatly discriminate against the larger portion of Canada. And it would, in our opinion, be only a matter of justice to all parties concerned that the arrival of goods at any seaport in Canada in the vessel in which they are shipped should be considered evidence by the government of their arrival ; and additional time allowed to pass entry and pay the duties on such goods reaching their final port of destination.

Respectfully submitted,

D. W. BOLE,
Chairman Committee.

2. Is it the intention to so extend the date fixed by the government, viz., July 1, 1903, so as to give ample time to western importers to enter at the old rate of duty ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

1. Yes.

2. As this is a subject that has not only engaged the attention of the Winnipeg board of trade, but of traders throughout the Dominion, I will say a few words in reference to it so that business men may be apprised of the action which the department, sanctioned by the Governor in Council, are about to take. The resolution before the committee defined that goods ordered prior to the 16th of April should be admitted without the surtax being charged, provided the goods were for immediate transportation. The time had to be defined by the department, and we thought that by giving ten weeks we would allow time either to cancel the orders that had been given or to make arrangements to transfer the goods via some other country. That notice reached the business men of the community, but very soon afterwards communications from all parts of the country reached the department pointing out that there were exceptional circumstances connected with the German trade, particularly that some kinds of goods were ordered and had to be made after the order went in, such as goods for the holiday trade, and it was impossible for the merchants to cancel the order, and even if they did cancel it they would be in this position, that travellers had already been on the road with samples selling them. The department after considering the matter and finding that a greater portion of the orders would be covered by the 30th of September, instead of the 30th of June, it is my intention to recommend to my colleagues an extension of time, maintaining firmly that the order must have been actually placed before the 16th of April, but that the time for the importation under the term 'immediate transportation' shall be extended to the 30th of September. With reference to the second suggestion of the Winnipeg board of trade, that inasmuch as goods landed in Canada might require some weeks before they reached the port of destination and make entry, to require not only that goods should be landed in Canada, but entered in Canada, would be manifestly unfair. The department has no desire to deal inequitably with any merchants living in any part of the country, and it is the intention to have that rectified by providing that the arrival of the goods at any port in Canada shall be sufficient notice to the department.

CATTLE-GUARDS.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the government to the cattle-guard question. On the 6th April last, the House adopted a motion for the bringing down of all correspondence in connection with the cattle guard inquiry, including the appointment of commissioners and all matters of that kind. I have inquired and I find that these papers have not yet been brought down. The government will see the importance of having these papers brought down immediately. A long time has elapsed already and if we are to have any benefit from them they must be brought down soon. Within a short time the government will have under consideration the Bill introduced by——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) must not make a speech in asking a question. If he wants to make a speech we will go into Supply shortly and he can then discuss the question.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not going to make a speech. I would like to ask the minister if the report of the commission has yet been brought down ?

The PRIME MINISTER. What report ?

Mr. LENNOX. The report in reference to the cattle-guard commission.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot say but I will take note of the inquiry of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) and I shall endeavour to give him an answer after recess.

TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I made an inquiry yesterday in regard to the terms of the proposed commission to investigate the Treadgold concession. The hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Hon. Sir William Mulock) said that possibly the government might be in a position to make an announcement to-day, and I merely rise for the purpose of reminding the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in case he should be prepared to make any announcement.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Hon. Sir William Mulock) informs me that he has been engaged to-day and that he has not been able to give his attention to the matter. I have reason to believe that after recess I will be able to lay the commission on the Table.

HALF-BREED CLAIMS COMMISSION.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Hon. Sir William Mulock) when I can get the balance of the return in regard to the half-breed claims commission ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The Deputy Minister of the Interior informs me that the preparation of the remaining part of the return would involve a great deal of labour—many weeks—and it was a question whether we would not have to seek outside assistance. I do not think it would be possible to get it out before the end of the session. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. LaRivière) could reduce his demand to something within reasonable limits and let me know and I will be glad to meet his object. Perhaps his order is a good deal larger than he intended it to be. It was for that reason and not from any wish to withhold at all the information that he desires that I instructed the department to prepare as much of the return as possible.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. From what I can gather from that part of the return which I have already received there are some 3,000 names on the list, and surely it would not take very many weeks to write down 3,000 names.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman may be correct. I have no knowledge myself. I am only telling him what the deputy minister informs me. If the hon. gentleman would find it convenient to call on the deputy minister and make clear to him exactly what is wanted, he might be able to get the return completed.

I.C.R.—WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). In answer to an inquiry made yesterday, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) said he had no objection to lay on the Table of the House the evidence taken by the commissioner appointed to inquire into the cause of the recent accident at Windsor Junction. I would like to know when that finding can be laid on the Table of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will take note of the inquiry.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Miscellaneous expenditure including North-west Territories, $37,000.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) is not here, but we expect him in a moment. This item for miscellaneous expenditure is the same as last year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I just wish on this item to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) to the point I raised some time ago. It is that prisoners of all grades are carried in the North-west Territories as first-class passengers and they sit in the coaches with those who have purchased first-class tickets. I drew the attention of the House some time ago to the fact that last fall there was a murderer and two or three other condemned criminals of the lowest type travelling from Edmonton to Regina in a car, and sitting in a seat adjoining a number of students who were going to attend the Normal School at the latter place. In Ontario and other parts our volunteers have to travel second class, and they have frequently been known to travel in box cars and cattle cars. I think it is a very improper thing that criminals should be allowed to travel in coaches with ordinary passengers.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I think this is a matter which ought to be dealt with by the mounted police. The mounted police have charge of the conveyance of prisoners in the North-west Territories, and I apprehend that because officers connected with the police like to travel first-class they take these prisoners with them. However, now that our attention is drawn to it, I think that practice should be avoided if possible.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We want something more than to be left at the mercy of the mounted police, although I always stand up for the mounted police. I am perfectly willing that the mounted police should be able to have every possible comfort, but I object to these prisoners riding in that way. Do I understand that the Hon. Minister of Justice will give the subject his attention ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will have the attention of the officers of the mounted police drawn to this remark.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is covered by this item ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think this is practically all expended in the North-west Territories. Judging from the way in which it is drafted you would imagine that it was intended to cover expenditures other than those in the North-west Territories, but as a matter of fact, it is almost entirely expended there. It covers for instance the maintenance of prisoners at police barracks; transport of prisoners by North-west mounted police; Crown prosecutors; legal services and expenses; jury and witness fees; coroners inquests; sheriffs' fees; clerk of courts, &c. Last year these services cost : Maintenance of prisoners, $11,224; jury and witness fees, $11,673; transport of prisoners, $3,847; sheriffs' fees and expenses, $761 ; extradition fees, $2,091; and so on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the administration of criminal justice dealt with directly by this government so far as the expenses are concerned.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Absolutely controlled by us.

Mr. BORDEN (Haifax). And paid for by us.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Travelling allowances and expenses of judges in Manitoba, $3,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this the usual sum for this purpose.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. This amount has been paid under authority of Order in Council since 1882, and there has been no variation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are travelling allowances for all the judges in all the provinces.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, but they are dealt with differently. In Ontario a round sum is paid each year to each judge, and in Quebec there is an allowance of $6 per diem while judges are attending court in other districts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In Nova Scotia it is a lump sum per circuit.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Haifax). In Manitoba it is a per diem allowance.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is fixed by Order in Council passed in 1882. The judge is allowed his actual moving expenses from his residence to the place where the court is held and return, and $5 per day during the time he is absent.

Travelling allowances of judges in British Columbia, $13,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This seems to be a large amount compared with the other provinces.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The distances are very great in that province. The payment is based on an Order in Council passed in 1887, which says that the travelling allowances of the Supreme Court judges shall be fixed and determined by their actual and reasonable disbursements for travelling and hotel accommodation to be certified by themselves according to a stipulated form. In the case of county court judges an Order in Council of 1879 provides that each judge shall be paid his actual moving expenses from his residence to where the court is held and return, and $5 per diem for the time he is absent attending to the duties of his court.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that when I was in British Columbia last fall I had quite a conversation with one of the judges, and from my experience of travelling through that province I am quite sure that they are not overpaid.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They are not.

Mr. SPROULE. In fact I believe they are underpaid.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It did seem to me that the cost of living and especially the cost of travelling is much greater in British Columbia than it is in any other part of Canada. One can hardly appreciate it until he has travelled in that country, and I think the government would be justified in making an even more liberal allowance for this purpose. It is not as liberal an allowance as in the older provinces, taking into consideration the increased expenses in British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The judges in British Columbia are paid less than is received by the judges in Quebec and Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. On what basis are the judges paid for the weekly high court sittings in Ottawa and in London ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When the judge sits at Ottawa he is allowed $25 for moving expenses and $10 for London, besides a per diem allowance of $5 during the time he is absent from his residence attending to this court.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by 'moving expenses' ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I should think that would mean the ordinary transportation expenses and the per diem allowance would go to pay his board bill.

Salary of divorce and matrimonial court, New Brunswick, $500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that under the statute ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That amount is voted each year. If it were omitted from the estimates one year the judge would not have it, as there is no statute which sanctions the payment of this sum.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any difference in this regard between the judge of the Matrimonial Court of New Brunswick and the judge of the corresponding court in Nova Scotia? The Minister of Justice knows that at the time Nova Scotia entered confederation the judge holding the position of Judge in Equity was, by statute, authorized to dispose of divorce cases and matrimonial cases generally. The title of Judge in Equity has been, I think, continued in Nova Scotia for that reason; but apart from that the title of Judge in Equity has no significance in Nova Scotia, as all the judges in that province have the same general jurisdiction. There is a certain amount of business of this kind in Nova Scotia as in New Brunswick; and I do not see any reason for making any distinction between the judges performing these duties in the two provinces.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Last year the hon. gentleman brought this matter up in the course of the discussion of my estimates. I was struck with the force of his remarks, and on inquiry I found that the distinction arose from the fact that the judge in Nova Scotia accepted his duties and performed them without demur, whereas the judge in New Brunswick made it a condition of his taking the office that a salary should be attached to it. It did not strike me that this was a very satisfactory reason for the distinction, and when my hon. friend sees the supplementary estimates, I think he will find that the observations which he made last year have borne fruit.

Expenditure under cap. 181, R.S.C., $700.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the meaning of this?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is to meet the expenses attending executions.

Office for clerk of the court and judges' chambers, Prince Albert, $260.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is represented that there is not sufficient accommodation in the court building for the offices of the clerk and the sheriff; and rooms are rented in the town of Prince Albert, outside the court for these officials. I hope that some day we may have proper accommodation there, because if a fire occurred, the registers of deeds might be destroyed. Although provision has been made for their protection, the proper accommodation would be the construction of a court-house. I have endeavoured to bring this about, but have not yet been successful. The construction of a court-house is not under the control of the Department of Justice, but is connected with another branch of the public service.

Allowance to ad hoc judges, $200.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What ad hoc judges are there?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I find on looking over the accounts that this allowance has not been drawn upon for several years. However, it is occasionally found necessary, when a judge is required to hold court for another judge who is disqualified, to provide his moving expenses, and this vote is for that purpose.

Supreme Court of Canada—reporter, $2,100.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are increases of $50 each in the case of five or six officials.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. These are ordinary statutory increases.

For the purchase of law books and works of reference for the Supreme Court library, $4,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The condition of the library of the Supreme Court at the present time is not, I think, very creditable to the country or to the court or to my hon. friend's department, although I have no doubt that no blame is to be attributed to him in that regard. The books are increasing to such an extent that it is almost impossible to do any work there. The room which is now used as a library was never very suitable for the purpose, and now that the number of books has increased so very greatly, there is really no room at all for counsel. It is impossible for the officers of the court, the librarian and the assistant librarian, to do their work properly. It is impossible for counsel to prepare their briefs. The whole library is to some extent in a jumble for lack of space. Besides I believe a large number of books are stored in the attic and another large number in the cellar. I think some steps should be taken to provide the library with better accommodation. To do that may involve a larger proposition than anything we can discuss very fully this afternoon. Still, I think it is right that the attention of the government should be brought to this condition of affairs, and I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, who has some practical acquaintance with it, will realize it just as much as I do. If my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works would go down there and look at it, his inspection would convince him that some remedy should be sought at a very early date. It is the highest court in the country, and counsel from all over Canada come there, and they have no place in which to get ready for the argument of their cases, except the library of the Supreme Court. The space formerly used as

a means of communication between the two ends of the court-house is at the present time crowded with shelving, and one can barely edge his way through it. The condition of affairs is such that I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works should consult the hon. Minister of Justice and see whether something cannot be done to improve it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter has been brought to my attention by the hon. Minister of Justice, as well as by a delegation which I met some two weeks ago. Personally, I believe the best policy would be to erect a new building, especially for the court, but whether that would meet the views of my colleagues I do not know. I doubt whether any improvements could be made in the present building. The matter, however, will receive the consideration of the department as early as possible, and I hope to be able to make some recommendations at an early date.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would like to add to what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has said that not only is the present court building very inconvenient, but it is exceeding dangerous to have the valuable library there in the condition in which it is at present. Some of the books could never be replaced, and it would cost from $50,000 to $60,000 to replace the whole library.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are the records of the court besides.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. I visited the building with my hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works, and we agree that no improvements of any value could be made and that the whole building would have to be reconstructed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that the building has been patched up as much as it possibly can be. When suggestions were made with regard to acquiring more land, I have always thought that there was no need whatever of our acquiring any more ground, as we have all we require in order to construct all the public buildings this country needs. The ground on which this building is erected, together with such additional land as could be taken in, would suffice to provide ample accommodation for the records of the court and the library and probably the Department of Justice.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I fear very much that we have not ground enough, judging by recent requirements, for the public buildings we require. I agree with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that the site of the Supreme Court may suffice for one building, but if we are to have the public buildings required in Ottawa, I fear that it will be necessary to spread out and acquire more ground. When one looks to the great increase of business during the past few years, one can form some idea of what may be the increase during the next twenty years, and we will have to face the necessity of acquiring more land for public buildings. No doubt a good building could be erected on the site of the Supreme Court. But whether it will be better to build on the open grounds is a matter for serious consideration. Opinions differ very much, but it will be most desirable to maintain the open spaces we have now and not crowd the buildings so close together.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that if we would build a high level bridge across the canal, we have there unoccupied land belonging to the government which we might use. A portion of this is taken up by the park, but if necessary for a public building, I do not see why we should not encroach on the park. We have, however, a lot of ground unoccupied, not used for park purposes, which we might use to build on. Then there are some departments which might be further away. At Washington many of the buildings are some three miles apart, no doubt owing to the great scarcity of ground. In this city there are departments which might be transferred to another portion of the city, and which could be easily reached by the electric cars. And it would not be difficult to get ground not very expensive, but which would be a little remote from the grounds here, and which would suit the purposes of the departments which the public do not often require to visit.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). The suggestion of the hon. Minister of Public Works is, in my opinion, a very good one. There is no doubt that we shall have to acquire more land to meet the requirements of the public service. I would throw out the suggestion that the government look out for some other site on which to erect a new parliament building and devote the present building to departmental purposes. In this we would be following the examples set in London and Paris and other capitals, and it seems to me that we could devise a plan for a building in which the representatives of the people could meet which would be a credit to the country at large.

Supreme Court of Canada—contingencies and disbursements—salaries of officers (sheriff, registrar as editor and publisher of the reports, usher, &c.), books for judges, not exceeding $300, and salary of messenger, $330, $5,030.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase of $30 here.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I find that the sheet of my memoranda containing the details of this vote is mislaid, so I cannot give details. The sheriff, of course, is given a per diem allowance during the sitting of the Supreme Court, and the registrar, as

editor and publisher of reports, receives an amount in addition to his salary.

Printing, binding and distributing Supreme Court reports, $3,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that work done at the Bureau ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. At what price are these sold ? Is it sufficient to meet the cost ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. At $2.50. The details are given in the Auditor General's Report. If hon. gentlemen will turn to page M—52 of the Auditor General's Report, they will see the amount paid not only for the Supreme Court Reports, but for the Exchequer Court Reports as well.

Mr. CLARKE. I see that $3,149 was received.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. From the sale of Supreme Court Reports, yes.

Mr. CLARKE. The expenditure in connection with the preparation and printing of these reports exceeded the receipts by $3,000 per annum ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, we here have to provide for the expense of preparation and publication, then the amount which is received, as shown by the Auditor General's Report, goes into the consolidated revenue fund.

Mr. LENNOX. Then, a little more is received than is expended ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

For the purchase of law books and works of reference for the Supreme Court library, $4,500.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the explanation of that ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is an amount which has been voted for several years past for the purchase of law books for the Supreme Court library. I do not think that my hon. friends who visit the library will find there is any objection to the expenditure, because we are obliged to expend a large sum for reports, for we receive the Canadian reports, also the British and the American reports that are of value. In addition, we must buy text books. Those who are obliged to maintain a working law library find it an exceedingly expensive undertaking.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). One of the objections is that after you get the books you will have no place to put them.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No place to use them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And not even much of a place to put them.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the great difficulty.

Exchequer Court of Canada—junior second-class clerks, $1,000.

Mr. CLARKE. How many junior second-class clerks are there ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are two in the department—one has reached the maximum of his class, and I am making special provision for the other.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, this covers the salary of only one clerk ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, it should read 'second-class clerk.'

Junior second-class clerk, Duncan Clark, notwithstanding any thing in the Civil Service Act, $900.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister seems to be giving this officer three statutory increases at once.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I wish to explain the circumstances. I can fairly say with regard to the Civil Service Act that I heartily approve of the conditions it imposes on the executive with regard to the treatment meted out to civil servants. This is one of the departments controlled by the Act, and so we could not give this officer more than $50 increase in one year. But there are special circumstances in this case which lead me to come to parliament and ask its approval of what I have done in increasing his salary to the extent of $150. The registrar of the Exchequer Court, under whose immediate direction this young clerk is, wrote to the deputy minister of Justice that this young gentleman has been in the department for nine years. He says :

He has proved himself a faithful, reliable and able officer, and the work he has to do is one of responsibility and requiring skill. Mr. Clark keeps all the documents and books in this office and takes down in shorthand and transcribes on the typewriter all my correspondence. He sells law stamps and generally does all the work at the counter, and in the discharge of such duties has proved himself most faithful. I may also add that he has not yet got one annual statutory increase. I believe he is most deserving of the increase which I now recommend.

I concur in the recommendation of the Deputy Minister of Justice, and I think it my duty to come to the House and get the statutory increase which has been recommended.

Mr. SPROULE. Has he been getting the regular or statutory increase from year to year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. With one exception, in 1897. From the information which was furnished to me about this young gentleman by the registrar of the exchequer court, if they were deprived of his services now they would find it very difficult to replace him with the salary they are now paying, $900.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to draw attention to this feature of the case, that there are many deserving clerks in the civil service who have had no statutory increase for a good many years, some of them owing to the fact that they were in the maximum of their class and could not be transferred to another class. This clerk has been receiving the regular statutory increase, it appears, with the exception of one year; but there are many others who have remained for several years without it, and it seems to me an injustice to them.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is a case of special merit. This young man went into the department many years ago, and has risen to the position he now occupies. He is vigilant and active in his duties, and under these circumstances we ought to show our approbation of what he has done.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I can point out instances where men have been in the service over twenty years and have received no statutory increase for the last eight or ten years.

Contingencies—judge's and registrar's travelling expenses, salaries of sheriffs, &c., printing and stationery, &c., and $50 for judge's books, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In regard to travelling expenses this is a very expensive court. The Exchequer Court sits at various places throughout the Dominion as occasion requires. If there is a case at Halifax or Vancouver originating in the Exchequer Court, and where it is necessary for witnesses to be heard, the judge goes to such place. As a result of that arrangement four-fifths of the time of the judge and registrar of the Exchequer Court is spent in travelling about from place to place. At the present moment the judge of the Exchequer Court is at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, trying a case. To-morrow he may have to go to British Columbia. I think he is careful in his expenses. I understand the expenditure stands now at the amount at which it stood in 1890. I think that is fair evidence of the fact that the judge has not been extravagant.

Additional to registrar as editor and publisher of exchequer reports, $300.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The registrar of the Exchequer Court has taken the responsibility of editing and publishing reports of the judgments rendered in that court, and for these services he has been receiving for many years the sum of $300. The registrar of the Supreme Court performs a like duty with respect to the judgments of that court and he also receives an additional salary.

Charles Morse, for furnishing reports of Exchequer Court decisions to legal periodicals, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $50.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. These reports are extracts of the judgments which are rendered, and are furnished to the legal papers for the information of the general public.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not see that the government should pay for that service. The papers who are publishing that legal information should pay for it themselves.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend, who like myself belongs to the profession, knows that the unfortunate publishers of legal periodicals are not as a rule overburdened with this world's wealth. These periodicals, though they are exceedingly useful to the profession, are not a source of great remuneration to the publishers. As the expenditure has been going on for a number of years, it is hardly worth while to object to it now.

Salary of registrar in Admiralty, Quebec, $666.66.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With reference to this item and the next one for salary of marshall, in what way are these officers distinct from the registrars at St. John and Halifax ? Are they paid on a different basis ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. These gentlemen who are connected with the Admiralty Court at Quebec were appointed at the time that court was a branch of the Imperial Admiralty Court, and their appointments were made subject to the approval of the home authorities. At the time of the change in our admiralty system when the Admiralty Court ceased to be a branch of the Imperial Court and became a branch of the Exchequer Court of Canada, these officers who were then in the receipt of a salary were taken over, it was understood their salary was to continue on as long as they remained in the office at the same rates that they were then paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think in the admiralty courts of other provinces the marshall and the registrar are paid by fees, which are a burden upon the litigants. I suppose the intention is, after the present incumbents cease to hold office, to place the court in that respect on the same footing as the courts in the other provinces.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Act provides that when these incumbents cease to hold office their successors should come within the operation of our Exchequer Court Act, which provides that they should be paid by fees. In addition to this salary they receive fees also.

To provide accommodation when necessary for Exchequer Court in Admiralty, $300.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this vote usually drawn upon ? Do not the judges in the Exchequer Court and the Admiralty

Court make use of the court-house buildings provided in each of the provinces ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Sometimes a claim is made upon us, but this vote is not usually drawn upon. Take, for instance, the case of the Halifax court-house which, as far as my limited knowledge enables me to speak, is under the joint control of the province and the county.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The city and county.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, the city and county. A claim has been made on us by the county in respect to the occupation of the court-house by the judge of the Exchequer Court. The point is still in dispute, but it is to meet such cases that we have this vote. It has not been drawn upon to any extent.

Yukon Territory—travelling allowances of judges, $1,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do the judges in the Yukon go on circuit at all ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Very little, but they sometimes sit at White Horse and occasionally they have to move away from Dawson. I have made inquiry as to the amount spent under this vote and I find it is very small as a rule.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much was expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have been referred to page M—17 of the Auditor General's Report and I have looked the matter through, but I cannot find that there appears to have been any amount paid. I cannot speak with any degree of accuracy. But I asked what amount had been paid under that item, and I was told that the judges sometimes went to White Horse and that a certain expenditure was made, but that last year a very small amount was paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty I find about page M—17 is that there is no item at the top to show out of which vote these things have been paid.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the page given to me in the brief that was prepared for me in connection with my estimates, but, upon looking at the page, I find that it does not give me any information whatever. There is an item for travelling expenses of $791.75 made up as follows :

George Craig, stenographer, travel, Dawson to Ottawa and return, $322.45 ; George L. Taylor, police magistrate, travel, Bothwell, Ontario to Ottawa, and removal expenses to White Horse, $49.30.

I do not find any item showing the travelling expenses of judges.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman explain what is the meaning of this item of $791.75 for travelling expenses ? Why should a stenographer travel to Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In respect to Mr. Taylor, I know that this expenditure was connected with his removal when he went into the country, but in respect to Mr. Craig, why we should pay his travelling expenses from Dawson to Ottawa and return, I am not in a position to say. I am quite willing to allow that item to remain over for the purpose of making inquiry as to these expenses.

Item allowed to stand.

Salaries of sheriff and clerk of Territorial Court at $4,000 each, $8,000.

Mr. CLARKE. In the Auditor General's Report at page M—54, there is some correspondence in reference to sheriff's fees. Would the hon. minister give us any explanation about that ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That was a difficulty that occurred with the sheriff previous to the estimates of last year. The sheriff was in the habit of receiving in addition to the salary voted to him a portion of the fees, but last year it was decided by the government that in future he should not have the right to receive any fees.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are we to understand by that ? Are the fees paid into the consolidated revenue fund, or are they abolished ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They come into the consolidated revenue fund. The arrangement with the sheriff formerly was that he received a certain amount by way of salary, then he had a living allowance and he retained one-half or one-third of the fees of his office. The Auditor General argued that it was doubtful whether the government had the right to make any such arrangement as that with the sheriff and after considerable discussion and some correspondence, it was decided that we would take statutory authority to pay the sheriff each year a fixed salary of $4,000, and take away his right to sheriff's fees. So that, the fees now go into the consolidated revenue fund.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was that put into the form of a statute last year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, and the salary was fixed at $4,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do you make an allowance to the sheriff besides that for his travelling expenses ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We give the sheriff a living allowance in the district.

Mr. CLARKE. How much ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. One thousand eight hundred a year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And no travelling expenses ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

Salaries of deputy sheriff and two assistant Clerks of Territorial Court at $1,800 each, $5,400.

Mr. LENNOX. Is that necessary? We have a sheriff and a chief clerk of the Territorial Court, as well as a deputy sheriff and two assistant clerks, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has looked into this matter at all. I do not know whether it is necessary, but I would not think it necessary.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have been recently pressed for the appointment of two additional clerks of the Territorial Court, and I have withstood the pressure up to the present time because I could not believe it was absolutely necessary. I was under the impression that a chief clerk and two assistants ought to do the work of the court. But, in respect to the sheriff my information is that a sheriff and an assistant are required. The courts have had a good deal of work to do during the last two or three years, and I do not think any complaints have been made that the officials have not had plenty to do. There is considerable litigation going on in the Yukon.

Salaries for two stenographers of Territorial Court at $2,000 each, $4,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are these salaries in any way provided for by charges made against litigants?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The litigants are charged an amount which is more than sufficient to provide for that expense.

Yukon—living allowance of judges at $5,000 each, $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Three or four years ago we had as an explanation of this item, that living expenses were very high in the Yukon, but notwithstanding that the cost of living is decreasing, the allowance is kept as high as ever. What is the explanation of that?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend will remember the trouble we had last year with respect to the living allowance paid to the judges in the Yukon. That trouble arose out of the fact that a certain sum was allowed by the Department of Justice, and in addition to that the judges were allowed residence, and fuel and light, by the Department of Public Works. We thought it better to take the position that we should pay these gentlemen in addition to their salaries of $5,000 a year each, a fixed sum of $5,000, in view of all claims for living allowance. They now receive no perquisities or allowances of any description that we know of, except this sum. This was done last year after the difficulty had arisen in connection with Judge Dugas. I may say that it became necessary for us to take action against Judge Dugas to make him account for certain perquisites he received outside of his living allowance paid by the Department of Justice. We came to the conclusion that he should have to account for anything he was paid by any other department than the Department of Justice, and we are having that issue settled in the courts now. To avoid all possible difficulty in the future, we have decided that the judges shall each receive $5,000 a year as salary, and $5,000 as living allowance, and no more. That amount was fixed after the discussion last year in the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the judges given residences besides that amount?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, we do not give them anything whatever except the $5,000. We take the position that we give a judge in the Yukon $5,000 over and above what would be paid to a judge in a similar position in one of the older provinces, in order to compensate him for any additional expense he may be put to in connection with his residence in that country.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a good deal better system than the former system which was growing to be a scandal, because no one could tell what we were paying these judges every year or from what source it was coming. This system has the merit of showing us how much we are actually paying. I am not prepared to say whether the amount is too high or not, but it is claimed that the cost of living in the Yukon has much decreased, and if that be so, it would seem that the compensation is very ample. I see that in addition to that we are paying the sheriffs and other officials as well. I do not see why we should do that now. We are giving them good salaries, and in other portions of the country they would have to provide for their own living.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This amount for living expenses is put in the estimates every year, so that we may be in a position to reduce the amounts at any time we may think proper. It was originally suggested that the judges should receive $10,000 a year all told, and that that should be put in the statutes, but we thought it wiser to give the Yukon judges the usual salary paid to other judges in a similar position, and to vote the living allowance each year, so that we could decrease it at any time we thought we would be justified in doing so. I think, however, that the conditions have not yet reached that position where we should decrease the amount, but at all events, under the present system we can consider it each year.

Mr. LENNOX. The explanation af the minister appears to be satisfactory, provided that the decrease be made at as early a period as possible. I am not in a position to judge as to whether the $10,000 a year all told is too high or not, but it appears to me that it is quite questionable whether the additional $5,000 for living allowance is not

decidedly too high at the present time. We pay a judge in the province of Ontario $5,000 a year, and out of that he has to furnish his own living. Suppose we estimate that at $3,500, and allowing, as we do, the Yukon judges $5,000 a year for living allowance, that would place their living expenses at $8,500 a year. As the result of the agitation from this side of the House last year, what has been referred to as an improper method of remunerating these judges has been done away with, and I have faith that the Minister of Justice will see to it that next session these living allowances will be revised. I do not want to put the judges in the Yukon on any unfair basis, but we should put them as nearly as possible upon an equal basis with the judges in the other parts of the country.

Mr. CLARKE. Did I understand the minister to say that there was a suit in progress against one of the Yukon judges to compel him to restore some moneys he has retained ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not say that. Last year we had a considerable discussion here with respect to the living allowances that were paid to the judges in the Yukon. I said that they received a certain amount by way of living allowance under the authority of parliament voted in the estimates, and it was discovered that in addition to the amount paid to them by the Department of Justice, they received divers other amounts from the Department of Public Works. I did not say they received money, but they received benefits such as being allowed to reside in houses that were the property of the government, or, that the rent of their houses had been paid by the Department of Public Works, or, that fire-wood or light had been supplied to them. When the matter was discussed in the House it was my opinion that it was more or less irregular that they should receive these allowances outside of the Department of Justice, and in order to have that opinion properly tested, I drew the attention of the judge to the fact, and asked him to refund the money. He replied that he was under no obligation to do so, because that was one of the conditions under which he went into the Yukon, and as the matter was in issue between us, I thought the proper way to have it tested was by a suit, and a suit was begun.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is trying the suit ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is an insinuation which I think I must repel. It will be tried in the Exchequer Court.

Mr. LENNOX. Do I understand the minister to say that the suit that is being brought is to recover, amongst other things, the money which represents rental and the expenditures for fuel and lighting which were in controversy a year ago ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Living allowances of sheriff, deputy sheriff, clerk of the court, assistant clerks, police magistrate and stenographers of Yukon Territorial Court, at $1,800 each, $14,400.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister tell us how much money Sheriff Eilbeck draws for salary, living allowances and incidentals, not only in his department, but in the other departments of the government ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman is rather unfair in expecting me to answer for all the other departments of the government. So far as the Department of Justice is concerned, he receives $4,000 as salary and $1,800 as living allowance.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see he was paid also expenses in connection with the execution of O'Brien, erecting scaffold, executioner's fee, &c., $586.80.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. These are expenses which are paid in the other provinces by the provincial governments. When persons like O'Brien have to be disposed of, the sheriff cannot be expected to pay the expenses out of his own pocket.

Mr. TAYLOR. They cost a good deal, however. I also find that Sheriff Eilbeck is paid large sums by the Department of the Interior for selling town lots. He must be a valuable officer. I think his salary as sheriff should cover his services in selling government property at auction ; yet he is paid auctioneer's fees. I would like to know how much he draws altogether.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot say how much he drew in connection with the hanging of O'Brien ; but judging from the Auditor General's report, O'Brien proved to be an expensive luxury to the Dominion of Canada. It cost a good deal to catch him and a good deal to try him, but I think the way in which he was captured and disposed of reflected great credit on the administration of justice in the Yukon, especially on the North-west Mounted Police.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see that Mr. F. C. Wade, Crown prosecutor, got $3,000 for his services in connection with the prosecution of O'Brien. It appears to me that these officials are drawing pretty large sums.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that all these officials are paid about as much for living allowances as they are for salaries. If their salaries are fairly adequate for the work done, I do not see why we should pay their board also. In no other part of Canada is it done. I could see some reason why it should have been done in the early history of that country, when living was exceptionally high ; but to-day living in Dawson is as luxurious as in most other parts of Canada, and the cost of living is not so great as it was. We pay two deputy sheriffs a salary of $1,800 each, which would be con-

sidered a fairly good salary in other parts of Canada ; and why we should add to that $1,800 more for living allowance I cannot understand. It practically means that we are paying $3,600 for a deputy sheriff in the Yukon, whereas in other parts of Canada such an official would not be paid half that amount. We are paying all these officials good salaries, and I do not see why we should pay them living allowances also.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the officials in the Yukon are being paid reasonably good salaries, and I think the question of living allowances is one that must be considered in the immediate future ; and in view of the discussion which has taken place to-day, I will look into it very carefully. When these estimates were prepared in December last, I was told that the cost of living in the Yukon was still very high, and was fairly represented by the amount we allowed. Of course, I cannot speak from my own experience, as I have not been there ; but one of the gentlemen whom I consulted on the subject was connected with the North-west Mounted Police.

Mr. HENDERSON. With reference to this increased cost of living in the Yukon, may I ask the minister if he knows the cause of it ? I understand that in the Yukon they are now producing grains and vegetables of the very best quality, and I fail to discover how it is that our officials there require so much compensation on account of the cost of living. I rather fear it is because of the extravagant habits they have got into, and I am not sure that this parliament is justified in cultivating those habits. Perhaps it would be wise to put a little check upon these officials, and ask them to live more as other people do.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of course, if grain and vegetables were grown in the Yukon to a sufficient extent to meet the local needs, I would agree with my hon. friend. But if he supposes that to be the case, his knowledge of the Yukon is about as imperfect as mine. That is not my information. For instance, I have been informed that $75 a month has to be paid for a maid servant ; and if everything else costs on the same scale, one can understand what living in the Yukon means.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that the hon. minister's source of information is the government officials. Of course, that does not explain why domestic help is so expensive. When there is so much immigration coming to the country, perhaps the government can do something in the way of providing increased help there.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice that there does not appear to be any regular scale of living allowance. The sheriff is allowed $1,800, and the police magistrate, who bears a good name—George L. Taylor—receives a salary of $2,400 and a living allowance, from September 9 to June 30, of $2,433.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The police magistrate receives $1,800 living allowance.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Auditor General's Report says he receives $2,400.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That was before last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Besides that, he is paid $469 for a trip from Bothwell to Ottawa, and from Ottawa to White Horse.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When he went into the country, the expenses of getting into White Horse were allowed him.

Mr. SPROULE. Take the stenographer there. He gets $2,000 per year, which is the same price as a stenographer gets here, and the work is not so heavy. But in addition he gets $34 per week for living expenses. Take the deputy sheriffs, they get $34 per week for living expenses, over and above their salary of $150 per month. If you were adding ten or twenty per cent to the salaries for the increased cost of living, that would perhaps not be unreasonable, but when you double the salaries, I think you are paying too much. It cannot cost a man $34 more per week to live there than here.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not say that there is not a great deal in what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be the case, then the hon. minister had better look into it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. But we have the same thing every year. Although there is partial admission of the soundness of our criticism, still from procrastination or from some other cause, the government puts off applying any remedy and there is no improvement.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is an improvement. Formerly the sheriffs were paid salaries by way of fees, but a remedy has been applied. The question is whether $1,800 per year for living allowance is too much. My information is that it is a reasonable amount, but in view of what my hon. friend has said, I shall make further inquiries, and if I conclude that that is too much, I am not compelled to pay it. The vote simply puts a certain amount at the disposal of the government, but the government is under no obligation to pay it out. It is not a contract.

Mr. SPROULE. The vote is for a specific purpose, and I do not see how the hon. minister can get out of paying it. If we vote an amount for salary, we have to pay that out.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If a man is voted a certain salary then a bargain is entered into with him; but with respect to

living allowance, that is an amount which is to be paid him in addition to his salary unless we come to the conclusion that it is too high and notify him that we will not pay it. He then has the option of taking what we offer or giving up his place.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). As regards the cost of living in the Yukon, let me quote a few items from the 'Dawson Times' of April the 3rd, 1903. Butter, 50 cents per pound; fresh eggs, $1.50 per dozen; cream cheese, 50 cents per pound; lard, 35 cents per pound; potatoes, 21 cents per pound; onions, 20 cents per pound; carrots, 20 cents per pound; beets, 20 cents per pound; apples, 9 to 10 cents; oranges, 25 cents; lemons, $1.50; flour, $4 per hundred pounds; rolled oats, 20 cents per pound; sugar, 15 cents per pound. Fresh meats: sausages, 50 cents per pound; beef, 30 to 75 cents per pound; pork, 43 to 50 cents; mutton, 35 to 60; veal, 35 to 75; poultry, 45 cents; turkeys, 40 to 50 cents; ducks, 40 cents; white fish, 50 cents; oysters, $1.50—I do not know per pound or not. Canned fruits and vegetables, canned tomatoes, which are retailed here at 10 cents, sell in Dawson at 50 cents; beans, 25 cents; canned peas, 25 cents. These are the retail prices in Dawson. Everything seems to sell at extraordinary prices compared with the prices in Ontario. Dried apples which we can buy in Ontario at three cents, are sold at Dawson at thirty cents; peaches, apricots and pears are sold at thirty cents. Pearl coal oil sells at $7, but I do not know whether it is $7 per gallon or not; oats, seven cents; hay 15 cents; bran, seven and a half cents.

This will give some idea of the cost of living in the Yukon. Of course this is in the month of April when things perhaps are higher than at any other season, but according to these quotations, it would cost a man twice, if not three times as much, to actually live in the Yukon as it would in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. No doubt it would cost him a good deal more, but the hon. gentleman has partially answered himself by referring to the fact that he has quoted the market when it is at its highest. But compare some of the items with Ontario prices. Butter sells at 50 cents in Dawson and at 25 cents here, which would indicate that in the staple articles of life, the cost is twice as high as it is here. But when we give these employees $34 per week for increased cost of living, it seems to me we are giving an extravagant sum. You can get your board here at $6 per week, and if you add $34 to that, you have $40 as the price of board per week up there, and no one will pretend to say that it would cost that much. While the cost of living is much dearer there than here, it is not dearer in proportion to the increased allowance we give these officials. The hon. minister says he is at liberty to cut down this item. But suppose he notified one of the employees that he intended cutting down his living allowance, and the employee went on doing his work to the end of the year and demanded his allowance for living expenses as now voted, I am inclined to think that the Auditor General would say that he was entitled to it. I do not think we could prevent it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That would be right.

Mr. SPROULE. That being the case, we ought to revise it. At the time this was struck I was going to mention that there were perquisites coming to these officers from many sources. I have no doubt that, with the salary, a liberal living allowance, and all these perquisites, we made their remuneration very high. And, as the cost of living comes down, we ought to reduce the allowance. But we are making no effort in that direction, so far as I know.

Mr. BOYD. I would like to ask the minister from whom the recommendation was received on which the allowances for expenses were based? Who recommended to council to make these allowances?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The position we took last year, when this was fixed, was that the cost of living in the Yukon was about three times the cost of living in eastern Canada. I did not follow closely the figures given by my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Ross), but I should think the cost would be quite three times what it is in the east. In any event, that is the basis on which we proceeded.

Mr. BOYD. I am glad the hon. minister has given that explanation, because it enables me to draw his attention and the attention of the government to a matter we discussed here last year. It seems to me there is a little government clique in the Yukon, and whatever they recommend or propose or desire they are able to have carried through. I drew the government's attention last year to the fact that men are working in the Yukon—not labourers or anything of that kind—at salaries of $100 and $150 a month, without any allowance, I refer to the telegraph operators. It will be found by the Auditor General's Report that these officers are paid only $150 a month. These gentlemen are not in the clique I mentioned, and, not being in this little particular family circle, they are not allowed this $1,800 to $5,000 a year for living expenses. They are men of intelligence, education and ability, and, besides, they have a craft at which one cannot become expert with less than from three to five years' training. I would ask the Minister of Justice if he thinks this is fair treatment for one body of men as compared with that meted out to the sheriff, the Crown prosecutor and others?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I should not like to be asked to express an opinion

on what my colleagues may do; I have as much as I can take care of to answer the questions with regard to my own department. But I do not think it fair to assume that this rate of living has been fixed at the suggestion of those who are benefited by it. I may say that when the rate was to be struck last year, I considered what was being paid out then, and I thought it ought to be reduced very considerably. I consulted those who, I thought, ought to be in a position to help me, including officials whose experience in that country would be likely to be useful in enabling me to judge what it would cost to maintain a man in that region. After considering the whole matter, I came to a conclusion that I thought fair. It may be that I looked at it from the generous side—I will not say that I did not; it may be that it is my nature to do so. I think I dealt fairly with these people. I may have transgressed somewhat, but I am willing to be criticised and to consider any facts relating to the matter that may be brought to my knowledge. When the supplementary estimates are before us, this matter will come up again. In the meantime I can discuss the question with those who are in a position to know, and, in that way judge as to the correctness of the conclusions we have reached.

Mr. CLARKE. I regret that the Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) was not here to hear the statement of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) with regard to telegraph operators. These are skilled workmen, and, in view of the fact that they must devote a number of years to their training before they can become expert in their craft, it is only reasonable that this should be allowed for in fixing their remuneration. And, if a subordinate official receives from $1,200 to $1,800 per year for living allowance, surely the claims of the telegraph operators are deserving of consideration. The Minister of Labour or the fair wage officer ought to look into the matter.

Mr. LAVELL. Do I understand that this $5,000 of living allowance to the judges is not a matter of contract with the judges, but is within the discretion of the Department of Justice?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The position we took was that, under the statute, we would fix $5,000 a year as salary, and, with respect to the living allowance we would make that a matter of vote to be passed upon each year by parliament, so that each year we might reduce the allowance if we felt that the reduction of living expenses would justify it. That is not a matter of contract at all, but it is a provision made by parliament for the maintenance of these gentlemen during the ensuing fiscal year. At any time, I take it, we could come here and say: We will abolish the living allowance altogether, or we could simply omit the item from the estimates. Or we could say: In view of the altered conditions in the Yukon, instead of proposing to parliament to give $5,000, we will propose to give only $3,000 or $2,500. Of course, there is a statute to fix the salary.

Mr. LAVELL. But once the amount is passed in the estimates and fixed for the year by parliament, the judge is entitled to it as a matter of right?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. With regard to the amount for a judge, I would say that it would be difficult to interfere with it. But with respect to an official who is not in a position to be able to say that his position is permanent, I think we can say to him: Parliament has voted $1,800 for your living allowance, but I consider that excessive. I would be within my right to notify an official that, in addition to his salary, instead of $1,800 living allowance, he would be allowed $1,000 or $1,200. If this were done, it would be for him to decide whether he would remain in the employ of the government or not.

Mr. LAVELL. But, so far as the judge was concerned, does the minister think it would be a matter of question whether their allowance was within his discretion?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Clearly.

Mr. LAVELL. It seems to me that it is at variance with the principle of the independence of our judges to give the government control, practically over their salaries—for that is what it comes to. Most certainly, under these circumstances they cannot be as independent of the government of the day as—well, as the rest of the judges of the country are.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The judge is appointed by statute, and his remuneration is fixed by statute. In addition, he receives this amount, but that has nothing to do with his position.

Mr. LAVELL. Nothing to do with his position, but very much to do with his remuneration. As I said before, it seems to me that this is calculated to interfere very seriously with the independence of the bench, which is recognized as part and parcel of our very constitution. There are no other judges, so far as I am aware, whose salaries can be at all interfered with by the government of the day.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think my hon. friend has suggested a broad question in bringing this matter up. But it does not go any further than we have been in the habit of going when we appoint judges, for instance, to act as commissioners and vote them remunerations in addition to their salaries. All these questions are on the same line. When parliament undertakes to give additional remuneration to a judge for additional services, we get on

the fringe of the independence of judges, as my hon. friend has pointed out. I remember some years ago reading an interesting article on the subject as to whether, when a judge had been appointed for the purpose of giving the whole of his time to the country, it was not unconstitutional for us to take him from the service, to the performance of which he was appointed under the statute, and employ him for some other purpose, or to give him any other remuneration whatever for that additional work. However, that is one of the broad questions that I think I would not like to discuss now without giving it careful consideration.

Mr. LENNOX. I think we might direct our attention for a moment to what has been said by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). The Minister of Justice pointed out that he has no direct control over this matter of the telegraph operators, but he tells us that his sympathies are in the line of generosity. I think we ought to enlist his sympathies on behalf of this class of persons. It is unfortunate that the Minister of Labour is not here. It would be satisfactory if we could get that hon. gentleman down to some practical action in relieving these parties who require in many instances the assistance of the Minister of Labour in order to get fair remuneration. We make a mistake in think- that because a man holds a pen, or fills some other position that requires no particular amount of intelligence, he should get a large salary, whereas a man in a mechanical occupation which requires a good deal of skill, where he requires to be constantly on the alert, should be paid much on the line of an ordinary labourer.

An hon. MEMBER. Less than a servant girl.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, because according to what the Minister of Justice has said, a servant girl gets $75 and her board up in the Yukon. There seems to me to be a great disparity between the pay of these two classes of individuals. I think the scale of wages should be revised up in the line of assisting the telegraph operators, and revised down as regards these officials whose living expenses we have been discussing.

Mr. SPROULE. When I total up the items for the administration of justice in the Yukon, I find they aggregate $123,800. That sum is spent in a country not as big as one of our ordinary counties. It seems extravagant, and ought to be reduced.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. By way of illustration, let me remark to the hon. gentleman that for the maintenance of prisoners in the North-west Territories we pay to the mounted police sixty cents per head per diem. But when you come to the Yukon the charge is $2 per head per diem. So you get some indication of the reason why the administration of justice is so costly in the Yukon Territory. These figures show the difference in the cost of living between the two countries.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the Minister of Justice to say that the living allowance for the sheriff had been fixed. What was it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. One thousand eight hundred dollars.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will he explain why he paid $2,437.23 from September to June ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That was for last year finishing in the month of June. The $1,800 was fixed during last session.

Mr. TAYLOR. Could not the hon. gentleman have found a gentleman in the Yukon country suitable to be appointed police magistrate, without coming east and getting a man to whom he had to pay $461 to get him in there.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I don't think you could find a better man than Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. The name is all right. He must be some party who wanted a government office pretty bad, and the government thought the best way to get rid of him was to send him out to the Yukon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By chapter 36 of last year's statutes, we provided that the police magistrate may be paid, in addition to his salary, such living allowance as may be fixed by the Governor General in Council. Are all these fixed by Order in Council ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, and voted in the estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not understand how six of the judges were paid $3,000 living allowance according to the Auditor General's Report last year. Now we are to increase it to $5,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend will remember what occurred last year when these items were voted. We had a very interesting discussion with respect to the payments to Mr. Justice Dugas. At the time I contended strenuously that he had been paid nothing except what he had received by way of living allowance from the Department of Justice. A reference to the Auditor General's Report established the fact that he had been allowed by the Public Works Department certain perquisites in respect to a residence and other matters of that sort. Then the question arose whether it was proper for the Public Works Department to make this allowance. I explained a moment ago that it had been necessary for us to take a suit against Mr. Justice Dugas to recover back the money

value of the perquisites he received from the Public Works Department, as a test question to ascertain whether he was entitled to receive these perquisites. Then we determined that the salary should be fixed at $5,000, and that the living allowance should be $5,000 each year—not $10,000 together, but in addition to the permanent salary of $5,000, we might give him from year to year a living allowance of $5,000 so as to be able at any time to reduce that allowance without interfering with the independence of the judges.

Mr. BOYD. I see in the Auditor General's Report, at M—54, that the Auditor General says :

An Order in Council passed May 31 last, increases the sheriff's salary from $2,000 to $3,000 per annum, his living allowance from $1,200 to $1,800 ; and in addition allows him to retain one half of the fees after paying remuneration and expenses of his deputy or deputies and other expenses.

Then a little further down :

During the summer of 1900, Sheriff Eilbeck was paid $2,751.37 by the Department of the Interior for fourteen days services as auctioneer at the sale of mining claims in the Yukon.

Now, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice and also that of the right hon. leader of the government to these items. We all know the generosity of the Minister of Justice because his nationality would not permit him to be otherwise, we know the generosity of the right hon. Prime Minister himself. We all admit that and we are pleased with it. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the great disparity that exists between one class of the employees of the government and another. The right hon. leader of the government, I have no doubt, puts in the exact farthing that it costs to maintain the mounted police. Under the department over which the hon. Minister of Justice presides it costs $2 a day to keep a convict. They do not feed these men as a rule on delicacies; at least, they are not supposed to. If it costs $2 a day to keep one of these ordinary convicts what about the poor man who gets $100 a month, pays out $60 for board and has $40 left ? In view of the fact that a member of that particular family is involved in the question, $2,751 for fourteen days work does not seem to be out of place. This government will allow it to pass unquestioned. I would like to draw the attention of these generous members of the cabinet to the position of the mounted police to see if they will not do something for these men who, I believe, are under paid.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry to say that we have been guilty of being too economical. We will try and not do it again.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there no answer to make to the statement that the sheriff was paid this large sum as an auctioneer in addition to the salary he received for his ordinary work ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have nothing to say about that. It is a question as to whether or not the Department of the Interior ought to have paid the sheriff any fee for the service he rendered in connection with the sale of mining claims. He never received it from my department and I am not responsible for the payment.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister said : We will fix the salary of the sheriff at $3,000 and give him a living allowance, but he said nothing about retaining his fees. The Auditor General makes the statement of the receipts and disbursements of fees by the sheriff. The disbursements were as follows :—

North-west Mounted Police and others for serving papers.. .. ..$	406 00
J. M. Eilbeck, as deputy sheriff..	750 00
Retained by sheriff as his share of fees.	819 53
Deposited to credit of Receiver General..	819 53
Total..	$2,795 06

Now, some correspondence took place with the hon. gentleman's department in which the hon. minister's deputy, Mr. Newcombe, says :

The government is authorized to pay him a salary of $3,000 in addition to such fees of office as may be allowed by the Governor in Council.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I thought I had made myself clear about that. Last year there was a change in the position of the sheriff. We made provision that the sheriff, instead of receiving, as he had been in the habit of receiving, a share of the fees in addition to his salary, should be paid a fixed salary of $4,000 and $1,800 living allowance. That was to take the place of the fees he had received heretofore and to avoid the difficulty which the Auditor General had pointed out. That arrangement took effect late in the year 1901 or in the early part of 1902.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did you also relieve the sheriff of the privilege of being employed by other departments and being paid $2,700 for his services as an auctioneer, while neglecting his duty as sheriff, working fourteen days and drawing $2,700 for it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Department of Interior made that payment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I observe that a question arose as to the collection of the fines, the correspondence in regard to which will be found in the Auditor General's Report at page M—59. The correspondence is in an unfinished condition as a reference is made to the Hon. Mr. Ross who was then the commissioner of the Yukon Territory, and it is said that the matter will be dealt with upon his return.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Are those the fines paid to the magistrates ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. These have been paid over. The fact is that a magistrate there was of the opinion that he was entitled as part of his perquisites to receive these fines. I agreed with the position taken by the Auditor General and as a result the magistrate's cheque did not go out until he had paid these fines in.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is a very extraordinary view of the situation for a magistrate to take that he would be entitled to these fines.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He argued that he was entitled to receive a portion of the fines. I never had any doubt about the matter and it was speedily disposed of when it was brought to the attention of the deputy minister and myself.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. minister to say that he had stopped officers receiving perquisites or salary from any other source.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not say 'salary from any other source.' You have the services performed as auctioneer, for instance. I could not control that.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. minister think that the government should allow a practice like that to go on, if a sheriff gets $4,000 a year and which is supposed to pay him for all his time ? For fourteen days work auctioning off mining claims we paid him at the rate of $195 a day in addition to his salary ? Is that not an abuse, particularly when we consider that in addition to paying $4,000 a year salary we are giving him $1,800 for a living allowance ? That is $5,800 a year that he receives by way of salary and in addition for fourteen days work he gets $2,751. Does the government think this is good management or that it is not unreasonable extravagance and mismanagement of the funds of the country ? It seems to me that it is. If the sheriff is paid for every hour of his time surely he is not entitled to charge the country with a large sum of money in addition to his salary.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule). The sheriff has statutory duties to perform. His duties are fixed and circumscribed by the statute. He is obliged to perform these duties and he is not obliged to perform any other. If he is called upon to perform the duties of an auctioneer, then, he can reasonably be dealt with as if he were a stranger. He is not under any obligation to sell these mining lands or to perform these duties ? If he does perform them is it not possible that he may be dealt with as any other stranger would be ? It is not part of his duties to sell them. If it were a stranger that was called upon to perform these duties would the stranger be entitled to receive this money ? What is the difference between them, and why should he not be employed as an auctioneer, not with respect to the Department of Justice but with respect to the Department of the Interior which has no control over him and no command over his services ? That is the answer as it occurred to me, but I would like at the same time to make it clear that I am not undertaking to be responsible for what anybody else may have done. I find that my road is as hard a one as I want to travel to explain my own short-comings.

Mr. SPROULE. As the result of a very long inquiry in 1891, we found that many officials were receiving pay from different sources, and they set up the same justification for that as the minister now presents to the House. They said that having discharged their duty to their own department, they could sell their spare time to other departments without any injustice to the service or to the country. We found that civil servants were obtaining money from different departments while they were paid what was considered an ample salary for the services they rendered to a particular department. That was declared to be an abuse, and it was stopped. The law was amended so that if a civil servant were paid anything in addition to his salary under the Civil Service Act, it should appear in the estimates each year, and parliament if satisfied that such extra payment was justified, could then vote it after deliberation. Here we have the same abuse cropping up again, and we have the Minister of Justice giving the same justification for it as was given by the civil servants at that time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not justify it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Justice is not responsible from a departmental point of view, because this is not in his department, but the responsibility of one minister is not confined to the minister himself. It seems extraordinary to pay $2,751 for fourteen day's work to any man, but when you find that that amount is paid to a sheriff who is in receipt of an annual salary, it does require an explanation from some member of the government who is familiar with the circumstances. We should know who was discharging the duties of the sheriff during these fourteen days when he earned a sum equal to about two-thirds of his annual salary of $4,000. It may be that the sheriff is not bound to perform these services for the Department of the Interior, but if he does he should perform them for a reasonable amount. We are entitled to an explanation from the Department of Justice as to whether the sheriff was discharging the duties of his office during these

fourteen days, because I suppose if the sheriff could earn $198 a day by conducting auction sales, he must have given his whole time to that particular work. Why, the remuneration which he received from the Department of the Interior was at the rate of $70,000 a year. I can hardly believe that possible ; surely this amount must include disbursements or something of that kind.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are there no disbursements ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know. I cannot find out. I am not surprised that the Minister of Justice cannot tell us, but some member of the government should be able to explain what seems to be an extraordinary condition of affairs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is there any explanation given in the report ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is what the Auditor General's Report says :

> During the summer of 1900, Sheriff Eilbeck was paid $2,751.37 by the Department of the Interior for fourteen days' service as auctioneer at the sale of mining claims in the Yukon.

That was paid to a salaried officer of this government ; an officer who is receiving $4,000 a year as salary and $1,800 for living allowance. We ought to have some explanation of that transaction.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This item was paid in 1900, and therefore it would not come up in a discussion on the estimates of the Interior Department, but I am quite willing that this particular item should stand over, and I will get the best information I can. I recognize that something should be said about it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is perfectly fair.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the minister give us information also as to on what basis deputy clerks and assistant sheriffs and stenographers and so on, are paid a living allowance at the rate of $150 a month, while telegraphers in the employ of the government in the Yukon are receiving no allowance at all.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It was understood that this question of the living allowance would be resumed on the supplementary estimates, and I will then endeavour to deal with my own responsibility as to the question of the living allowances paid to the officials under my control.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Justice has suggested that the cost of living is perhaps three times as much in the Yukon as it is in the east. The Yukon judges get exactly the same salary as that paid to judges in this part of Canada, and out of which the judges here are required to meet their own expenses. That certainly presents an anomaly. If the judges in the east had a living allowance of $1,700 a year each, then according to the view of the Minister of Justice, they would only be in the position which the Yukon judges now occupy. It, therefore, seems to me that some further consideration of these living allowances is necessary. I also recognize what my hon. friend (Mr. Lavell) has said as to the undesirability, on general principles, of having what is virtually the salary of judges, fixed by Order in Council so far as one-half of it is concerned. I do not think that is a very good principle to adopt, or one that should be persevered in any longer than is absolutely necessary. I understand the reason why these living allowances were given in the first instance. It was suggested that if you fixed a salary measured by the cost of living in the Yukon, you might have that salary fixed for all time, and, therefore, it was better, until the conditions of living in the Yukon became normal, that you should pay a salary and a living allowance as well. The question is whether the cost of living is not now approaching what will be the normal level for some years to come. If this is the case, speaking for myself, I should be in favour of fixing the salary and abolishing the living allowance, not only for judges, but for all other officials in that country. However, I understand that the matter will come up again when the supplementary estimates are before the House.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The difficulty we found ourselves in was this, that if we fixed the salary of a judge at say $10,000, that would be fixed for all time. The conditions in the Yukon might at any time become normal, and we could not explain how it was that we paid so large a salary. There is also this to be considered. The residences of these judges may not be permanent. It may be considered advisable at some time to take a judge from the Yukon and bring him to the North-west Territories. In that event, with this large salary, his position would be anomalous, and not fair to the other judges. So, under all the circumstances, while I agree that the conditions are not normal, and should not be continued for a day longer than it is possible to prevent them, this is the best solution I have been able to arrive at, that we should keep parliamentary control over these living allowances, and be in a position to regulate them each session.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister has asked that this item stand until he can get some information with regard to the large payment made to Sheriff Eilbeck by the Department of the Interior. Will he bring down information as to the time that money was paid by the Department of the Interior, the time Mr. Eilbeck received leave of absence to leave the Yukon and come down to Ontario, and the date of the bye-election in West Durham, which was at the same time

as he was granted leave of absence, and may have had some connection with it. Perhaps there will be some explanation why he was paid this large sum of $2,700 for fourteen days' work in the fact that he camped down in the town of Bowmanville during that election.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. And if there is no connection, what will my hon. friend undertake to do ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, there is a connection all right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We still undertake to say that it is a pretty high sum to pay for fourteen days' work.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to call the minister's attention to a matter which I think requires immediate consideration. We have from the minister the fact that a lawsuit is pending against a gentleman who has acted very badly, a gentleman who was originally appointed to his position by the government, and we know that lawsuits are expensive. It is important, therefore, that the minister should carefully consider whether there is any reasonable ground for expecting that this lawsuit will be successful; because if it is not, it will only have this result, that it will be expensive to the government and that the only person who will reap a reward will be some friend of the government who may be employed in prosecuting it. My reason for directing the minister's attention to the matter is this : He tells us that a year or two ago the judges were receiving a living allowance of $3,000 a year from his department, and that they were also receiving from the Public Works Department certain perquisites which brought their full allowance up to $5,000, or perhaps more. Now, I wish the minister to take into consideration whether, in view of these facts, there is any reasonable prospect of success in this suit. We have one minister allowing $3,000 for living allowance, and another making certain allowances by way of rent, fuel, &c., towards the living expenses of the judge. How can we expect, under these circumstances, the allowances having been concurred in and probably originating with the ministry, that that same government bringing action can possibly succeed ? I do not think the attention of the Minister of Justice has been directed to that point, or I imagine that with his astuteness he would hardly expect to succeed. I believe the suit cannot be undertaken with the object of getting back this ill-gotten gain for the government, and, therefore, I have great confidence in submitting the matter to the Minister of Justice for consideration.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I may say to the hon. gentleman in all seriousness that I have carefully considered the question, and here is the way it appears to me : No man, whether a judge or an official of any other kind, is entitled to receive anything from the public exchequer, unless it has been authorized by statute. In this matter the Department of Justice was authorized to pay Judge Dugas a certain amount by way of salary, and a certain amount by way of living allowance. The Department of Public Works, when the judge went in there, gave him certain assistance in connection with his going in, provided him with transportation, a house, fuel, light, and other perquisites. The question arises as to the authority of the Department of Public Works to do anything of the sort. It had no statutory authority to do it. The judge, on the other hand, says : These perquisites which I received, and the money value of which you ask me to refund, were paid to me under a contract which I entered into at the time with the government, as represented by the Minister of Public Works ; the Minister of Public Works agreed to supply me with these requisites. The question comes back to the authority of the Minister of Public Works. The Auditor General came to the conclusion that the remedy was in his hands, and that all he had to do was to stop the monthly cheque payable to the judge, on the ground that he being indebted to the Crown and the Crown being indebted to him, he had the authority to stop the cheque. That appeared to me to be a rather high-handed proceeding, in view of the plea set up by the judge that if there were laches, the government were partly responsible for them. We have determined to try the suit with the judge and endeavour to get back these moneys, we urging that the Department of Public Works had no authority to make these advances, and the judge, on the other hand contending—I have not yet seen his defence—that the Department of Public Works, as a department of the government, made a contract with him, and that if he had not received that consideration he would not have gone in at all. There is the case, and I need not attempt to foreshadow the result. I have stated the facts and the law as I understand it, and my hon. friend must be content to let the decision remain with the judge of the Exchequer Court, always bearing in mind the proverbial uncertainty of the law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely there is an anomaly which must have presented itself to the Minister of Justice, that the Minister of Public Works had the statutory authority or he could not have paid the money.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is what I was trying to say.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. With the checks we have provided against any expenditure, unless authorized by the legislature, and with the Auditor General, how could the minister possibly spend the money without the statutory authority of parliament.

Mr. CLARKE. As this is an important case, might I ask who is acting for the Crown.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am under the impression that we drew the information ourselves, but I must confess that I did not want to take the responsibility of pressing the suit myself, as we had been in the habit of doing, through the action of the Deputy Minister of Justice, but handed it over to Mr. Chrysler or Mr. McDougall, I do not remember which. The information however was draughted by the deputy minister, and there is no man more competent to do it.

Mr. LENNOX. I quite appreciate the force of what the hon. Minister of Justice has said. He puts an entirely new feature of the matter before the committee. I had no reason to apprehend that there was so great an irregularity as is disclosed by what the hon. minister has told us, but even should the suit result disastrously as to costs, if it is shown that the government may be estopped by the action of its ministers, that will be a useful piece of information for the country, and we will probably not be paying too high a price for it.

Some resolutions reported.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) moved that Mr. Clare be appointed a member of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts in the place of Mr. Ganong.

Motion agreed to.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 26, 1903.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

JUDGES RETIRING ALLOWANCES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts, and to provide as follows :—

1. If any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any Superior Court in Canada, resigns his office, His Majesty may, by letters patent, under the great seal, reciting such judge's age and period of service, grant unto him an annuity equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his resignation ; to commence immediately after his resignation, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life, provided such judge has (a) attained the age of seventy-five years, and continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts, or as such judge, and as stipendiary magistrate of the North-west Territories, for twenty years or upwards ; or (b) attained the age of seventy years and continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts for twenty-five years or upwards ; or (c) continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts for thirty years or upwards.

2. Every County Court judge who has attained the age of seventy-five years shall be compulsorily retired ; and His Majesty may, by letters patent, under the great seal, reciting such judge's age and period of service, grant unto him an annuity, if he has continued in office as such judge for twenty-five years or upwards, equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his retirement ; or if he has continued in office as such judge for a less period, equal to two-thirds of such salary ; the said annuity to commence immediately after his retirement, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

SUPPLY—TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, I would like to bring to the attention of the government a matter of some importance, and as to which I think there should be some announcement of policy by the government at the very earliest possible moment. In the speech from the Throne we find this passage :

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

That speech was delivered to parliament nearly eleven weeks ago, and up to the present time we have had no announcement of policy, and no commission has yet been appointed. The utmost we have been able to obtain in the way of information on this subject is from one of the ministers of the Crown, some four or five weeks ago, who announced in the city of Montreal that certain gentlemen were to compose this commission. But there was some question as to whether he announced that as a matter that had been determined upon, or merely as a sort of prophecy with regard to the gentlemen who would probably occupy places

upon that commission. The last information we have on the subject is from the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, and who told us some few days ago that the terms of the commission were being settled in the Department of Justice. Now, it seems to me that under present conditions the House and the country are entitled to some information as to what the policy of the government is with regard to this matter.

The matter mentioned in the speech from the Throne is one of very great moment to this country, we are all agreed upon that. There are being brought into cultivation in the west large areas of land, the product of grain in the great west is increasing very rapidly, and we are glad to know that a very large and increasing immigration is pouring into that country. At the present time we have more than one scheme brought to the attention of parliament for the purpose of supplying these increased transportation facilities that have been referred to, and one of the companies proposing to engage in that work is at present having its Bill considered by the Railway Committee. I understand that throughout the country this is a subject of much discussion. We know that the Bill I refer to has occupied the attention of the Railway Committee for more than one session. It is necessarily a matter that must engage our attention, and upon which we should have some information in this House. It has been announced in the public press, and it has been announced by no less a person than the president of the Grand Trunk Railway, that the government propose to give aid to at least one of these transcontinental lines. It is probably the most important measure with regard to transportation in this country that has ever been brought to the attention of parliament since the time when the Bill relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway came before parliament. Inquiries are being made on every hand as to what the policy of the government is with regard to this transcontinental line. We have one minister of the Crown, the hon. the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), announcing that so far as he is concerned his policy is to build a government line from Montreal to Winnipeg. We have another very important member of the cabinet, the hon. the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), who announces to the country that his policy is to build a government railway directly through to the Pacific coast. But in the meantime the government do not seem disposed to give us any information on the subject.

Now, there is a strong feeling in the country, and particularly in the maritime provinces, and one that the government should especially keep in mind, that the country should insist on guarantees that the termini of any road to which government assistance is given shall be within the limits of the Dominion of Canada. Public meetings have been held, boards of trade have passed resolutions, municipal bodies have passed resolutions, not only in the maritime provinces, but throughout the length and breadth of Canada, insisting on this condition. Indeed, I am led to mention this matter to the House now because of a resolution which has just been placed in my hands passed by the Halifax Board of Trade, and which I will take the liberty of reading to the House. This resolution was passed on the 23rd of May instant; at least it is dated 23rd May:

> Whereas, application has been made to the federal government for a charter to build a line of railway known as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, from Quebec to Port Simpson, or Bute Inlet on the Pacific coast (said line to run south of Lake Winnipeg), and no provision has been made in application for the shipment of the traffic originating on said line through the maritime province ports in the winter season.
>
> And whereas, members of parliament representing maritime province constituencies at Ottawa, have urged that the charter be granted only on the condition that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company agrees to build the line from the Pacific coast to the town of Moncton, N.B.
>
> Therefore resolved, that this board approves of the stand taken by the representatives from the maritime provinces.
>
> And further resolved, that this board protests against government assistance of any kind being granted to any transcontinental railway unless a distinct and binding condition is enforced that said railway shall be built entirely on Canadian territory, and its export and import traffic shall be through Canadian termini, and that the rates of freight charged by said railway shall be as low via the ports of St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S., as rates charged via any port on the Atlantic seaboard.
>
> And further resolved, that if aid is asked from the Canadian government by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway the interests of the maritime provinces should be safeguarded by compelling this railway company to commence the construction of the eastern portion of its line at Moncton, N.B., and complete it as far as the city of Quebec (or the bridge where connection is made with that city) concurrently with the commencement and completion of the western portion of the line.
>
> And whereas, the route from Quebec to the Pacific coast, running north of Lake Winnipeg, would in our opinion best serve the interests of the province of Quebec and of the maritime provinces, and open up for settlement a new and valuable part of the Dominion.
>
> Therefore resolved, that the government be urged to adopt this route for any new transcontinental railway company, seeking government assistance.
>
> This board also desires to express its opinion that the interests of Canada demand that the Intercolonial Railway be extended to the grain producing centres of the west, thus rendering it independent of other railway lines for its traffic.

I am informed that a somewhat urgent telegram has been sent from the board of trade, I think, in St. John, to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) to the following effect:

Unless the Grand Trunk Pacific build their line through to some maritime province port we believe the export business will continue to go through an American port as in the past.

Mr. Hays rightly says shippers can route freight as they please and if the Grand Trunk are interested in route via Portland, shippers can be easily influenced to route practically every ton of export freight that way.

We cannot believe that any arrangement can be made between Intercolonial and Grand Trunk which will prevent this.

We urge in the strongest terms that no government assistance be granted to any transcontinental railway that does not undertake to build their line through to some maritime province port.

I must confess, that, having regard to the conditions as they are in Canada at the present time in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway, I have not been able to reach a conclusion that such guarantees as have been spoken of in the press and in these resolutions, can be very easily enforced or carried out. I should be glad indeed to see the Grand Trunk Railway taking its part in the solution of Canadian transportation problems, and I hope it will be able to do so, but we have to consider conditions as they are and we know that the interests of the Grand Trunk Railway to a very considerable extent are, of course, centred in a winter port in the United States in which it has expended a very large amount of money in terminals and shipping facilities. The subject is one that I have not been able to consider carefully or attentively, and I am not professing to express an opinion upon it at the present moment, but, be that as it may, I think the House and the country are entitled to hear from the government an announcement in regard to this very important subject. Is the government in a position at the present time to say to the House and the country in what way it proposes to deal with this transportation problem? Is it able to disclose to the House and the country any really comprehensive national policy by means of which it may be able to deal with this question of transportation in the west and in the east also? We know that not only in the west of Canada, but in the east of Canada as well, it is of the utmost possible importance to the people, it is vital to the interests of the people that they should have means of transporting their products to the foreign market equally as cheap and equally as available as those which are enjoyed by their competitors to the south of us, and we know that it is otherwise impossible for our people in the east or in the west to compete on fair conditions with their chief competitors, the people of the United States of America.

Now, has the government any policy upon this matter which it is prepared to disclose to the people of this country, and if it has not any policy at the present time when may we expect that its policy shall be announced to the country?

It is some eleven weeks since this session began. It is no new question. Transcontinental lines have been engaging the attention of the people of Canada for a year at least. During last session it was currently said that great pressure was placed upon the government for the purpose of inducing it to grant aid to a proposed transcontinental railway and the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made a statement in the House during the latter days of the session in which he announced, as far as I recollect his language, that the government would come to a conclusion in regard to the matter at an early day, but that they were not able at that time to make any announcement to the House.

There are some interesting problems in connection with the transcontinental railway question at the present time. There are some interesting questions arising in connection with it. For example, has the government at the present time determined whether or not it will grant assistance to a transcontinental railway, and if it has decided to grant any such assistance is it prepared to state what form that assistance shall take? I think this is a matter upon which it is right that the House and the country should be informed while this Bill, to which I have alluded, is under consideration by the railway committee.

In the next place, has the government any policy in regard to the construction of an additional line from Winnipeg north of Lake Superior so as to connect with the east? This is a subject which is discussed very much in the public press at the present time, and it is one of the gravest possible importance to the country. Has the government come to any conclusion as to whether or not the congestion in the west can in any way be relieved by the construction of another line north of Lake Superior? Is it a fact, as has been stated in the public press and as has been stated, I think, by public men in this country, that the present line which runs north of Lake Superior does not command one-fifth, or even one-tenth, of the traffic which it would be capable of handling, and if that be a fact does the government seriously think that the building of another line north of Lake Superior will in any way relieve the difficulties with which transportation between the east and west is confronted at the present time? Whether or not the government has any policy, or any ideas upon this subject I do not know, but it does seem clear, speaking with all deference, that this is a subject upon which the government should have made up its mind before this, and it is a subject upon which it should have been prepared to state to the House and to the country what it intends doing.

Has the government any policy in regard to the proposition of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), who seems to adopt the view that the best

solution of the difficulty is to build a line which can be used in common by all railways between Port Arthur and the east, or between Winnipeg and the east, and in that way assist in bringing the produce of the west to the east at such rates as will enable our people in the west to compete on fair terms with the people of the United States ?

And let me ask this, especially : What guarantees or safeguards does the government think necessary, or efficient for the purpose of seeing that traffic over any transcontinental railway to which assistance shall be afforded shall be carried from the east to the west of Canada through Canadian routes and shall leave Canada for the markets of Europe by Canadian ports ? What is the policy of the government with regard to that ? Does the government regard that as a sound policy, and if so, in what way does the government expect to meet the difficulty pointed out by the telegram from St. John which I have read to the House, and which, quoting the language of Mr. Hays, says : Traffic must be routed in accordance with the wishes of the shippers. I think we might even go further than the business men of St. John have gone. Suppose that the Grand Trunk Railway should construct its line to the maritime provinces; suppose that it made connection with a port in the maritime provinces, what guarantee can you have, what safeguard can you have that the traffic from our Canadian west shall go through Canadian routes and via Canadian seaports.

Lastly, but not the least by any means ; why is it that the government has so long delayed the proposal which they laid before the House and before the country at the opening of the session ; why is it that they have so long delayed the formation of this commission on transportation. If we are to have in Canada any broad comprehensive policy of transportation, it seems to me that the government must call to its assistance the very best experts with regards to such matters that this continent can produce. It is not any ordinary problem that confronts the government of this country at the present time with regard to transportation, and so we understand from the speech from the Throne :

> The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy our attention and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

If what we hear through the press, the organs of public opinion which are in very close touch with the government ; if what we hear is true, the government proposes to deal with this question without obtaining the slightest assistance from the commission which is proposed to be formed; indeed it would appear that the government is likely to deal with the matter even before the commission has undertaken its work.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that on a question of this kind which touches the whole future history of the transportation question of this country, the government ought not to take any leap in the dark, it ought not to take any step at haphazard. If the government proposes to appoint a commission it should have appointed that commission long ago, and that commission should have been at work dealing with and studying the very problems of transportation which are now confronting the government. I submit that whether the government proposes to deal with the matter in that way or not, it is highly right and proper at this stage, when a very important measure is engaging the attention of a committee of this House, that the government should give to the country some indication of what its intentions are with regard to this matter, and should thus enable the House and the country to deal with the question of transportation between east and west in a more intelligent way than it otherwise could. I think therefore, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances, I am justified in asking the Prime Minister to take the House and the country into his confidence with regard to this matter, and to make that announcement of policy which it seems to me should have been made long ago in this session which has already occupied nearly three months ; and to state to us fully and frankly what we are to expect from the government in the shape of a policy on a question of so much importance to the most vital interests of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to express my regret that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) did not give me any notice of his intention to bring before the House such an important question as this. I would have been able to give him more information than I feel warranted in doing at this moment had he given notice, but at all events, I shall endeavour, though it be on the spur of the moment, to give to hon. gentlemen all the information to which they are entitled on this question which is no doubt of very great moment. In my humble judgment, the transportation question under existing conditions, resolves itself into three different parts. First of all there is the question of water transportation, chiefly connected with the terminals. Then there is the transportation question for the new and rapidly growing settlements in the prairie sections ; and then there is the question of transportation from the prairie sections to the seaboard. With regard to the first, this is the question which we had chiefly in our minds when at the opening of parliament we declared that the transportation question was engaging our attention, and that we intended to appoint a commission to deal with the subject. We

have been carrying on works of great magnitude at all parts of our great water system, in order to develop it and to make the transportation of the products of the west, and of the products going from the east to the west cheaper to the producer and to the consumer. We have works on the great lakes ; we have works on the St. Lawrence ; we have works at Port Arthur and Fort William, and it is possible that we may require some more. We have works at the head of canal navigation at Port Colborne which are now under construction ; we have works in the city of Montreal which have been carried on both by the Harbour Commission there and by the government ; we have works at Sorel and Three Rivers carried on by the government ; we have works at Quebec and we have also extensive works in St. John, New Brunswick. Now, I think it may be said that all these works have been carried on, not under any general system, but chiefly from the local point of view of each particular place. We deem it of the greatest importance to have, if possible, all these different works carried on under a general comprehensive system. Before we ask for more money to be expended upon them, we think that it is advisable to have the report of a commission of the best experts that we have in the country in order that we may be able to lay before parliament at this session or next session a comprehensive plan, as to what should be done in these different localities or in other localities in order to meet the object in view. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that the commission has been organized, and not later than to-morrow its terms will be laid on the Table of the House. I may say now that the commission is composed of men of great experience whose names will I think command the confidence of the country. Sir William Van Horne is one, and Mr. John Bertram and Mr. Harold Kennedy of Quebec are the others. As to Sir William Van Horne it is useless for me to say anything. His experience, his great ability and talents will at once command the confidence of the country, and I believe it will be admitted that no better selection could have been made. I am sorry to say, however, that I am not yet sure if we can secure the services of Sir William Van Horne for this important work. He is engaged in so many other enterprises that it is doubtful whether he will be able to engage in the work of the commission. At all events we are using our best efforts to induce him if possible to take charge of this commission as we intended that he should do. Mr. John Bertram is one of the great merchants and ship-builders of the province of Ontario, and next to Sir William Van Horne I think that no better man could have been selected for the position. We have been informed that Mr. Harold Kennedy who is an experienced and extensive ship-owner in the city of Quebec cannot undertake the work of the commission as we intended, and we propose to replace him by Mr. Fry of the city of Quebec, who is Lloyd's agent there, and who is a man of great experience in the shipping business. The commission will be laid on the Table of the House to-morrow, and my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will be able to judge whether or not its terms are sufficient to meet his views. I think myself that they will be found not only to be sufficient, but extremely practical, and that they will form the basis of what I trust will be a very valuable report.

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not say with regard to this particular company ; I said with regard to transcontinental railways.

The PRIME MINISTER. It was not with regard to transcontinental railways, but with regard to railways from the east to the new and rapidly settling districts of the Northwest. Our policy in that matter is prepared; and we shall be able to place it on the Table of the House probably this week, at any rate at an early day. The proposi-

tion to have another transcontinental railway is a new idea, and it behooves the government not to launch too rapidly upon its consummation or to come too hastily to a conclusion with regard to it. I may say to my hon. friend that the government are not prepared to say that on that subject they have settled on this or that policy; but we are prepared to give at once to the House the salient ideas which we think should be kept in view in carrying out this new proposition. The first idea is that such a line must be exclusively on Canadian territory, from tidal water to tidal water, that is to say, eventually to connect the waters of the Pacific with the waters of the Atlantic; and that the first point at which it would reach tidal water at the east would be the city of Quebec in summer and Halifax or St. John, or both, in winter time. My hon. friend rather assumed that the government were committed to the scheme of the Grand Trunk. I may say that the government are not committed to the scheme of the Grand Trunk nor to any other scheme; but we say that if we are to have another transcontinental railway—and it may be that we should have to take steps in this direction during this very session—the salient idea which ought to guide our minds, and on which I believe we can command the support of the House, is that that road must be built exclusively on Canadian territory and afford the cheapest possible route to the east for the products of the west. My hon. friend asked what guarantee we had that the trade would not be diverted to American ports. I may say to my hon. friend that this is a subject which will be discussed with more propriety when we come before parliament with any proposition. At the present time perhaps it is premature to say how we can bind any company or any undertaking of that kind in such a way as to make it absolutely under any and every possible circumstance, that the trade should not be diverted from our own channels to American channels. Whenever we should lay any proposition before parliament on this subject, we shall do the best we can by legislation to ensure that object; but I have very little hope that any legislation which this parliament could place on the statute-book would ensure the result which my hon. friend and I have equally at heart, if we had to rely on legislation alone. It is always easy for lawyers, such as my hon. friend is, and as I was at one time——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I hope my hon. friend has not left the profession.

The PRIME MINISTER——to legislate on such matters; but even railways have sometimes found it not easy to carry it out. But there is another way of guiding the railways so that every pound of traffic shall go through Canadian channels; it is to take advantage of our geographical position, and to make sure that such a line would be the cheapest and the shortest between the Pacific ocean and the Atlantic ocean at the city of Quebec. A line of that character should run from the city of Quebec north of the mountains and on west to the prairies. With such a line we should have solved the problem, because we should have provided the shortest route from the Pacific ocean and the prairies of the west to the tidal waters of the Atlantic ocean. I am not prepared to say, however, how that line is to be built. Three propositions have been made to us, and between them we should have to choose. It has been suggested to us that the government should own and operate a railway itself, just as we do the Intercolonial railway. It has been suggested also that the government shouud build a railway and not operate it, but lease it or give it to any lines which would take charge of it. It has also been suggested to us that we should subsidize and give assistance to any of the companies now seeking aid. There are three companies seeking aid—the Trans-Canada, the Canadian Northern, and the Grand Trunk. I may say to the House that the government have not made up their minds to any one of these schemes—whether they will be prepared to aid this one or that one, or any one at all. The question is under consideration, and requires a good deal of consideration before any conclusion is come to. The field is open to all. I may say this much, however, to dispel some anxiety which exists in the minds of a good many people, that if the government make up their mind to give assistance to some company, it cannot be in the form of a land subsidy. The subsidy must be given in some other form. More than this I do not know that I can say at present. But I may say, before sitting down, that no conclusion will be come to before we shall have an ample opportunity of discussing the matter with those who do the government the honour of giving it their support.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It seems to me that the weakness of the government's position is this, that an intimation was given to the House in the speech from the Throne at the opening of the session that a commission would be appointed immediately. After we have been here ten weeks, we have the announcement that a commission has been appointed or is about to be appointed. But, if I am not mistaken, the government intimated in the beginning of the session that this commission would be appointed in time to make inquiry and report to the House before the session closed. But certainly if the commission be only appointed to-day, it will be utterly impossible for it to report to the House before prorogation. The right hon. gentleman tells us that the commission will be appointed immediately. What does he mean by imme-

diately ? Ten weeks have elapsed, and it has not yet been appointed.

The right hon. gentleman also told us that the transportation problem consisted of three important links : First, water stretches and harbours ; second, eastward to the seaboard; and third, an important space which must be built up by railway. I presume, then, no scheme can be the very best which will not embrace all those different portions and dove-tail them into each other so as to work in one harmonious whole. But no such scheme can be framed until the information which the commission is intended to gather is in the hands of the government.

Have the government proposed a policy on any portion of the scheme for a transcontinental line, on which, we are told in the press, week after week, the government intends giving us information ? But should a decision be arrived at without any definite knowledge on the part of the government, such decision cannot be in the best interests of the country. The government are face to face with a choice between two things. They must either bring down an immature scheme this session or await the inquiry and report of the commission. There are three schemes mooted—Grand Trunk Railway scheme, the Canadian Northern, and the Trans-Canada Railway. The government have not given us any information as to which one of these it will take up or whether it will take up any of them or not. They are therefore misleading some of the companies or the companies are misleading the country. The Grand Trunk Railway have certainly given the people to understand that their scheme has been practically adopted by the government. The president of that company wired home to his directors that the Grand Trunk Railway scheme will undoubtedly be carried out without any additional burden being imposed on the company. If that means anything, it means that the government are prepared to give the Grand Trunk Railway ample assistance to carry out their project. Is that correct or not ? Has the president of the Grand Trunk Railway misled his own directors, or are the government misleading the company, or are both the Grand Trunk Railway and the government misleading the country ? It is important that the House should have information on this question at an early day, because if brought down at a late day, it cannot be maturely considered and the worst results are likely to be the outcome. The government should come to a decision and inform the House without delay. If they wait for the railway resolutions, which are usually passed through the House at the dying stages of the session, that information will be received too late to be of any practical utility. If the government have any policy on this very important question, they should give that policy to the House and country at the earliest possible day. The House ought to be in a position to deal with any such policy intelligently, but if the government should spring such a policy on this country when it is too late to give it full and careful consideration, they will be doing considerably less than they ought to do.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART (South Lanark). I am very much interested, Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of this important question. I agree with the right hon. the leader of the government that it is one of the utmost importance. It is the most important that has engaged the attention of this House for a number of years. This question divides itself, as my right hon. friend has said, into three sections : The prairie, the lake and river, and the section connecting with the maritime provinces. I wish this House to remember that all grain exported from the North-west will seek the shortest route to Lake Superior, because it can be carried down thence to the place where it can be consumed, either in American or European markets, cheaper by water than it possibly can by rail. All railways that are carrying western products to the east try to secure the shortest possible route to the head of Lake Superior. The Canadian Northern Railway has done it, the Canadian Pacific Railway are doing it, and any railway which carries the surplus products of the North-west and Manitoba will get to that point as quickly as possible. We have in the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has a route from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, a line of route as good as it is possible to get from the western prairies to Lake Superior—a line with low gradients and built at an immense cost to our people. Coming eastward, the grades are about twenty-six and a half feet per mile, and going westward fifty-two feet per mile. It has an even roadbed, well constructed and capable of carrying three times as much as is carried from the west to the seaboard. We have besides another route, the Canadian Northern, which goes partially through American territory, connecting now with Port Arthur. It is not perhaps quite finished or in a proper state for carrying products, but I think it will be shortly. Then that part of our transportation policy will be accomplished, namely, to get all the routes we possibly can, with the easiest gradients to the head of Lake Superior. There will be no grain of any account carried on any road constructed to Quebec or Montreal, or St. Johns, or Halifax, because such a road would compete with other lines which connect with the waterways and reach the Atlantic. Any grain that is carried down that route, and over the Intercolonial Railway will be carried at a loss to the country—the people will get no return in any respect. We carry grain from Quebec to St. John and from Quebec to Halifax at an expense to the country, and it will be the same in carrying it from Winnipeg to Quebec, if it is carried to compete with grain going by the Canadian Northern or the Canadian Pacific

Railway, and other routes through the North-western States that reach Lake Superior. The very quickest all-rail route from the North-western to the seaboard would not at all compete with the route which goes in part by waterway.

Mr. CHARLTON. How about the winter?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I dealt with that in the remarks I made a couple of years ago. I showed the advantage the water route had over the all rail route. I showed that it amounted to from one cent to one and a half cents a bushel. I am not going over that again, but I assert it to be a fact that cannot be controverted that grain that reaches the head of Lake Superior and is carried eastward by the water route has the advantage over grain carried by any all rail route that it is possible to construct across the continent of America.

As to the traffic going westward, it may be necessary to build a road from Quebec to the north, not necessarily a competing line with those which we already have and which we have subsidized: the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I would favour the route proposed by the right hon. Prime Minister, keeping it as near as possible to the height of land and running, perhaps, to the north of Lake Winnipeg and the Saskatchewan valley. This would open a new country, and I hope to see the day when there will be cities to the north of Lake Winnipeg greater than Winnipeg and a traffic in that country greater than that now carried by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Port Arthur and Montreal. The right hon. gentleman says that he is bound to no route. In other words, he says that the government has put off the formulating of a plan of transportation policy until another session. He says that when the government have considered it, and decided upon a policy, they intend to bring that policy down to this House and ask that it be given the fullest consideration. When the speech from the Throne was discussed in this House on the 13th March last, I took the opportunity, when the right hon. gentleman was addressing the House on the question of transportation and saying that this question, including that of affording terminal facilities at our lake ports and seaports would be referred to a commission, to ask when that commission would be appointed, and the right hon. gentleman said that it would be appointed 'next week.' I asked the right hon. gentleman: Then we shall have the report of the commission, with its full consideration of the whole subject, so that we may intelligently discuss it, before any aid can be given toward the building of other routes, and the providing of facilities on our ports on the lakes and on the Atlantic? And that commission has not been forthcoming yet, and its members not yet appointed.

The PRIME MINISTER. The commission is appointed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I believe the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says the commission has been appointed. But he has not yet received acceptance of appointment from the most important man on the commission, and the only one named that I know of as fit to sit on such a commission. I know Mr. Harold Kennedy. He is a very efficient man. But he has not accepted the appointment. I never heard Mr. Fry's name in connection with transportation. He may be a very excellent man and fit for the position. But the man whose name sticks out, the man whom we at once recognized as acquainted with the subject is Sir William Van Horne. If he accepts a position on the commission where his interests would not conflict with the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway—for the Canadian Pacific Railway's interests come first in all he is bound to do—I would pay a great deal of attention to his report on the subject. But having been for so many of the best years of his life the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, his interest must lie in the furtherance of that enterprise.

Then, there are only two roads that can possibly receive assistance from the government. The Canadian Northern cannot, because, as I believe the right hon. Premier says, if assistance is given to any road it must be one running entirely through our own country, and the Canadian Northern passes in part through the United States. It could not get assistance unless it diverted its through line from the United States and built it altogether on Canadian territory. I strongly believe that any line that receives assistance from the government, no matter what development it may afford the country, must be one that goes through within our own borders. I agree with the right hon. gentleman in that. The lines then open are two. There is first, the Trans-Canada route. That is like a good many other roads—in the air. I do not know whether a mile of it has been built. It is a road from Quebec I gather—for we get pamphlets about it every day—and is to run through to Manitoba and the North-west. I do not know who the promoters are or anything about it. But, if the Grand Trunk Railway propose to build a road into that section of country that is another matter. The Grand Trunk Railway has done a great deal towards the development of this country, and the stockholders of that concern have had but meagre return on the money they have invested. Anything the Canadian people can do in return for the great benefits that that company has yielded to this country ought to be done, other things being equal. If they propose to build a road which will open up a new territory in the North-west and make a connecting line with Quebec, I would rather see it assisted than

any other scheme I hear proposed, that is, if the government have determined on a policy of subsidies, and that is a policy which commends itself to the country—which I doubt very much, for I think there is a feeling in the country, voiced in a good many of the organs of public opinion that the day of subsidies is done, and that any railroad that proposes to build a line any where on our territory hereafter must build it as a commercial undertaking. The right hon. premier says that they will receive no land grant. Well, that seems very likely, for I do not see where we have any land to give them in the North-west, unless we go some where in the neighbourhood of the Arctic ocean.

An hon. MEMBER. Or the Klondike.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, or the Klondike, as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Who gave the lands away ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose it was the late government. And friends of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston, Cape Breton) in Manitoba and the North-west were coming before the government every day insisting that the land of that country belonged to the people of that country, and urging that as the government would not give them sufficient money for the purpose of building railroads to develop that region, the lands should be given away for the purpose of building railroads. Who was it, for instance, who advertised in the newspaper press for offers to build the Canadian Pacific Railway for a sum of money per mile and nearly all the available lands in that country ? In those days the feeling, even amongst those who were resident in the North-west, was that the public lands should be given to enterprising companies and corporations for the purpose of building railroads into that country. It was in obedience to the wishes of the people that that was done, it was done at the dictation of the people in that section of the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask the hon. gentleman how in that case the government could propose to retain the power to fix the price of those lands, to name a maximum price and keep in its own hands the control of the price of those lands for the protection of the public interest ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I never heard of that, certainly that was not the proposition. The land was offered to any company competing for the building of the road, and the company was told : If you won't do it for this, how much more land do you want, how much more money do you want to build the road ? I say therefore that no attack can be made upon the late government by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston), who asked who it was that parted with the land of the country. I say it was done at the request of the people themselves in that section of the country, it was done in order to afford facilities for them to communicate with the east and to get their grain to market. If that had not been done we would not now see that great country opened up as it is at present with railroads running in every direction. The development we see there now is due to the policy of the late government in granting both land and money for the purposes of railway building. However, enough upon that subject.

As I said before, we have a choice of deciding between two companies for the building of this road. My opinion is that if the government should decide to give any assistance for that purpose, the company which is entitled to the preference is the Grand Trunk Railway Company. That company has done a great deal to open up this country, they have spent a great deal of money, and have received very little return for it. It may be the fault of the management of the company, but the fact remains that for the vast sums of money which that company has invested and which have had the effect of developing this country more than any other railway except the Canadian Pacific Railway, it has received very little return in the way of profits. I think the policy of the government should be to have this road built as far north as possible, to pass as near as possible to the height of land in order to tap a region of country which has not been opened up at present.

Now with regard to the policy of the government with regard to waterways and terminals, I think they should have decided on a policy long ago, they should have known exactly what they wanted to do, they should have come to a decision whether to expend money on little harbours here and there throughout the country, or to devote it to the development of a broad Dominion policy. Let them build a harbour at Port Arthur which will accommodate ships drawing twenty feet of water, ships which will pass through the Sault Ste. Marie canal and come down through Lake Erie. As to the building of that harbour at Port Colborne, I do not see a great deal in favour of it, though the late Minister of Public Works, as well as many others, were in favour of building it to a depth of twenty feet, so that it would take in vessels which would lighter there and pass through the Welland canal. They could do the same thing at Buffalo, they could go to Buffalo and tranship their cargoes into vessels that go through the Welland canal. I do not see what benefit there would be in that arrangement unless you intend to deepen the Welland canal to twenty feet. But there is no use deepening it to that depth, because in that case you would have to canalize the whole route of the St. Lawrence from Kingston to Montreal. The bed of the river is not deep enough, and you could not raise the water by dams

on account of the over-flowing of the farms on each side of the river. You would therefore have to deepen the whole river from Kingston down to Montreal. The plan which I proposed some time ago, and which I think is best in the interests of the country, and the one which I think must be ultimately adopted, is to build from Lake Superior down to Montreal, via Lake Nipissing and the Ottawa river, a canal with a depth of twenty feet which will take vessels drawing that depth of water down to Montreal. Such a route would give us the command not only of the carrying trade of our own country in our own territory, but it would draw from American sources the whole of the trade of the American Northwest which at present goes down the Erie canal and finds its way to New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore.

As Mr. Hays stated to the committee the other day, water finds its own level, transportation finds its own level. When a vessel is loaded with grain it will inevitably go by the cheapest route, notwithstanding any legislation that you may put upon the statute-book to divert it into any other route. The right hon. gentleman is right, no legislation will prevent trade going by the cheapest route to the point of consumption. The cheapest possible route for grain grown in Manitoba and the North-west, and in Michigan, Minnesota and the neighbouring States adjoining our territory, is through our country via the St. Lawrence to the ocean. I am fully convinced on that point. Let the St. Lawrence be made navigable by the means that were mentioned the other day by the ex-Minister of Public Works and by the present Minister of Public Works, that is, by lighting the whole route in such a manner that the river can be made safe by night or by day. There is no reason why that should not be done from Montreal to Quebec, the same as it is on the River St. Mary, with a line of piers bearing electric lights, so that by night or day a vessel could navigate those waters quite as safely as any part of the ocean. The St. Lawrence, I believe, can be made navigable from Montreal to Quebec, and just as safe as any other river on the face of the globe. There are no tides, there are no heavy storms, there are no ocean waves to take away the piers upon which you plant your lights and fix your booms. You might have a boom all through Lake St. Peter, and in fact all the way down to Quebec, lighted night and day, which would make the St. Lawrence as safe for navigation as any other river in the world. I hope that our natural advantages will be utilized to their fullest extent by the government, and that a system of works will be carried out by which the traffic of the country may be taken through a twenty foot channel from the Canadian shores of the great lakes down to the waters of the sea. It is a cheaper way of carrying grain. It is the cheapest form of transportation. No railways that you can construct with the least possible gradients can ever compete in cheapness with that form of transportation. What grain does the Canadian Pacific Railway carry north of Lake Superior and down to Ontario and that section of the country ? It is carrying less than it does from Port Arthur down. It is just a moiety of what is raised in the western section of the country. The great bulk of it goes by way of Port Arthur, and it is being carried from there to the ocean. Part of it goes to Duluth and part is carried by the Canadian Northern to Fort William, but the cheapest possible way to get it down to the point of consumption is to get it to Lake Superior and have it carried down from there to the maritime provinces and from the maritime provinces to the point of consumption. That is all you can find out from any commission which you may appoint to make an inquiry. The question of transportation has been answered as far as railways are concerned. When you have ascertained the quickest possible way to reach water transportation, you have solved the problem. When you have reached that point, you must furnish means by which produce may be carried as cheaply through our waterways as it can be carried on the American side of the line. We have natural advantages. Make use of these natural advantages, and the carrying trade will be done in our country. I am sorry to say that the question is virtually put off until another session. If I understood the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) rightly, he said that the policy of the government when formulated would be brought down in the form of an Order in Council for the full consideration of the House. If the right hon. gentleman is going to consult this proposed commission on transportation and terminal facilities, it is not possible that this can be done this session, because, to get the report of the commission as to transportation and other facilities, it would require the remainder of the session and perhaps longer, and if the government are going to make a practical use of the advice that is to be given to the commission, it cannot possibly be done this session. I do not think there is any necessity for a commission. If there be any necessity, the only necessity for a commission is to determine which is our best waterway. The work of the commission should be confined to the question of terminals. There is no necessity for a commission as to railways. That commission might have been appointed before this session and the government might have formulated some policy, because now is the time to formulate a policy and to build the works that are necessary. The day of depression may come within a year or two, because this country cannot always be in the position which it is at present, and it should take advantage of the tide. A

few years is a great deal in the history of a country, as it is in the history of a manufacturing enterprise. We should take advantage of the opportunity at the present time to divert the traffic into this section of the country while the routes are being formed, because once you have traffic going in a certain direction it is almost impossible to turn it into another channel. Take advantage of the present tide in our favour. Canada is in a better position now than she will be for a number of years to come to adopt a definite transportation policy, because this is a state of affairs that cannot continue for a number of years. Take advantage of the present, formulate some policy which is destined to build up this country, take advantage of the opportunity which nature has afforded us, because we are now in the best possible position to secure for ourselves a place amongst the foremost peoples on the face of the globe.

Hon. J. ISRAEL TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Mr. Speaker, the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has made to-day three statements of importance. He has informed us, first, that the government has not yet come to any arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and, second, that next week, or in a few days at any rate, the government will place on the Table of the House resolutions concerning help to another railway company. The right hon. gentleman has not told us what that company is. I apprehend it is the Canadian Northern Railway Company. The last statement he has made is, that the government have not succeeded as yet in convincing some gentlemen to whom they had applied to accept positions as commissioners on the board that was announced in the Speech from the Throne. Sir William Van Horne is too busy, Mr. Harold Kennedy has not the time, and two other gentlemen will replace them. However, the government have fully made up their minds, as the right hon. gentleman has told us, not to spend any more money on the waterways before the commission, which is not yet appointed, reports. If my right hon. friend would allow me, I will say that it will be sad news to the country to hear that. The right hon. gentleman and the government have led us to believe that the commission to be appointed will cover the whole ground, not only in regard to waterways, but the whole ground. Now, we are informed that the government have resolved, without waiting for any report, to grant help to a railway company in the North-west. Well, we are all glad, indeed, that there is a North-west, and we are all very ready to help the North-west, but at the same time we believe there are other parts of the country which deserve consideration, and they are those parts of the country in which the waterways are located. The North-west is very much interested in the development of our waterways; if not more interested, at least as much interested as the older provinces are. The older provinces are deeply interested, the North-west is deeply interested also, and the whole country is interested. I fully share the view which is expressed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) when he says it is not necessary to appoint a commission to know that certain works have to be done. We are all aware that our great national waterways have to be equipped. If we are to handle the trade we must equip our harbours, we must deepen, light and prepare our waterways. Now, there is a port which is called Montreal, and which is, I believe, known to this country. Montreal is quite a village, and I have no doubt is known throughout the land. Montreal is located at the head of ocean navigation and at the foot of the lakes. It is one of the great centres of exchange between the west and the east. That port has to be equipped and equipped now. We have started too late. There is no public man who knows what the transportation question is, and who knows our geographical position, who will not freely admit that we have not constructed in the port of Montreal in past years the works of importance that should have been constructed. We have started; we have started by borrowing money, and borrowing money means dues on every pound of goods and every bushel of grain that goes through Canadian ports; whereas, in my humble opinion, they should be as free from dues as it is possible to make them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I believe that the government have done right in making the canals free this year, but that is only a small matter after all. The port of Montreal, the port of Quebec, the port of St. John and the port of Halifax should be free ports. What is the use of doing work by piecemeal as we are doing now. The result of the consideration I have been able to give to this important question—and it was not difficult to come to the conclusion—leads me to believe that to complete for the time being the improvements on the port of Montreal it will be necessary to spend at least $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 additional, and that is a small sum compared with the large amounts which are spent on the American ports. The harbour of Quebec has to be equipped also. The works carried on there in past years are scarcely of any value because they have been wrongly planned. The government is doing something there this year; not as much as in my opinion they should do, but they are doing something. Three Rivers has to be equipped also; St. John has to be equipped.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). And Halifax.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Halifax is a natural harbour and it is fairly equipped. Halifax will be an important port for passenger traffic, but so far as the western freight is concerned, St. John will be the port. The people of St. John have taken great risks upon themselves. They have spent about $1,000,000 of their own money and as they have to pay interest on that it means that they have to exact dues. I say without hesitation that it is the duty of the government to take over that debt and to make that port free just as it is the duty of the government to make the port of Montreal a free port. The port of Quebec is practically free now because the Quebec Harbour Commissioners have borrowed money and they have been wise enough not to pay interest on it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not ask them to pay the interest; far from it. They cannot pay interest; the trade is not there and they cannot afford to do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a Montreal question; it is a Dominion question. From one end of the country to the other we have the same interests at heart. Let us develop our waterways. Will the right hon. the Prime Minister permit me to ask him that we should not take as final what he said a moment ago. There are works for which no commission is necessary. The equipment of the ports of Montreal, Quebec and St. John, and the completion of the deepening and widening of the river St. Lawrence are works for which there is no necessity for any commission. The raw material is there; the work is under our eyes and let us do it. I do not object to giving a few additional millions for the development of the west.

Mr. McCREARY. How much have you spent on Montreal in the last twenty-five years?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We have spent very little money on Montreal. Unfortunately we have not spent enough money there, and unfortunately too that money has been borrowed. The trade of the country has to pay interest on that borrowed money which is a bad thing, because every pound of merchandise and every bushel of grain has to pay dues to meet that interest. These ports should be free unless of course we make up our minds to ship through American harbours. The whole question is between the St. Lawrence route which is our national route, and the American route. That is the question just as clear as the sun at noonday. There is no use recriminating now. We have been doing for the best in the past but we did not expect such a rapid development of our country and so we did not understand the position. This is not a party question. Both parties are responsible for what has been done in the past and now let bygones be bygones once for all, and let us look to the future. What are we going to do. The right hon. gentleman has told us that the government have resolved to give a few millions additional to the Canadian Northern, because that is the meaning of what he said. Well, the Canadian Northern has been subsidized by us in the past. I repeat that this is not a party question, but as my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has said, the Canadian Northern goes through a hundred miles of American territory in Minnesota and it will be the easiest possible thing in the world to have a little tapping line to Mr. Hill's railways which will divert that trade of the Northwest through American channels. The best way and the only way to keep our own trade and to divert American trade through Canadian channels is to improve our waterways. If my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works would within the next fortnight give his personal attention to the reports that are available in his department, he will find that the plans d'ensemble for that portion of the work at Port Arthur and Fort William is a very easy matter. It is only a question of money, and not very much money at that, to make these two harbours safe and cheap harbours for some years to come. As every one knows, there are a certain number of harbours on the lakes and are terminals for the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but properly speaking the Canadian Pacific Railway has no terminal ports on the lakes for through traffic. Up to the present time Owen Sound has not been looked upon as a port for export trade because the grades are too steep, and so to-day the fact is that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canada Atlantic Railway are the lines which have terminal facilities on the lakes for the transportation of grain. The Canada Atlantic Railway has done a great work in the past but it is not sufficiently equipped on the lakes because they have not sufficient plant to carry the traffic between American and Canadian ports. Mr. Hays agreed last year to settle in Montreal—to settle additionally in Montreal if I may say so. However, the most important thing to be done now is the equipment of the ports of Montreal and Quebec, but Montreal especially. In the port of Montreal to-day there are fifty large steamers and at least for forty of these there is no accommodation. I again say that the right hon. gentleman should not ask us to take the statement which he made to-day as final. The government should make up its mind before the session is much more advanced to strengthen and equip the port of Montreal, because it is essentially our national port. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has alluded to the canalization of the Ottawa river. Well, it would be a good thing but it will take years to accomplish it. There is one thing that should not be lost sight of. The conditions to-day require that we should get along as quickly as it is possible to get along, and although the

canalization of the Ottawa and the French rivers is a good scheme, it will be a pretty slow process. Let us put the port of Montreal in the same position as the port of New York is in. Let us have some harbours on the lakes like Buffalo, to be reservoirs of freight. Midland is about 365 miles from Montreal, North Bay is about the same distance and Depot Harbour about the same distance. These three ports are the ports to which we must give our very best attention. There are other ports which are used to-day for the grain trade ; but these are the ports best located for the trade between the St. Lawrence and the west.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will my hon. friend allow me to inform him that Mr. J. R. Booth a short time ago told me that he could have taken 5,000,000 bushels more grain to Montreal in the season than he did if we had proper harbour facilities there.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is no doubt that if we had proper harbour facilities at Montreal, all the railways would take more trade than they do. Yet I cannot forget that when I began talking about improving the port of Montreal, there were business men who called me a little notary from St. Lin. But the little notary had travelled a good deal, while the business men who spoke in this way had not travelled with that subject in view, which proved that notaries and lawyers may be good for something. I fully agree with the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals as to the importance of improving the navigation of the St. Lawrence river. Let us have it lighted in the best possible way. The American waterways from Duluth down are lighted in such a manner that it is possible to travel through them in the darkest nights and meet the largest ships without any danger. There are also good captains and seamen on these routes. Many of the accidents on the St. Lawrence route are due to the negligence and incapacity of the commanders of ships. The steamship companies have their duty, and the government have their duty in this matter. Let me ask the government not to direct their attention to one part of the country exclusively. In so doing, they would carry out an anti-national policy. If they do not improve the navigation at the outlets of the trade, vainly we shall develop the trade of the west, that trade will become Americanized, and we cannot help it. Let us develop the trade of the west, but for God's sake, let us develop the trade of the east as well if we want to be a nation. For that reason I would regret exceedingly if the government would not during the present session bring down to the House all the appropriations necessary to carry out the improvements required in our waterways, at the same time that they carry out the projects for the development of the west. For this parliament there is no west and no east, but there is a great country which is all Canada.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Mr. Speaker, this question as presented to the House, divides itself into three parts—the central, the west and the east. The great object before the country is to secure additional means of getting the products of the prairies of the west to the seaboard. The proposition is made that the Grand Trunk Pacific should be the only transcontinental route, and the one selected by the government and the people of Canada for assistance. I am prepared to endorse any proper scheme of assistance, that does not involve the country to too great an extent, to enable the Grand Trunk to reach the prairies of the west from North Bay ; but to suppose that the Grand Trunk Railway will abandon all their $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 worth of property between North Bay and Portland, and the $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 of improvements which they have made in Portland, and let all that property go to waste in order to have an all-Canadian route to the seaboard, is, to put it mildly, perfect nonsense. The Grand Trunk are not going to abandon, and no sensible man would ask them to abandon, their great system from North Bay to Portland. We find in this country many people advocating the admission of the Great Northern of the United States and the Northern Pacific into our Canadian North-west ; and the farmers there will not hesitate to tell you that it matters not to them whether their grain is delivered to the Canadian or the American seaboard, so long as they get a better price for it. What they want is the service, and if we can give to the farmers a better service by extending the Grand Trunk system to the prairies of the west, I am prepared to assist that scheme. But there is another aspect of the case. We are in danger of losing sight of a very important part of the Dominion of Canada. If you consult the reports of the officers of any of the departments who are familiar with the vast region north of the height of land to the north of Lake Superior—and these reports are undoubtedly as accurate as it is possible for any reports to be—you will find that there are vast areas of valuable farm lands in that region. Those of us who have travelled on the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior cannot fail to have been struck with the barrenness of the region traversed by that railway. But, forty or fifty miles to the north of that line you strike a fertile belt like the country around Lake Temiscamingue, which is to-day being rapidly settled up. Then, why should we not build a line or half a dozen lines through that country if the needs of the country demand it ? My own notion is that the government should be prepared to guarantee the bonds of, or endorse, to a reasonable extent, any legitimate scheme for building one, two, three or more lines across the country from our Canadian seaports or the eastern parts of Canada to open up the great west. If

the people of Canada thirty or thirty-five years ago had had the same confidence in the country that they have to-day, that country would have been opened up long ago ; but unfortunately the people of Canada had then very little confidence in their own country. Those times have all changed, however, and we should not now go in for half-hearted measures. The hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) in dealing with the question what road should be assisted, has wiped the Trans-Canada out of existence altogether. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that that road is partly in existence now. The Lake St. John Railway really forms part of the Trans-Canada system, and the surveys are made from that railway westward.

Be that as it may, I am not an advocate of one route more than another, but will take the liberty of pointing out to the right hon. the first minister that when he says that the people of Canada owe an immense debt to the Grand Trunk Railway, he is not exactly speaking by the book. I am quite prepared to support the Grand Trunk Railway, but when an appeal for support is made on the basis of sympathy, I would point out that the people of my county are made to pay higher rates of freight to the Grand Trunk Railway than are charged on freight to Chicago. There is no use saying that the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Northern Railway or any other railway company are actuated by patriotic motives, and that we should assist them because of these motives, and because forsooth they charge cheap rates. Why, Sir, there is not a railway company in existence which will not grind the last dollar it can out of its customers and look for more. The eastern portion of the transcontinental business, I regard as by all odds the most important. You cannot expect the Grand Trunk Railway to abandon their road from North Bay to the east. No amount of prohibition can force them to travel over certain routes any more than prohibition can force people to be temperate in the use of intoxicating liquors or cigarettes. Freight will travel along the routes that people ship it by, and if the Grand Trunk Railway wants to bring freight over its route to Portland, the Canadian government cannot stop it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Unless the company have a shorter route to the ocean.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If the government should make the company a present of another route to the seaport, no doubt the company would be glad to accept and use it. I submit that there is room at Lake Superior for at least three transcontinental roads, and these roads should be forced to take the Quebec and maritime provinces route. Then in summer these new railways would develop our ports of Montreal, Three Rivers, and certainly Quebec, and in the winter they would develop St. John, Halifax, Louisburg and Canso and the other magnificent ports of the eastern sea board.

There is another aspect of the case which does not seem to strike the House at all. Any one who has visited the Pacific slope will know that the people out there are not so interested in the eastern as in the western route. The people of the Canadian North-west are awake to the value of the Pacific ocean trade, just as Mr. J. J. Hill of the Great Northern realizes its importance.

They realize that all the grain grown in the North-west is not going to find a market over eastern routes, but that as soon as routes are constructed west, the products of the North-west will find markets in China and Japan as well as in our Pacific ports. The question of a transcontinental route involves the eastern as well as the western part. As regards the question of profit in carrying grain by rail, which was raised by my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) let me point out that grain is now hauled from the foot of the Rocky Mountains in the United States to New York harbour by rail in competition with water.

Mr. CLARKE. What charge ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The same by rail as by water. Owing to the reduction of grades, the improvement in rolling stock and road beds, &c., it is to-day possible—it is being done throughout the length and breadth of the United States—to haul grain by rail to the seaboard as cheaply as by water. When we are told it is impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway to haul grain to the seaboard from Port Arthur and Fort William, I would point out that if the curves on the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior were straightened out, that would mean a shortening of thirty-five miles in the northern section alone. The grades are heavy and there are many curves. Reduce your grades and curves, and you can haul grain at a profit. Two years ago, in conversation with Mr. McGuigan, whom I regard as in many respects the ablest railway man on this continent, he pointed out to a number of gentlemen that an engine on the Vanderbilt system was capable of hauling 2,000 tons to New York, the road was so perfect. But that same engine could only haul about 700 over the Grand Trunk Railway system. The same engine, which could haul 2,000 tons over the American system, could only haul one-third that quantity to Canadian ports. I believe that the government should give liberal assistance to railway companies, but not in cash or land. We have been told that there is not much land available, but although a great deal has been given to railway companies, there are still millions of acres of excellent farm land in the Peace river valley, which will yet be filled with prosperous sturdy settlers, and where the

soil and climate will be found more productive and genial than in Manitoba to-day. I would suggest that the government should, either by guaranteeing the bonds or by loans repayable in a certain period, give legitimate assistance to two or three roads. This country is young, and our people, in the near future, will be able to pay. The government should give assistance to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, if necessary, to improve their roads to the east of Port Arthur, so that these roads may be able to haul the grain to the east in winter, and I am satisfied that, in ten or fifteen years, the government would be amply recouped for its expenditure.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). This debate, Mr. Speaker, which has been sprung on the House somewhat unexpectedly, certainly opens up a question of great importance. Views have been expressed which will be of great service indeed in instructing the public as to the extent and character of the problem which now confronts the government—the problem of affording an outlet to the great and rapidly settling regions of the North-west Territories for the productions of that country. The hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) in the course of his speech, made reference to matters which, though not exactly ancient history, yet occurred some time ago. I might crave the indulgence of the House while I refer for a few moments to what was said by that hon. gentleman as to the scheme at first propounded by the Mackenzie administration for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the comparison made by him between that scheme and the one adopted in 1881, by the then government of Canada. The scheme of Mr. Mackenzie, broadly stated, contemplated the construction of a line from some point south of Lake Nipissing to the Pacific ocean. It provided that:

—the road, with its branches or sections, bridges, stations, engines, freight and passenger cars and rolling stock shall be constructed under the general superintendence of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) quoting from?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am quoting from chapter fourteen, thirty-seven Victoria, section seven. The Act went on to provide, in subsection three of section eight, that the company formed under this Act should receive aid to the extent of $10,000 per mile, and it went on to provide that aid should be provided on progress estimates. In subsection four of section eight the Act provided that the company should receive 20,000 acres of land per mile in separate blocks of 20,000 acres each, with a frontage of from three to six miles upon the railway, these blocks to be alternate blocks. Two-thirds of this land was to be sold—but I may as well quote the language of the Act with regard to that:—

Two-thirds of the quantity of land so appropriated shall be sold by the government at such prices as may be from time to time agreed upon between the Governor in Council and the contractors, and the proceeds therefrom accounted for and paid half-yearly to the contractors free from any charge of administration or management. The remaining one-third to be conveyed to the contractors.

Here are the broad features of the Act—$10,000 per mile cash subsidy; the road to be built in all respects under the supervision of the government; the government to control—of course with the consent of the contractors—the sale of two-thirds of the land grant; the land grant to be given in alternate blocks of 20,000 acres—which was superior to the practice subsequently adopted of making the land grants in alternate sections of 640 acres, for then the company would be required to make the improvements necessary to make the land valuable, while under the subsequent arrangement, the company would only have to leave the homesteaders and purchasers of other portions of the township to develop the township, the company reaping the benefit. Now the scheme ultimately adopted in 1881 involved a grant of $25,000,000 in cash, 25,000,000 acres of selected lands in the fertile belt of the North-west—the land grant under the Mackenzie scheme was to stretch along the entire line—and, in addition, the government built sections of the road at a cost of $32,000,000 which it handed over to the company, and it also subsequently loaned to the company $20,000,000 and took back land to pay $10,000,000 at $1.50 per acre. Thus the company received cash and other resources sufficient to build the main line; they received 706 miles of the most difficult portion of the line completed, and they received $20,000,000, only one-half of which they required to pay. They also received privileges and exemptions of the most important character—freedom from taxation for all time to come upon their main line and equipment; freedom from taxation on their lands for twenty years—(and it seems that twenty years under their interpretation of the law is almost an indefinite period)—and a monopoly of the transportation of the North-west by a prohibition against the making of connections between that country and lines to the south of the American border, in fact, a prohibition of the construction of any railway further south than within fifteen miles of the American boundary; the free admission of material, a privilege under which they imported for many years after the construction of the line material for renewing bridges and various other purposes. Now, I think a fair comparison of conditions and character of the two schemes would result in the exoneration of the Mackenzie administration from the charge of having proposed a

scheme not in the country's interests as compared with the scheme actually adopted. I will say no more upon this point, but I felt that, out of regard for the memory of my old leader, the late Alexander Mackenzie, it was as well to place the facts before the House. I am sure that my hon. friend from South Lanark had no intention of placing Mr. Mackenzie in a more unfavourable light before this generation than the facts of the case would warrant.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount of cash bonus and what the extent of the land grant under the two schemes, leaving aside all the rest ?

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) will give me the exact length of the line from Lake Nipissing to the Pacific coast, I can give him the land grant by multiplying the number of miles by 20,000 acres, and the amount of cash subsidy by multiplying by $10,000. I have not the exact length of the line, but it was about 2,600 miles, I imagine.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was that the last proposition made by the Mackenzie government ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it was. That was the offer placed upon the statute-book which the Mackenzie government——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is not aware of any other ?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, and I have not the time, at the moment, to examine the statutes and see. Now, in the position taken by the hon. member for South Lanark as to the futility of attempting to force trade against natural conditions, I fully concur. Of course, it is necessary, in our own interest, to have railway lines through from one of our own seaports on the Atlantic to one of our own seaports on the Pacific. That line, in my opinion, should run from Quebec, which is our natural seaport, in summer at all events—much superior in many ways to Montreal and certainly more accessible. I believe that our effort should have been to concentrate trade at Quebec and make that our great national seaport instead of dredging a channel through Lake St. Peter to bring sea-going vessels up to Montreal in spite of the obstacles that nature has imposed. A railway from Quebec to the Pacific is a scheme which commends itself to us and that should be carried into effect. The only questions to be considered are the questions now before the government—whether there shall be a cash subsidy, a land subsidy, or a guarantee of bonds, or whether government itself shall undertake the construction of that line. It has always seemed to me that we had in our North-west one of the most magnificent fields for embarking in the business of government ownership of railways and government transportation that has ever been open to a government. It has seemed to me that it would be a wise policy for the government to build that road from Quebec to Port Simpson, from ocean to ocean; that such a road would be an asset worth very much more than its cost, and that we should not have to consider its cost, because it would pay interest upon that cost and pay, in addition, large sums of money toward other expenses of government, and so give to the government control, to a large extent, of freight rates through that whole country.

There has been, however, and is now, a question as to whether this business could be undertaken by the government of Canada, whether it is not a line of business foreign to the genius of our government, one that our government is not capable of grappling with upon business conditions. It must be admitted that if this road cannot be built honestly, if it cannot be built in conformity with sound business principles, and unless it can be run in the same way, placed in the hands of railway men who will run it upon railway principles and not allow it to be made a political engine for furnishing places for camp followers and so forth—unless these things can be avoided, it is useless to talk about the construction of the road by the government. The experiment would be a very hazardous one. I am free to confess that I have to some extent been forced to forego the strong bias that I had in favour of building a government road, and the bias I have now, believing it almost impossible to secure the condition that I mention regarding the construction and operation of that line. Be this as it may, however, the line is necessary, the line must be constructed, Canada demands it. The line should be pointed towards Quebec, with a winter outlet at Halifax or St. John, preferably, I think, at Halifax, so that the trade of the North-west could be accommodated, and an ocean port reached over our own railway lines, passing the entire distance across the continent upon our own territory. That should be done, we should be able to offer facilities, and the best conditions that can be attained, to the business of the west.

But after having done this we will find, as my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) points out, that actual conditions will in all probability divert the greater portion of that trade to another route. That trade will seek the waters of the great chain of lakes; inevitably, during the season of navigation, that grain will be carried to Lake Superior, and improvements have been made in the construction of lake vessels and the deepening of channels between the head of Lake Superior and Buffalo, which enable forwarders to secure the shipment of wheat from Duluth or from Port Arthur to Buffalo at a ridiculously low rate as compared with rates prevalent a

few years ago. For a cent and a quarter or a cent and a half per bushel, you can transport your wheat from Duluth or Port Arthur, and put it in an elevator at Buffalo.

Mr. OSLER. That is only occasionally.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, you may count two cents as more than an average rate. Now when you reach Buffalo, there is a canal from that port to New York, which for years past has not been a factor in the transportation problem at all. It is a canal with seven feet of water, which served a good purpose years ago in regulating railway freights, but I doubt whether it has much influence in that direction at the present time. So when you reach Buffalo, if the competition is keen, if the American railway lines find it necessary, in order to secure the control of the business of carrying wheat from Buffalo to New York at a price which would leave them a bare profit, it can be done, I am told, on the New York Central Railway at fifty cents a ton, or one cent and six mills per bushel. So you have the possibility of carrying wheat from Port Arthur to New York for three cents a bushel, or at most four cents a bushel. Now there are conditions which render it, in my opinion, impossible at present to compete with that route. It is useless to think of hauling wheat from a point as far west as Port Arthur by an all-rail route to Quebec or to Halifax at prices such as those I quoted with regard to the American lines. Of course in the winter we should control, to a large extent, the transportation of that country. We should certainly, and under all conditions, control the transportation of all the products of the soil and of the forest north of the height of land, and between Lake Winnipeg and Quebec.

With regard to the appointment of a commission, some of my hon. friends have said that we have gone on and spent enormous sums of money in Canada on a system of waterways, and we find ourselves now in the position, after expending more than fifty million of dollars, of having a system of waterways and improvements of a character that are worthless. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not quite agree with that statement. We have a canal from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario with fourteen feet of water, and locks of a large size, not large enough of course to accommodate the large vessels of the upper lakes. We have the St. Lawrence canals deepened to fourteen feet. Now this is the system which we have created. The American system is a system of canals, one from Buffalo to Albany on the Hudson river of seven feet of water, one from Whitehall, on Lake Champlain to the Hudson river with seven feet of water, canals which are so inconsiderable in their capacity, so ridiculously inadequate for the immense amount of business they would be called upon to perform, that our own system of waterways, I think, is a credit to us. I think for the money expended, we have a system of waterways that have done us good service, and will do us good service still.

I do not believe that we are in a condition to-day, even if we decided to improve the Ottawa River Valley route, to decide what are the proper conditions upon which to proceed. For this reason I think the appointment of a commission to take this whole question under consideration is in the highest degree desirable, is not only desirable but is necessary. We are now confronting conditions that require careful consideration. We are called upon to inaugurate a policy and to proceed in a direction that has for its purpose the affording to the great North-west of transportation facilities. It is beyond all things necessary that we should make no false step, that we should proceed upon no false hypothesis or basis; and for that reason it is a wise thing to appoint a commission, composed of men who are capable of examining this question and arriving at correct conclusions. We cannot do it here in an expert and scientific manner, we must rely upon the service of men of the character of those who are to be appointed upon this commission. Let us wait untill we have the decision of these men as to the proper course to pursue.

Now with regard to the Ottawa Valley canal, if we decide that we must have that canal constructed to afford competition with the railway companies and afford another outlet for the North-west, for myself—and I have given a good deal of thought to the matter—I would be at a loss to say to-day whether I would favour the construction of a ship canal with twenty-one or twenty-two feet of water, or whether I would favour the construction of a barge canal for the transmission of grain to the mouth of the French river, thence carrying it in barges to Quebec, there to be elevated into vessels. I say I would not be able to decide at present which is the proper course to pursue. True, I would have before me the evidence taken by the commission in the state of New York, I would have the outcome of this investigation; I would have the fact that after the consideration for several years of the question of a ship canal versus a barge canal, the authorities of the state of New York have arrived at the decision to construct a barge canal with a draft of twelve feet of water, with large locks, and with barges of a capacity of 1,500 tons, these barges to be hauled in tows.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Can they build a through one to a depth of twenty feet?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, they are quite competent to build a through one. They have the alternative of building a ship canal from the Niagara river to Lake Ontario and of leaving Lake Ontario at Oswego and going by way of Albany or by taking the old Erie canal route. All these things have been considered and the state of New York, under the advice of competent men,

and especially of Major Symons, who has made a life-long study of this question, has decided that a barge canal has advantages over a ship canal. Among the reasons they assign for this conclusion is that when a vessel fitted for the navigation of the lakes, or of the ocean, enters a ship canal she retains the whole of her crew, she retains all of her outfit and goes plodding through that canal at the rate of three or four miles an hour, when her normal rate of speed upon the sea would be fifteen or sixteen miles an hour. This is a consideration which has very much weight in determining the cost of the transmission of grain, and it is a question as to whether that grain had not better be transhipped into barges and sent through the canal and transhipped again into vessels at New York. There is an advantage in transhipping it. Elevating the grain at Buffalo cools it and improves its condition. It is put into these barges and goes through the canal, handled again and exposed to the air when it goes into the hold of the vessel. It is claimed that it is absolutely cheaper to transport it in that way and that the condition of the grain under this method is very much better. Here is a question that would confront us if we were proceeding with due caution, in determining the nature of our premises at the outset; here is a question that we have to decide, a question that may most properly be referred to a commission of experts, to collate information and statistics that will enable us to decide among other questions that we want to decide not from a party standpoint, not for the purpose of making party capital, but on a sound economic baisis for the purpose of commencing the prosecution of a system of works upon proper principles that will be found to be the best under the circumstances. If, after having given to our seaports connections in the form of a railway to Quebec right through the country, and a railway from Quebec for winter communication with Halifax and St. John, we attempt in addition to affording facilities and the best facilities that can be given, roads with low grades and great capacity for hauling heavy loads—such as the loads that can be hauled over the New York Central and Lake Shore of 2,000 tons to a train—to force trade over these roads we will make a mistake, because we have to allow this trade to find a natural outlet. We cannot prevent the diverting of grain to American channels unless we do it in an artificial manner. We might do it by export duties and custom-house restrictions which would provoke the resentment of the North-west, and we must remember in addition to this, that the time is not far distant when the North-west will be the master of the situation. That country is filling up rapidly, that country will demand that it must have access to the best markets it can obtain. The wheat growers of the North-west will not be particular whether they sell to the Minneapolis millers, or the millers at Rat Portage, or the millers in Ontario, or the millers in the eastern states, or the millers in England. What they want is the best market. They want access to that market, they will demand it and they will be entitled to have it. We must simply make with care and make efficiently, provision for securing this trade in our own seaports under circumstances which are possible, having regard to our natural facilities and natural advantages. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says that the question resolves itself into a mere question as to whether there shall be American trade or Canadian trade. Of course, there will be competition between American channels and Canadian channels which will have a salutary effect upon the business of the country that furnishes that trade, which perhaps will lower rates, which will keep down the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the Canadian Northern, and which will keep down the rates of the trans-Canadian line if it is ever built. In so far as the diverting of trade from the Canadian Northern, south of the Lake of the Woods to the Jim Hill line is concerned, I have no fear of that. Let them divert the trade to the Jim Hill line if the farmers of the North-west are to be benefited, if their freight rates are to be reduced or if their facilities for reaching the markets are to be increased. The trade will reach its natural level and it will go by the best and quickest route notwithstanding any efforts we may make. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's demands that we should put the port of Montreal in the same position as that of New York. We cannot. It is impossible. New York is perhaps the finest harbour on the Atlantic coast. Montreal is away up the St. Lawrence, where you have to keep digging a channel through Lake St. Peter to maintain the thirty foot depth of water, when under natural conditions there is only a depth of fifteen feet.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is one of the most beautiful rivers in the world.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, it is a magnificent river and the outlet of a great chain of lakes, and down at the point where the river meets the sea, is found the proper national harbour, and it is the harbour of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We have no objection to that.

Mr. CHARLTON. Montreal has great advantages and displays great enterprise and the hon. member does well to stand up for his native city. I admire him for that, but it is impossible to make the port of Montreal the same as the port of New York, because nature has said you cannot. You have to spend large sums of money to secure an entrance to this harbour. The port is closed for several months in the year,

insurance rates are against it, many things are against it, and so it is impossible to place the port of Montreal on exactly the same footing as to natural advantages, because the natural advantages do not exist. For that reason I may say again, that I have always been in favour of attempting to make Quebec the seaport of the Dominion. I have always thought that it was the natural seaport. I believe we would find, if we went into the business of maintaining access to the port of Quebec as long as possible, that we would have a season of navigation six weeks longer in the year at the port of Quebec than at the port of Montreal, and I think that we have been acting on false premises and that we have been expending money injudiciously in overlooking the natural advantages of Quebec, in overlooking the fact that this is actually and positively a seaport at the head of deep water navigation where vessels of the size that navigate the high seas can come in without dredging or artificial aid.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Of course, we do not object to Quebec having as much done for it as it is possible to do, but how can the hon. gentleman explain that with its deep harbour and its natural advantages there are fifty large ships in Montreal to-day although the channel has not yet been completed, and this has been going on for fifty years past? How is it?

Mr. CHARLTON. I give the hon. gentleman and his fellow citizens of Montreal credit, and they do deserve great credit for showing greater enterprise than the citizens of Quebec. I give them credit for having had these natural difficulties overcome. I give them great credit for concentrating business in Montreal, and for securing the apropriation of money for overcoming the natural disadvantages, and for making Montreal a great port, but notwithstanding that, I hold that Quebec is the better port, that it is more accessible, that it will answer the purposes of the Dominion much better than the port of Montreal, and that we should at least give Quebec a fair show by the construction of this railway line from Quebec right through the interior, by the construction of wharfs and elevators at Quebec, and by—if we ever construct the Ottawa valley canal—having transhipment take place at Quebec. Thus, we will give the ancient capital and the historic city of Quebec the position which nature destined she would occupy in this Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) knows as well as I do that neither Montreal nor Quebec, nor any one port, can possibly in summer time handle the whole trade of this country. On the American side we have New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Portland. Let Quebec have all the trade we can give her; let the biggest ships come to Quebec; but surely my hon. friend does not mean to insinuate that the port of Montreal should be closed up.

Mr. CHARLTON. Oh no.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Or that the St. Lawrence should not be improved as much as money can improve it. Both ports combined will not be able to handle all our trade in the future.

Mr. CHARLTON. All right Mr. Speaker; we will give Montreal all the show my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) asks for it, and we will concede that we want more ports than one, and we will hope that Montreal will maintain its position and continue to grow. But all these things do not detract from what I have said, that Quebec has natural advantages and is the point where our natural seaport is situated. We must give to each fair play, and in view of the vast development of the trade of this Dominion and especially of the Canadian North-west, as the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says, one port or two ports, or three, or four ports are not going to handle that business and the business of the American west. There will be Quebec; there will be Montreal——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Three Rivers.

Mr. CHARLTON. There will be Three Rivers perhaps; there will be Halifax; there will be St. John, and Portland and Boston, and New York and Philadelphia, and Baltimore, and perhaps ultimately a great city may grow up at Newport News near Chesapeake Bay. All these will claim western trade, and we have to confront conditions here and not attempt to force trade in any direction, but to give to each place the benefit of its natural advantages, to develop its natural advantages as well as it may, and to secure for our own route and our own seaports all the trade of our Canadian North-west that can possibly be attracted. But we must not allow ourselves to suppose that we can divert the whole of the trade or that we can overcome the natural advantages I have referred to with regard to some of the American lines.

Now, Sir, this debate sprung up upon the presentation of certain matters by the leader of the opposition who called the government to task for its failure to announce its policy with regard to transportation routes; for its failure to announce the names of the transportation commission; for its failure to deal exhaustively and finally with all these great questions. Why, we could not deal with these questions at once. We must take time. If we acted precipitately and hastily we might make very grave mistakes. The transportation commission, even if named at an earlier date in this session would not have been in a position to make a report before giving it a proper and intelligent consideration which would guide this House in its action. We must give them some time. The govern-

ment have had to deal with many propositions. The government have had to look over a vast field; a field where great conflicting interests are contending for the mastery; a field where they had to decide whether they would themselves enter upon that field as a competitor for business and afford an outlet under their own supervision for the products of the great west. We must have a little patience; we must unite altogether in seeking to arrive at a decision and formulating and perfecting schemes for overcoming these difficulties and meeting these problems that confront us in the interest of the country without reference specially to this party or that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Let us look at this thing from patriotic motives, for it is the biggest question that ever has confronted us. We feel to-day the thrill of a new life in our veins; the electric thrill of a new energy that is flowing through all classes of our population. We are confronted by new questions. We realize that we have the resources of an empire; we realize that that country which we bought, supposing it to be a howling wilderness for $1,500,000 in 1871; we realize that it is an empire. We realize that it is the granary of the world with room for forty or fifty million people, and we want to look at these things candidly, carefully, and like business men. Let the opposition spur on the government if it does not do its duty or comprehend the issues, but let the opposition give to the government fair consideration, and fair play, and let us work together for the good of Canada and its development.

Mr. TALBOT. Might I ask the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) a question. He spoke of the enormous sacrifices that the Grand Trunk Railway had made for the development of Canada, and I would like to ask him how much the Grand Trunk Railway has spent to improve their shipping terminal facilities on the St. Lawrence.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They have very fine terminal facilities in Montreal.

Mr. TALBOT. How much have they spent?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They have as fine terminal facilities as any railroad in the country. I am not an advocate of the Grand Trunk Railway——

Mr. TALBOT. You are speaking of their railway facilities, but my question was directed as to their shipping terminal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose no railroad makes a port a shipping terminal or improves the shipping facilities. What the railroad does is to bring its freight to where there is shipping facilities, and these facilities are afforded them in the shape of docks and wharfs and depth of harbour.

Mr. TALBOT. What about Portland?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not know, I never was in Portland in my life.

Mr. KEMP. Might I ask the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) a question? When the hon. gentleman was speaking I was not quite clear where he intended the railway to which he referred, to run from west of Quebec, and whether he intended that it would be a private enterprise; an enterprise encouraged by government aid, or a government built and controlled railway.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not profess to be in a position to lay down absolutely or accurately what the route of that road would be. I have a general idea that it should strike from Quebec pretty well north. As my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) said, it should go through the valley of the Notaway river and the Moose river, north of the height of land, and I would imagine that if it were a government road and was aiming for the Pacific Ocean, that it had better go north of Lake Winnipeg and skirt the Peace River Valley, having in view ultimately the construction of a branch from its main line to Fort Churchill for the purpose of utilizing, if it is capable of being utilized, the navigation of the Hudson's Bay. If I was outlining it, it would be a pretty broad and comprehensive scheme of national character and national importance. With regard to the question as to the method of the construction of this road, I do not think I expressed any special preference. I did descant in a general way upon the advantages I supposed would result from the construction of a government railway, always supposing that we could get ourselves into a position to keep ourselves free from the ordinary debasing influence of politics, so as to have that road built upon business principles and managed upon business principles by competent railway men who would have no connection with politics, who would not be influenced by politics at all, and would not be hauling coal at a loss of three or four mills per ton, or doing any business on that line for the accommodation of localities and to meet the demands of politicians. All these things would have to be secured to us, or I would at once condemn that proposal and say it was not a good one.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Since we are discussing this matter in a friendly way, would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Macdonald). This discussion is irregular. Hon. gentlemen cannot put questions from one side of the House to the other after they have made their speeches. An hon. gentleman can make a speech and include in it any subject he wishes, but this is not an interrogatory discussion.

Mr. T. C. CASGRAIN (Montmorency). I do not rise to put a question Sir, but to make a few remarks upon this very important matter. I cannot join with my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) in congratulating the government on not announcing their policy to the House at this late date of the session. This question has so long occupied the attention of the country, that long before this, the government should have made a definite announcement to the country on its transportation policy. Not only during the present session but in the last year of the last parliament, this question was under discussion, and the very idea of this transportation commission was suggested to the government in 1899 by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). In a speech which I see in 'Hansard' of 1899, the hon. gentleman suggested what I thought at that time and still think should have been the policy of the government. In a very exhaustive examination of the question, after going fully into all the intricacies of it, the hon. gentleman expressed himself thus.

For this reason I for one would be very glad to see the government hold its hand for a year, and in the meantime appoint a commission of engineers from the Department of Public Works and the Department of Railways and Canals to inquire, not only into the feasibility of the Ottawa, Lake Nipissing and Georgian Bay route, but also into the feasibility of the Toronto and Collingwood route. I am sure that no factious opposition will be offered by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, if they are satisfied that the government have selected the best route under all the circumstances ; and it is because I believe we have not yet the necessary information before us to justify us in endorsing the expenditure of $150,000 as an initial expenditure on the very vast work at Port Colborne that I have risen to make these remarks.

These remarks were made to the House as far back as August 2, 1899, by my hon. friend from West Toronto. What have the government been doing ever since ? The question has been discussed in this House. I remember the late member for Quebec West, the Hon. Mr. Dobell, who was a great believer in the possibilities of the west and also of the east, and especially of our seaport towns, getting up year after year as a minister of the Crown and calling the attention of the House to this very question. It seems to me that having had the valuable suggestion of my hon. friend from West Toronto, it was the bounden duty of the government—if it was necessary for them to appoint a commission, to obtain information which they could not supply themselves —to have done so, long before this. What have they been doing since that time ?

Mr. SPROULE. Marking time.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It seems to me they have been doing to a great extent what my hon. friend says—marking time. They have had no definite policy. We have spent large sums of money in improving harbours on the lakes and improving the navigation on the St. Lawrence river ; but there has been no general plan, and to-day we are face to face with this position. In the North-west we have, or are going to have in a short time, a great many roads—the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern, and probably the Trans-Canada and the Grand Trunk Pacific—all supplying the needs of that vast territory and bringing to the seaports of the east the crops which grow there. In the face of this state of things, is it not a patriotic duty laid on the shoulders of the government and also upon the members of this House to see, as far as possible, that we have every benefit we can get from the hauling of the grain from the North-west down through the eastern portion of the Dominion of Canada ? I am a strong believer in a policy which would force, as much as nature would permit, every bit of the grain produced in the western provinces to come down through Canadian territory and help to build up our seaboard towns on the Atlantic and on the St. Lawrence river. My right hon. friend who leads the House says the government are about to appoint this commission. They are not yet appointed. Hon. gentlemen do not seem even to be quite decided on the names of the gentlemen who will form this commission. We all regret, I have no doubt, that it is impossible for Sir William Van Horne, as we are informed to-day, to be the head of this commission, because there is no man so well qualified to be the president of this important body, which will, to a certain extent, decide on the future transportation policy of the government of Canada. The names of other gentlemen have been suggested. I have the pleasure of the acquaintance of Mr. Harold Kennedy, and if that gentleman had been able to accept the position, I am sure all who know him would have been most pleased, and would have felt that the interests of Canada could not have been placed in better hands. As to Mr. Bertram, I know nothing. I am told that he is a ship-builder ; but whether he has sufficient knowledge for the position, I am not at present well enough informed to be able to say. With regard to Mr. Fry, I may say to the right hon. gentleman that there are ten or twenty men in the city of Quebec who would be superior to him in occupation to be a member of this commission in the place of Mr. Harold Kennedy. I have nothing to say against Mr. Fry ; he is an estimable citizen of Quebec, but nobody heard of him outside of his having been agent for Lloyds in Quebec for a number of years. It seems to me that if this commission is to be appointed, the government should first of all endeavour to obtain, irrespective of politics, the very best possible talent in the land, no matter what it would cost ; as all hon. gentlemen agree that this is probably the most important question that has been brought to the notice of this

parliament. I may say that I for one do not believe in government by commission. I believe it is the duty of the government to handle these questions themselves. When this government came into existence in 1896 it was heralded all through this continent and through the continent of Europe as the greatest conglomeration of business men that was ever called into being; and it seems to me that such distinguished lights as those I see before me—as my right hon. friend who leads the government, the Minister of Railways and Canals, and my hon. and learned friend the Minister of Justice, who has studied this question—should have formed a commission to deal with this question, and obtain the information necessary to enable the government to come before the House with a definite policy. When I said a moment ago that I did not believe in government by commission, my right hon. friend smiled; the sunny smile with which we are all so familiar beamed on his face. But my hon. friend from West Toronto in 1899 probably did not believe that the government was such a great conglomeration of business men, and he thought it was necessary to have a commission to find out and report what policy the government should adopt.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend has a better opinion of us now.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have not. I am not yet converted; but it seems to me that, with the time they have had since my hon. friend from West Toronto gave them the cue in that speech which was so replete with information, and after all the discussions which have taken place in this House since that time, the government should themselves be in a position to state their policy to the House. I do not believe in government by commission. I really do not believe that it is constitutional for the government not to shoulder the responsibility of a great question like this, but to put it on the shoulders of men who are not responsible to this parliament. Here we are face to face with this great transportation problem, as to how we are to get the products of the wheat fields of the west down through Canadian territory and to Canadian ports. We have not decided that question yet. We are now going to appoint a commission; but before that commission will have time to report, the end of the session will have gone by, even should the session last until August or September. No doubt the commissioners will have to take their information in all parts of the country in order to become thoroughly acquainted with the transportation facilities, but in the meantime the traffic of the west which we desire to send through our Canadian ports will have taken another direction. Hon. gentlemen opposite, I am convinced, desire as strongly as we to see our own ports built up, but, judging by the experience of the past, if our western traffic should become diverted to American ports, it will be exceedingly difficult to bring it back into Canadian channels and Canadian ports, either on the Atlantic or the St. Lawrence river. Some time ago we were told by a gentleman of undoubted authority in railway matters that our spouts were too small for our hopper. Well, now is the time, Mr. Speaker, when we should enlarge our ports on the St. Lawrence and Atlantic coast. Now is the time when we should make our spouts sufficiently large to receive and to distribute everything that comes from the west. Now is the time to provide means for bringing the enormous products of the west to our own ports. In my opinion, the ports of Montreal and Quebec and the other important ports on the St. Lawrence and on the Atlantic coast should be made free. The government boasts of an enormous surplus, amounting, they say, to $13,000,000. They boast of having had the largest surpluses this country has ever seen. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the time to use this enormous amount of money in equipping Canadian ports on the St. Lawrence and the Atlantic ocean with all the facilities required to receive the enormous traffic of the North-west. I have every desire, and have always had, to do everything possible for the advancement of our North-west. The very earliest political speeches I ever made were in defence of the acquisition of the North-west. I was then convinced that the acquisition of that country would be of the greatest advantage to Canada as a whole. The Conservative government of that day was condemned by the Liberal party for their policy with regard to the North-west, but to-day the statesmanship of the Conservative party is fairly vindicated, and we have hon. gentlemen opposite compelled to admit that the prosperity of Canada depends in a great measure on the enormous wealth which flows from the North-west. We must not forget however that the people of the North-west owe something to the eastern portion of this country. We find in some newspapers the opinion expressed that the people of our North-west do not care at all about the east, that all they want is to sell their grain, and they care not whether it is exported through Canada or the United States. I feel convinced that such statements do not reflect the real opinion of our western friends, and I have no doubt that they are prepared to back as much as possible the patriotic policy of sending Canadian grain through Canadian territory to Canadian ports. I am not one of those who think that the improvements I have mentioned would cost too much. We can deepen our St. Lawrence, we can deepen the channels we now have sufficiently to allow us to ship the grain from Quebec or Montreal. Just see what the Americans have done to build their ports and waterways and other means of transportation from the west to the east. We have in this country a population every whit

as patriotic as the population of the United States. If we want to build up this country as the United States has been, we must not shirk our opportunities. We ought to be able to accomplish everything, which can be accomplished with the aid of money and patriotism.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Speaker, when you rose at six o'clock I was adverting to the acquisition of the North-west. I am certainly not one who would not grudge a cent of the money that Canada has paid very lavishly for the acquisition of the the North-west Territory. If it were to be done again, I would be glad to support any measure which would bring into the country this large territory which has proved to be of such advantage to Canada as a whole. But what I say is that Canada to-day must reap the benefit of the large expenditure which it made at that time. It is said that grain cannot be hauled at a profit—a profit either to the railways or to the farmers of the North-west—if it passes around the north shore of Lake Superior. But it is admitted on all hands, I take it, that grain can be brought down to Port Arthur or Fort William and there transferred to barges and brought down to our ports on the St. Lawrence or transferred to other parts of our railway system and taken down to the port of Halifax or St. John. What, then, is our manifest duty ? It is to so improve our waterways as to give the cheapest and most direct route to Europe. It is said that this will cost a great deal of money. Well, what if it does ? We have the money. As I said this afternoon we pride ourselves on having immense surpluses. It seems to me that in no better way can the surpluses and immense amounts of money the government is deriving from the country be put to use than by building up our seaports. What I advocate is a bold policy at this very moment. It seems to me it is the duty of the government and of this House to have a bold policy. When, many years ago, it was decided to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, people said that this was a bold policy and our hon. friends on the other side of the House said, many and many a time, that this railway would never pay, even for the grease for the wheels. Of course, since then, we have changed, and, to-day, we know that there is no greater factor in the prosperity of Canada than this very Canadian Pacific Railway. It was a bold policy which animated our predecessors on the Conservative side when they made an agreement with a syndicate to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was a bold policy when, in 1882, I believe, they loaned $20,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway. At that time, the agreement was that the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be completed not later than 1891. But, Sir, in 1886, the Canadian Pacific Railway was built from end to end and the traffic came pouring into the eastern ports of Canada. To-day, we want a return for the sacrifices Canada made at that time, and the best return that can be made is to build up ports on the St. Lawrence and on the seaboard. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) seemed to advocate the claims of Quebec as against the claims of Montreal. There need be, and there is, no jealousy between these two ports; each port has its advantages and each should receive from this country and from the government the liberal encouragement that it deserves. Of course, Montreal is situated nearer the heart-centre of the wheat growing North-west. Situated, as it is, as the commercial centre of one of the principal provinces of the Dominion, of course, it will always be a great shipping port. I am not here to advocate the claims of Quebec as against the claims of Montreal or the claims of Montreal as against those of Quebec. But I say, as I said this afternoon, that what should be done, what should be the policy of the government, is to make the port of Montreal and the other principal ports in Canada free ports. And not only that, but, if it is true that we can secure the traffic at least during the summer months through the St. Lawrence route, we should deepen the channel between Quebec and Montreal, we should so light it and buoy it that it shall be as easy to navigate the St. Lawrence by day or night as it is to navigate the ocean itself. Of course, in the natural course of events, the larger ships, the ships that are building to-day, ships of great tonnage, will probably not be able to go so far as Montreal. These will go to Quebec. And here is the fault I find with the government in this matter—they are certainly not doing their duty towards Quebec; they are certainly not doing towards Quebec what they should do in view of its natural position and in view of the faithful support that they themselves have received from Quebec and the district of Quebec. Consider what has happened. Sir, last year, when this question came up, my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) speaking then as Minister of Public Works, brought down a project by which it was said that at least a million dollars would be spent to improve the harbour of Quebec. What is the condition of things in Quebec to-day ? How many berths are there for ocean going steamships ? How many elevators are there ? What accommodation have ocean-going steamships in Quebec ? I know very well that my hon. friends opposite may say, with some degree of certainty, that a mistake was made when large sums of money were spent in the port of Quebec. But we must take the facts as they are to-day. Conditions are not now as they used to be. We

certainly have the prospect in view that, if the port of Quebec were properly equipped we should be able to load large steamers there, and the fact is that every day almost, large steamers would go to Quebec to be loaded if proper accommodation were given. I read in the papers the other day that there was one berth for a large steamer in Quebec, and that when a second large steamer came in, she had to stop out in the tide until the first steamer was unloaded. There is a state of things which the government certainly should have seen to before to-day. And, if this commission which they have promised is given, that is one of the first questions that should occupy its attention. The other day, again, I heard that the 'Monteagle' came to Quebec to unload, but there was so little accommodation in the warehouses on the docks, they were so overloaded that they could not take any more goods into it. That is a state of things that it seems to me should prove to the government that they have not done their duty toward the city of Quebec. I remember very well when this plan of the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was brought down to the House, 'Le Soleil,' the government organ in Quebec, had articles with great headlines on the subject. For instance, on the 29th July, 1902, it had an article with headlines which I have translated as follows :—

Hurrah for Quebec.
Construction of piers from Comner's Wharf to Beauport.
Work to be begun by the Department of Public Works.

And there followed an article which expatiated on the benefits that the city of Quebec would reap from these plans. Then, on the 8th of August, appeared an article with these headlines :—

Great news for Quebec.
Advertisement calling for tenders.
Cheques accepted.

—and the article said that these piers or wharfs were to be built from the St. Louise Basin as far as Beauport. Referring now to 'Hansard' of the same day, what do I find ? I find this plan exposed to the House by the Minister of Public Works of that day, who said :

However, Quebec has practically no harbour equipment. There is only one berth for large ships in the whole harbour of Quebec. A ship loading or unloading there has either to anchor in the middle of the river, or to be loaded and unloaded with lighters. Now, we think the time has come when the port of Quebec will have to be equipped. I have here a plan of the improvement, which I invite hon. gentlemen to examine with me.

I remember the hon. gentleman unfolded the plan on the Table of the House.

It shows the famous Louise Basin, of which we heard so much years ago. We propose to construct four berths for the largest ships. They will have 40 feet of water at high tide. Of course, we will build the cribs deeper than the existing walls of the old cribs, so as to give them greater solidity. These works that I intend to carry out gradually will cost about $1,000,000.

Sir, if I understand it aright, the policy of the government to-day is to build one berth in Quebec, not four berths as was then decided upon. It is decided now to spend $200,000 on the port of Quebec, and not $1,000,000 as was the policy of the government at that time. I say that that is not only unfair to Quebec but it is unfair to the country at large. And, if we are to carry out the policy which is based upon the saying that 'the spout should not be too small for the hopper,' we should see to it that, as soon as time will permit us to do it that the port of Quebec is so equipped that, when the grain comes down from the west, we in Quebec and Montreal may be prepared to receive it and ship it on board vessels which will take it to European ports. I cannot understand why the government has changed its plans upon this subject; I cannot understand why the government is not carrying out the policy which it propounded to this House last year; I cannot understand why this vast plan, which was heralded throughout the province of Quebec by the 'Le Soleil,' is not being carried out by the government this year.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, speaking this afternoon, mentioned several lines of railway which were in contemplation. He spoke of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Trans-Canada. I was glad to hear my right hon. friend say that the policy of the government is to encourage some of these lines by subsidies, but that not only one of them had yet been decided upon definitely by the government. I must say I was a little surprised to hear some hon. gentlemen say that they knew nothing of the Trans-Canada, that the Trans-Canada was a line that nobody knew anything about; they did not know where it started from, they did not know where it went, and they did not know the country through which it would pass. Now in speaking of this line I may be anticipating somewhat, because to-morrow, if I am correctly informed, a deputation from Quebec is going to appear before the Committee on Railways and Canals, and that deputation will give the committee all the information which it can desire upon the Trans-Canada. But let me say just now that the Trans-Canada is a line which goes in an almost straight direction from Quebec, or north of Quebec, to Port Simpson on the Pacific ocean. This line, from the information which we have now, goes through an undeveloped country, but a country which is perfectly susceptible of producing as much wheat as the country which lies to the south of it.

It is a line far removed from the international boundary; and if at any time, which God forbid, a war were to break out between the United States and Canada, when other lines of railway would probably become an easy prey to an invading force, the Trans-Canada line would be far removed from any such attack, and therefore would afford a safe and easy means of transportation for troops going from one end of Canada to the other. Then again the telegraph lines along this railway would be equally far removed from the international boundary, and communication could be kept up by them from one end of Canada to the other. There is another consideration I may mention, and that is that the Trans-Canada line will develop an important part of the province of Quebec. Now I fail to see from what I know, or from the information which has been given to us, that the Grand Trunk Pacific will have any such effect. If I understand the plan which has been imposed upon the Grand Trunk Pacific, that railway is going to pass through a part of the province of Quebec which will derive no benefit from it, and the province as a whole will derive no benefit from it. It is a line which, if my information is correct, will be almost impracticable. It is a line which is proposed merely to blind the eyes of the people of Quebec to the real situation. As to the Trans-Canada Company itself, I may say that it is composed of some of the best men in Quebec, and hon. members of this House who are acquainted with the incorporators know very well that they are energetic, that they are pushing, and that they will be able, if the government give them any support, to command as much capital in England as the Grand Trunk Pacific itself.

Now, Sir, let me briefly recapitulate the facts of the situation as they appear to me. First, the government has come down too late with this plan of appointing a commission to get information as to the best means of transportation through Canada; secondly, after all the discussions which have taken place in this House the government should be to-day sufficiently informed to be able to decide upon a policy and to propound it to this House; thirdly, government by commission is not in the true spirit of the constitution under which we live, and the government itself should take upon its own shoulders the responsibility of propounding to the House and to the country a policy upon a question so important as the one we are now discussing.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). It may seem out of place for a member representing a part of the country that is certainly the most deeply interested in the question of transportation, to take any part in this debate. The question of transportation has been up for discussion on a number of occasions ; but I must say, speaking for the western part of the country it seems to me that what the House considers transportation is quite a different thing from what we consider transportation. Canada extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a distance of 3,000 miles; I would suppose that national transportation meant the carriage of supplies from one ocean to the other, or over a part of that distance. But as this question has been debated in the House on the present and on previous occasions, transportation does not mean the carriage of produce or supplies, but merely their transference from rail to boat or from boat to rail at a lake or ocean port in the North-west are interested in the transportation question as Canadians, we are interested in the equipment of our ocean ports, we are interested in seeing Canadian traffic go through Canadian channels; we are interested in these things, I say, as Canadians, but not as North-westers. As North-westers, speaking locally and sectionally—we have no special interest in the equipment of these ports. But we do not look at the matter in that light, we look at it as Canadians desiring to build up Canada, desiring to see Canada developed in the east as well as in the west. Therefore we are prepared to vote money to build up ocean ports at Montreal and Quebec ; but we do not want it understood that the building up of these ports is for the special interest and development of the North-west. The great question of transportation is : How shall produce and supplies be transported most cheaply, to the benefit of the producer and the consumer ? It seems to me that we are wandering far from the real essence of the question when we think of the question of transportation as merely a question as to the port at which our supplies shall be transferred from the warehouse to the steamer. Would hon. members look at it in this way ? Our wealth is derived from our crop, and the question of transportation is important to us just in proportion as it affects the value of the crop. Give the crop a cheapening of transportation to the extent of a cent a bushel, and you add a cent a bushel to the trade of Canada. It makes no difference whether the crop goes out of the country by one port or another, you have added that amount to the trade of Canada by cheapening transportation. Is it more important to Canada that a crop of 100,000,000 bushels of grain shall be advanced in value one cent a bushel or that that amount of grain shall pass out of the country by a particular port ? If you can increase the vaule of your crop by cheapening your transportation, you are thereby benefiting the country by adding to the trade of the country, but if you are merely taking a course to, as it were, compel the trade of the country to go this way or that way, there is no special addition to the trade of the country and there is no benefit. Everything ac-

cording to its value. We want to see Canadian trade go through Canadian ports. We are willing to vote money to help to put these ports into proper shape, but let me tell my hon. friends that the difference between the value in our export of grain that will accrue from the expenditure of perhaps some $6,000,000 at the port of Montreal will not possibly amount to more than one cent per bushel, taking the extreme view of the case. That amount of one cent per bushel could be added to the value of the crop of the west by a reduction in the rates over the railways very much more easily than it could by equipping the port of Montreal. If it is transportation we are to talk, let us talk transportation and the cheapening of transportation, and if we want to talk ports, we will talk ports and the improvement in the means of transfer. It was said here to-day by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the New York Central carries wheat from Buffalo to New York at, I think he said, something less than two cents a bushel.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not say that, but I said that they could do so.

Mr. OLIVER. Could the hon. gentleman tell us at about what price they do carry it?

Mr. CHARLTON. About three to three and a-half cents per bushel.

Mr. OLIVER. We will say four cents a bushel. The distance is about 400 miles. The distance from Buffalo to New York is approximately the same as the distance from Winnipeg to Thunder Bay, and we pay twelve cents a bushel to carry grain from Winnipeg to Thunder Bay, when that same grain, after it gets to Buffalo, is carried from Buffalo to New York for four cents a bushel. Do you want to talk transportation ? Do you want to cheapen transportation ? Then cut the rate on grain between Winnipeg and Port Arthur, and add the difference to the trade of this country instead of to the dividends of the railway company. The cheapening of transportation will come by the improvement and increase in our railway facilities, and by the better arrangements we may make from time to time as to the control of rates over these railways ; that is as to getting the advantage of the facilities which we provide.

Let me say that in my own estimation, and I believe in the estimation of the greater part of the western country, we do not look for the cheapening of transportation by the improvement of our present canal system or by the addition of another canal system. We have a canal system of which as an engineering work, I presume we may be very proud. But as a means of drawing the trade of North America through our country, it has been a dismal failure. Then, we do not look to the duplicating of the system to accomplish what it has failed in doing. The day of canals has gone by. Canada has practically lost the money it has put into canals, and I am one to say that Canada has no more money to put into a canal scheme, the Georgian bay or otherwise. In regard to the equipment of ports, I believe, and we all believe, that our trade should go through our own ports, and that these ports should be equipped properly for the carrying of that trade, but there is a limit, or there should be a limit, to all things, and as one who is not amenable to the local vote, perhaps I have the opportunity of saying certain things that may not be convenient to hon. members representing localities in this part of the country. The qualifications of any place to be a national port depend upon the ease with which it can be made a national port, and I say that when it is declared that after the vast expenditures which have been made it will yet require $6,000,000 to equip the port of Montreal as the national port of Canada, it is evidence that Montreal is not properly the national port of Canada, that the day that Montreal could be so considered has gone by, and that we have to select a port nearer deep water than Montreal ; that is to say, Quebec. If we had only one means of reaching the ocean, and that one the port of Montreal, then we certainly would have to spend these millions of money, but we are not so confined. We have all the length of the St. Lawrence river, and I am credibly informed that from Three Rivers to Quebec these impediments to navigation which cause the great difficulty in reaching Montreal do not exist, that we are not tied to Montreal, but that we have from Three Rivers to Quebec as a means of accommodating the deep water ocean traffic without these vast expenditures which are necessary to bring it up to the port of Montreal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) permit me to tell him that this is the worst part of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. OLIVER. Where ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Between Quebec and Three Rivers. The Cap a la Roche is the most dangerous part of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. OLIVER. I will accept the correction, but I understand the large expenditures were made between Three Rivers and Montreal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Oh no ; very far from it.

Mr. OLIVER. I accept the correction. I am not familiar with the circumstances, certainly not as familiar as is the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte). However, I repeat, that these expenditures are too vast for the good resulting ; and, that when we have a deep water ocean port at Quebec we cannot afford to spend so many millions of dollars to make Montreal that which nature did not intend her to be. This discussion, Mr. Speaker, has covered a great

deal of ground; hon. gentlemen who have spoken have gone pretty far afield, and I will take a similar liberty to a slight extent.

The question of a winter ocean port for the proposed Grand Trunk Railway line has been spoken of. I understand that our friends from the maritime provinces are making a stiff fight against the Grand Trunk Railway project, unless there is connected with it a Canadian ocean port during the winter months. There is this difficulty about their position, if they will allow me to say so: that they do not seem to be decided as to which port is to be the Canadian winter port. To my mind there is only one port in the maritime provinces that is suitable as a Canadian winter port for freight traffic, and that is the port of St. John. If the maritime province people will unite in supporting the port of St. John I think I can promise them that many of our western friends will favour that port also. We want a winter ocean port in our own country, but we cannot have a perambulating ocean port.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. Neither can we have an ocean port that is too distant from the centre of production. I would like to say to my friends from the maritime provinces, that it is St. John or nothing. If they will unite on St. John, I will be, for one, ready to give them a lift. I believe we can make St. John our winter ocean port, and if we cannot unite on St. John, then we cannot put ourselves in a position to deal with the Grand Trunk Railway company on the basis of having a Canadian winter ocean port.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Did I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) to say that the government were going to spend $6,000,000 on the port of Montreal?

Mr. OLIVER. No. I said it had been stated by the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that it would require $6,000,000.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If the hon. gentleman said the government were going to spend $6,000,000 on the port of Montreal, I would have wired it down there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is not such a large sum of money for such a purpose.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the projects of the Grand Trunk Railway Pacific and of the Canadian Northern Railway, let me ask what are really the transportation propositions that are before the House, and before the country. There is no doubt that the development of the west requires the construction of another trunk line of railroad by an independent company, if not by the government itself. The transcontinental trunk line of railway which we have now has answered a good purpose; it has developed a part of the country, but it has not developed the whole country. If we are to have the whole country developed, we must have other lines of railroad constructed. It strikes me that it is much better that these additional lines of railroad should be constructed by an independent company rather than that they should be constructed by that company which already has its transcontinental line. If we must have new lines we may as well have an independent company owning these lines, and have competition rather than have monopoly. Therefore, I say that we welcome the proposition of the Grand Trunk Railway and the proposition of the Canadian Northern Railway to open the western country by the construction of two railroads. There seems to be an idea that there is room for only one of those two roads. I am not prepared to say how it is from Winnipeg to Quebec, but I will say to the House that there is room and there is need for both the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway Pacific to develop the country from Manitoba west to the Rocky mountains through the fertile belt. There is need of a railroad at least every forty miles. I would say even every thirty miles in the fertile country. There is a country there every foot of which is fertile for a width of from 100 miles to 200 miles, all the way from the Manitoba boundary to the Rocky mountains. That country cannot be fully developed by one line of railroad. It must have two; it must have more than two lines in order to be properly developed. Therefore, just as we need one line more than the Canadian Pacific Railway to develop the North-west, so we need more than one to develop that fertile belt. There is no danger of overcrowding in the fertile part of the North-west by two trunk lines of railroad. In the narrow strip of country between the international boundary and the lakes, a distance of 100 miles, there are five parallel lines of railroad and they were blocked with grain last fall. If 100 miles of fertile country in the province of Manitoba requires five parallel lines to do its work, surely the country further west equally fertile; a strip from 100 to 200 and 300 miles wide will not be overcrowded with two lines of railroad.

Now, in regard to assistance to the building of a railroad through that country, I am sure that the people will hear with great satisfaction the announcement of the Prime Minister to-day that there will be no grant of land in aid of railroad construction in the North-west. There is the strongest feeling in the North-west against giving aid to railroads by grants of land. The country has been throttled by that system; we do not want to repeat it. I was somewhat astonished to-day to hear the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) say that these land grants to railroads in the North-west had been made at the request

of the people of the North-west. That certainly was news to me, and I have been very well acquainted with the North-west for a number of years. I wonder if the people he alluded to were the half-breeds who in 1885 expressed their opinion in regard to the land administration of that country, by taking up arms in defence of what they thought to be their rights in regard to these lands—and the half-breeds were the principal people of the country at that time. Those deputations who came to the government here and asked that the lands of the North-west be given away to railroads—I certainly never heard of them starting. I do not know who they were, but we are bound to take the word of the hon. member in parliament. However that may be, I do not think they came from the North-west. Speaking, if I may, on behalf of the North-west, I will say that the people of that country have been so ill-satisfied and are so ill-served by our present railroad that they would welcome—in fact they look upon it as the only full relief—the construction of a government railway as a means of settling the transportation question in that country ; a railroad built and owned and controlled, even if not operated by the government. I presume, however, that that view will not find favour in the House, and that we will be required to make a bargain with one or the other company to build the railroad in consideration of certain assistance to be given. On that point I want to say very definitely that it is the absolute understanding of the case by the people of the North-west that any aid granted to a railroad company towards the construction of its line in that country shall be compensated by a corresponding control of the rates upon that railroad. Our view is : no control, no bonus.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. We would rather give a bonus and have control of rates than have the railroad built without a bonus and have no control of rates. The rates are everything. We can wait for the railroad for a year or two years, but if we have no control of rates, we are at the mercy of the railroad; the railroad is our master for all time, and we are its servants. Whatever bargain is made between the railroad company and this parliament or this government, our position is that for every dollar of assistance we give, either in guarantee or in money, we want a corresponding control of rates, which control shall be actual and effective, and not visionary. We cannot afford, this country cannot afford, eastern Canada cannot afford, to load ourselves up with any more indebtedness for the construction of railroads, which railroads, after they are built, shall be run absolutely regardless of the interests of the people of Canada, either east or west. Do you people of eastern Canada know how you stand in regard to this transportation question ? Your market for your manufactures and for your wholesale dealings is in western Canada; it is there or it is not anywhere. Do you know that the manufacturing and wholesale centres of the United States are much nearer the Canadian North-west, than your manufacturing and wholesale centres are ? Do you know that the distance is much shorter from Minneapolis and St. Paul than it is from Toronto and Montreal ? Do you know that you have to get, not the same rates, but lower rates per mile on your supplies going from here to the North-west than United States dealers get on their supplies going from Minneapolis, St. Paul or Chicago ? But you say, we will put up the duty. You cannot put your duty high enough, because just as you put up the duty the railroad puts its rates up to include the duty. You do not get the benefit of the duty; the duty is figured into the railroad rate every time, and do not make any mistake about it. Let my hon. friends look at the transportation question from this point of view; and when they are dealing with a railroad corporation to-morrow or on any other day, let them make up their minds that it is not the man growing grain in the North-west who needs control of the rates on his wheat going out, so much as you need it on your merchandise going in. You need it more than he does, because if he does not send his wheat by the Canadian road, he can send it by an American road; but you cannot send your merchandise in by any but the Canadian road. Make no mistake about it; eastern Canada is vitally interested in this question of the control of rates over any railroad that may be built between eastern and western Canada. There is no east or west in this matter. You want to trade with us, we want to trade with you, and it is for you as much as it is for us to see that our interests are protected according to the amount of money we pay or according to the amount of security we give.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, the present discussion arose this afternoon through two questions which the hon. leader of the opposition asked of the government. One question referred to the commission which the government had promised to appoint, and the other referred to the much-talked-of transcontinental railroad project. I do not propose to discuss in a general way the transportation question, which has been so much discussed this afternoon and this evening; but I will just confine myself in a few words to the two questions which the hon. leader of the opposition asked. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) raised a very important question this afternoon in stating what it cost to transfer grain from the head of the great lakes to the seaboard. He claimed that the cheapest route from Duluth and Port Arthur was by way of Buffalo and New York, and he made out a pretty good

case in favour of that route. But it seemed to me that he was a little inconsistent when he came to deal with this transcontinental question for a line from Quebec westward, because, having demonstrated that the cheapest route was by way of Buffalo and New York, he proceeded to show the House that if the government could be trusted to manage honestly a government railroad, the government should build that road. As he had already argued that that road could not carry grain as cheaply as it could be carried in other directions, his reason for advocating the government undertaking the road was evidently because he felt that no private enterprise would do so. Then with reference to the commission, we were told by the Prime Minister that this commission was for the purpose of looking into the question of water routes and Canadian ports—Montreal, Sorel, Three Rivers, Quebec, St. John, and so forth. We were told that the commission was not to look into the question of railroad transportation. It seems to me this is a mistake. It seems to me that this commission, which was to have been appointed a week or two after the opening of parliament, should have power to look into the great transportation question in the broadest possible manner. If what the hon. member for North Norfolk has told us is a fact, that grain can never be carried as cheaply around the north of Lake Superior, through a country in which it is difficult to operate railroads, and if we have in view sentimental and patriotic motives in building up Canadian ports, what this commission should be in a position to tell us, after they have solved the problem to their satisfaction, is, how much more it will cost to carry the grain from the North-west by this northern route through Canada. For my part, I am prepared to support the sentimental Canadian idea, but I want to know when I come to vote what the extra cost is going to be. When we have the information we will be in a position to decide whether we ought to put our hands in our pockets and pay the amount required or not. We are informed however that it is very doubtful whether the gentleman mentioned as president will act. Possibly Sir William Van Horne may refuse to act. He may plead that he himself does not require the advice or counsel of the other gentlemen whom the government have suggested to advise with him on this commission. Or he may say that he is quite competent to advise the government forthwith. Or for any other reason he may decline to act. If Sir William Van Horne should refuse the appointment, I would suggest that the government should avail itself of his great experience and invite him to come to Ottawa and discuss that matter with them. Whether discussion should take days or weeks, it will be time well spent, and the government will have received valuable advice and suggestions from one thoroughly competent to speak on the subject and thoroughly versed in all its details.

Another matter with which the government have been dealing, and with which the government have been exceedingly dilatory is the Canadian Northern Railway. We are told by the right hon. the First Minister that a measure dealing with what we understand to be this road would be laid on the Table in a week or so. We must presume that the right hon. gentleman intended to convey the impression that a money subsidy would be granted this company. But why have the government not dealt with this matter before? Population has been flowing into the North-west far beyond our facilities for receiving and distributing it. There can be no possible excuse for the delay of the government. Last session they were not prepared to face this question, and they are in an equally helpless condition today. They knew last year that the tide of immigration was setting in, that greater facilities were needed to handle this immigration, still they had not the courage to deal with the question, and the Canadian Northern Railway people were asked to wait until this session. And here we are, beyond the middle of the session, and yet this measure is not before us. It is high time the government took some action. It is high time that we had a pronouncement and a definite policy submitted on this great transcontinental railway question in general. But leaving the question of the commission and the question of the Canadian Northern Railway and its subsidy, we come to another great question, we come to another proposition to build a transcontinental railway from a Canadian port on the Atlantic to a Canadian port on the Pacific. This is a matter which has been talked of for a year or more, and on which supporters of the government have been for a long time urging the government to take action. The granting of a charter to the Grand Trunk Pacific is now before the railway commission. Surely in a great national enterprise such as this, it is the duty of the government to announce its policy before the charter is granted. Members of the railway committee are called upon to discuss this charter, in complete ignorance of the policy of the government. We all realize that no railway will be built from one side of this continent to the other, through a country certain parts of which cannot furnish much freight or passenger traffic for many years to come, unless that railway receives a certain amount of subsidy or aid of some kind from the government. But when in the committee we seek to have the government declare its policy on the subsidy question, we are told that as the question of granting aid to the company is not before the committee, but solely that question of granting it a charter, we are debarred from discussing the subsidy ques-

tion at all, and thus we are all at sixes and sevens and nothing is done. In contrast with this, an hon. member has pointed to another transcontinental charter which went through the railway committee at the rate of about a thousand miles a minute. It was said it was put through in three minutes and the line was 3,000 miles long. But supposing we should grant the Grand Trunk Pacific a charter embracing all the privileges contained in the charter before the committee what may happen. That charter gives them the right to go in for coal and iron mining and a host of other things concerning the propriety, of which I am not raising any question, but am simply pointing out what broad privileges and important concessions the company are asking. But supposing, I say, this charter should ultimately be granted and that the government then should decide to build a railway themselves from the Atlantic to the Pacific or that another corporation should come along and offer better terms, the question of vested rights would then stand in the way. We would be told that the Grand Trunk Pacific had gone to a great deal of expense and had acquired certain vested rights.

I insist, Mr. Speaker, further that we should have a declaration from the government as to whether it is the policy of the government to build a road from the city of Quebec or from a port in the maritime provinces to Winnipeg, or whether it intends to subsidize a company for that purpose, or what is its policy ? One hon. member referred this afternoon to the obligations this country is under to the Grand Trunk Railway. Well, we all recognize that the Grand Trunk Railway was the pioneer railway of the country and has done a great deal for Canada, but if the shareholders of that company did not reap the benefit they might have expected, I am not aware that the Canadian people are in any way responsible. Can it be charged to the Canadian people that they did anything or interfered in anyway in the management of the railway, which rendered it impossible for the company to pay such dividends as the shareholders expected. This question of a transcontinental road must be dealt with from a business and not, in this respect, from a sentimental standpoint.

Mr. Speaker, had the government the ability as well as the desire to deal with this transportation question, they would have no need to appoint a commission. Why delegate the powers of the government to a commission ? Why ask Sir William Van Horne or anybody else to submit to the country their views on this matter. It is the government who are responsible, and we should have had from the government long ago their policy. This business of shifting the responsibility on to a commission is not in accord with our ideas of responsible constitutional government.

What we desire to know from the government is the following : Is it the intention of the government at this session of parliament to grant aid either with money or land, or by the guarantee of bonds, principal or interest, or in any other way, to another transcontinental railway ? If so, has the government decided upon a route the terminals of which at the seaboard will be in Canada ? Does the government intend, if aid is granted, to make it a condition that the freight traffic originating on such railway and its branches and destined to the seaboard shall be shipped all the year round through Canadian seaports ? Does the government intend to prepare plans and formulate conditions relating to the building, or to the equipping, or to the operation of such railway ? If so, is it the intention to submit the same to the public for tender, with a view of ascertaining the most advantageous terms that may be secured from various parties, syndicates or corporations for the building of, or for the equipping of, or for the operation of such railway ?

Now, as I said before, we are all at-sixes-and-sevens with regard to the government's railway policy. We are more than half through the session, and we are supposed, during the remaining weeks of the session to develop a great transcontinental railway scheme, to arrange for the granting of bonuses and so on, in a manner that will meet the views of the country. The right hon. the Prime Minister is reported, in a despatch to the Toronto 'Globe' which is printed with very heavy headlines, as stating that, so far as he is concerned, he would favour guaranteeing the bonds for the railway. What bonds ? What route ? What terminals ? What conditions ? The amount which the government are to guarantee is not stated. These are the headlines on the despatch which is dated, Ottawa, May 20th :

> Bond interest guarantee for Grand Trunk Pacific.
>
> Government policy not decided, but the Premier personally seems disposed to advise an interest guarantee—no land.

Now, Sir, is this as far as the government has got on this great question ? I say we should have some more definite answer from the government with regard to this question which involves one of the greatest projects that has come before this country since the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have had very little satisfaction, and I am very much disappointed with the attitude of the government at this date with regard to this matter.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). The interest that has been displayed in this debate and that has been aroused on all questions of transportation, I think, should convince the government that the transportation problem is the most important that they have to deal with. Of course, when I

speak of interest displayed, I mean displayed by the House, not by the government—they have not shown much interest in the matter. This question has been before the House ever since I first had the honour of a seat in this chamber. It has been talked of most earnestly, and, undoubtedly the speakers, and I think all hon. members on both sides, are in earnest on the subject. This question of how we are to get the products of the North-west to the market, that market being for the most part in Great Britain, is the most important question before the people of Canada to-day. It behoves us, then, to look at this question in the broadest possible way and to grapple with it—not to refer and to defer it from day to day and from year to year. Personally I have expressed my views in this House before on the question of railway subsidies. I have not altered my opinion. I believe that it is vicious, absolutely and entirely, to grant railway bonuses. I would appeal to the lesson taught us by the experience of the United States. I think I am right in saying that for twenty-five years, neither by states nor by the central government, have the American people given any aid to railways; and I can appeal to my friends from the west, and I think they will not contradict me when I say that there is no lack of railway building in the western states. If the government sees fit to grant aid to railways or to grant aid to public works, that aid should be granted in the general interest of the country and not in the interest of any one section. I contend, however, that the government, in the proposal which we feel is practically before the House, to grant aid to another transcontinental line, is going the wrong way; as some hon. gentleman has said, it is putting the cart before the horse. By building another railway they will still more congest our ports, will still more overwhelm our means of export and so will force, to a greater extent than now, export by way of foreign ports. I say that the first thing the government should do in this great question is to carefully look into the matter and make up their minds—if this government have minds that they can make up on any great question, which I very much doubt——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. On subsidies.

Mr. OSLER. They cannot even make up their minds on subsidies. They do not even know to what road they are going to give a subsidy, or how much they are going to give. They do not know but that they may give it to themselves. To build a government road, of course, I do not mean personally. I contend that the main question before this country to-day is how we are most cheaply to get our grain and cattle from Canada where they are grown to England where they are consumed. And I say also that if you build twenty transcontinental lines, you will not have solved, or even have begun to solve that question. That question must be solved by first deciding where our summer port and where our winter port are to be. If our summer port is to be in Montreal, then money must be expended on the St. Lawrence channel; you must light that river, you must deepen it and clear it and make the river and the port as safe to reach as Portland or Boston. It is absurd to think that we can export grain by the St. Lawrence route with insurance rates £2 and £4 per hundred—as they have been—higher than the railway rates charged from Boston or Portland. If you are going to make Quebec the port, then I say that is a matter that should be looked into, and decided upon once for all; and I believe members on this side of the House will support the expenditure of whatever sum of money is necessary to make Montreal or Quebec the port of Canada. I will go further than that, and I say without any hesitation that it will meet the approval of the whole population of Canada if you make Montreal and Quebec free ports. We are voting large sums of money for the development of railways and public works in various parts of the country. For what reason? In order that the farmers and the stock raisers may be able to transport their grain and their stock at a cheaper rate to Great Britain. How can you help them better? How can you help the Canadian agriculturist, the Canadian ranchman and all our other interests better than by securing for them cheap transportation to the seaboard, than by making the port where this stuff is shipped, free, by making it the best port in the world? We have difficulties to contend with as against Boston and New York ports, but I think we can overcome them if we face them. We are not overcoming them, and we will not overcome them if we build more railroads in the west while neglecting that one thing needful above all others, namely, a free and cheap port, and a cheap ocean rate. I think if the government were to expend public money in making Montreal, or Quebec, or Halifax, or St. John, as the case may be, as nearly perfect ports as it is possible to make them, in supplying the best possible facilities for shipment, they would do more for this country in the meantime than they would by bonusing railroads. In view of the rapid growth in the west at the present time, I do not think there is much danger of the people in that section of the country suffering from lack of railway competition or from lack of railway facilities. You may build three or four competing transcontinental roads, but you will find that almost the entire grain crop will be transhipped from the railroads to boats on Lake Superior. You can send it cheaper from Lake Superior by boat than by railroad, you can send it cheaper that way than by taking a long haul from Lake Superior, and I ques-

tion whether it would pay to build railroads for that purpose.

Now I want to take exception to one statement made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). He said that the true distributing and manufacturing centres for the North-west were Chicago, Minneapolis and St. Paul, and that we must always look to these centres in securing competition for transportation to the east. I take exception to that statement altogether, I think it is entirely too narrow in its view. I have a strong idea that we should adopt a thorough national policy with the object of building up in our own country these manufacturing and distributing centres to compete with those which now confront us on the south of the line. I have a greater belief in the future of Manitoba and the North-west than the hon. member for Alberta has, if I am to judge from his speech. I believe that those of us who live ten years more will find in Winnipeg and Port Arthur and other western centres, the real rivals of Minneapolis, St. Paul and Chicago. I believe that if we adopt a true national policy, in a very few years from now we will find Winnipeg, Edmonton and Port Arthur manufacturing goods for the people of that western country as cheaply as St. Paul and Minneapolis. While it may bear a little hardly upon the western people for a time, still that day is sure to come. I believe they are already getting their implements nearly as cheap as the people anywhere else in the world. Winnipeg is bound to become a great manufacturing centre, because they are going to get electrical power probably at one-fourth the cost of the power that is now supplied. In a short time you will no longer have to look to Chicago and to the other cities of the North-west for your manufactured articles. When Winnipeg becomes a manufacturing centre, you will have there a population of 200,000 or 300,000 ; Edmonton will be a large place, and look at what this will mean to the small farmers in the vicinity of those cities. When you have a good home market, you can make cheaper articles, and you can get cheaper rates over railways, because you get freight both ways. So I believe that this transportation problem, when looked at from this broad standpoint, and when looked at in connection with a true national policy, will very soon solve itself. But the first thing we have to do is to see that our seaports, wherever you may select them, should be able to compete with the best seaports on this continent.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont). This discussion has taken a very wide range, and I will only occupy the attention of the House for a moment. In the speech from the Throne, which was delivered on the 13th day of March, we had this statement :

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

We have now reached the 26th day of May, and the right hon. the Prime Minister tells us that the commission has not yet been appointed, although we were promised in the speech from the Throne that it would be appointed immediately. We are also told that the government have no settled policy in regard to this transcontinental line. Now, Sir, that is entirely at variance with the utterances of Sir Charles Rivers Wilson, at a meeting held in London on the 16th day of April. He then told his shareholders that this whole matter had been discussed with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Prime Minister of this country, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues had that matter under their consideration, and that there was very little doubt but that substantial assistance would be given to that transcontinental line. He said :

> The Bill has been introduced, and the form and extent of the government assistance are under discussion with Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues.

Now, Sir, if, on the 16th day of April, the Bill had been introduced, and the form of the assistance was under discussion by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues, is it not time that we should hear something as to the policy of the government on this great question ? We are dealing with the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill in the Railway Committee, and we are told from time to time by members of the Liberal party in that committee that we should discuss that Bill as if there was to be no subsidy, as if there was to be no assistance from the government. Why, Sir, it would be idle to discuss that Bill on any such idea as that. Sir Charles Rivers Wilson told his people at that meeting in London distinctly that they would not have gone into this great scheme which might involve them in heavy loss unless they were to receive substantial assistance from the government. I am not quoting his exact language, although I have it here. So I say it would be idle for us as members of this House to discuss that Bill on any other basis than that the Grand Trunk Pacific are going to get substantial assistance from this government.

Now, I think before we go further in discussing this important Bill in the Railway Committee, we should know something of the policy of the government on this question. Nobody recognizes more than I do that the time is approaching when a greater Canada than we now know of will exist

west of Winnipeg. We all recognize that the North-west Territories are filling up at a tremendous rate. We all recognize that there may be a necessity for another transcontinental line, or at least a necessity for improved transportation from that country. But, Sir, when a Bill of the magnitude and importance of the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill comes before this House, or comes before the Railway Committee, we certainly should have from some member of the government a statement as to the policy of the government in regard to that Bill. We have had no statement from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) who sits in the committee day in and day out. This is probably one of the most important questions that has come before this parliament for many years, and it is a question of such great importance that the government evidently have not been able to grapple with it and to tell us what their policy is. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has made reference to the cities of Chicago, St. Paul, and other cities, as being the most convenient cities for the people of the North-west Territories to deal with. I would like to say to the hon. member that this is bringing up the old cry that was raised by the western farmers of the United States against that great national policy which was inaugurated in that country in the form of protection. It is the old cry that they had no manufacturing industries in the west and that the policy which was then advocated was only a policy which would benefit the eastern portion of the United States. I would like to call his attention to the fact that to-day in the state of Nebraska there are 5,414 manufacturing establishments with $71,982,127 of capital, and an annual production of over $143,000,000 ; in Iowa there are over 14,000 establishments; in Missouri over 18,000; in Minnesota over 11,000; in Kansas over 7,000; and in South Dakota, 1,639 establishments. Nearly all of these western states have developed large manufacturing establishments and the day is coming in this country when Winnipeg will develop just as large industries as Chicago has developed. It is poor policy for our friends from the western country to take any narrow or provincial view of this matter. These hon. gentlemen have to take a national view of questions of this sort, because, what is in the interests of the nation certainly should be in the interests of all the different provinces. The government having promised us that this matter would be dealt with immediately we are entitled to know now before this Bill goes any further in the Railway Committee what the policy of the government is going to be in rgerad to this transcontinental line. But, Sir, it is the old policy of delay, the policy of leaving things alone. We saw from the utterances of the hon. member from Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) how these people acted in regard to the great question of the tariff. Let me just refer to a few words of the speech of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, in regard to the course they pursued in 1897. Now, I do not want to go into the question of the tariff, because that question does not form part of this debate, but only to refer to the speech of that hon. gentleman to show the course that these hon. gentlemen pursued. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, said :

> Of course, if the past utterances of some of my hon. friends of the Liberal party had been carried out, the tariff which is in existence to-day would not be where it is. We would have simply wrecked and destroyed this country. It was out of the question for any government in 1897 to try to carry out the utterances which some public men had delivered in the past.

Canada owes a great deal to the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, in preventing these hon. gentlemen from carrying out their anti-election pledges which would have destroyed the tariff of this country, and which, to use his own words, would have wrecked and destroyed this Dominion of Canada.

I.C.R.—WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the attention of the hon. gentleman who is in charge of the House to-night——

An hon. MEMBER. Who is it ?

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), or the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick).

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Minister of Customs to-night.

Mr. CLARKE. On the 19th of May I asked the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) if he would find it convenient to lay the evidence taken in the inquiry in respect to the cause of the accident at Windsor Junction on the Table of the House. The hon. minister said that he had not intended to do so, but that if I desired, it would be laid on the Table. I did certainly desire to see the evidence and the finding of the commissioner, and on the following day—the 20th of May—I again drew the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who was in his seat, to the matter.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What accident was it ?

Mr. CLARKE. The accident at Windsor Junction, involving the loss of four lives. The government were so impressed with the importance of having an investigation that a special commissioner was appointed to inquire into the cause of the accident. I asked the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals if he would lay the evidence and the finding of the commissioner on the Table of

the House and he promised to do so. On Wednesday last, nearly a week ago, I drew the attention of the right hon. leader of the government to the promise which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals had made on the previous day. The right hon. gentleman was good enough to say that he would take note of the inquiry. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs to the fact that this finding and the evidence have not yet been laid on the Table of the House. I do not desire to take up the time of the House or of the Minister of Railways and Canals in discussing this matter the next time the House goes into Committee of Supply, but I think the hon. minister is in duty bound to implement his pledge by laying this information, which he promised to bring down, on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). I will take care that the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) are conveyed to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and I have no doubt that he will be anxious to carry out what he promised to do.

TRADE COMMISSIONER IN LONDON.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I would like to make an inquiry of the members of the government. For some years it has been said that the government intended to appoint a Canadian trade commissioner with an office in London, England. I would like to inquire whether the government have the matter under consideration and whether they are prepared to make any statement in regard to it ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is giving consideration to that question. A gentleman was appointed not long ago to fill a similar position in Birmingham. I think the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has not yet reached a decision as to the man who shall take the position in London. I will mention to him that the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) has asked the question, and he, perhaps, when he is in his place, will be able to give a more definite answer.

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to make a few remarks in connection with the subject of discussion which has gone on for the most part of the afternoon and evening. It seems to me that the position which the House finds itself at present, not only in its work here but in its work in another place, seems to indicate that it has not been put in possession of as much information on the subject which every one in the House seems to think is of very great importance as it must have been. We are constantly hearing that the transportation problem is the great problem before this country, but when we come to discuss this matter we find that apart from the information which individual members can gather, there is nobody of ascertained knowledge on this subject to enable us to determine what ought be done for the solution of this problem. Judging from the remarks made by our friends from the North-west, this is the great question to them beyond all comparison, but it is a question in which we are all interested and in which the west is not peculiarly concerned. We certainly are interested in the outcome of any action that will be taken by the government as a government in constructing a railroad itself, or, in aiding as it may see fit any companies that are now or may hereafter be disposed to add to the existing railway facilities. Generally speaking we are all agreed that it is highly important that all the products of Canada so far as possible shall be turned in such direction as to be exported from this country through a Canadian port. In view of the light that has been thrown upon the subject to-day, it is impossible to come to any other conclusion than that arrived at by Sir William Van Horne in his celebrated expression 'that the hopper is too large for the spout.' Sir William Van Horne seems to be the gentleman whom the government is exceedingly anxious to secure as chairman of the Transportation Commission, and Sir William Van Horne has already given all the answer to the question that the commission would possibly give if it sat for months. His idea is that the urgent thing in connection with the transportation problem is to develop the facilities for exporting via the port of Montreal.

Mr. TAYLOR. Enlarge the spout.

Mr. BELL. Yes, enlarge the spout. As I understand it, there is an elevator capacity of about 4,000,000 bushels of grain at the port of Montreal, and at the joint ports of Port Arthur and Port William there is now or shortly will be an elevator capacity of 11,000,000 bushels, so that a spout representing 4,000,000 bushels is expected to relieve this hopper of 11,000,000 bushels. It seems certain that what is urgently required now is that some action should be taken in the direction indicated by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) namely, that for the immediate relief of the situation you do not need the construction of any further railroad in the west at present, but that you urgently need the enlargement of our facilities for export from Montreal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And on the lakes.

Mr. BELL. Yes. I think I saw it stated a few days ago that the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator at Montreal had no legs for discharging barges, so that it presumedly is not in a position to handle any traffic com-

ing through our expensive canal system. If that be so, it is remarkable that after Canada has spent over $60,000,000 upon the St. Lawrence canals, there are no facilities at Montreal to discharge the barges which this $60,000,000 of expenditure has enabled to reach the port of Montreal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We use floating elevators.

Mr. BELL. Yes, they have some floating elevators in Montreal, but on the whole it is perfectly clear that Montreal is not properly equipped at all. You will find a proof of that in the report of the Montreal Board of Trade which says that in 1902, Montreal handled 15,000,000 bushels of wheat; in 1901, 12,000,000 bushels; in 1900, 9,000,000 bushels; and in 1899, 10,000,000 bushels of wheat. Our crops in the North-west have developed to something in the neighbourhood of 100,000,000 bushels last year, and yet we find that the exports of wheat from the port of Montreal actually declined from 1899 to 1900 by 1,000,000 bushels; only increased the next year by 2,000,000, and in the next year by 3,000,000 bushels. This refers to wheat alone. The whole trade of Montreal shows that while they exported of grain generally 31,000,000 bushels in 1899, last year they only exported 19,000,000 bushels or a little more than half the grain that was handled at that port in 1899. What is the use of all the expenditure made by Canada upon our canal system if the fact remains that the receipts at Montreal from that canal system are practically stationary, or, in view of the enormous increase of grain offering for export, the proportion being handled through the port of Montreal instead of increasing, is, in proportion to the great output of the North-west actually diminishing. In face of these facts, to build another line of railroad in the North-west in order to increase the exports of grain through Canadian ports is going entirely to the wrong place. We are undertaking by that to do something which instead of relieving the present situation will simply aggravate it. The remark was made in the Railway Committee the other day, by a gentleman who spoke for the Grand Trunk Railway, that he could fill the port of Montreal to congestion; that he could fill the port of Quebec to congestion—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot refer to what took place in a committee until it has been reported to the House.

Mr. BELL. I did not know that I referred to the committee. I thought I had said; in another place.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman mentioned the committee.

Mr. BELL. The fact is that one of the Canadian railroads which is now carrying to the port of Montreal, could last year have sent 5,000,000 bushels more to that port if Montreal had facilities for handling that amount of grain. In view of these statements which are undoubtedly correct, if we are going to develop the export trade of Canada so that our grain products can go out of this country through a national port, then the first thing for us to do is to equip that port in such a fashion that it can do the business. I understand that at present the debt represented by the Montreal harbour works is somewhere in the vicinity of $5,000,000. Although I presume the city of Montreal bears a portion of the burden, yet I believe they are not paying or have not paid the interest.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Every cent of interest has been paid in Montreal.

Mr. BELL. I did not think so.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Oh, yes, they are not one cent behind in Montreal. Quebec does not pay the interest.

Mr. BELL. I believe that is so. There is an indebtedness of $5,000,000, in the port of Montreal. It is well enough that the city should bear its proportion, but if that port be of national importance as every speaker here assures us, then it is entirely worth the while of the government of Canada to supplement the efforts of the city of Montreal and to equip that port in such a manner that it shall become a great national port. We find that in the ports of the great nations of Europe, they do not hesitate to make very much larger expenditures. If I am not mistaken, the equipment of the port of Hamburg, has cost something in the neighbourhood of $75,000,000, and it was undertaken by the country of which that port is the outlet, and is looked upon, I have no doubt, as a good investment. It has been held to-night that it would be impossible to make Montreal the national port —that the very fact that we have spent so much money on it, and that it has not developed to a greater extent than it has, shows that it has not the advantages that it should have to become the national port of Canada.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Would the hon. gentleman say how much money the government has spent on the port of Montreal ?

Mr. BELL. I understand that the government has not spent anything, but it has advanced moneys to the harbour commissioners, which are looked on as their liabilities. It is held by some that because of what has been done for Montreal by the harbour commissioners without having effected more than it has, therefore the matter is settled, and we have proof that Montreal is really not a national port, and that it is impossible to make it such. This is not my argument ; I am merely repeating what has been stated in the course of this discussion. But when you compare the situation of Montreal with that of the other ports, I do not think you will find any reason for coming to the conclusion. The port

of Glasgow, the greatest port in north Britain, is situated 20 or 21 miles from what was originally the port of West Scotland. The trade instead of stopping at Greenock, the old port at the mouth of the river, has been by the expenditure of money carried 20 or 21 miles up the Clyde, and Glasgow, which has not the natural advantages of Montreal, has been developed into the great port of Scotland. In the same way you will find that the great port on the Thames is not at the mouth of the river, but at London, a long distance from the mouth, where the trade is carried only as the result of a large expenditure of money and of the enterprise of the merchants and business people of that city. It seems to me that you can lay it down as a proposition which is almost invariably true, that business will ascend a navigable stream as far as it possibly can; and the natural feature which fixes the city of Montreal where it is, is the Lachine rapids, which make it impossible for trade to go further up the river. I feel convinced that Montreal is the natural port; and while some of the great ocean carriers drawing from 30 to 40 feet of water may stop at Quebec, nothing can take the trade away from Montreal except the construction of a great railroad through the northern country, which could bring the trade as cheaply to the port of Quebec as it could be brought to the port of Montreal. If that project should be carried out, then Quebec would probably compete with Montreal; but apart from that, I have no doubt that what has been the history of the country in the past will continue to be its history in the future. Quebec was not behind Montreal in the beginning; but in the course of time business following its natural channels has made a selection of Montreal, so that Montreal has developed to be the greatest city of Canada, while Quebec has remained where it has been for a long time. An hon. member speaking to-night has expressed the view that if the railroad under contemplation is to be constructed in a manner to meet the wishes of the people of the maritime provinces, it is absolutely essential that they should agree in selecting a port. It does not seem to me that that is more incumbent on the people of the maritime provinces that it is incumbent on the people of the province of Quebec to make a choice between Quebec and Montreal. These ports may grow up side by side, and we hope to see the ports of Halifax and St. John developed side by side to a certain extent. St. John has advantages in the matter of distance, not very important, but so far sufficient to decide that all the heavy traffic carried to maritime province ports should go to St. John. But, I do not feel at all compelled to assent to the proposition that you must limit a country or any district of a country to one port. What we do find is that business, in seeking its outlet through this country is, to such an extent as to make its operations very plain, following the line of least resistance. In the case of the maritime provinces, the fact that St. John is taking the export business rather than Halifax is simply because of the advantage of a few miles. If the port of St. John be the choice of the current traffic, because of the difference of a very limited number of miles indeed in comparison with transcontinental distances, then it seems that in dealing with this question of transcontinental transportation, we should have in view the shortest possible distance that can be obtained from the grain-growing districts of the west to some port on the Atlantic seaboard; and apparently it is necessary to go as far north as possible, where the parallels are shortest, to obtain that shortened distance which is the determining factor in these matters. The greatest differences of opinion have been expressed in this House on important elements of this question. We had one hon. gentleman contend that the North-west country required not one new transcontinental line, but possibly two. We had the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals on the other hand say that the Canadian Pacific Railway could handle three times the trade it has now. The most diverse and contradictory opinions are expressed, and there is an absolute want of knowledge that must be had before this question can be satisfactorily dealt with. In reference to such a very important question all the information that can possibly be got should be obtained and laid on the Table of the House, and it seems to me that the mode in which the government proposes to get the information is not a very satisfactory or efficient one. They propose to appoint a commission, and, judging from the names of the gentlemen mentioned in the House to-day, I do not believe their findings would carry a great deal of weight in the House or in the country. The only man who can be looked upon as the master of the subject, we are told, will not accept the position, and the other men whose names have been mentioned are not men of very great weight.

The other gentlemen suggested are not, as far as I can understand, men whose opinions would carry a great deal of weight. I cannot see any great necessity for a commission to investigate this matter. There cannot be any great difficulty in arriving at certain facts. The government could very easily make the inquiries necessary, obtain the statistics required, and put the House in possession of all the facts necessary to determine what course should be followed. If grain can be carried, as was shown to-day by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) from Duluth to New York at three cents to four cents per bushel, there is no reason why it should not be carried at a lower rate from Duluth or any other lake port through our canal system down to Montreal. Otherwise all the findings of the commission which investigated this question of the

relative cost of carriage by water and by rail, in the interests of the United States, are at fault. We have every reason to believe that we have in our lakes and canal system, a channel through which freight can be carried at cheaper rates to the seaboard than it can be by any other route in any part of the continent. If this be not the case, there can be no confidence at all in the opinion generally held as to the comparative cost of moving freight by rail and water. This opinion is confirmed by this fact that, as far as possible, freight seeks the water route. From the prairies it comes to the nearest lakeport, then it follows the water route until it arrives at Buffalo, where it reaches the end of lake navigation for large freight carriers. It only takes the railway when compelled to do so by accident or by necessity. We have in Canada a canal system of fourteen feet navigation, and we have the findings of the American commission recommending that the Erie canal be deepened to fourteen feet. That commission decided against making waterways of greater depth and against using large vessels or ocean carriers in canal navigation. The cost of carrying these large and expensive vessels at the low rate of speed compulsory in passing through a canal system rendered the smaller boats much more economical. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are to-day in the possession of just such a system as this American commission says is what the United States require. Yet we find the traffic of the port of Montreal is worse than stationary; we find that in three years it declined from 30,000,000 bushels of grain to 20,000,000. Why then go to great expense in building other railways ? Why do not the government use their intelligence to find out the fatal flaw which prevents the port of Montreal from realizing the advantages which, according to this American commission, would be realized by the port of New York if that port were equipped with a fourteen foot canal such as serves Montreal to-day. Montreal is in possession of the very canal system which the American commission say New York requires in order it may get back the trade which has been diverted from it. Yet Montreal, which ought to be the great exporting point on the North American continent during the summer months, is practically, so far as the grain trade is concerned, not only stationery but a long way behind the position it occupied in 1899, and this, in spite of the fact that the grain exports of this country have doubled or trebled in the course of those three years. In view of these facts, which cannot be controverted, the idea of asking the people of Canada to submit to an expenditure or liability in the shape of endorsing or guaranteeing bonds for the purpose of building another railway to compete with those already existing—not to bring business to Montreal because there is no use of bringing business where it can-

not be handled, but to Ontario, whence it must be diverted to the port of Portland, is absurd. It would mean asking the people of Canada to throw away their money on a piece of work which could not do this country a particle of good. If it is necessary to increase the facilities for moving freight from the western end of Lake Superior and the lakeports on the Georgian bay to Montreal, I am satisfied that it could be effected in a much cheaper way than by building a new and independent line. No one has yet pretended to show that any such line is required; no one has set up the contention that the Canadian Pacific Railway is overburdened with traffic on that portion of its system extending from the western end of Lake Superior to Montreal or to any points in Ontario. There is no necessity for increasing the facilities for hauling freight by rail from Port Arthur to any Ontario point because no freight or very little comes in that direction at all. Our object is to gather into elevators on the lake front the grain of the west and they send it by steamers to Buffalo, Midland, Port Colborne, or some other point on the Georgian bay. There is nothing at all to show any necessity for increasing the capacity of the railway for carrying freight over that particular distance, and yet a great part of the expenditure this country would be called upon to make, if it were to subsidize or in any way assist the new transcontinental railway, would be applied to increasing the facilities over that portion of country, which, so far as we have reason to know, requires no further facilities. But if it were necessary to increase the railway capacity between the extreme west of Ontario and the Ontario Peninsula, then it seems to me that that might be done at a very much less cost than by building a new and independent railway, which would not only be very expensive, but would impair, to a certain extent, the efficiency of the railway system already in existence. It is a fundamental principle that we should not set up competition which would injure existing rights.

We know that it is a principle that we shall not parallel an existing line and induce a competition which will impair the efficiency of both the old road and the new. A work that would, to my mind, give increased haulage to that section—if it were required, which I maintain it is not—would be to assist the Canadian Pacific Railway to double track its system over that part. Generally speaking, while I think it is not hard to show that another transcontinental railway is not wanted and cannot be justified at present to the people of Canada who are to be asked to pay for it, I think that a large amount of influence ought to be exerted upon the government of Canada to make a positive declaration of their intentions in this regard. In the Railway Committee, which is to meet to discuss the questions which are before the House and the govern-

ment, as was very well pointed out by the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle), the knowledge of the course the government is prepared to take in regard to this matter is an essential feature. If you are asked whether you will grant a charter to another line of railway, that in itself is not a difficult matter to decide—you treat it as you would treat any other question, and consider whether it would be a disadvantage or an advantage to set up a competing line, or to open a line through new territory. But the really important question must be and ought to be settled before any reasonable result can be reached by the committee, and this involves a clear declaration on the part of the country as to whether or not they propose to give assistance by a money grant or extensive guarantee to the construction of any such public work. It is not enough—it is not enough by any means—for one gentleman or another to rise in this House and assert that the transportation problem is a great problem. That may be quite true. But the more important that problem becomes the more important it is that we should approach it intelligently, and that we should know every detail in connection with it; that we should not blindly or ignorantly put our hand to the work of effecting what we think would be an amendment or improvement, where, perhaps, instead of effecting that amendment or improvement, we may be aggravating the situation and at the same time adding enormously to the burdens of the people of Canada.

Mr. GEORGE A. CLARE (South Waterloo). It is not my intention to take up much of the time of the House, but I cannot let the motion pass without saying a few words. I was very much surprised by the remarks made by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) this afternoon in reply to the speech of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I was particularly surprised to hear the right hon. gentleman say it was unfair that he had not received notice of the subject brought up by the leader of the opposition. It has been stated by the Liberal press and by many of the Liberal members of this House that this government is a government of business men, who understand the affairs of the country. I have also understood from many hon. gentlemen on the other side that the question of transportation was one of the most important questions before the House. It was surprising to me, therefore, that the Prime Minister should feel that he was taken unaware when he was asked to lay before the House and the country his policy on the question of transportation. As usual, the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is the apologist for this government on every occasion, cropped up, and delivered one of his usual interesting speeches. It was also very interesting to me, and, I think, to every member of this House, to hear him speak of the patriotism we should show on this question of transportation and how we should forget our party feelings and work to develop a transportation policy which would be for the benefit of the country at large. It seems to me the hon. gentleman has not always been the patriot that he asks us this afternoon to think he is. When we think of him preaching throughout this country commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, I do not think we can regard him as acting patriotically towards this country. And, for eighteen long years, according to the confession he made to the House last year, that hon. gentleman preached the policy of free trade, although in 1876 and 1877 he had urged his leader to support a policy of protection as being more in the interest of the country. It appears to me quite plain that, before the Railway Committee meets tomorrow to take up the question of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, the government should take us into their confidence and tell us what assistance they intend to give to that company. We have not had the policy of the government laid before us, and have no means of judging what that assistance may be. But we do know that Sir Charles Rivers Wilson has stated to the directors and shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway that it shall not cost the shareholders a cent, that with the assistance that is to be given by the government, and other means, they will be able to build the entire road from the Atlantic to the Pacific. If that is the case, I think it is fair that the Railway Committee should not pass a charter to that company. The business of the country would not be delayed if the government should take us into their confidence in this subject. I also think this House should adjourn now. We have had this transportation question discussed all this afternoon and evening, and only a few of the ministers have been present. The Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) has not been in his seat this afternoon, nor has the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland). These are the men who should tell us what the policy of the government is on this subject.

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

Law books and freight thereon, for the use of the bench and bar, and stationery and freight thereon for use of courts, $2,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of that item, law books for use of Bar?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We are doing at Dawson as we did in the Northwest Territories. Up to two years ago, the law library was provided at the court house at Regina, and two years ago when a Bar Association was formed the library was handed over to the association and has been

kept up by them since. At Dawson we have adopted the same system of establishing a library for the use of the bench and the bar of the court-house, where both judges and the members of the bar have access to it. But as soon as a bar association is formed at Dawson we shall hand the library over to them as we did at Regina.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In all the eastern provinces I believe the law libraries are kept altogether by the bar associations. I do not know the size of the bar, so far as members are concerned, in the Yukon Territory, but assuming that there is any considerable bar there, one would suppose that they should contribute something to that purpose out of their own resources, possibly not all. Is the minister able to state whether any portion of the expenditure on the library is borne by the local bar?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not know what the local bar contributes. I know that the library up to the present time has not cost us a great deal of money. But with respect to the books in the library, I think they have all been purchased by the government and have been sent there for the common use of the judges and of the lawyers. My hon. friend will realize what an expensive luxury it is to get law books in there at all. It costs almost as much to pay the freight on them as it does to buy the books themselves. We paid $700 freight on one lot of law books which cost $1,700.

Miscellaneous expenses, including fees and expenses of Crown prosecutor, salary and living allowance of stenographer for police court, and other officials or employees connected with the administration of justice, coroners' inquests, &c., &c., $25,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I promised the other night to give information on several items of the estimates then under discussion, one with respect to contingencies of the Supreme Court. I promised the leader of the opposition that I would supply detailed information with respect to that item, and the information I now have before me. I find the details with respect to this item to be: Sheriff and constables, $5 per day during session, approximately, $500 to $600; registrar, as editor and publisher of reports, $600; usher, $100; books for judges, $300; salaries of messengers, about $400; reporting for newspapers, $100; total $2,100. The other items are the following: Binding for Supreme Court library, about $500; insurance on library last year, $285; postage, including that required for distribution of the Supreme Court reports, approximately, $600; printing for the office, including mailing lists for Supreme Court reports, $300; stationery for judges and office of Supreme Court, $750; telegrams for judges and office $250; rental of telephones and long distance messages, $250; cabs, used mainly in conveying books to and from the library to houses of judges, $250.

With respect to the leave of absence given to Sheriff Eilbeck, I find that on the 3rd of July, 1901, he applied for leave of absence during the vacation of the Dawson bar, which commences October 1, and lasts to February 1. He complained of ill health, and informed the deputy Minister of Justice that the business of his office would be well looked after by his deputy, who is a thoroughly capable and reliable man. The Deputy Minister of Justice, on the 4th of September, 1901, informed the sheriff that in view of what he had stated in regard to the business of the office being well looked after, there would be no objection to his having leave during the bar vacation. The leave of absence was subsequently extended for a month to 1st of March, 1902. Last year when my estimates were under consideration there was a discussion on this matter, which will be found in 'Hansard,' page 3586. Now with respect to the employment of Sheriff Eilbeck as auctioneer, this statement is furnished me:

Regarding the employment of Mr. R. J. Eilbeck, sheriff of the Yukon, as auctioneer to conduct sales under this department, I beg to say that during the years 1900 and 1901 the Department of the Interior decided upon disposing of all the fractional claims owned by the government in the Yukon by public auction, regarding which full notice was given. (Fractional claims are those portions which remain over after a survey has been made, and are really the difference between the lands as staked by the miner—which in nearly every case exceed the limit of a claim—and the area as afterwards found by survey. All these fractions then become the property of the government).

The arrangement in the first place for the employment of Mr. Eilbeck was made by the then assistant gold commissioner, Mr. J. Langlois Bell, and the commission paid at that time was three per cent. The department, however, later on decided that this commission was too much and on a later sale held in January reduced it to two per cent. The assistant gold commissioner in explanation of his engagement of Sheriff Eilbeck as auctioneer stated that he was afraid there would be some collusion with regard to the sale between other auctioneers and persons who might attend the sale, and that he had already heard a rumour to that effect. Consequently he undertook to engage the services of Sheriff Eilbeck.

It may be mentioned that the list of claims sold included a large number and the price realized did not average a very high figure.

Mr. Eilbeck was, of course, known to be well qualified, and perhaps was the best qualified of any of the persons whose services might have been had at the time to make the sale a satisfactory one. His fees for the various sales which he conducted amounted to $2,751.37.

The engagement of the sheriff was made by an official of the Department of the Interior, and we had nothing whatever to do with his engagement. As a matter of fact, when the attention of the Department of Justice was drawn to the fact that he had received this large sum of money for services rendered as auctioneer, the assistant Gold Commissioner was notified by the De-

partment of Justice that his services were not available for any such purpose, and the Department of Justice was assured that the sheriff's services would thereafter be devoted exclusively to the performance of his duties as sheriff.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wanted to show how much this sheriff is costing the country. I see in the statement the minister has furnished the leader of the opposition that it includes $5 a day out of the general expenses.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That statement furnished to the leader of the opposition has reference to the contingencies with respect to the Supreme Court here

Mr. TAYLOR. I find that he drew from one department of this government. for fourteen days work, $2,751, acting as auctioneer, and at the same time he was paid as government official by another department for services the year round, a salary of $7,000, besides living expenses of $1,800. Over and above that he retains half the fees, amounting that year to $1,819. Altogether he drew $8,370. He is rather an expensive luxury. At the same time he was given leave of absence to come down and attend to the election in West Durham. He was there during the entire by-election, taking an active part, and was instrumental in returning a government supporter. Perhaps this may account for the very large sum he drew for fourteen days services just previously because as we know he received $2,751 from this government for fourteen days work. Did he receive this money for the purpose of spending it in West Durham? I think that should be condemned by every hon. member of this House whether he be a government supporter or a member of the opposition, and I hope, before the session is over, we will draw the attention of the House to that question and ask the sense of the House as to whether the government is justified in paying to one of its officials who is in receipt of a yearly salary $2,751 for fourteen days work. I think it is an outrage upon this country.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. Minister of Justice was also kind enough to say that when we reached Supply he would advise us in regard to the principle of paying living allowances and why the telegraphers should be discriminated against. They seem to be the only paid government officials who have no living allowances made to them.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When I took charge of the Department of Justice, it occurred to me that possibly it was an anomalous practice to allow gentlemen living at such a distance away to take any share of the fees paid into the government offices, and I thought it would be much safer for the administration of justice that these gentlemen should be paid a certain fixed salary and a certain amount by way of living allowance, putting an end to all perquisites. Then the question arose: How are we to fix the living allowance? I asked Mr. Cory, who is now and has been for many years connected with the Department of the Interior, to proceed to Dawson in connection with an investigation he was making into the affairs of the officials of the Department of the Interior, and to make an audit of the accounts of those who are connected with the Department of Justice. The result of that was that he made a report recommending that certain salaries should be paid to these officials in lieu of the allowances they had been receiving theretofore and that they should be paid a certain amount in the way of living allowances. This report was based upon the information which he gathered in the country, but not content with that, I inquired of officials connected with the mounted police, and I asked them to give me some data upon which I might determine the amount of these living allowances. The information which I received from the commissioner of the North-west Mounted Police is to the effect that rent in the Yukon for a small house is $150 a month. That makes $1,800 a year. Wood, say fifty cords, which is a small allowance, as it runs up as high as seventy-five sometimes, $12 per cord, making $600; light, water, &c., $300; servants, say two, at from $100 to $150 a month, two of them would amount to about $1,800 a year. Now, I am told that all house furnishings and domestic necessaries, may be estimated at from three to four times the value of similar articles if purchased in the east. Fresh meat is from thirty to seventy-five cents per pound, according to the cut and the supply on hand. Butter from forty to sixty cents a pound; tomatoes retailing in Ottawa at ten cents a can are thirty-three cents a can in Dawson; peas, fifty cents a can; fresh potatoes, eight to ten cents per pound. The allowance of $5,000 which is paid to the judges barely covers the cost of house, wood, light and servants.

Mr. CLARKE. The stenographers come under a smaller scale ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Stenographers get $1,800.

Mr. CLARKE. What about telegraphers ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not concerned with them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) must not get me beyond my depth.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood the hon. minister to say that wages of servants were from $100 to $150 a month.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. I find that telegraphers are paid from $90 to $100 a month, and there is no allowance made to them.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There may have been a change lately.

Mr. CLARKE. We can get that information probably later.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, I think that would be safer.

Dominion police, including one junior second-class clerk, A. J. Cawdron, at $700, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $30,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the same as last year. In respect to the proviso 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' my memorandum from the commissioner of police says that Cawdron is a clerk there now and receives $500 a year. It was proposed to increase him to $700 a year. He acts as clerk and stenographer in the office of the commissioner, he has been in the public service for eleven years, during nine and a half of which he has held his present position. He has passed both the preliminary and qualifying examinations and discharges his duties in a satisfactory manner. I think that a man who acts as clerk and stenographer to the commissioner should get $700 a year, and I have decided to give it to him with the permission of the House.

Penitentiaries—general, $7,820.

Mr. CLARKE. There is an increase of $1,500.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In respect to penitentiaries my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will find that in the general vote there has been a decrease of $17,570.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the cause of the increase of $1,500 in this vote ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The increase is caused by the removal from Kingston of Mr. Adams, the architect, whose salary hitherto has been charged to Kingston, notwithstanding that his services were available for all the penitentiaries in the Dominion. I have had him removed to Ottawa, where he can be more directly in contact with the inspector and other officials with the result that instead of charging $1,000 to Kingston we charge it now to the general penitentiary fund. Then there is an increase in office contingencies of $500. In the office here we have not only an architect, but we have also a general accountant, who passes on the accounts of all the penitentiaries. I have removed Mr. Creighton from Kingston so as to enable us to have direct control over all the penitentiaries in the central office. This has enabled us to make this large decrease that my hon. friend has noticed.

Kingston, $178,600.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a decrease here.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is a decrease of $8,900 in Kingston in part as a result of the reorganization of the binder twine industry and generally of the system of keeping the accounts. Mr. Creighton was the accountant there at a salary of $1,200 a year and he has been brought here to Ottawa because he is a very efficient and capable young man and we thought he was entitled to promotion. Mr. Adams who acted as architect for all the work that was done at the penitentiaries has also been brought to Ottawa, and his salary was formerly charged to Kingston. Mr. Hughes the chief keeper and clerk of the cordage industry has also been promoted, and the others have been changed to other positions or allowed to go. The balance, $5,000 is a decrease in the working expenses.

Mr. TAYLOR. On the first of May the warden of the Kingston penitentiary issued a circular which I presume was distributed to all the members of the House, stating the price at which the twine would be sold to the farmers this year and it quoted pure manilla 650 feet to the pound at 11½ cents. To-day I received the same circular of May the first, but stamped across it is 'the 650 feet twine all sold a few days after this circular was issued.' Can the minister tell me to whom all that 650 feet twine was sold and at what price.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot say to whom it was sold, but the price was the price mentioned in the circular. The price was estimated on this basis ; we took the estimated cost of manufacture per pound, the cost of the raw material, the expenditure for bags and paper and repairs and renewals ; we took the convict labour at the price of free labour ; the cost of salaries, advertising, &c.; depreciation of plant at five per cent and interest at three per cent, and having added all these items we were in a position to offer the twine at the price mentioned.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman get us the information as to who purchased that twine, and whether it was sold by tender or not ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It was not sold by tender. A circular was issued to farmers fixing the price at which they could purchase the twine, and that was done under instructions from the House, as the House had determined the conditions under which the twine would be offered for sale, namely, first come first served.

Mr. TAYLOR. This circular says 'for farmers only' and leaves the impression that the twine was to be sold to the farmers of the country. We did not receive this circular until several days after the first of May, and now we receive another saying that this particular class of twine was all sold. I want to know to whom it was sold.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In July, August and September, 1902, we manfactur-

ed 110 tons. The mill was stopped until January because the price of manilla was so high that we did not think it profitable to carry on the industry. In January, February and March, 1903, we made 61 tons so that there was only 171 tons to be sold of all sorts. I understand that the hon. gentleman asks to whom the twine was sold, what quantity was sold to each, and the price. I will get that information.

Mr. TAYLOR. I refer to the 650 feet quality.

Mr. SPROULE. A price list was sent out last year to the farmers and only a small portion of the twine was sold to farmers, but before the season was nearly over the balance of the twine was sold to one individual, and sold to him at about half the price the farmers were charged for it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend will remember that a resolution was passed by the House some years ago which restricted the sale of twine exclusively to farmers. Notices were sent out and farmers were asked to take the twine, but at the end of the fiscal year more than two thirds of the twine was on hand. What was done was done in conformity with the instructions of the House. There was nothing left for us to do then but to offer it for sale by auction, and Mr. Henderson Black, of St. John, bought the twine.

Mr. SPROULE. At what price was it sold by auction.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. At four and four-fifths cents, and five and one-tenth cents. When this matter was under discussion last year before the Committee on Agriculture, the committee came to the conclusion that a mistake had been made and they cancelled the former resolution of the House, and reported in favour of the matter being dealt with by the Department of Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. What I complain of is that the price at which the twine was offered to the farmers was quite as high as they could buy it at almost any retail store in the country, and in the opinion of many it was more than the twine actually cost. Had it been sold to the farmers at anything like the price that it was sold for to this individual at auction, it would have been snapped up so quickly by them that there would have been none left before the season was half over. The farmers did not get an opportunity of buying it at a reduced price, but some favoured individual bought the balance at about one-third the price that the farmers could buy it. If the twine had to be sold at a reduction, surely the farmers ought to have had an opportunity to share in the advantage as well as some speculator.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend is not fair in making that statement. The House, not the Department of Justice, decided in 1901 that the twine must be sold exclusively to the farmers of this country. Not only did they do that, but they fixed the price at which it should be sold to the farmers, that price being the cost of the raw material plus the actual cost of manufacture. So that the Department of Justice had no responsibility whatever in fixing the price, we having simply conformed to the resolution adopted by the House. We found, however, that the farmers did not want it, and my hon. friend says that we then sold it to favoured individuals. After the expiration of the time during which it could be marketed, we advertised for tenders, and it was sold to the gentleman who made the highest bid for it; and if my hon. friend will ask the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) who knows Mr. Henderson Black, of St. John, he will tell him that that gentleman would not be likely to be much favoured by the present government if there was any politics in it.

Mr. SPROULE. At what time was the twine sold ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Immediately after the first of July. That was the date fixed by the resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. gentleman one thing, that if the farmers of Canada had known that the binder twine was for sale at any such price, it would have been taken very readily and very rapidly by them. But the price at which the twine was calculated was about the same as the price at which you could buy the product of any other factory in any hardware in the country.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But my hon. friend knows that the responsibility was not with us. He knows that we were acting in conformity with the resolution passed by the House. After the resolution had been in operation for a year, however, it was considered that we had made a mistake. I take my share of the responsibility for it, because the resolution was carried by a unanimous vote; but after it was in operation one year, it was found to be so unjust in its operation, that it was decided to withdraw the resolution and leave the Department of Justice to fix the price.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister give us the calculation showing how the price was fixed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We estimated the cost of manufacture based on the actual cost during the seasons of 1898-99, and 1899-1900. We took the number of pounds manufactured and added the cost of oil, bags, &c,; repairs and renewals; that convict labour; allow five per cent for depreciation of plant and three per cent for interest on the outlay; then add the actual cost of the raw material, and I may say

that in the purchase of the raw material we enjoyed certain advantages, taking advantage of the lowest price, and of course having the cash to pay for the material. These are the items taken into account in fixing the price.

Mr. SPROULE. Do the number of pounds of raw material represent the number of pounds of binder twine you turn out ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The inspector tells me that by the Auditor General's Report it would appear that there were 137,000 pounds of raw material manufactured. That would produce about the same number of pounds of binder twine—I speak subject to correction, because I do not know very much about this business—because the oil supplements what is lost in the way of waste.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the minister to state that the binder twine was sold last year on the terms of the resolution passed by the House ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, up to the first of July, 1902.

Mr. BLAIN. That was altered by the resolution adopted by the committee.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The resolution of the committee was passed on May 9th, 1902, but I read the resolution as being applicable to the next season's output. It would not apply to that season's output, because we had issued circulars all over the country offering the twine to the farmers at a price which we had fixed in accordance with the resolution of the House. The resolution passed by the committee on August is applicable to the output of this year, but not to that of last year.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought the complaint of the hon. minister to the committee was that the resolution called on the department to sell the twine on hand on the first of July by tender ; and when that matter was up for consideration in the committee last year the committee passed a resolution setting aside that portion of the resolution of the House calling for tenders and the department were not called on to offer the twine for sale by public tender after July the first. That was my understanding of the matter when it was up in the committee.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think that was about what was done. Here are the words of the resolution reported by the select Committee on Agriculture :

> The committee having heard and considered the evidence of the officers in charge of the manufacture and sale of binder twine at Kingston penitentiary, recommend that binder twine industry thereat be continued, and the product sold directly to the farmers of Canada ; and that the responsibility of fixing the date up to which such sale should be made to the farmers be left with the Department of Justice.

Mr. BLAIN. That being the case, it is hardly fair that such a large quantity should have been sold at such a low price. Last year the complaint was that a resolution compelling the department to sell binder twine on hand, July the first by public tender, was against the best interests of the department.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I find that I was entirely wrong. The selling of the stock on hand was made in July, 1901, and not last year. The inspector tells me that the output of last year was sold entirely to farmers. The sale in 1901 was made to Henderson Black, of St. John.

Mr. BLAIN. That is the item in the Auditor General's Report at five and one-tenth cents ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, at page M—47.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are Henderson Black and John Connor, of Ottawa, one and the same person ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot tell you. My own impression, since I have had anything to do with the department, is that every sale of binder twine at auction or by tender or in any other form, has in some way been made to Mr. John Connor, and as a result of that, I have made a change in the binder twine factory at Kingston, and Mr. Connor's brother has ceased to be superintendent.

Mr. BLAIN. All the twine made last year was sold direct to the farmers, and that system has proved a success ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is a circular which was issued May the first, fixing the prices for the current year. It seems to me very strange that a second lot of circulars should be issued so soon saying the binder twine 650 feet to the pound was all sold. Surely all this twine was not sold direct to the farmers ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There was only manufactured in all last year 80,000 pounds of twine 650 feet to the pound, of which we had less than a ton on hand at the beginning of the season. That was snapped up by the farmers immediately. There are 200,000 pounds still remaining of twine 600 feet.

Mr. CLARKE. Who was the lucky man got that ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The man who came first.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you know his name ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will get it.

Mr. BLAIN. There ought to be some discussion as to whether this system ought to

continue. I have no desire to unduly criticise the department for no doubt they are doing their best. I am personally a little interested because it was I who brought up the resolution two years ago instructing the department to sell the twine direct to the farmers. That portion of the resolution calling for sale by tender on July the first, I am not responsible for, as I had nothing to do with it. Last year the committee struck out that portion of the resolution. With that portion set aside, the system of selling to the farmers at cost or about the cost has been successful ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, this year also. We cannot make the twine fast enough.

Mr. BLAIN. I think it rather strange that in this circular issued May the first, and the other circular issued May twenty-second, we are told that all the best twine is sold. It looks as if one or two put in an application and bought it at a fixed price. I think that the department should continue the manufacture of this twine in larger quantities and sell it direct to the farmers. The department are quite right when they say that they should not be bound down to offer a commodity by public tender, because I am sure that when the farmers understand that they can purchase their binder twine direct from the institution every year, they will purchase their full quantity of twine from the government. This being a business government, the department will, no doubt, be able to do what is right, and see that all this twine is sold direct to the farmers. And in such case, we should not find such large items as these $18,000 sold to an individual, another $11,000 sold to another individual, neither being farmers.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That was a good while ago.

Mr. BLAIN. It was some time ago. I accept that explanation. There should not be any disposition on the part of the government to abolish the manufacture of binding twine in that Kingston penitentiary, but rather to increase it, and put as much binder twine into the market as possible in order, in some measure, to keep down the prices.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is an industry in which necessarily a great number of people are interested. It is one of which I can personally know but very little, but which I am anxious to see successful. I think it would be very useful if the Committee on Agriculture would fix a day for the purpose of discussing this question of binder twine. I would be on hand and have my officials present, and we would have the benefit of the experience of those in the House who are conversant with the business.

Mr. FRASER. If the government will take my advice they will sell the whole machinery or send it to the junk shop and save money.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Send $40,000 of machinery to the junk shop ?

Mr. FRASER. I would do it immediately. Here we have a resolution at one time ordering the government to do a certain thing and at another session the House lays down another rule. The idea of parliament making rules for the sale of binding twine—

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is a statute governing that in the United States.

Mr. FRASER. I would not care to follow that precedent. I believe that this was begun for political purposes—to try to make the farmers believe that the government was going to help them by reducing binder twine. And so it has been carried on. I think the wise thing to do is to let the farmers or the manufacturers produce the binder twine. A number of farmers have gone into this business, and I think there are seven or eight binder twine factories in Canada to-day. Why should the government, assuming the expense and doing little else, go into competition with them ? We are told that about 800 farmers have bought our binder twine. What is that number compared with all the farmers in Canada. I think the quicker we get rid of this as a business speculation the better. It will always be coming up in this same way ; no matter what party is in power, fault will always be found as to the method of carrying on the business. It is not a business for a government to go into, and I do not think that the results have proved beneficial either to the farmers or to the government.

Mr. KEMP. What other lines of merchandise are the government interested in coming under the management of the Department of Justice ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am happy to say I have only binder twine—besides the quarrying of stone at St. Vincent de Paul and making brick in British Columbia.

Mr. KEMP. I should think it would not be a very serious task for one of the minister's qualification to become an authority on one line of business. Since the question was brought up in the House, he tells us he has paid great attention to the subject, and it seems to me he ought to have it down fine by this time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) overates my ability. I humbly confess it.

Mr. LENNOX. I am greatly surprised by the attitude of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). However, I do not know that I ought to be surprised. Last year, I called the attention of the committee

to the fact—a more than ordinarily gratifying one—that one minister of the Crown was prepared to take the representatives of the people into his confidence.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is that ?

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Justice. That hon. gentleman said he would be glad to have the advice of the opposition in his endeavour to make his industry more successful than it had been in the past. I think that is the proper way to approach such questions as this. I do not know whether that accounts for the warmth, the excitement, I may say, of the hon. member for Guysborough. I was afraid for a moment that we were going to have another of those family quarrels with which we have been so familiar in the past. I think however, that the Minister of Justice prevented this coming to a crisis. Now, I hope this industry will be continued. The hon. member for Guysborough asks us what are seven or eight hundred farmers. I do not know that they are a large number compared with the entire population of the Dominion, or with the number of farmers of the Dominion. They are not a very large number in proportion to the amount of wealth that is invested in the farms of this country. But, if we can assist seven or eight hundred farmers, and if we can extend this industry in the way suggested by the hon. member for Peel—and particularly if the hon. minister continues to receive the able assistance of the opposition—this will be one of the most successful branches of the public service.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) desires this manufacture of binder twine under the government to be done away with. That hon. gentleman is more interested in fishermen than in farming. But the whole number of those engaged in farming is far greater than the number engaged in fishing. I am sure he would raise very serious objections if any hon. member of this House proposed doing away with something that was in the interest of the fishermen, and I think we have equal ground for objecting to his observations. He said, in the first place, that this factory was started for political purposes. Whatever purpose it was started for, it had one beneficial result and that was keeping down the cost of binder twine to the farmer. That is a fact that cannot be successfully contradicted. From the time that the factory in Kingston penitentiary began to turn out and sell binder twine, until the present government came into office, the farmers got their binder twine at lower prices than they ever got it for in Canada before or since. And why was this ? Because the government that then controlled the factory provided that the person purchasing the binder twine should sell it to the farmers at not more than 10 per cent profit. So, if any farmer found that he was obliged to pay a higher figure for binder twine elsewhere he could apply to the Kingston penitentiary and purchase it at this low price, viz., 10 per cent above that for which it was sold wholesale. During the time that this factory was under the management of the predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite who now control it, what were the farmers paying for binder twine ? They were paying from five and a half cents to seven and a half cents per pound. But when this government took control of it and began to sell it to speculators under their system—a very improper system as we contend—the manufacturers throughout the country were able to reach an understanding as to what they should sell it at. The same speculators bought up the output of the Kingston penitentiary, and of the Central prison of Toronto, and controlling the output of these factories, they appear to have reached an agreement with other manufacturers of twine that all would sell at the same figure no matter where it was manufactured. Therefore, the farmer was obliged to pay a very much higher price than before. And, from that time to the present, binder twine has remained at a high figure. We say that binder twine has been at a high figure, because the output of the Kingston penitentiary has been improperly handled by the government. Why, who got the output of the binder twine from that factory ? Mr. H. N. Bate, of Ottawa, the Hobbs Hardware Company, of London, and Mr. Connor, of St. John. When tenders were asked for the purchase of this twine, there appears to have been an understanding between them, so it did not matter who got the binder twine, they all shared in the profits.

Mr. CLARKE. Played Hobbs with the whole business.

Mr. SPROULE. The result of it was that the government paid Hobbs with the whole industry, and the farmers suffered in consequence. We remember very well when tenders were asked for and were put in by H. N. Bate, of Ottawa, and by the Hobbs Hardware Company, of London, and one by Connors as well. The contract was given to a firm in London, and when they were called upon to put up their forfeit the reply was that the Connors Company would put it up here in Ottawa—showing conclusively that they were in collusion.

The same parties who had control of the output at the Central Prison controlled the output at Kingston as well and then they sold it as they saw fit. The farmers were obliged to pay from nine and a half to twelve and a half cents a pound for their binder twine, whereas the year before the highest price paid was about seven and a half cents a pound for the best twine. Now we claim that increased price was a consequence of the improper way in which it was sold by the government.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). What about the cost of the raw material ?

Mr. SPROULE. The cost for three years was very much the same, averaging about four and a half cents a pound. It has been shown over and over again by the Auditor General's Report that during the three years when binder twine was sold at the very highest price to the farmer, the cost of the raw material was practically about the same as when the twine was sold at the lowest price. That shows plainly that the difference was not due to the increased cost of the raw material, because the twine was sold at a price out of all proportion to the raw material. Now we are told to-night that no matter who sold it, it got into the hands of Mr. Connor. One time it got into the hands of Connor under one name, and another time it got into his hands under another name. It seems that the same practice has been going on from year to year. At the commencement of this season, on the 1st of May, a circular was issued, at a time when no farmer requires binder twine, for his crop ; but in a few days the quality which was made 650 feet to the pound was all bought up. The regulation was that this was to be sold to the farmers only. Have we any information it was sold to the farmers ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, if my word is worth anything. You have all the information you want.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Minister of Justice to say he was not aware to whom it was sold.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, and I am going to have it investigated. I undertake to give the quantities sold, to whom sold, and the price paid by each party.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood it was all picked up by one party.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, never.

Mr. SPROULE. If it was sold to a number of individuals, then can we not get the number of those who purchased it, with the quantities purchased ? We are entitled to know whether it was sold to the farmers, because the resolution required that it should be sold to the farmers only. But if it was sold to the speculators, it is not carrying out the spirit or the letter of the resolution.

Mr. FRASER. I desire to say now, as I have said on previous occasions, that this is not a business that the government should go into at all. The statement made by the hon. member shows that it has not been a success.

Mr. SPROULE. Since the present government took hold of it.

Mr. FRASER. It has never been a success. We had trouble after trouble, and judgment after judgment against purchasers of the twine when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power.

Mr. KEMP. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that it was not managed on business principles ?

Mr. FRASER. According to the evidence given against the late government and statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite that things are not just right now, I would say decidedly that it was not managed on business principles. I believe the business is done now as well as any government can do it. But my point is that it is not in the interest of the country that any government should engage in that kind of work.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think this is a time for recrimination, nor for a discussion as to the way in which this was managed. If I wanted to go back to ancient history I might tell the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) that when we took charge of the business in 1896 there was $50,000 odd of the price of the output of 1894 that had not been paid. Now, I do not want to go into these details, they are unnecessary, and it would not be wise for me to do so if I want to get my estimates through. But this industry has been managed since 1896, perhaps not successfully, but at all events, so far as my knowledge has gone, honestly, and every pound of twine sold from that day to this has been sold on tender, after public tenders were called for, and the output has been given to the man who offered to pay the highest price for it. As I said a moment ago, Mr. John Connor has been connected with this industry since its inception; that is my firm belief, perhaps if I were asked to prove it I might be at a loss to do so. In 1894 and 1895 he was undoubtedly connected with it, and I believe since that time he has continued in connection with every tender that has been put in. I thought under the circumstances it would be wise to make a change with respect to the management of the industry where his brother was in control in Kingston. I do not say there was anything wrong between them, any common understanding between the brothers, because I have no knowledge of anything wrong; still I did not think that the gentleman who was getting the output of the industry should have charge of the industry. A change has been made in that respect, and since 1901 the twine has been sold to the farmers direct. The result was that in 1901 we had a large amount on hand at the end of the year which we sold by public tender, and since 1902, it is now being sold to the farmers. As far as last year is concerned, the hon. gentleman will find in the Auditor General's Report the names of the farmers to whom the twine was sold, the prices paid and the amount sold to each man. So far as this year is concerned, all that has been sold up to the present time I will account for, I will give the names of the persons to

whom it was sold, the prices paid, and the amount sold to each. Now, with respect to the industry itself, if it is to be regarded as a regulator of the price of twine, I suppose to some extent it has effected that purpose. The amount of binder twine, if I am correctly informed, used in Canada, is 10,000 tons, of which 2,250 tons are manufactured in Canada. At Kingston the extreme limit of our capacity is only 500 tons. So to some extent it seems to me this may be considered a regulator of the price of binder twine. But with respect to the other feature of the business, let us bear in mind that we must find some occupation for the inmates of the penitentiary. Let me say what we have accomplished by the means of this industry. We have charged against this output which we have put on the market by convict labour, $6,598 for one year. We give them a useful occupation and we realize that amount of money. We charge, in addition to the $6,598, the salaries of the officials connected with the industry. Then, in addition to that, we have the plant which is there. We charge for depreciation of the plant, five per cent, and we charge for interest on capital invested in that industry, three per cent. I do not know if there is any industry connected with the government that shows anything like the same result. Take the Printing Bureau here. I had recently occasion to look into that in connection with the prices they charged. They make no charge for plant depreciation, building, or the like.

Mr. TAYLOR. And they run in debt.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not know whether they do or not.

Mr. LENNOX. Have you the amount of the salaries there ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Formerly there was a superintendent, Mr. Connor, to whom we paid $1,500 and an assistant superintendent to whom we paid $900. Now the superintendent and the assistant superintendent have disappeared and we have appointed one man named Dickenson as superintendent of cordage at $1,000 to do the work of them both. The $2,400 in salaries formerly paid to Messrs. Connor and Price are saved, and we now have a man at $1,000 a year as superintendent.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the hon. minister give us again the total amount of the twine estimated to be used in Canada and the total amount manufactured in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is almost impossible to get a correct estimate, but I have had an inquiry made by the inspector, and according to the returns I find that the total amount used in the country was about 10,000 tons, and the total amount manufactured in Canada by the industries here 2,250 tons last year. The limit of our capacity is 500 tons, but as a matter of fact, we have not exceeded 400 tons.

Mr. CLARKE. The fact is then that nearly three-fourths of the twine is made on the other side of the line ?

Mr. KEMP. What is the object of selling binder twine at a lower price than the farmer can buy it for from a retail merchant ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) is a business man and he will appreciate the reason which I am about to give. We pay for our raw material, manilla 8·42 cents per pound, which is a better price than the ordinary manufacturer has been able to get it at because we happened to pick it up at a time when the market was favourable; New Zealand 6·90 cents per pound, and Mexican sisal 5·50 cents per pound. If you add together the items making up the cost of manufacturing including oil, bags and paper, repairs, renewals, convict labour, salaries, freight, depreciation in plant and interest you will find that it adds 1·813 cents to the cost. As a result of that we manufactured 16,000 pounds running 650 feet, 120,000 pounds of 600 feet, and 86,000 pounds of 500 feet and 4,000 pounds of 500 feet. Taking the cost of pure manilla at 8·42 cents a pound, and adding the cost of production amounting to 1·82 cents per pound it gives us 10·24 cents per pound as the cost.

Mr. SPROULE. When you speak of pure manilla you mean that there is not more than one-third of pure manilla in it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am discussing the question of cost.

Mr. SPROULE. The question of cost will depend on what you put into the binder twine. When you speak of pure manilla you must understand that the twine does not contain pure manilla.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. member is a doctor and of course an expert. I am a lawyer and I am not an expert. The inspector tells me that pure manilla means pure manilla. Take the cost of pure manilla at 8·42 cents per pound and the cost of manufacture at 1·82 cents per pound, that gives us the cost at 10·24 cents per pound and we put it on the market at 10¾ cents a pound and in ton lots or to clubs of farmers at one-quarter of a cent less than that price.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. Minister of Justice that there is not a pound of pure manilla twine made in Canada today. The fact was brought out in the report of the committee which looked into the question that pure manilla twine was not all made out of manilla but that it was a mixture.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of course I defer to the better knowledge of my hon. friend, but I have to rely on the reports of the two inspectors who are both here and who both re-affirm that pure manilla is pure manilla twine.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not know that it is necessary to discuss the question as to whether pure manilla means pure manilla or not. The Brantford Company which I believe for years has made as good twine as you will find anywhere in Ontario, or perhaps anywhere in Canada, I was positively informed by one of the directors, who, at the present time, has a seat in this House, make their best twine out of 60 per cent manilla and 40 per cent sisal. My own impression is that any twine that contains 60 per cent manilla and the balance of sisal is equally as good and is much better than twine that is made absolutely of manilla. In fact I do not think that the farmers care about twine made entirely of manilla fibre. That may be the reason why the Kingston twine is not as popular in the country as it ought to be. Go through western Ontario and you will find that the twine made at Kingston is not popular with the farmers. They will buy other twine in preference to the Kingston twine, and it may be for the reason that they put in more manilla than should be put in. The difference in cost is not so very material. I find by reference to the Auditor General's Report of last year that whilst manilla hemp cost 6 cents per pound, sisal cost 5⅜ cents per pound, only a fraction of a cent difference. It may be that I am not sufficiently familiar with the mode of calculating to arrive at just what a pound of twine ought to cost, but I followed the hon. Minister of Justice very closely, and I confess that I am entirely unable to reach the high figure of 11¼ cents as the cost of a pound of twine.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I said 10·24 cents.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well take the lower price of 10·24 cents. A pound of twine does not consist all of manilla or all of manilla and sisal. We know that there is about one-fifth part of what is called cordage oil, a coarse oil that goes into the manufacture of twine. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) here says one-sixth, but there is not very much difference between one-fifth and one-sixth. I have always understood it to be one-fifth. Now, taking one-fifth as oil, 60 per cent of the balance as manilla and the remainder sisal, I make out the cost of a pound of twine in this way: The actual cost of the material would be the one-half of six cents which is the cost per pound of the raw material.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Where does my hon. friend find the six cents?

Mr. HENDERSON. In the Auditor General's Report for 1902, page 27—M.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am figuring on the price paid to-day.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not aware that there has been any great disturbance in the market from which we buy this raw material, and I have not access to any better guide than the Auditor General's Report. I will give the minister the calculation I have made. The manilla fibre in a pound of twine would cost three cents; the sisal would cost two cents and the cordage oil one cent which would make six cents. Adding the cost of manufacture and the other incidentals the minister has referred to, we will say two cents, it would make the cost of a pound of twine eight cents which falls very far short of the ten and a quarter cents which is the price fixed. On this basis we would get it down to something like the cost that twine was manufactured at some years ago. I fail to see that the farmers are receiving justice at the hands of the minister, and I am afraid that in selling it at ten and one quarter cents he is demanding a large profit from the farmers. The late hon. David Mills when Minister of Justice stated that the cost of manufacture was three quarters of one cent per pound, and even allowing for the other things which the present Minister of Justice adds, it would seem that the price charged to the farmers is unreasonable when we consider that according to the Auditor General's Report he pays six cents for manilla, five and three-eights cents for sisal and nine cents a gallon for cordage oil. Eight cents a pound is a reasonable price to sell this twine to the farmers if it is intended that no profit should be made by the government. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who has now left the House, endeavoured to introduce the political element into this discussion. He said that the manufacture of twine was started in the prison for political reasons. I will give the hon. gentleman the credit for making one correct statement to-night. It was started by his friends in the central prison in Toronto no doubt to gain political advantages. That was however, years prior to the plant being installed in Kingston by the late Conservative government. They simply followed suit, and in order to offset what their political opponents were doing in Toronto. I shall not enter upon the larger question as to whether it is advisable to continue this industry in the Kingston penitentiary. The minister has told us that it is necessary to keep the prisoners employed, and they might as well be employed in making twine as anything else, but I do say that so long as twine is manufactured in Kingston it ought to be manufactured not for the purpose of making a profit but for the purpose of using it as a lever to maintain a fair level of price. As was said by the member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) three-fourths of the twine used in Canada to-day is imported from the United States. These large American trusts combine together, and I am sorry to say they have combined with some of the small Canadian factories to raise the price unduly to the farmer. Twine is not worth ten cents or eleven cents a pound, much less fifteen or sixteen cents, and I have no

doubt that the farmers will be called upon to pay by retail fifteen cents a pound for this American twine this year. The Kingston penitentiary is only able to turn out out about one-fortieth part of the total consumption, but still that is a factor and it may be used as a lever to protect the farmers against the exorbitant charges made by importers and by the large manufacturers in the United States who practically control this industry in Canada. I hope the day is not far distant when the government will see its way clear to encourage this industry in more ways than one. There was a time when we had a respectable duty on twine and when the greater part of the twine used in Canada was made in this country. Under the protective system the competition among Canadian factories maintained a fair level of price, but an agitation was started in favour of removing the duty and it was gradually reduced from 25 per cent to 12½ per cent and finally it was removed altogether. The lower you made the duty the higher you made the price of twine, just the same as in the case of coal oil and barb wire. That has been our experience all along. The Americans keep up a good stiff duty against us of two cents a pound, and if we had an industry in this country manufacturing twine it would have to pay that duty going into the United States while they send their twine in here free. I believe there is to be a small duty now of about three-eighths of a cent per pound. I maintain, Mr. Chairman that we should continue this industry at Kingston and increase the output as much as possible. I would not advise the government to make any profit out of it, but use it for the purpose of breaking down the price of the American twine that comes into this country. I would not sell the Kingston twine in large quantities to any one man, but would scatter it throughout the country as much as possible amongst farmers or small dealers, and use it in every way possible to operate against the attempts on the part of importers or American manufacturers of twine to unduly enhance the price against our farmers. Even if we should lose thousands of dollars I would not allow any one man to get possession of 200 tons of it so that he can fix the price to suit himself and charge the farmer what he likes. I hope that will be the policy that the government will pursue. For my part I would rather lose money by it than give up the industry altogether. I believe there is a benefit accruing from it, and so far as I am concerned I would not advocate the making of any profit out of the industry.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice in the calculation which the hon. Minister of Justice has given us, that the price per pound for the raw material, taking the thre different kinds together, that manilla at $8.42, the New-Zealand at $6.90, and the Mexican sisal at $5.50, you get the average price per pound of the three kinds. Then $1.81 will cover the cost of the manufacture, which makes the average cost of the three kinds eight and three-quarter cents per pound. But at the prices you quote in your circular the average price would come to ten and two-third cents.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We are not dealing with averages.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not fair to take the three different prices, and put them together and find the average price ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Certainly not.

Mr. SPROULE. If you take 100 pounds of each kind.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What object has the hon. gentleman in view ?

Mr. SPROULE. The object is to ascertain the actual cost.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, the hon. gentleman is trying to make a case.

Mr. SPROULE. If you take 100 pounds of each, you get what is the actual price.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I do not know by what species of calculation the hon. gentleman can come to any other conclusion. You can only make 300 pounds of twine out of 300 pounds of raw material, except for the additional weight of the crude oil, which is about one-third or one-fourth of a cent a pound. But if you take the three qualities together, 100 pounds of each, you only make out of them 300 pounds. You sell these 300 pounds at the prices stated in this circular—manilla at eleven and a half cents, the other at ten and three-quarter cents, and the Kingston special at nine and a half cents a pound. You sell 100 pounds of each. You add the cost of the three together, you add the cost of manufacturing which the minister has given, and that represents the whole cost, does it not ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am afraid my arithmetic is out. I am lost, so far as the calculation of my hon. friend is concerned. You take a ball of manilla hemp containing 600 feet for which I paid $8.42 per 100 pounds. To that you must add ten per cent for waste, which is replaced by ten per cent of oil. When I make up my calculation as to what this has cost, for the purpose of ascertaining the price at which it should be sold, I take the cost of the raw material and the cost of the oil, but I have nothing to do with the average cost of New Zealand or Mexican sisal, which does not enter into the calculation at all.

Mr. SPROULE. What difference does that make if you take 100 pounds of each,

add them together, and divide by three. You have only so many pounds of twine, which costs you so much money. 100 pounds of one kind costs $8.42, 100 pounds of another $6.90, and 100 pounds of the third, $5.50. Add these together and divide by three, and you have the average price of the three. Then I take the average price at which the binder twine is sold, which is ten and two-thirds cents per pound, while according to the minister's calculations, the average cost was eight and three-quarter cents per pound.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I think we have carried this debate far enough. The subject has been stretched too long. The question is, shall we go on manufacturing binder twine at the Kingston penitentiary ? I think the sense of the House is that we should, and that the farmers of the country should get the benefit of it. My idea is that we should take means to increase the output at Kingston penitentiary, not only for the benefit of the farmers, but for the sake of the men in the penitentiary. At a certain time some of them may come out to earn their own living, and they may be trained to some useful employment. The Minister of Justice is glad to receive advice from the opposition as well as from the supporters of the government in this respect, and if my advice would be worth anything, it would be that he should see that the best and most improved machinery be used in the Kingston penitentiary, and that the facilities be enlarged so that the output would be larger and the farmers would have the benefit. I do not think the price is too high, otherwise the farmers would not buy the twine from the penitentiary in preference to buying it from other manufacturers of the article. But I agree that it could be sold at such a price that there should be no large profit made, but that the farmers should get the whole benefit.

Mr. TAYLOR. I fully agree with what my hon. friend has just said, if the farmers were getting the benefit; but since this government have undertaken the handling of binder twine, the farmer has been the man who has been fleeced, and the jobber has got the benefit. If my hon. friend will look at the Auditor General's Report at page M—47, he will find the sales given, as follows :—Beaver, 180 pounds at eight and one-third cents and 5,125 pounds at eight and one-half cents to the farmers; and 366,793 pounds, the balance of that quality, to Mr. John Connor, or Mr. Henderson Black, who represents him, at five and one-tenth cents.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I am dealing with the future, not the past.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the way it was dealt with up to the first of July, 1902. Why should this government sell the twine to this man John Connor for less than the cost of the raw material ? We have maple leaf, sold 17,325 pounds at ten cents. Was that sold to the farmers ? John Connor got 220,000 pounds mixed manilla at five and a tenth cents, and the government are paying eight cents per pound for the pure manilla. The New Zealand was all sold at six and a half cents per pound, but none of it was sold to the farmers. The next sale is 60,000 pounds at four and five-eighths cents, and at the same time the farmer paid nine and a quarter cents for what he got. John Connor was a lucky man. Henderson Black was only another name for John Connor. $12,000 worth was sold directly to John Connor, and $32,000 worth sold to Henderson Black. There was $45,000 worth sold at four and five-eighths cents in job lots, and then the department turned about and bought raw material for the next year's manufacture. There was evidently some job in every one of these dealings. First it was Hobbs Hardware Company, and then H. N. Bate, and afterward John Connor.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend forgets that he is speaking to the committee and imagines that he is speaking to some meeting in a back constituency, otherwise he would appreciate the fact that a parliament in 1900 directed the sale of binder twine to be made to the farmers up to the first of July, after which date it was to be sold by public tender. Up to the 1st of July, 1901, it was sold direct to the farmers, and then the balance on hand was sold by public tender by parliament's direction. If my hon. friend see a job in that, I will go before a committee any time he choses.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman is in the position of a trustee, and if he called for tenders and accepted a tender for the manufactured article at a less price than he could buy the raw material at, how can he justify that ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The time for selling was gone by and it would depreciate 50 per cent if kept over a year.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman is not in business, or he would know that it would keep two or three years without depreciating.

Mr. SPROULE. We should know what this binder twine costs and whether it has been sold to the farmers at less than the cost or more. The complaint is that while the government have convict labour, they sell at the same price as in the retail stores.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is not a manufacturer in the country who sells that at the same price as we do. I have letters from manufacturers complaining about our prices.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. minister that it was sold last year at the stores at the same prices.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We are talking of present prices.

Mr. SPROULE. What I complain of that it was not sold to the farmers at the cost price plus one cent a pound, which is what the resolution required. The hon. gentleman should bring his experts from the Kingston penitentiary before the Agricultural Committee.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I agree.

Mr. SPROULE. The information given to-night differs from that given a few years ago, and we wish to ascertain whether the firms are getting binder twine in accordance with the resolution.

Mr. CLARE. I see that in the calculation which the Minister of Justice has made that the profit on the manilla is 1·26 per hundred or 10 per cent, in the medium twine the profit is 2·04 or 23 per cent. And in the cheaper twine 2·19, or a profit of 30 per cent.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot have given the figures correctly.

Mr. CLARE. The cost of pure manilla is given at 8·50, 1·82, 8·72, and 10·24 per pound. The cheapest was sold at 9½ cents.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The cheapest is sisal, sold at 9½ cents with a profit of 2·30 cents. Perhaps I should explain. With respect to the manilla the cost of the raw material is 8·42 cents, to which add 1·82 cents of manufacture, and you have a total of 10·24 cents. That is pure manilla running 650 feet, and sold at 11¼ cents. Then you have pure manilla--the same material—but running only 600 feet, at 10¾ cents. Then there is what we call Kingston special, which is made from New Zealand material. That costs 6·90 cents for raw material or adding 1·92 cents for manufacture, a total of 8·72 cents. That is sold for 9½ cents. The sisal was purchased last fall at 5·50 cents per pound; the price to-day is 8 cents per pound. Pure sisal, which cost 5·50 cents a pound for raw material and 1·82 cents for manufacture, a total of 7·32 cents, is sold at 9½ cents. I ought to say, perhaps that if my hon. friend (Mr. Clare) would compare these prices with the prices ruling in Chicago on the same date, the 31st of March, he will find that for pure manilla of 650 feet, the Chicago price is 13 cents against 11¼ cents, which is our price.

Mr. CLARE. What I want to get at is this—why does the hon. minister add 10 per cent to the best twine and about 30 per cent to the cheapest twine? Why make the farmer pay more in proportion for the one than for the other?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The lower grade made from pure sisal is a cheaper article and we have only about 4,000 pounds altogether. As it is a low grade and as we have but a small quantity, the inspector thought that altogether the raw material is now worth 8 cents per pound, we might fairly put the price at the figure mentioned. It is much cheaper than any one else sells it. If my hon. friend would allow me, when I come back to my estimates, I will bring letters from manufacturers from all over the country complaining of the prices at which we sell binder twine.

Mr. CLARKE. Selling Canadian or American binder twine?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Selling Canadian twine. The price in Chicago fixes the price elsewhere.

Mr. CLARE. Was it not arranged last year that the government should add one cent per pound to the cost of the binder twine?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think it was left entirely to my discretion to decide. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clare) will remember that a resolution was at one time passed that fixed everything, but last year the Committee on Agriculture discussed the matter and decided that this should be left with me to exercise my own discretion.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the minister a question or two. I listened with great interest to his statement. Like any other minister, the Minister of Justice must not be expected to carry all the details for which we ask in his head, but must necessarily depend largely on what his officers tell him. I wish to call the attention of the hon. minister to two or three matters which are in direct conflict with what he has said. He will remember that a very thorough investigation was made before the Public Accounts Committee two years ago, and that the evidence there went to show that, including all the services the hon. gentleman has enumerated, the cost of manufacturing the twine was one cent per pound. It is an important thing if, from changed conditions, or from the facts not being correctly stated then, or not being correctly stated now, the cost of manufacture is counted as being nearly double what it was counted at before. There was another statement made, a very important one, bearing on the selling of the twine—and, perhaps I may be permitted to digress here for a single moment. I think some question came up between the superintendent at Kingston and the Department of Justice as to whether the twine should be sold at the expiration of a certain time, it not having been sold to the farmers. The Minister of Justice gave it as his opinion that it was necessary, and so the twine was sold. That point I do not intend further to discuss. But the point to which I wish to call attention, I think the minister will agree, is a very important one. The evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee disclosed the fact—correct or incorrect, I am not able to say—that twine did not deteriorate by being held over one

year. But we have from the hon. gentleman's own department two statements in direct opposition to each other, and I would like to ask the minister if he is able to account for that. The witnesses were under oath and were closely examined, and yet there was a clear contradiction. These matters as to the cost of manufacture and as to the affect upon the binder twine of keeping it over one year are important questions. I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but I think the minister will see that these points should be answered.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As to the question of deterioration, the inspector tells me that the result of keeping the binder twine in their warehouse is that the oil is apt to run out and the twine therefore may not work so satisfactorily as new twine would, and the farmer would not buy twine which had been kept in the warehouse from one season to another, or, if he did, would not pay so much for it as for new twine. The proportion of deterioration is a matter of opinion. I had not consulted the inspector when I said that I believed that it would deteriorate 50 per cent, and I do not wish the officials to be held responsible for a statement that I made on my own responsibility. As to the cost of manufacture, I confess that I do not recollect the evidence given before the committee two years ago, I cannot carry the evidence so long in my memory. I will give the basis on which I proceed, and I think it is a fair one. First, I take the actual cost of raw material that goes into the manufacture of binder twine. Then I add the cost of labour at the same price as free labour.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman will permit me—

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will explain that as the inspectors puts it to me. They charge thirty cents per day for convict labour, and, as we feed and clothe and house these people, they count the total expense the same as free labour. Then I add the salaries of the officials connected with the industry, also the advertising and the freight on material. Then I add 5 per cent for depreciation of the plant—which I think is a very low allowance—and 3 per cent for interest. That is the basis of my calculation. And, as I say, it seems to me, to be a fair one. The result is a total of 1·81 cents and a fraction per pound—practically two cents in round figures.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has made what appears to be a fair statement. But I am amazed at the statement that was made on a former occasion when all these services were said to be taken into consideration. Now, could the hon. gentleman tell us offhand how much is charged to labour, how much for deterioration, how much for interest, and so on ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. These items are used to fix the price of the output of the present year, and we had to take the items of the expenditure for the past year to ascertain the true amount. We manufactured in 1898-99 and in 1899-1900, 1,726,320 pounds of fibre, for oil, bags and paper we paid $5,436.40 ; for repairs and renewals, $1,109.85 ; for convict labour, $6,598.35 ; salaries, advertising, freight, &c., $11,910.39; depreciation, five per cent, $4,000; interest three per cent for two years, $2,400. That makes itemized over each pound, 1·813.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to this bugaboo of depreciation, my experience is this : For three years in succession we kept twine over every year on my farm. I asked the men whether they found the twine to run all right and to give satisfaction, and they said it worked equally well with that which was bought fresh every year. Of course, we can imagine that it might dry a little.

St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary $110,300.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is a decrease here: Salaries, $1,500; maintenance of convicts, $2,000 ; working expenses, $3,500 ; equipment, land and buildings, $1,300. The number of guards has been reduced by four.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the minister give us the cost per diem of the prisoners in the various penitentiaries ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman will find that in the beginning of my report, page xv.

Manitoba penitentiary, $50,100.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the Minister of Justice if there is an understanding that some item will be reserved on which we may have a further discussion on penitentiaries ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will hold over any item my hon. friend may wish. I suggested a moment ago that we could resume this discussion in the Agricultural Committee.

Mr. CLANCY. That committee is rather overburdened now with work, and I doubt if we will be able to resume it there this session.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has sent me over his report, but I do not find any place where the cost is given of the keep of the prisoners in the various penitentiaries.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. At the head of page xv, he will find the gross expenditure for the years beginning 1896-97 down to 1902, the cost per capita per diem for all the penitentiaries together.

Mr. SPROULE. I wanted the cost in each penitentiary.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman will find on the preceding page a comparative statement of the cost per capita for six years for the different penitentiaries, Kingston, St. Vincent de Paul, Dorchester, Manitoba and British Columbia.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Customs, House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 27, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—OFFICIAL GUIDE.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Was the Official Guide of the Intercolonial Railway of Canada and Prince Edward Island Railway, of 1902 and 1903, the title page of which states that it was issued by authority of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and the introduction of which appears over the name of D. Pottinger, general manager of the Intercolonial Railway, compiled and issued by any department of the government railways ? And if so, by what department ? Or if not, by whom was it compiled and issued ?

2. How many copies of said Official Guide were printed ?

3. What was the cost of printing said Official Guide ?

4. What was the total amount received for advertisements in said Official Guide ?

5. What sum, if any, was received by the government railway, or by the government in any other way in connection with the publication of said Official Guide?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair).

1. The Official Guide was issued under the authority of the Minister of Railways and Canals, but was not issued by any department of the government railways.

2. It is understood that 5,000 copies were issued, but at no expense to the government.

3. It was not printed at the expense of the government, therefore cannot say what it cost.

4. The government received nothing in cash, but it is thought that the traffic of the government railways must have benefited.

5. It is not possible to state what amount the government railways benefited by the circulation of this guide book, but there is no doubt the guide book is a convenience to the travelling public.

Mr. SPROULE.

MEDICAL EXAMINERS OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

1. Has one Doctor Ellis been employed by the government as port physician, or medical examiner of immigrants landing at Quebec, during the years 1902 and 1903, or during either of each years ?

2. Is the said Doctor Ellis employed by the government in any other capacity in connection with the medical service in and about the port of Quebec ? If so, what are his duties ?

3. Has the said Doctor Ellis an annual salary; or is he paid so much for the season, or in any other way ?

4. What is the amount of the remuneration, either annual or otherwise, of the said Doctor Ellis ?

5. Is Doctor Howe employed by the government as port physician at Quebec, or medical examiner of immigrants, or in some other capacity in and about the said port ; and in what capacity ?

6. What is the salary or remuneration of the said Doctor Howe ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). In the absence of the minister, I beg to reply as follows :

1. Dr. Ellis was employed for about two or three weeks of the year 1903, in supervising the examination of immigrants landing at Quebec, under the new regulations which had just come into force at that port.

2. Dr. Ellis is the medical officer of the Department of the Interior, and subject to the direction of the department as to his services. He is also the medical examiner at St. John, his headquarters being at that port.

3. Dr. Ellis is not employed by the season, but by salary.

4. The salary paid to Dr. Ellis is at the rate of $2,000 per annum, his whole time being engaged by the department.

5. There are two medical attendants in connection with the immigration service at Quebec. Dr. Arthur Potvin is the medical attendant on all patients in the immigration hall, or those who may be compelled to remain over for hospital or other treatment, having been rejected or refused permission to go forward to destination until they are cured of the diseases for which they were rejected. Dr. Howe is medical examiner of immigrants at the same port.

6. Dr. Howe is paid by fees and receives $5 for every vessel examined by him with 100 immigrant passengers or less, and ten cents extra per head for every immigrant passenger over 100, provided his total earnings do not exceed $100 in any one month. If the fees exceed the amount named his total allowance is $100.

LIGHTKEEPER AT NORTH HALFWAY POINT.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Why was Denis Ménard, keeper of the range light, North Halfway Point, dismissed from the service of the department ?

2. Did any one make a charge against him ?

3. Was said Denis Ménard given communication of the complaint, if any, made against him ?

4. Was any opportunity given said Denis Ménard to be heard before his dismissal ?

5. How long has the said Denis Ménard been in the service of the government ?

6. Was the said Denis Ménard allowed any delay to find another situation ?

7. By whom was his successor, Jos. Lord, recommended to the government ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine) :

1. In the public interest.
2. No.
3. No.
4. It was not necessary.
5. Since the 17th of August, 1890.
6. No, this is not the practice of the department.
7. A petition of influential persons of that locality has been standing in the department since 1896, requesting this change.

CANADIAN FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. KEMP asked :

Has the Canadian Freight Classification No. 12, taking effect May 1, 1903, been approved by the Governor General in Council ? If so, what is the date of such approval ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The Canadian Freight Classification No. 12, has not been approved by the Governor General in Council. There has been no freight classification approved since October or November, 1899.

MR. CAMILLE DESJARDINS.

Mr. BUREAU asked :

Was Camille Desjardins, a clerk in the Public Works Department, at Montreal, appointed by Order in Council ? If so, on what date ? What salary does he receive for each day's work ? Is he paid for holidays, Sundays and days of absence ?

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

1. No, not by Order in Council. He was appointed 26th January, 1896.
2. Paid by the month at the rate of $90 per month.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I understand from the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) is going to make his statement in connection with the Intercolonial Railway to-morrow. There are three notices of motion asking for returns to be brought down—Nos. 11, 12, and 13. I would ask if he would be kind enough to have them before the meeting of the House to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he would like to have them to-morrow ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, if the hon. minister is going to make his statement first thing to-morrow. I would like to have them before he makes his statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid I cannot have them to-morrow. The orders for these returns would require to be sent to Moncton, and it will be some days before the information could be got here.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You could telegraph to Moncton.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but the information would not be here in time even then. It would be available later just as well as to-morrow for reference. If the hon. gentleman makes these motions, I have no objection whatever to their passing and I will telegraph for the information and get it as soon as possible, but it would not be possible to have it here to-morrow.

THE RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 3,

Mr. MACLEAN. The minister informed us, when last we were considering this Bill, that he would consider whether the Bill should be made to apply to express companies or not. What has been the result of his consideration in this respect ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I have been considering the matter carefully since the last sitting of the committee, and I have come to the conclusion that, considering the enormous magnitude of the Bill, it would be quite impracticable to encumber it with any further provisions if it is to be disposed of during the present session. My own view is that if it is desirable express companies should be taken under control of the railway commission, it would be necessary to have that dealt with by a separate Bill. I cannot think of incorporating it in the present Bill. It would complicate it, and would involve a great deal of labour in making alterations and amendments in other clauses.

Mr. MACLEAN. Seeing that the minister has made a study of this matter, I would ask him whether the Inter-State Commerce Bill, and the several State Bills dealing with this matter, do not give jurisdiction over express companies ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Except so far as they may con-

trol common carriers, I do not think that they deal with any of the express companies in any of the states.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is not an express company a common carrier ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not dealing with the liability or the power of common carriers in this Bill ; we are dealing with railway carriers.

Mr. MACLEAN. The board of trade of the city of Toronto and other boards of trade have represented to the minister that it is essential the rates charged by express companies should be subject to regulation by the railway commission. I agree thoroughly with that idea. If this Bill is as comprehensive as it is said to be, it should contain such a provision, and without such a provision it is an incomplete Bill and almost useless. The express companies handle a great deal more freight now than ever before, and their charges in some cases are said to be excessive. The commercial people of this country desire that express companies should be included in this Bill, and I cannot see any reason why the minister purposes not to do so. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway have three or four car loads of express matter on each train now, whereas formerly half a car was sufficient for the express business. Again, it is the railway companies that own these express companies. As a matter of fact, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway own their express business. I again ask that the express companies be brought within the purview of this Bill.

Mr. KEMP. I think the minister would do well to reconsider his intention not to include the express companies in this Bill. A few weeks ago the fruit-growers waited upon the minister and complained that their fruit, which is largely shipped by express, was subject to the discriminations and irregularities which this Bill is supposed to overcome in respect to railways. Hundreds of car loads of fruit are shipped by express, and it seems to me a reasonable thing that the express rates should be regulated by the railway commission. Not only the fruit-growers, but other shippers are very anxious to have some regulation of express companies, and I trust the minister will include them in this Bill.

Mr. McCREARY. I do not know why these hon. gentlemen bring up such matters as these at the present time, unless it be their object to defeat this Bill. While the express charges are very high throughout Canada, yet I believe that if we are going to hamper this Bill with every detail of transportation that can be thought of, the result will be to prevent its passage during the present session. I believe the majority of the members of this House are in favour of having this Bill passed at once, and having the railway problem solved so far as it is possible to solve it in this respect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCREARY. We cannot expect to cure every ill by one Act. This is something like the Municipal Act, and it will require amendments probably for the next four or five sessions before it is made nearly perfect. The railway Bills in Minnesota and Dakota have taken ten or twelve years since their passage to reach their present condition, and they are not perfect yet. We cannot expect to have this Bill perfect all at once, and if we desire to pass it this session we should not encumber it with details in regard to express charges or telephone charges or telegraph charges, or anything else but construction, equipment, management, operation and rates on railways. We could deal with the express companies either in a separate Bill or after we have finished the main body of this Bill.

Mr. KEMP. So far as my knowledge goes of the agitation which was the cause of the introduction of the amendment to the Railway Act by the Minister of Railways and Canals, the complaint was in regard to freight tolls, and not, as the hon. gentleman seems to think, in regard to the construction of railways. The great complaint throughout this country was that the railways were not held within reasonable bounds in respect to freight rates, and express rates as well. If we are going to have a Bill dealing with the tolls on railways, why not have it regulate rates by express as well as by slow freight ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I resent what the hon. gentleman from the west says. I am very anxious to see a railway commission Bill carried through the House, and I will do my best to help to get it passed. I believe the country will support the minister in putting such a Bill through but the country expects that a Bill dealing with freight rates will deal with all freight rates, including those of express companies. Why should not the railways be regulated in regard to the rates they charge on express matter as well as in regard to other freight ? Goods are sent by express not only for speed, but often also because they are perishable. Carload after carload of perishable freight is sent by express from the fruit districts of Ontario, and the fruit-growers have said time after time that they can only grow fruit under the condition of having favourable freight charges. If the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher)—and I would like to see him in his place to-day—wishes to aid the farmers, the fruit-growers and the dairymen of this country, he will see that this Bill takes jurisdiction over express charges. I am anxious to see the Bill passed, and I suggest to the minister now that there is no reason why he should not put into this

clause the word express or introduce later a clause, providing that express companies shall be considered railway companies, to make them subject to the jurisdiction of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid that the jaunty way in which my hon. friend would dispose of the question and the confident ease with which he thinks this matter can be dealt with, show that he has a lot to learn as to the proper and effective method of legislating on this question. The assumption of my hon. friend that we are withdrawing express companies for the carriage of goods from the operation of this Bill is a mistaken one. All arrangements between railway companies and express companies are subject to the control of this proposed legislation, and I do not myself apprehend that there will be a great deal of difficulty in a general or broad way in covering all reasonable complaints with regard to the carriage, not of express freight, but of express packages—all goods which are taken up by express companies. But beyond that it would be absolutely necessary, I may tell my hon. friend, in order that proper legislation on that subject should be on the statute-book, that it should be dealt with by itself in a separate Bill. I have given a great deal of attention to this and other questions in connection with the proposed Bill, and have spent a good deal of labour upon it, and I want to say to the hon. gentleman that what he suggests cannot be done. It would simply destroy the Bill, and probably would not be effective at all. But what my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) said a moment ago has much force in it. We cannot hope to exhaust all legislation for the carriage of merchandise by railways and other carriers in this Bill. I feel myself that we have undertaken as much as we can well and properly carry out during the present session. I do not want the Bill to be encumbered, if I can avoid it, with any new propositions. I want to deal with what we have here, and when we get this Bill in proper shape and working order, we shall have a footing on which to proceed to take up other cognate questions and deal with them in a much more effective manner than we could undertake to do in the present circumstances. Referring to what has been said by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), I do recall that some delegations of fruit men waited upon me, but I do not know that they made any special reference to grievances which they suffered from the express companies. What they did impress on my mind was that, owing to the facility with which the railway companies were able to change their freight classifications, so as to transfer merchandise from one class to another, it was possible for them to do a good deal of injury to fruit and other perishable goods. It was express freight, so far as my recollection serves me, that they had in mind, and as to which they impressed on me the need of improvement. We are covering express operations in a much larger degree, I believe, than the hon. gentleman imagines, because the word express company is not in the Bill. A railway company cannot, through an express company or other instrumentality, exact exorbitant charges. Its actions over its line are controlled by this board. I do not know how much more you could ask in a general way.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the railway company were an express company, could it not evade the law ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it could if it were an express company any more than it could if it were not. I do not think, as legal entities, any of the railway companies are express companies. I suppose some of the individuals who constitute one company may constitute the other ; but for all legal purposes they are distinct corporate bodies. I believe that to be the case in regard to the Canadian Pacific Express Company, and I think it is likely to be the case with regard to the others. If my hon. friend desires, as I believe he does, to see this legislation go through, he will not urge that it should be encumbered with an attempt to deal with other questions than those included in it, and I would strongly counsel him to have patience with regard to these matters which he has in his mind, because in another session somebody will be able to take them up and deal with them if we are not here to do it. We certainly have a very large contract on our hands to get through with all these various clauses, and discuss all the complicated questions involved in the Bill, without increasing the number.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This Bill proposes to give to the commissioners the absolute power to fix rates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not come to that yet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We are discussing it under this clause. I do not see how it would encumber the Bill or affect it in the slightest to give these commissioners power to deal with rates on freight carried either as express freight or in any other manner by a railway. Express companies are put to much more expense handling small freights in the different sections of the country than railway companies are subjected to on the average class of freights they carry. But the commission could make allowance for the difference and could fix the rates accordingly. And inasmuch as the express companies deal with nearly every individual in the community, inasmuch as, compared with railway companies, they stand pretty much in the position of re-

tailers as compared with wholesale dealers, I fail to see why the commission should not have the power of fixing express rates as well as rates on ordinary freight. In the American states, jurisdiction is given the commissioners to deal with this very class of freight. Then, it is provided that this Act shall apply to all persons, companies and railways other than government railways, within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada. I suppose the hon. Minister of Railways knows what particular railways are not within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada. I believe that all railways with a provincial charter, concerning which there is no express enactment declaring them to be works for the general advantage of Canada, and some railways which have a special charter subjecting their rates to the approval of the Governor General in Council, would be removed from the jurisdiction of this commission. I would ask the hon. minister what railways are included or excluded.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no doubt that a portion of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway would not come under this commission, so far as any reduction in their rates is concerned, unless their income should come up to a certain percentage.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How much of the main line ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. From Callander west.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is nearly the whole railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have a good many more miles of railway in the west of Canada subject to this commission than would not come under it. They are extending lines in all possible directions. Their whole system in the east of Canada would come under the operation of this Bill. Year by year the mileage of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which would be subject entirely to the control of the railway commission as regards rates, will be increasing. My hon. friend is under the impression that none of those railways should come within the operation of this Bill which were incorporated under the old Railway Act, and allowed a margin of 15 per cent. I think that the hon. gentleman is in error. I have no doubt, and I think that legal opinion will bear me out, that there are no other companies incorporated in Canada which would be exempt except that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway I have named. It is perhaps true that railways with local charters and which have not come under the legislative jurisdiction of the federal parliament would be exempt from the operation of the Act. But there are very few lines of any importance, and their mileage is very limited indeed, which have not been brought within the jurisdiction of this parliament. But if it should become necessary, by reason of the amount of business done, or because of any complaints concerning rates, that parliament should have authority, there is a very easy and simple method of obtaining that control. A general Act declaring these roads to be works for the general advantage of Canada would bring them within the jurisdiction of this House. On the whole, I think that railways doing 95 per cent of the business of Canada will come within this section.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister, in reply to a statement of mine, says that this Bill will apply to certain railways which were chartered at a particular time when the Railway Act provided that there would be no interference with the rates until they had earned at least 15 per cent on their capital. But what I pointed out was that this provision operated in the nature of a contract between the government and these companies. I understand that the power is vested in this government of absolutely expropriating without remuneration at all to these railways. But they got their charters when the general Railway Act provided that there would be no interference with the rates until they had earned 15 per cent. It is true, we have the power, but will it not be an interference with the mutual contract or understanding applicable to every railway company which received a charter under that particular Railway Act ? Though you may have the power, the moral obligation, the mutual contract remains with these railway companies, which got their charters at that particular time. Then, as to the application, the hon. minister admits that these roads which are not under the jurisdiction of Canada by being declared works for the benefit of Canada would not be subject to this commission.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As regards control over the rates.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. minister does not argue that the commission would have power to regulate rates on roads which are purely provincial and have not been brought under the jurisdiction of this parliament by the clause declaring them to be of general advantage to Canada. I would like to see a decision on that question—whether the general Act of the Dominion which states that all railways which touch or cross government railways, the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, are brought under the jurisdiction of Canada, is valid. It is possible it may be so, but I doubt the legality of it. To bring a work under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada you should at least specifically declare what work it is.

In the case of a railway you should name the two points between which you assume jurisdiction over that railway. If my interpretation of the law in that respect is correct, the jurisdiction which we can confer upon this commission will be a very limited one. It will cover works which receive their entity from the Dominion parliament, except as the hon. minister says, the Canadian Pacific Railway from Callander westward; but it will not cover roads which have provincial charters. Morally, if not legally, it must exclude roads which receive their charter under the virtual notice given by the government that the parties investing money in railway enterprises need dread no fear of interference with rates until they have declared a dividend of fifteen per cent. I doubt very much that it can apply to those roads which were supposed to be brought under the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament by being declared works for the general advantage of Canada, because they touch or cross the Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway. As I say if we have power to take over the jurisdiction over these roads, it should be by a specific declaration as to the points between which our jurisdiction is to extend. If my contention is correct, this Bill will have an application only to a moiety, perhaps to a minority, of the railways in the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must confess that I am quite unable to form an opinion as to what is the attitude of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) on this question—his mental attitude or his political attitude. He attacks this Bill because of its limited application. The apparent inference is that it is not worth while to promote a Bill looking to the establishment of a railway commission because of this limited application, and I understand, for that reason he opposes the Bill. Is that his attitude ? Is it possible that he opposes the Bill on the ground that it is not more comprehensive, while he argues that it cannot be made more comprehensive? Is that his attitude ? My hon. friend, then, I assume, is in that frame of mind. But, how comes this, when he was such a red-hot, enthusiastic supporter of a railway commission not nearly so far reachng in its power as this, which his friend the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy tried to establish by the measure which he introduced session after session in this House. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) ardently supported that Bill and was deeply pained that it did not receive the support he thought its merits justified. What is the difference between the conditions then and the conditions now ? The same special contract was in existence and confirmed by legislation with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that company covered a larger proportion of the territory under which railways within our jurisdiction were built than it does to-day. The same law existed then which exists to-day with regard to the power of the provincial legislatures and our legal attitude towards local roads was exactly the same. Why is it that when the difficulties were much more serious than they are to-day my hon. friend so warmly supported the Bill which he cannot support to-day ? Now, he says that in this Bill there is an element that is immoral——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Immoral ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, immoral. The hon. gentleman says it may be legal, but it would be immoral for this parliament to take away from the companies which were incorporated under the former Railway Act, the privilege of exemption from control of rates until the time when their profits realized fifteen per cent. It may be legal, he says, but it is wrong. Now, by whom was the wrong done ? By my hon. friend himself. How is it possible for me to understand my hon. friend when he criticises a Bill which in this respect is simply a transcript of the Bill introduced by himself—or, if not by himself by the government of which he was a member—which gave control of these railways to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council irrespective of whether they were earning fifteen per cent or not. How is it that he can have got himself into such a frame of mind ? How can he so shut his memory against what he himself has done ? Is it any wonder that I find it difficult to understand what he his aiming at ? Is he for or against this measure ? If against it, is he against it for the reasons which existed when he was in favour of this class of legislation ? If I do him less than the justice he may think he is entitled to, it is only because I am unable to comprehend the position in which he stands.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals cannot mention anything I have ever said against the creation of a tribunal for the purpose of controlling railways. I was not arguing in that light at all, the hon. minister must notice it. I was pointing out that this Bill had application to only a moiety of the railways of the Dominion, as against the claim of the hon. minister that it had application to nearly the whole of them. I was pointing out that it could have no application to provincial railways. I pointed out—and the Minister of Railways and Canals admitted that point—that it had no application to that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Callander. I expressed doubt of its applicability to those roads which were supposed to have been brought under our jurisdiction by the section of the law which declares them works for the general advantage of Canada. But all this is no reason why I should object to the Bill itself. I was a party to the Act—

at least I was supporting the government under which the law was passed—which virtually gave notice to every man who invested in a Canadian railway that there would be no interference with railway rates until fifteen per cent profit had been paid. I was also a party to the Bill which annulled that, and which would make it exclude from the benefits of that section all the roads which received their charters afterwards. Does that mean that I changed my mind as to the application of that section while it was in force? Not at all. I am simply pointing out that this Bill would have application to comparatively few of the roads in Canada. The hon. gentleman refers to my attitude in the past——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) say that under the Railway Act introduced by the government of which he was a member and which is in force to-day, that railways incorporated prior to a certain date were exempted from the operation of the Act?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not say anything of the kind. What I stated was that the moment that law was passed, it was a notice to every one who got a charter under it that there were no conditions in it such as that under the fifteen per cent clause. That does not say that because the Act was passed that from that time any person applying for a charter had a different notice——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does distinctly and absolutely.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It does?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I say not. That is my opinion to-day. Why, then, can you not take under control the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman asks me a question, I will tell him. Because there was a distinct contract between the government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that contract was confirmed by this parliament; and we could not, we would not, no man would venture, without the sanction of the Railway Committee under these circumstances, to rescind that contract.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That contract is no more binding than a contract made with any other company under the general Railway Act, in which rates are not to be interfered with until they earn fifteen per cent. You changed that law, and you took away from them some rights which were virtually a contract with these companies. You have the same power to take jurisdiction over the Canadian Pacific Railway. No contract should interfere with such control if it is necessary in the interest of the public. The hon. minister knows that he can take the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under control, notwithstanding the contract that the government made with them, and put them under the jurisdiction of this Act, the same as he can any other railway, the same as he can when he assumes jurisdiction over a provincial railway by claiming it to be for the general advantage of Canada. In the same way he could declare this work to be for the general advantages of Canada, notwithstanding the conditions of the contract and the part of the charter they may have received from a provincial government. By the terms of his commission, in proposing to take control of the railways he violates contracts, he violates solemn agreements embodied in the statute-book, just as much as he would by taking control over the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway and putting them under the control of this commission. I am not arguing against the commission, I am merely pointing out the anomalies and the troubles the minister has to get over, and when I do so he should not attack my inconsistency for supporting the Bill establishing a railway commission introduced by the late Mr. McCarthy some years ago. I am of the same opinion still; but even if I had altered my opinions or discarded them, that is no reason why the hon. gentleman should complain. During my lifetime I have discarded or altered many opinions which I formerly held, and if they are of any advantage to the hon. gentleman he is welcome to them. I would say with the late hon. Mr. Howe, that no man has more contempt than I have for opinions which I have altered or discarded in my lifetime.

Mr. MACLEAN. The minister has referred to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as being, in a way, outside the jurisdiction of this Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I said in one respect only, and that is the control of rates. In every other respect the company is entirely under our control.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am coming to that point. There is already a way to bring the Canadian Pacific Railway and its rates under the jurisdiction of this parliament and of this commission, and it is set out in the contract which he has quoted, and I have myself referred to many times in this House. The clause which regulates the charges of the Canadian Pacific Railway is this:

20. The limit to the reduction of tolls by the parliament of Canada provided for by the eleventh subsection of the 17th section of the 'Consolidated Railway Act, 1879,' respecting tolls, is hereby extended so that such reduction may be to such an extent that such tolls when reduced shall not produce less than ten per cent per annum profit on the capital act-

ually expended in the construction of the railway.

Now, we have asked this government to ascertain in some way what the actual cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway was, as set out in this Act, and the government have never done so. But the moment it is done the Canadian Pacific Railway and all its charges can be brought under our control. I believe that time has arrived now. They are earning sufficient on the actual expenditure incurred to bring them within the jurisdiction of the Act, and one reason why we need this railway commission is to ascertain what the actual cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been as provided in this Act. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) in regard to the partial jurisdiction of parliament over these railways. I believe this parliament has an absolute and supreme jurisdiction over these railways. If we have not supremacy, we ought to have it. I do not believe that we are bound so much by the vested rights of the companies, because the whole tenor of our parliamentary institutions is to take jurisdiction over these railways and to regulate them in the public interest, no matter what the past legislation may have been, and I believe no injustice would be done to the shareholders, the stockholders or any one else, and it is high time that parliament should take possession. The Minister of Justice, although he has heretofore strongly argued for vested interests, I am glad to see now that, by giving his consent to this Bill, he abandons somewhat his former position, and that it is now the intention of the government to take complete jurisdiction over all these railways. This parliament has now jurisdiction over all the other railways, and the only one excluded, the Canadian Pacific Railway, can be brought under by this commission immediately if the government should take the steps providing for it in the Act incorporating the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Now, to return to the question of the express companies. The minister says that he does not wish to encumber the Bill. Does he not see that if he allows the express companies to remain outside he gives the railway companies an opportunity of evading the Bill? They will turn themselves into express companies, and probably do all their business as such, and in that way they will get outside the jurisdiction of the Bill. The way to regulate the whole of them is to bring them under the jurisdiction of this Act.

Mr. MONK. I wish to point out that it is very essential that we should include the express companies in this section three. Of course, as the Minister of Railways and Canals is aware, the express companies with which we have to deal are closely connected with the railway companies. They may be separate legal entities, they are no doubt; but the connection is notorious. It is so close that undoubtedly if the railway commission for which this Bill provides secures any amelioration in the matter of rates, there will be a tendency in the railway companies to take back in the matter of express charges what has been lost in railway charges. I think that applies not only to the community in general, not only to fruit growers, but to that numerous class of persons who ship perishable goods of other kinds. I am sure that the advantage of the railway commission, if there is any, will be in many cases totally lost unless it has control over express rates. I point that out to the minister, because I feel convinced from my experience that there will be a tendency to take out of the public in express charges what may be lost by the commission taking control of the railroad rates. For my part I have very little faith myself in a commission. I believe in retaining in the hands of the minister all that authority which, to a certain extent, he is now divesting himself of in the creation of this commission. I believe in responsible control. I believe it is better for the department to have under its control a large number of experienced men of whom the minister himself should be the responsible head, and in all important matters he should be responsible to parliament. But that is outside the clause we are now discussing. This question of express charges, I do not think, will encumber the Bill. It will enable the commission to act equitably with these parties and it is absolutely essential for the proper and successful application of the Bill.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Mr. Chairman, I regret to hear the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals say that it is not possible to bring express companies under the provisions of this Bill. I hope he will find a way, on further consideration of the Bill, to bring express companies under its operation. The express and railway companies are intimately connected especially when we consider the relationship of the Canadian and Dominion express companies with Canadian railway companies. If they are not the same as the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies they are at any rate owned and operated by the same men. We know as a matter of fact that if any complaint is made to the express companies in regard to the rates the onus is very frequently thrown on the railway companies, and the immediate reply is: We have to pay so much to the railway company that we are unable to reduce these rates. In some cases the payment has to be made by the express company to a railway company other than with which it is connected. I know of numerous cases where express companies have charged very much higher rates for carrying carloads of fruit a short distance than they have charged for

carrying them a much longer distance by their own company, and when asked why they should charge so much more for carrying fruit for a short distance than for a long distance, the reply was: We have to pass over another railway, we have to pay it a fixed charge, and having to pay that charge, we are unable to reduce the rates. The express companies say positively, and apparently, candidly, that the charges they are making are not excessive, because they are not able to pay their shareholders more than 6 per cent dividend. We have no means of knowing whether this is true or not. The railway and express companies are so intimately connected with each other that it may be that the express companies do not make more than 6 per cent, but it may also be the fact that any profit over and above that is credited to the railway companies. So it seems to me that there is very great reason why the express companies should be brought under the operation of this Bill on account of their intimate connection with the railway companies, so that they would not be able to shift the responsibility upon the shoulders of the railway companies. I notice that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said that he did not remember that the fruit growers had brought this matter to his attention, but I read in the 'Globe' of the 12th February, some remarks by one of the delegates who waited upon the hon. minister which would seem to indicate that the question of express rates was discussed:

Mr. Bunting, president of the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association, said that in September last 2,500 baskets of peaches were shipped by express from the Niagara district to points east of Toronto, principally Montreal. The transportation companies received thirteen and a-half cents per basket, whereas the grower received only eight and three-quarter cents.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I remember that statement was made, but I did not understand that it referred to express companies. I understood that it referred to express charges by the railway company.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I know what the rate is from the Niagara district to Montreal. The express rate is 13½ cents per basket, so that Mr. Bunting, in referring to it, evidently referred to the express company's charge, because that was the express company's charge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not take it in that way.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Yes, that was the express company's charge. They charge 80 cents per 100 pounds. I should hope, therefore, that the hon. minister will find a way to bring the operations of the express companies under this Bill. The express companies do a large portion of the business in fruit. From the Niagara district I should say that not less than $200,000 annually are taken out in express charges on the fruit carried from that district. Whether this is more than ought to be taken out of this district it is difficult for us to say. We know that in many cases by a reduction of rates the fruit growers would capture markets that are now controlled by fruit from the United States. We think the companies can afford to carry fruit at a lower rate, but being unable to know ourselves, we cannot press our claim on the express companies with as much force as we could if we had definite information on the subject. The great Northwest is supplied with fruit from California and from Ontario. It absorbs an enormous quantity of fruit, and the demand is constantly increasing. Our fruit is of such a perishable nature that we require the best accommodation possible. We do not receive that at the present time. Our express service is very inferior indeed. The fruit has to go by way of Ottawa and Carleton Junction instead of going by North Bay, and the train service is inferior. The fruit is not carried on the best trains and an enormous trade is lost to Canada and is placed in the hands of the fruit growers of California simply because the express service is not as good as it ought to be. I hope the hon. minister will find his way clear to bringing the express companies under the operation of the commission, so that it will be able to control the rates and see that the railway companies do not charge the express companies more than they ought to charge them for carrying fruit cars.

Mr. MACLEAN. I see the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) in his place now. I think he was otherwise engaged, and did not hear the argument of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith). The statement has been made repeatedly that the fruit growers cannot get into the markets unless they have the best possible express service. They cannot hold the market of the North-west Territories unless there is some regulation of the charges made by these express companies, and I cannot see now, after all that has been said in this House, why these companies should not be brought under the jurisdiction and control of this commission. What is the reason of this protection that seems to be given to telephone and express companies in Canada? Their charges are exorbitant. They are rivals of the government. The government is carrying on a large business in what is known as the parcel post system. They have a much better parcel post system in Europe than we have in Canada. We in Canada want to have the same kind of a parcel post system that they have in Europe, and we have asked for it, but for some reason we cannot get it. I know the reason. It is because of the influence which the express companies are able to exercise. They are able to wield

a potent influence that enables them to escape public jurisdiction and control of rates. It is time that these companies were regulated. The government has gone to the country and said they would propose legislation that would regulate all railway charges, and they bring down a Bill that completely ignores the most important feature of these charges. Why is this peculiar protection afforded to telephone companies and express companies ? Why should express companies not be brought under the jurisdiction of this Bill ? Why should the hon. Minister of Agriculture not go to his colleague the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and say : In the interest of the farming community, in the interest of the dairying community, in the interest of the fruit-growers I recommend you to include provisions in the Bill dealing with railway companies for the complete control of express charges.

Mr. KEMP. In the report of the interview of the delegation that waited on the government on the 11th February, in regard to the charges on fruit to which the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) referred, I find that this statement was made :

A very large proportion of the fruit grown in the Niagara district, is necessarily shipped by express. Taking express and freight rates together, and averaging the season through, one-third of the price realized on the Niagara fruit sold in Montreal is absorbed in the carrying charges imposed for hauling from Niagara to Montreal.

In view of the fact that such a large proportion of this fruit is taken by express the hon. minister will see that it is a very important matter. I wish, however, while I am on my feet, to refer to the question of the appointment of the commission. I am not prepared to make any statement as to the legal aspect of this question. I do not know what the moral or legal obligation of the people of Canada is in respect to what dividends the railway shall earn, but I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway are entitled to earn a dividend of 10 per cent on certain portions of their mainline before their rates can be regulated. It is news to me that any moral or legal obligation rested on the people so far as the other railroads are concerned. I am one of those who would not seek to interfere with vested rights or to enter upon a campaign to confiscate the rights of any corporation or private individual. At the same time most people admit that so far as the tolls and freight charges on railways are concerned, the railways have been free up to the present time to impose just about what conditions they like upon shippers. Whether the Railway Committee of the Privy Council could or could not interfere for the protection of the public, the fact remains that up to the present that body has not done so. I have not myself been an enthusiastic supporter of the idea of a railway commission, because I have feared that perhaps the constitution of that commission might be such that it would not accomplish the ends we seek. The fact remains that there is today no control over railways, that the public have suffered and are suffering, and that some way or other the railways have been able in the past to get the ear of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or the officials. Let me give an illustration which I think will convince every hon. member of this House. I put a question on the Order paper as to whether a certain classification of freight which had been framed by the railways had been authorized by the Governor General in Council. The Railway Act clearly states that it is the duty of the Governor General in Council to authorize this freight classification before it is put into effect, and so far as I know all such other classifications have been authorized in the past. The Minister of Railways replied to my question that the last freight classification authorized was in November, 1899, to take effect in January, 1900, and that none had been authorized since. I hold in my hand a freight classification issued by the railways which has never been submitted for the approval of the Governor General in Council. It contains all kinds of regulations which are no doubt all right from a railway standpoint, but what is to become of the public if every private individual or every public corporation in Canada can make rules and regulations to suit himself or themselves. Here is apparently a flagrant violation of the Railway Act. This unauthorized classification came into effect the first of May, 1903, and every pound of freight from the Atlantic to the Pacific is now being shipped under it. Surely this this would prove that if the railway commission is properly constituted and if this Bill is of any use, it will be a benefit to the public. I do not oppose this Bill. I quite believe that the minister realizes as a great many people realize, that the time has come when something should be done. It is not the intention of any one in this House I am sure to take away from the railways any vested rights or just privileges which they enjoy, but I repeat that the public should have some means of being heard before a tribunal whether it be a railway commission or a re-organized Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I would like the minister to explain how it comes that this freight classification can be issued by the railways in absolute violation of the law ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have never expressed any very enthusiastic opinion as to the outcome of such legislation as we are now considering. I have always felt that the public were hoping for and anticipating greater results than the operation of such a law would justify. I therefore am quite in sympathy with

those who have expressed their doubts in that direction. But there is no doubt whatever in my mind that the Railway Commission of the Privy Council, composed as it is of members of the cabinet who have multitudinous duties to perform, is not a tribunal to do effective work, and I do not know of anything that can take its place except a railway commission. That seems to have been the judgment of all English speaking communities who have had the same experience as we have had. The opinion seems to be settled that the appointment of a railway commission is the best remedy to adopt. There may possibly have been instances where, when a railway commission was once constituted having control of railways and rates, the law under which it was constituted has been repealed, but I know of no such instance. I do think that these commissions afford a great deal of protection to the public, and the public soon realize that they reap some results, perhaps quite beneficial results, from their constitution, although they may not have come up to their expectations in practice.

My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) has called attention to the fact that the railways have sent out a joint freight classification to take effect on the first of May, without having obtained the approval of the Governor General in Council. I do not know how it would be possible for the Department of Railways to prevent them doing that. I do not know what measure of criticism or blame should be attached to the Department of Railways because of that, but I do say that it was a high-handed proceeding on the part of the railways all the same.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there no penalty against the railways ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have provided one in this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. None in the present law?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. It was an indefensible act on the part of the railways, without a word of communication being sent to myself or to my deputy ,or to any of the officers of the department. I confess that until the subject was mentioned the other day, I had not heard that this freight classification had been issued. I don't think that the department is at fault. It would be at fault if, knowing that this classification had issued, it failed to take any action the law empowered it to take in order to have that classification recalled or rescinded. I am now having the matter reported to me as to what remedy we have in our hands. The railway commission, I think, will be in a very different position. It will be their exclusive duty to see that the law is not violated and to see that those who violate it are brought to book. Acts of that kind they will be amply competent to deal with ; and they will, I think, assure the public against offence in the future. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) almost suggests to my mind the case of an individual who has been crying out for a long time for a railway commission ; then he gets it, and, after he gets it, he enters upon a close scrutiny of the Bill to see if there is some little point that might be put into it which is not there; and, after having made patient search, he finds at last that, broad and comprehensive as this Bill is, there is one thing that it does not comprehend—it does not give the commission power over all express companies ; and the moment my hon. friend discovers that, he begins to preach that this Bill is no good. That is the one thing he is particularly anxious to have in it ; there is nothing else that measures in value to that feature ; and because that is not in the Bill, he is going to give it no particular show. The hon. gentleman is running away with the idea that express companies will be allowed to run riot under cover of the railways, in handling express business. That is not permissible under the Bill. If the hon. member had listened to what I said a while ago, he would have heard from me that this Bill assumes control of the railways, and the railways could not put freight in the hands of express companies, and allow them under the cover of the railway to make all sorts of extravagant demands. In regard to the tolls that are to be paid to a railway company by an express company out of its earnings, they will be subject to the control of the commission.

Mr. MONK. We do not control the rates of express companies ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No ; and you cannot do it with this Bill without encumbering the Bill needlessly, without introducing into it, almost from the first to the last, exceptions and amendments to such an extent that I tell this committee frankly I am not prepared to undertake it at this time. I am not able to do so. It requires more thought and time and care than I can give to it. When I tell the hon. gentleman that, he has only another year to wait. We have lived through the past without much control, according to the hon. gentleman ; we have lived down to the year of grace 1903 ; and one might suppose that we could continue to live in the same way for another year. Any one who feels keenly on this matter might introduce a Bill himself, and I am sure it would receive the consideration of parliament. Such a measure should not control simply those express companies which are operated on railways, and let every other express company run free of control. That would be unjust. It will not do to deal partially with the question ; it will have to be dealt with carefully ; and I am not prepared to take that question up at

this session of parliament. If my hon. friend will apply that bright, penetrating, astute intellect of his to the serious questions which we may deal with in this Bill, I am sure that his assistance will be most valuable, and I shall be glad to have it, because I know that he has a great deal of interest in these general questions which are of public importance. But let me give my hon. friend one little word of advice. Do not assume, because these questions are not being dealt with, that there must be some motive or influence or power operating upon one's mind to prevent him dealing with them. My hon. friend is not one whit clearer from influences of that character than the people whom he criticises, and it would be much better and fairer on his part to deal with questions on their merits.

Mr. MACLEAN. On almost every occasion when I bring up questions in this House, the hon. gentleman undertakes to lecture me. I have a right to express my views here without being lectured by him, and I have a right to criticise his conduct whenever it seems well for me to do so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And I have a right to lecture you.

Mr. MACLEAN. When I look at the hon. gentleman's administration of the Railway Department of this country, what do I find? I find that this illegal classification has existed for years without his protesting against it. What is he there for ? What do we pay him for ? Why does he not bring these companies to time ? As a matter of fact, not one dollar of tolls can be collected by these companies without being approved by the Governor in Council. Yet there sit fifteen men who confess here to-day that this thing has taken place, and nothing has been done for the protection of the public. The hon. gentleman has lectured me in regard to this question of express companies. He says an opportunity shall be given to me to amend. I propose an amendment now. Mr. Chairman, I beg to move to amend the clause by inserting the words 'express companies' after the words 'to all' in the first line. The hon. gentleman says that the opportunity will be open to me to do something next session. I am sent here to do something this session. It is all very fine for the hon. gentleman to talk about imputing motives. Probably he is inviting this kind of thing today so that the Bill will not pass. He has promised it for this year, and when we propose to make it a good and complete Bill, he gets up and assumes a fatherly air and lectures everybody who ventures to criticise it. That lecture may be worth little or much. It has very little influence on me. In the interest of the public, of the commercial community, of the farmers, of the fruit growers, I propose that this Bill shall take jurisdiction forthwith, from the time of its passage, over express companies as well as railway companies. Express companies are another name for railway companies, to enable them to evade the control of the law. Why not bring them under the law now ? It only means that another schedule of rates shall come under the jurisdiction of the commission. I wish to see this commission created. I wish to see the measure pass this session. I will give every assistance I can to have it become law this session, and I hope that the minister will listen to suggestions made by gentlemen on this side of the House for the purpose of making the Bill as good and complete as we can, without delivering lectures to them.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see why the hon. minister should complain of too minute an analysis by an hon. member as he has done in the case of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean). It is our duty to scrutinize most carefully every section of the Bill in order to make it as perfect as possible. But what I rose more particularly to refer to is the fact that a good many railways will be outside the jurisdiction of this commission. We first exclude the government railways. I do not see why we should. If a railway commission is a good thing, it ought to be equally as good for the farmer in the maritime provinces as for the farmer in Ontario. It is quite conceivable that the government, in its management of the Intercolonial Railway, may discriminate unjustly against one shipper in favour of another. It would do no injustice to government or to the people to make this Bill apply to government railways. Then we exclude a large portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and also railways with provincial charters. Leaving these out, the Bill will apply to only a few railways at the best, and shippers will be confronted with the same difficulty as they were met with a few years ago before certain railways were declared for the general advantage of Canada when they had one-half of a railway a provincial road and the other half a Dominion road. Suppose a shipper in Ontario sends something to the seaboard. He first sends his freight over a provincial railway and then there is a dispute. He complains of being charged higher rates than somebody else. The company reply that the rate was a through rate and governed partly by local and partly by federal authorities. Under what law will the citizen prosecute to get his rights ? Will the commission deal with that question ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Section 5 specially provides that this Bill shall apply.

Mr. SPROULE. It applies to companies which are within the legislative authority of Canada, but these provincial railways are not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With respect to their traffic they are.

Mr. SPROULE. But not local traffic. What I was going to point out is that if this commission is to be as useful as we hope it will, it can only be made so by working in conjunction with provincial commissioners on the plan of the interstate law in the United States. We have an equal right to include electric railways just as well as steam. The interpretation clause says :

The expression 'railway' means any railway which the company has power to construct or operate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend will turn to page 29, section 118, subsection F, he will find that the Act applies to electric railways.

Mr. SPROULE. I looked to the interpretation clause, assuming that the electric railways would be found there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Can the hon. gentleman name any railways in the province of Ontario which are not subject to the control of this parliament ?

Mr. SPROULE. There is the Brockville and Westport.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That has a Dominion charter.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the railway being built by the provincial government towards Temiscaming come under this ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The number of railways which will not come under this commission is so small and their mileage so limited, that they are not worth considering. The Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway are the two great systems doing business in the older provinces and they apparently are going to do the business in the west.

Mr. SPROULE. Take Manitoba and Ontario, and the hon. gentleman will find there are quite a few.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The number is rapidly diminishing.

Mr. SPROULE. But it seems to me if we want to make the best use of the Bill, we should have provincial commissions as well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will find that all these railways will come under this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. May be in the future, but not now. Will the hon. minister tell me why the government railway should not be under this commission ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why should it be ? Is there any institution in the country more amenable to public opinion and to the demands which the public make, or one more likely to be run in the general interest than is the government railway ? You institute a commission practically free from control, but the management of a government railway would be infinitely more responsive to the demands of public opinion. That management can be got at, it can be got at here on the floor of parliament. That is why the Intercolonial Railway was expressly exempted from the Railway Act when it was first passed and why it has been exempted on the different occasions when the railway law has been revised or codified. There is no reason why the people should seek to control this road indirectly through a commission when they control it directly already.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say I have heard a great many complaints of the management of the Intercolonial Railway and the discriminations it charges on freight carried over it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will hear a great many complaints. We have had many complaints, for instance, because we could not furnish cars during the great pressure of business. But that is not the fault of the road, and it is not a difficulty which the commission could solve. In response to the complaints which have been made parliament has been asked to furnish money to provide more cars, so as to make up the deficiency as rapidly as possible. The Intercolonial in this respect, is much more responsive to public opinion than an ordinary railway would be.

Mr. SPROULE. The complaints I speak of have gone much further than that, I have heard it claimed that the Intercolonial Railway would carry one man's goods, even, for instance, one man's furniture, for little or nothing, while it would charge another man the full rate. I have heard that freely stated.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can only say to the hon. gentleman : Do not believe these stories that are circulated; they are pure gossip—nothing in them. There is no railway in the country that is not more likely to be influenced in the direction of discrimination than a government railway. A government railway cannot discriminate, for the management knows that what it does for one man it must do for another. No management could exist that would countenance or tolerate discrimination in any way; it would be heaping up untold trouble for itself. There was never such a thing known. It may be that, by the action of the Governor in Council, in the case of a great fire, or as a means of helping the sufferers from some other calamity, certain freight might be carried cheaply or for nothing. But as for

carrying one man's furniture for nothing while making others pay, under ordinary circumstances, nothing of the kind could occur; it is perfectly out of the bounds of possibility.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to rest in the conclusion that the hon. minister is as perfect in his dealings with the public as he seems to think he is and that nothing of the kind I have referred to could occur. But I have heard it very frequently stated that these discriminations have been granted. I am not prepared to say whether that is correct or not. However, I think that if the railway commission is to be of use, it might as well apply to the government railways as to others. I see no reason why it should not apply to government railways. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) says that we are only now establishing a railway commission, that the system will be perfected by amendments from time to time, and that, some time, we may include express companies under the jurisdiction of this commission. But we are told that the United States have included express companies under their railway commission, and to this, the hon. member for Selkirk replies that the United States have had a railway commission in operation for years. Well, surely we can learn by their experience. If they have brought express companies under the operation of the railway commission and are working out a successful system, it seems to me that we should take advantage of their experience rather than wait eight or ten years before we make this a part of our system. I do not see how we could hope for the best results in the operation of this law when, on the same train you have certain cars with goods the rates of freight on which are regulated by the commission and also other cars with goods for which the carrier can charge exorbitant rates or make rates which discriminate in favour of the person as against another. I do not see any reason why all the goods carried on a train should not be under the protection, so far as rates are concerned, of this commission. The hon. minister speaks of it being so difficult to bring the express companies within the operation of the Bill. I listened carefully to his explanation, but I did not hear any explanation of what this difficulty was. The hon. minister says it would be troublesome, but in what respect it would be troublesome he did not inform us.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think there ever has been a Bill introduced in this House which was received with more general commendation than the one now under consideration. There is hardly a board of trade or an association interested in trade matters that has not approved of this Bill. The idea of a railway commission has been for twenty-five years, to a greater or less extent, before parliament. Ever since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, there has been talk of introducing a railway commission Bill, but the idea has never come to maturity until now. The late government talked about a railway commission but they never actually introduced a Bill to establish it. The board of trade of Toronto sent a deputation to Ottawa which commended the Minister of Railways and Canals for the perfection of his Bill. It is true they suggested some amendment which they thought would improve the measure, but, if there was danger of the Bill not going through this session, they desired rather than that, to have no change made. It is probably right that a Bill of such importance as this should be criticised, but I rather think some of the criticism has gone a little too far. For my own part, I would like to see express companies brought under the operation of the Bill, and I have no doubt that, in time, this will be done. But as the Minister of Railways and Canals has pointed out, the Bill as it is covers them to a very large extent. And, if there is any danger that, in attempting to bring express companies under the operation of the Bill, the Bill itself would be made unworkable, we ought not to cumber the measure with such clauses. The hon. minister has intimated his wish that express companies should be placed under the control of this commission. But has pointed out that it would be better to do that by a separate Bill, which he purposes to introduce possibly this session, or, at all events next session. The hon. minister has given a great deal of care and attention to this Bill, and it is a Bill which ought to become law. It is supported, as I have said, by every public institution in the country. It is a Bill that has been petitioned for very widely and, as it stands it has been everywhere commended. Instead of our throwing obstructions in the way of the passage of the Bill we ought to help it along. Therefore, after the minister has given us the assurances we have heard, I think the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) should not pursue any further this hypercritical course in throwing out the little technical objections that he has been doing. One of the objections taken by the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is that this Bill does not provide for provincial railways. How can he make it apply to provincial railways ? How can he make it apply to the railway being built by the Ontario government ? Every possible railway that it can be applied to will come under its jurisdiction. Therefore, instead of that being a reason against the Bill, I think it is a reason in its favour.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not give that as a reason why it should not be passed. I am not opposing the Bill, I am in favour of it ; but I am endeavouring to point out its defects.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He pointed out that it would only apply, as he said, to a few railways at best—those were his words. Now, in point of fact there are only a few railways at best that it does not apply to. It does apply to 95 per cent of the railways in Canada; as to the other 5 per cent I understand the government have not power over them. I therefore think that the Bill should receive the support of the House. I believe it is a very good Bill, and the Minister of Railways deserves great compliments for bringing this measure before the House.

Mr. BARKER. On more than one occasion I have endeavoured to find out, and I have not yet found out, on what grounds the Minister of Railways and Canals proposes to keep the government railways out of the jurisdiction of this commission. I can quite understand that the minister would prefer to run the government railways himself. He no doubt has more confidence in the present Minister of Railways and Canals than he would have in any commission, whether appointed by his own government or not. But we want to know why it is that the government railways should not be put under the jurisdiction of this commission just as the Grand Trunk Railway or any other railway will come under it. The hon. gentleman knows that if there is one thing that is particularly desirable in connection with this Bill, it is that wherever possible there shall be uniformity of regulation, uniformity of tariff, of rates and of every detail in the management of railways. It is of the utmost importance that there should be no line of demarcation between the several railways of the country, that the commission should not be restricted in their power to control the rates over all the railways in the country. When the public want to know what the rates are to be from Woodstock or Windsor to Halifax or St. John, the commission should be able to tell them and not be obliged to turn around and say: For a thousand miles of this railway we have nothing to say, that is under the control of the hon. gentleman who happens for the moment to be Minister of Railways and Canals, and of his officers. Now we have, of course, the highest respect for the present Minister of Railways and Canals. He has managed this railway so well for several years past that perhaps he considers he can do it a great deal better than any newly appointed commission. But the hon. gentleman may be a commissioner himself; it has been so stated in the press, it is certainly a possibility; and therefore we may have him as one of these gentlemen who are going to compose this commission, and we may have a new minister without any experience whatever. Surely the public would be better satisfied to have this commission, appointed for a series of years, and composed of experienced men with all the railway interests of the country under their charge, rather than have some portion of the railway system under a minister for the time being who may not have had the slightest experience, and who may not possess our confidence in the same degree as the hon. minister who now occupies that position.

So far I have heard nothing from the minister on the subject except that he intends to omit government railways. Now surely, if the railways of this country are to be under a commission, and if it will be a benefit to the trading community that they shall be under this commission, we ought to know why it is that any portion of the railway mileage must be exempt. I would like to have that question answered. The hon. gentleman gave an answer a moment ago which he probably considered satisfactory. He said that in all the railway Acts that have been passed the government railways have been exempted. But what application has that to the present condition of things? The hon. gentleman knows that in the past the general Railway Acts have not applied to government railways, in all their details, at all events, for the simple reason that all the other railways were worked by officers appointed by independent companies. Therefore there were restrictions upon the management and their officers that do not necessarily apply to government railways. But that is being all changed. We are no longer going to have the matters to be dealt with by this commission left in the hands of the various railway companies and their officers, they are going to be controlled by this commission, and why should not a railway operated by the government and its officers be controlled in like manner? You are not proposing to interfere arbitrarily with the various railways, but you are proposing to interfere just so far as the public interest requires and to that extent the commission should have jurisdiction whether a railway is owned by a company or by government.

I may mention also that there are various things that will come under that commission as to which I am sure the public would feel safer in the hands of a commission than even in the hands of the hon. minister. I may recall to the minister that a short time ago there was a very serious accident upon the Intercolonial Railway, and there was an inquiry made into the accident. The minister, in referring to that in this House, spoke in the highest terms of commendation of the engine driver who was concerned in that accident, he gave a very high character to that man. Yet I understand that since then the investigation has shown that that man was not worthy of the commendation the minister gave him; it was shown, as I understand, that he was a drinking man, and he had been drinking before he went upon the train, and was not in a fit condition to run the train. Now, all that took place under the management of the government. I ask why a railway that is sub-

ject to such accidents should be exempted from the commission which is to have jurisdiction as to all other railways. There are many other things that should come under the control of this commission besides the operation of the road and the control of tariffs and rates. The hon. gentleman does not provide for counsel appearing on behalf of either party when the commission are investigating matters upon the Intercolonial. The hon. gentleman is to be a law unto himself in that respect. He assumes that the trading community are going to be content with all the minister and his officers may do. But I can assure him that the trading community will not be content, they will be just as anxious to know every detail of the rates on the Intercolonial Railway as they will be to know the rates of any other railway in this country. I think we are entitled to know, not what the hon. gentleman wishes, but why it is that these government railways should not be under the control and jurisdiction of the commission.

Mr. KEMP. Has it ever been suggested to him, may I ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, to put the matter of tolls, leaving out everything else in connection with the management of the Intercolonial Railway, under the jurisdiction of the commission ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. KEMP. That has not received the attention of the hon. minister ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has not been suggested.

Mr. KEMP. I may draw the attention of the hon. minister again to this matter of classification to which I have referred. Although it has not been authorized by the Governor in Council and although it is not supposed to be a legal classification, yet, I notice that the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway have consented to it with all the other railways, and that the name of one of the officers of the Intercolonial Railway is given as being one of the classification committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can understand how that occurred. A joint committee composed of representatives from all the different railway companies meet periodically. I would not say that they meet at stated periods, but frequently meetings are held to consider traffic questions arising between them. I presume in this case they had a meeting in the usual way, and that they had agreed amongst themselves as to what they would recommend. It would devolve upon the companies that were moving to have the matter presented to the department for submission to and approval of by the Governor in Council. I do not blame the traffic officers for the issue of that, because that would not properly be part of their duty. They only meet and agree upon what they think should be recommended. But, the department would not be committed in any way by any action of a traffic officer.

Mr. KEMP. I quite understand the position, but in effect, under the Railway Commission, the government railways in respect of tolls will be subjected to the commission inasmuch as their officers who meet with the officers of other railways agree to this in joint committee, so that, the tolls on the Intercolonial Railway would be in effect under the jurisdiction of the commission, would they not ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, that is only in reference to classification.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has only reference to classification. The rates are another thing.

Mr. KEMP. The same officers agree to the rates as agree to the classification.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The rates which govern on the Intercolonial Railway are not the same rates which govern on other railways.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The government have a member on the classification committee and from time to time there is an alteration in the classification. The classification is sent up to the department for approval. No doubt this has been sent to the department month after month and has been neglected by the department and therefore has not got the necessary assent by Order in Council to confirm it. Perhaps that has occurred under other regimes as well as the present one, and after all if the classification is in accordance with the freight rates which have been approved of by the Governor in Council, if it does not increase the rate upon any particular article, I do not think it requires the assent of the Governor in Council to it. If the classification has the effect of lessening the rate charged or leaving it at the same figure as before, I do not think it necessarily implies the assent of the Governor in Council to the new classification. The first think I did when I was minister was to inquire from the officers of the department if the new classification had the effect of increasing the rates or tolls which had been charged before, and if it did not have that effect, I do not think the officers went to the trouble of having an Order in Council passed to confirm the classification. I think the statute says that all rates and tolls have to be approved by the Governor in Council and that any new classification must be in accordance with the last classification approved of by the Governor in Council.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The last classification was the eleventh that was promulgated by the railway company, and approved by the Governor

in Council. I think it is necessary under the Act that each classification as it comes out, if it varies from the previous one, as of course it must, otherwise they would not issue a new one, must be approved. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) suggests that probably the companies might have sent this classification into the department and that it has been overlooked. I am informed that it has not been submitted to the department at all, and even if it had been submitted and overlooked that would not warrant them in issuing a new classification and taking action upon it. The law reads:

> The company in fixing or regulating the tolls to be demanded and taken for the transportation of goods, shall, except in respect to through traffic to or from the United States, adopt and conform to any uniform classification of freight which the Governor in Council on the report of the minister from time to time, prescribes.

Mr. KEMP. What clause is that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. 226. Some hon. gentlemen are complaining because they say I have not given them any sufficient explanation of why I pointed out that the inclusion of express companies by express terms could not be made in this Bill. I will try to repeat myself and make it clear if hon. gentlemen really desire information on the subject. I have said that the present Bill, I think, covers the subject quite fully now. It does not deal with all express companies. It only, by imputation, deals with the express companies which do their business upon railways. So far as the receipts of express companies are made up of railway charges and charges in respect to carriage upon railways, these charges are entirely within the control of the railway commission under this Bill. I am not prepared to say that the commission could not compel the carriage of these goods by the express company or by the railway company through the agency of the express companies who are using the trains to carry these goods at such a price as the railway commission might determine. The present Bill goes as far as we can properly go with respect to railways. The express company end of the thing is another matter. Possibly an express company might be justified in making some additional charge for removing goods from a warehouse or dwelling to a railway, or from the railway to their destination. Perhaps an express company might properly make some charge in respect to the oversight of goods in transit, but so far as the railway carriage is concerned, that is subject absolutely to the control of the railway commission under this Bill. I have seen the language of some of these clauses in the United States legislation, and I can understand how they deal with express companies. One cogent reason would be, that some of these Bills are Bills for the purpose of regulating tolls and charges which are imposed by common carriers. The definition of 'common carriers' is determined by a long series of judicial decisions, and under our law common carriers have not the same liabilities and are not the same people as common carriers in the United States. The relative rights and duties of common carriers are largely dependent upon the common law in this country and in the United States, and in the United Kingdom, modified to some extent by statute. We could not say that express companies in their express business shall be subject to the control of this Bill without setting up a machinery to provide for it. Express companies send by steamers as well as by railways and perhaps by horses and wagons, and if you are going to control their business it would be necessary to provide machinery for so doing. There is no common sense in putting in a clause saying that express companies shall be controlled in their rates by this railway commission when you have not any machinery prescribed, at all events for dealing with that portion of their business which is not carried by the railroad. If we limit or restrict the business of express companies which do their business by railroad, don't you think they would have reason to complain that we left a free hand to express companies who transacted business through other agencies.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If freight is carried partly by railroad and partly by water, don't you give the commission the power to apportion the rates to each.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but that does not touch the fringe of the question. As an illustration, the steamers between Montreal and Quebec do an express business, and so do the railways between these two points. You would have control over the one and not over the other, and if the express companies who did their business by railroad were to complain that they were restricted by legislation and that the water carriers were free, there would appear to be some reasonableness in that complaint. It appears to me that you can only properly deal with the control of express companies by independent legislation. If you insert it in this Bill, you will have to string all the way through the Bill provisions which will exempt certain clauses from application to them, and that would simply complicate the Bill and make it difficult of operation. I give my honest conviction to gentlemen opposite, whether they accept it or not, that this is a matter that can only be satisfactorily and properly dealt with by separate legislation. This Bill has reference to railways and all questions connected with railways that effect the public interest. It is not simply to control rates on railways, but its provisions govern the incorporation of companies, the construction of railways, the protection which is afforded to the pub-

lic by railways, the operation of railways in all their various departments; and it would be a mistake to thrust a clause into it to say that the Bill shall apply to express companies without looking ahead to see what other alterations will have to be made and what additional machinery may be required. I have no objection at all on principle to the control of express companies. I think it would be a proper thing to have power to control express companies, but let us do it in the right way. If we do it, let us do it efficiently.

Mr. MACLEAN. Would the minister allow me to make this suggestion which would meet his objection:

This Act shall apply to all persons, companies and railways including the express business of such railways.

Mr. BARKER. That would not do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course I have had no opportunity of considering the bearing of that amendment, but this thought occurs to me; Why should you throw the express business out of the railways and into other hands, which would be the result of that amendment.

Mr. KEMP. I think that this matter of express companies could be dealt with in four lines without affecting the general scope of the Bill. The hon. minister seems to think it would be necessary to extensively change its wording. I am advised by a very eminent lawyer that the addition of the following few words would accomplish what we want in regard to express companies:

Section 2, subsection C. The expression 'company' means a railway company and express company and includes any person having authority to construct or operate a railway or express company.

Section 3, subsection 4. Sections 1 to 50 inclusive, and 251 to 280 inclusive, only shall apply to express companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know whether the eminent lawyer my hon. friend refers to has been asked to express an opinion whether or not the present Bill does not practically control all rates that are levied for railroad carriage of every kind and description. Has that question been asked by the hon. gentleman?

Mr. KEMP. I may state that it was Mr. Staunton, who waited on the hon. minister with some other gentlemen, who framed that proposed amendment. He informed me that it would cover the whole case. The hon. minister must believe that Mr. Staunton is very sincere in his desire to see this Bill become law, and he would not make that statement unless he was sure of his ground.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sure that Mr. Staunton would not express that opinion unless he was assured in his own mind that he was right, and I am sure also that he is in sympathy with the Bill and desires it to become law. All the same, I am not prepared at this moment to express the opinion that express companies would not be as adequately covered by the Bill without that provision as with it, unless there were other provisions. There is no doubt whatever that other provisions would have to be incorporated to make this Bill, as a Bill, operative upon express companies, stronger than it is now; and, moreover, after you had done that, you would only have reached a portion of the express business and a portion of the express companies. It is a matter which I think this parliament ought seriously to consider, whether, when we are dealing with express companies, we ought not to deal with them as a whole. I cannot see what justification we can possibly have for dealing with them by instalments, or for dealing with a portion of their business, and not with the balance of it.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman propose to deal with them as common carriers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We cannot, because we are not legislating on the subject of common carriers here.

Mr. SPROULE. I mean in any proposed Bill to deal with them as a whole.

Mr. MACLEAN. If the minister says this is a question worth consideration, I am willing to leave it for the present, especially if it is to be taken up in connection with the amendments suggested by Mr. Staunton, to provide for jurisdiction over the charges of express companies, which are, as a matter of fact, a subject of common complaint throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am willing to let this section stand, if hon. gentlemen want to think more about it. But I would like those who wish to come to a direct conclusion on the subject to seek an opinion from those who may be expected to know, whether or not this Bill, as it is now framed, does not comprehensively cover the case of express companies, as respects the carriage of express merchandise on railways.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, yes, it does that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then you cannot make the Bill go any further by providing in specific terms that it shall apply to express companies, because you would have to include other provisions in order that the commission could deal with express companies in their business on other routes and conveyances than railways.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister's Bill may provide for the carriage of articles by express on railways, but that does not reach the question at all. Suppose an article is put in an express company's office twelve miles from a railway. It has to be carried to the railway station, and there should be an allowance for that and for warehousing as well as for the carriage on the railway. That principle is admitted in the Bill, because it gives to the commission power to apportion railway freights as distinct from lake and ocean freights. Otherwise the thing would be useless in the case of an article shipped partly by lake or ocean and partly by rail. In the same way you would have to give to the commissioners power to apportion so much for the carriage to the station and for the warehousing as well as for carriage by rail.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You would need to have provisions inserted for determining that, and you would then be dealing only with a certain portion of the business of express companies.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Do I understand the minister to argue that under the Bill as it is now the commission would have authority and power to regulate the express rates so far as the goods were carried on a railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, certainly.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). If that is the case, it covers 99 per cent of the goods shipped by express, because only a very small fraction of the goods so shipped are not shipped entirely on railways ; and the argument that express companies ought to be exempt from the operations of the Act because you could not cover their entire operations, is in exact contradiction to the argument that this Act is a good Act with regard to railways although it does not cover government railways, and some other lines of railway. If the Bill is a good one with respect to the operations of railways, although it does not cover them all, it seems to me it would be an excellent Act if it covered the operations of express companies on railways alone, because 99 per cent of the goods are carried on railways, not on water or by wagon.

Mr. KEMP. The suggestion of the hon. Minister of Railways is a fair one. He proposes to let clause 3 stand in order to see whether the proposition I have made can be adopted. It was not clear to Mr. Staunton that the wording of the Act covered express freights on railways.

Mr. LANCASTER. What part of the Act is it which the hon. minister thinks covers the express business ? I do not find anything in the interpretation clause to lead to that conclusion. The word 'company' is interpreted to a railway company and to include any person having authority to construct or operate a railway. By no stretch of the imagination can we say that that includes express companies. Nor can it come under the interpretation of the word 'railway.' It would be well if the hon. minister would point out what particular part of the Act he relies on for his opinion that express companies are included.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that I need particularize any one or more sections of the Bill. Take the sections between 251 and 280. This Bill gives to a railway commission power to say what shall be the tolls exacted by railways on every article of traffic. That is pretty comprehensive to start with. The commission need not wait for the railway company to say how much it wants to charge but may arbitrarily fix what the toll shall be. We do not discriminate between goods carried by an express company and those which are not. Every article carried on a railway must get, in respect of the tolls levied, the approval of the commission.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. minister has given in his Bill a special definition to the word 'railway' and the definition will exclude express companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all. An argument of that kind would result in this. All that a railway company would have to do in order to shirk its responsibility and escape the control of the commission would be, instead of carrying its goods itself, to carry them in the name of an outside corporation—call it an express company or agency company or anything you like.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is why we want express companies included.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the particular advantage of indicating any one company by name any more than any other ? When you say that this Act shall apply to all persons, companies and railways, other than government railways, what more do you want ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman ought to readjust his interpretation clause. He is giving a limited definition to those words 'persons, companies and railways.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will find no limitation.

Mr. BARKER. The word 'railway,' in the interpretation clause, means any railway which the company has authority to construct or operate, and that word 'company' means a company operating a railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the third clause, this Act ap-

plies to all persons, companies and railways other than government railways. Of course that means all companies operating railways, and when it means that, it means as well all companies doing business on railways and getting benefit out of the carriage of goods on railways.

Mr. BARKER. It would not mean a company carrying on a book-selling business on a railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, there are no freight rates in that business.

Mr. BARKER. By your definition of the word 'companies,' it includes any person having authority to construct or operate a railway. Express companies do not operate railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That does not affect the case. The Bill applies to all persons, companies and railways. If you can suggest anybody who is not comprised in one or the other of these, there might be some reason for changing the Bill.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Will it cover telephone companies ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have not anything necessarily to do with railways.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). This Act applies to all persons.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that have to do with railways, that are operating, owning or carrying goods on railways.

Mr. LANCASTER. It does not say anything about carrying companies. It says 'any person having authority to construct or to operate a railway.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the definition of the word 'company.' The Bill, in its provisions, does apply to all persons, companies and railways.

Mr. BARKER. Section 278 rather implies that express companies have a different meaning. It says : 'Every company'—that would mean a railway company—'which grants any facilities for the carriage of goods by express to any incorporated express company or person, shall grant equal facilities on equal terms and conditions, to any other incorporated express company which demands the same.' That rather implies that the general scope of the Act does not cover express companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not necessarily. This provision is included in order that there may be no advantage given to any express company over another. If you will take the clauses with regard to traffic and tolls and all that, you will gather this clearly from them, that no traffic can be carried on railways nor can any tolls or charges be imposed in respect of the carriage of such traffic, until the Railway Commission has said what these tolls shall be. Now, if the railway company itself cannot do that, it cannot by any contract that it may make or any authority it may delegate to anybody else, authorize some other person to do it. Any person or company who may, by the authority and permission of the railway company, have any special privileges in respect of the carriage of traffic over that railway can only exercise that special privilege subject to the control of the railway company. Otherwise all that would be necessary would be for the railway to hand its freight business over to another company and it would thereby avoid all control. That, I think, should be thoroughly understood, and it is so clear that it ought to be accepted. If the law does not mean that it is not worth the paper it is printed on even to control business carried on railways outside of that managed by the express companies.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. minister means what he says, why not amend clause c, of the interpretation clause, so as to cover distinctly what he says ?

Mr. GERMAN. I do not think that any amendment is needed at all. If hon. gentlemen will look further on in the Act, they will see the word 'companies'——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The amendment would be needed if you want to control the express business outside of railways.

Mr. GERMAN. Quite so. Clause c, of the Interpretation Act says that the expression 'company' means a railway company. If hon. gentlemen will look through the Act they will find the word 'company' here and there throughout the whole length of it. But clause 3 says :

This Act shall apply to all persons, companies and railways.

—and so on. That word 'companies' there has no reference to the Interpretation clause of the Act——

Mr. LANCASTER. Surely.

Mr. GERMAN. Certainly it has not, and I think I can give my hon. friend very ample authority for my position. This is the word 'companies' which is not interpreted by the interpretation clause, but the word that is interpreted is 'company' and that occurs throughout the length and breadth of the Act, and is interpreted to mean a railway company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And it has a capital 'C.'

Mr. GERMAN. Certainly. The word 'company' in the third clause has not the restricted meaning given in the interpretation clause, but has the same meaning as

it would have in any other Act passed by this parliament. So when we say 'all persons, companies and railways' we mean exactly what we say, that all these are subject to the Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) mean that the interpretation clause applies only to the singular of the word 'company' and not to the plural? That is what his argument means.

Mr. GERMAN. Certainly, that is exactly what I mean. Here you have the interpretation of a word, the word 'company' and that word is carried throughout the whole Act, and is interpreted to mean a railway company. I venture to say the word 'companies' is also used here and there throughout the Act, and that where it does not come within the meaning of the Railway Act it is a general term which covers all companies and is not intended to be restricted by the interpretation clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does not the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) know —I am sure he does, but he has not profited by the knowledge—that in the general Interpretation Act governing all statutes the very word 'person' means company as well as individual?

Mr. LANCASTER. I know that very well. But the hon. minister is not content with the general Interpretation Act, but proposes special interpretation clauses for his own Act, which he is asking us to approve. If he is not satisfied with the general Interpretation Act, we suppose that he regards these interpretations that he proposes as having special significance. In reply to what the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) says, I know very well the difference in the interpretation which he speaks of, but this Act expressly states what a railway shall mean and what the word 'company' shall mean. But I do not agree with him when he says that the word 'company' has a different significance in the singular from what it has in the plural.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) read the Bill?

Mr. LANCASTER. I have read it all through three or four times.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND Canals. Is the hon. gentleman of opinion that, if this Bill becomes law, any railway company in Canada can carry goods or allow goods to be carried on its line without first having arranged for tolls and tariffs approved or authorized by the railway commission?

Mr. LANCASTER. Not quite in the way the hon. minister puts it. But I want to point out that, in my humble opinion, the way to provide for what he desires is not by giving a special interpretation to the word 'company.' If he wants to make his Bill apply to the carrying of all traffic on railways, the natural, simple and efficacious way is to say that it shall apply to express companies that are carrying goods on railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) seriously tell this House that a railway company, if this Bill were in force, could not carry goods at rates fixed without the authority of the commission, but that it could authorize an agent to do so?

Mr. LANCASTER. No; but one way of reaching the point may be much more cumbersome than another. And if you wish to make the Act apply easily, quickly and cheaply, as it is in the interest of the country that it should do, to traffic carried on railways, the Act should be simple and direct, and should leave no question that the express companies, if they do carry freight, carry it as the agents of the railway company. We all seem to agree as to what should happen, but we disagree as to the way of getting at it. I submit to the hon. minister that he should put it beyond doubt by saying that express companies shall be in the same position as the railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it would be creditable legislation to us to attempt to remove doubts that do not exist. If the hon. gentleman admits that a railway company cannot carry goods over its line without being subject to the provisions of this law, he has not a leg to stand on, so far as the charges on express business carried on railways are concerned. And that is all we propose to deal with under this Bill. The hon. gentleman says it would be better and simpler to deal with the express companies as agents of the railway companies. I contend that it is simpler and better to deal with one company, the railway company, than to deal with a company and also with its agent. The railway company is responsible, under severe penalties under this clause, for any departure from the rates fixed by the commission. You do not want to deal with anybody else but the railway company. So far as it is necessary and proper to control the express companies in connection with the railways, they are controlled by this Bill. When you speak of general control of express companies you have not got it here, and you cannot put it here without embarrassing the Bill and imparing its value by introducing what is really an outside element, something that had better be dealt with in a separate and distinct measure.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would just like to put a case to the hon. minister. Suppose that goods to be carried in charge of an express company start on a railway in my county. The railway I refer to is not one

of the railways included under this Act, it is not within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada. It is an electric railway which carries fruit, and runs from the county of Lincoln——

Mr. GERMAN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him ? When he speaks of the Niagara Central, that is under the control of the Dominion parliament.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not talking about the Niagara Central, I am talking about an Ontario electric railway. I said a railway not included in this Act. I refer to the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway, and that road never had any connection whatever with the Niagara Central, which is now the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto railway, running from Port Dalhousie to Niagara Falls. But the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway starts at the village of Beamsville and runs through a fruit growing belt to the city of Hamilton. That is an electric railway only incorporated under an Ontario Act, and is in no sense covered by this clause three. Now, the question I want to put to the minister is this : Suppose some constituent of mine ships his fruit on that electric railway to be carried to Ottawa. It is to be carried by the Dominion Express Company that starts on the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway and is then transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is a railway within the provisions of this Act ? Now, what does the minister say about that express business ? Where the traffic in the goods originates on a railway not under the operation of this Act if this transfer occurs on their journey, whether the commissioners that look after this traffic are to do anything to help the shipper, because they must look after the goods on their whole journey from beginning to end. Now, would not the minister do better to say that this express business should be dealt with under this Act, that this Act should apply to any express company that carries goods on either an electric or a steam railway and whether such railway is or is not one of the railways covered by this Act ? Because in the case of fruit growers I have mentioned they do not ship their goods on a railway which is within the authority of this Act, their goods go twenty or twenty-five miles before they reach a railway that is within the authority of this Act. I think that class of cases ought to be provided for, and would be covered by the amendment such as I have suggested.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not wish to do the hon. gentleman any discourtesy, but I would recommend him to read the Bill, because when he reads the Bill he will find that the case he refers to is entirely covered by section five. There the hon. gentleman will find that the moment a through shipment is made and it is transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway, then the rate must be a through rate and will be controlled by the commission. But I am ready to consider the suggestion that has been made. In any case, I would now move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ERIE-ONTARIO POWER COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 134) to incorporate the Erie, Ontario Power Company.—Mr. German.

On section 11,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 11 has been amended to read as follows :

11. The directors may issue as paid-up stock, shares of the capital stock of the company in payment for all or any of the businesses, franchises, undertakings, rights, powers, privileges, and properties which the company may lawfully acquire by this Act or by law, and may, for such considerations, allot and hand over such shares to any person or corporation, including its shareholders or its directors, and any such issue or allotment of stock shall be binding upon the company and such stock shall not be assessable for calls nor shall the holder thereof be liable in any way thereon ; or the company may pay for the same wholly or partly in paid-up shares or wholly or partly in debentures, as may be agreed upon ; provided that any allotment and issue of stock under authority of this section shall be approved by the holders of at least two-thirds in value of the stock of the company, previously issued and held at the date of such issue and allotment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to ask any hon. gentleman who was in the committee whether or not he has examined similar provisions made in previous Bills in reference to the handing out of stock of this kind in payment. It does not seem to me that the clause safeguards the enterprise at all because the shareholders might hand over the stock for a mere nominal consideration. They might pass it over for a song and if the stockholders are all interested in one way, that is, in getting a distribution of stock among themselves, there is nothing to prevent it being done under that clause as it stands. I do not think it has been well considered.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is the usual clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite sure it is not the

usual clause because there is no provision to safeguard the transaction, except the consent of two-thirds of the other stockholders shall be had. Is it desirable or not that we should confer the power upon any company that we incorporate here to hand over its stock for nothing if it chooses? If two-thirds of the stockholders are prepared to give the stock out without any valuable consideration being received in return upon any terms which they choose, it is a question whether this is a desirable clause to incorporate in the Bill or not. That is my proposition and if it has been well considered perhaps there will be some hon. member of the committee who has had the matter in charge or was present when the discussion took place who could throw some light upon it.

Mr. GERMAN. That clause was not originally in this Bill, but when it came before the Private Bills Committee the acting chairman at that time, one of the hon. members for Ottawa, proposed that the original clause should be struck out and that this clause be inserted, being exactly in line with a clause in a Bill which the Private Bills Committee had passed the day before. I do not see very much difference between this clause and the one that had been originally in, but I was quite willing to accept it and the committee passed it. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence, (Mr. Bickerdike) had a Bill with this same clause in it which had passed the Private Bills Committee. When it was considered by the Private Bills Committee it was thought that this clause should be adopted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think there is much difference between the two clauses. I think there should be something in this clause which will require the transaction to be a bona fide transaction, not a mere nominal transaction, but a bona fide one in which bona fide value is being given for the stock. That is not secured by this present Bill. I do not think the new clause is any better than its predecessor. They are both open to the same exception.

Mr. GERMAN. So far as the promoters of the Bill are concerned they are not objecting at all to any reasonable amendment that the hon. minister, or any one else, desires to put in to ensure that it shall be a bona fide transaction. The gentlemen who are asking for incorporation are going into it in a bona fide way and they are willing to have any restrictions placed around them that are reasonable and that other companies are bound to submit to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no such clause in the General Company's Act and no such clause would be admitted in the General Company's Act, I am quite sure.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. GERMAN. What would you suggest?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not prepared at the moment to frame a clause. There will no doubt arise circumstances under which stock might be handed over for property which was being acquired in a bona fide way for the interests of the company. If any person wanted to put through a transaction which was not a bona fide transaction, but simply a cover to the getting possession of the stock, with a properly framed clause, the stock might be taken away from them and proceedings might be taken which would invalidate the transaction, but they could not be under this clause as it stands.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that it is doubly dangerous for this reason: In clause four the capital stock which the company may issue is placed at $5,000,000. They can divide that as they see fit so long as shareholders representing two-thirds of the capital stock agree. Then they can issue bonds to the extent of $5,000,000 and deal with them afterwards. With the provisions in clauses 4, 11 and 13 it seems to me to be susceptible of a good deal of stock jobbery if they were disposed to go into it.

Mr. GERMAN. This Bill was drawn in an exactly similar way to the Bill incorporating the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, which was obtained from this parliament in 1895. The clause originally drafted was taken verbatim from the act to incorporate the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company. I had supposed in drafting the Bill that what had been done on a former occasion by this parliament would be done again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You might reasonably do so.

Mr. GERMAN. One might reasonably suppose that. The company does not desire anything more than what is fair, and they intend to go into the project in a bona fide way if they go into it at all. Engineers have already looked over the ground and it is supposed to be a feasible and profitable proposition, and having taken this clause verbatim from a Bill which has already passed parliament, I cannot see why there should be objection to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps we should have a model clause.

Mr. FRASER. I think there should be a clause common to all Bills, but if some such words as 'bona fide' are inserted here, I do not see what objection there can be to the wording of the clause as it stands at present. If any party is willing to take stock in payment, then when two-thirds of the shareholders say that it is a good bargain rather than to give cash, I do not see what harm there is in it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Suppose they should be all in a ring.

Mr. FRASER. Then they would have to be in league with the parties who are giving them the franchise. It often happens that a corporation can make a better bargain with parties who are willing to take stock than if they have to go on the market and get cash. If you wish, let there be some safeguarding words in this section which will apply to similar Bills through all time.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If you strike out the words in the clause 'may make and' and leave it that the directors 'may issue as paid up and non assessable shares' I think it would meet all objections. The moment the stock is paid up, is it material to any one what they do with it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) apprehends the full extent of my objection. Even if these words be struck out it would still be possible for the company to issue as paid up and assessable stock any amount they please without getting anything in return.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I want to guard against that.

Mr. BELCOURT. As a member of the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills I am glad that this question has come up. Bills of this kind invariably contain a similar clause and on every occasion there is considerable discussion in the committee. The clause now before the House is the clause as amended by the committee, and we adopted it on the ground that it has been inserted in many Bills already and is looked upon as a model clause. If the House in committee should now rule as to what is a proper clause for such Bills it would save a great deal of the time of the committee and act as a guide. I cannot say that I have much objection to the clause as it stands. As the member for Guysborough has said, it is sometimes advantageous for the company to purchase real estate or other things by means of stock, and if there is any way in which the clause may be limited so as to overcome the possibility of fraud might be well to insert that limitation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman prefers, I am willing to have a clause drafted and submit it for consideration.

Mr. GERMAN. Surely there can be no objection to the company issuing stock as paid up stock for the construction of buildings, the purchasing of franchises or of any property as contemplated by this section. I infer from what the minister says that this is legitimate so long as the transaction is a bona fide one, and that if they are getting value they can pay for it in stock or in money. If people enter into a project with the intention of committing fraud it is very hard to prevent them from doing so by legislation, and if any clause can be devised whereby you can prevent persons from being guilty of fraud who desire to commit fraud, I would like to see it, because I have never seen it yet. What is there wrong about issuing paid up shares in a company as consideration for a contract for the construction say of a race-way that would cost $1,000,000? Why should not the contractors be allowed to take stock in the company just as well as forcing the company to raise the money to pay the contractors ? So long as you accede to the principle that the company may in a bona fide way issue stock as a consideration for payment of a contract or any franchises or privileges, I do not see how you can prevent them doing wrong if they want to do it. I doubt very much if it could be done. I am quite willing that the Bill should stand over, and if the minister can devise a clause that will meet the case, I should be satisfied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not wish it to be inferred that I took the position that a power of this kind might not be very properly and honestly exercised ; but what I did say was that this clause as it stands is peculiarly liable to abuse. The only condition attached to it is that two-thirds of the stockholders shall be consenting parties to the transaction. That is no protection at all. What I thought, and still think, would be an ingredient that would greatly militate against the use of this section in a fraudulent way, would be to include in it such terms as would practically make the transaction void if it were not in compliance with the terms of the section. If the parties to the transaction knew that it was liable to be attacked in the courts and set aside on that ground, I think they would hesitate.

Mr. MONK. Would not the non-compliance of the transaction with the provisions of the clause not render it void ipso facto ? Does the minister mean that if all the formalities of the clause were not complied with, the transaction would be void ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not thought about the proper wording of the clause ; but there is nothing in it as it stands that could not be complied with, and yet the thing might be the most fraudulent transaction in the world.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 143) respecting the Canadian North-west Irrigation Company.—Mr. Oliver.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 126) respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Thompson (Haldimand).

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 111) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 146) respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—Mr. Vrooman.

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Nipissing and Pontiac Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—Hon. Mr. Haggart.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 132) to incorporate the Père Marquette International Bridge Company.—Mr. Cowan.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 175) respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 177) respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—Mr. McIsaac.

SUPPLY—THE PREFERENTIAL TARIFF.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sidney Fisher) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

M. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Customs if he will lay on the Table of the House a copy of the amendments made by the officers of his department to the certificate of origin of British goods allowed to enter into Canada under the preferential tariff.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I shall have pleasure in doing that. I think it will be amended in the direction that I explained the other day. Does the hon. gentleman want the certificate enforced to-day ?

Mr. CLARKE. I refer to the amendments made to the certificate of origin rendered necessary by the surtax on German goods. May I ask the hon. minister when he will lay the amended certificate on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I announced to the House the other day that we had to extend the time somewhat. I have to obtain the sanction of Council to that. I have not yet obtained it, but as soon as it is obtained, I will lay the amended certificate on the Table.

Mr. CLARKE. I have not quite made myself clear. A certificate of origin of British goods imported into Canada under the preferential tariff was required to be filed. That will have to be amended in accordance with the resolution adopted by the House respecting the surtax on German goods. I understand from a recent number of the 'London Times' that such an amended certificate has been prepared under the officers of the Customs Department and it is a copy of that amended certificate which I ask the hon. Minister to lay on the Table. May I ask him when he will do so ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I can lay that on the Table immediately; but, as I have explained, we are extending the time from the 30th of June to the 30th of September, and the certificate pursuant to that change has not yet been printed; but I can lay the original one on the Table.

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

Militia—pay and allowances, $391,405.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Before the item passes, I would like to ask the minister if he proposes to make his general statement now.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, I do not propose to make a general statement as to the condition of the militia, or as to any changes that may be proposed until the supplementary estimates for 1903 are brought down.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I presume that if we go on with the estimates to-night, the hon. gentleman will consent to let one item stand.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Before we go any further, I would like to call the attention

of the hon. gentleman to one matter and ask for some information upon it. I allude to a late official of the department, Mr. Martineau. I would like to know when he was appointed and how appointed, and whether he gave any security to the department at the time he was appointed. I understand that he was appointed in a financial capacity. I would like a short statement in regard to him.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I scarcely expected to be asked to make that explanation to-night. The hon. gentleman is aware, I think, that a commission was appointed to inquire into that case, and into the condition of financial matters in the different departments. I think that commission has completed its labours, and it would perhaps be more convenient for me to make a statement on the subject when its report is brought down. However, if one item is left, I shall be very glad to make a statement at a later date. I have not the papers with me to enable me to give the correct details of the matter now. If the hon. gentleman will kindly accept that explanation and let the matter remain until a later period, I think it will be more convenient and satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I have no objection. I was not aware officially, though I saw in the newspapers, that a committee had been appointed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is really a commission.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Then I would ask the minister to give us information of the commission, who was appointed, and whether he can give us an assurance that its report will be down before we take up the supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not able to give that assurance, because it is a matter which my colleague the Minister of Finance has directly under his control. He suggested the commission, and I think he made a statement to the House early in the session with regard to it. But I will promise the hon. gentleman to speak to the Minister of Finance and endeavour to have the report brought forward as soon as possible. But in any case I shall be prepared to answer questions in reference to this matter on the next occasion when the militia estimates are brought up.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I would only, then, wish to say this much further. The hon. minister can hardly expect us to pass the estimates for his department until the report of that commission has been brought down. If it is not down, I hope that the hon. gentleman will not consider that we are unduly pressing the matter if we object to allow the estimates to go through without that information.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Do I understand that my hon. friend objects to our going on at all now?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Not now, but at a later stage we might not feel inclined to allow the estimates to go through unless we have the information.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That commission is looking into all the departments.

Mr. MONK. It is to be regretted that we should not have had the Bill, notice of which was given on the 3rd of April, before taking up these estimates. I recognize that the hon. Minister of Militia is entitled to some indulgence, but this year we have reason to expect considerable changes in the militia organization. The committee will remember that during the colonial conference in London, engagements were entered into by our representatives at that conference, and we are entitled to know how far the government intend adhering to those engagements, and what changes are contemplated. Under the circumstances, it is to be regretted that we have not had from the Minister of Militia some outline of all the changes he contemplates. We have estimates to the extent of over a million and a half dollars, and it would be more satisfactory if we knew in a general way, before voting those estimates, what new schemes the government may have in view. Another matter to which I wish to refer is this: I would like to know if the militia who were called out during the strike in Valleyfield, a considerable time ago, have been paid by the government or not? On the 11th of this month some questions were put regarding this matter, which will be found on page 2759 of 'Hansard.' Among those questions, which were put by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin), were these:

Were the militia ordered out at Valleyfield at the time of the strike? If so, what was the cost of the troops? By whom was the said cost paid? Has the town of Valleyfield paid the costs?

In the absence of the hon. Minister of Militia, the Postmaster General replied:

The mayor of Valleyfield made a requisition for the services of the militia on October 25th at the request of the company, and two companies of infantry arrived in Valleyfield from Montreal that night.

And in reply to the other questions, the Postmaster General said:

The Department of Labour has no information on the subjects referred to in these questions.

The questions were not put to the Department of Labour nor to the Minister of Labour, nor to the Postmaster General, but were put generally to the government, and I think that the answer given was neither fair nor sincere, because, from the information I have gathered, the troops on that occasion—just before the elections of 1900—

were paid by the government, and no claim has since been enforced against the town of Valleyfield for reimbursement. If such be the case, I submit that the answer given was neither sincere nor true. There is another matter to which I wish to refer. Recently at Montreal the troops were called out, not to protect any private industry as in the case of the Valleyfield riot, but to protect the shipping interests of the country. I am informed that the militia have not yet been paid. Some of the officers are even out of pocket. It is only just that these troops should be paid at once, and that the cost should fall, not on the city of Montreal, but on this government, if there is any strength in the Valleyfield precedent. In Valleyfield the troubles were between the men employed in the mill of the company and the company itself, whereas, in Montreal the troubles were of a far more public character. Troops were called out to protect the harbour, which is to a large extent under the jurisdiction of this government, and I think that, under the circumstances, the cost should not be saddled on the city of Montreal, but should be paid by the government. These are questions to which we are entitled to an answer. We are entitled to know whether the reply given by the hon. Postmaster General on the 11th of May is correct or not, whether the government have definitely assumed the cost of calling out the troops at Valleyfield, and what is the intention of the government with regard to the cost incurred at Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not think the hon. gentleman has any right to charge insincerity in the answer given. It so happened that I was not in the city the day that question was put, and until this moment, my attention has not been called to the nature of the answer given. I gave instructions that the question should be answered and the answer sent to the Prime Minister, but possibly through some inadvertence that was not done. There is not the slightest objection to answering the question. The government paid the men, of course. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to look at the law governing the case, he will see that it provides that when two magistrates or the mayor of the city make a requisition on the senior officer to call out the troops, in case of riot, the expense is paid by the city or the municipality interested, but where, for any reason, the pay is not immediately forthcoming, the Act authorizes the government to pay the men, and the officer in command, upon whom the requisition was made, then proceeds to sue the municipality for the amount. That is the law. In the case of the town of Valleyfield, the men were paid out of the consolidated revenue fund, and I understand that the commanding officer is taking the necessary steps for the return of the money. I do not know. That is beyond my control ; I have nothing to do with it. So far as the city of Montreal is concerned, the law, of course, is precisely the same as I have just quoted. There is not a question whether it is shipping or a government building or anything else that is to be protected ; it is simply a question of the violation of the peace. That having taken place and a riot threatening, the Act enables the chief magistrate of a municipality to call upon the militia to protect the citizens. That was done in the city of Montreal. If the men have not been paid they will be paid under the authority contained in the Act which I have quoted. I was informed on Saturday morning by my deputy that the accounts had not yet been forwarded to him, but that he had made inquiry into the matter, and, so soon as the accounts were forwarded to him they would be paid under the authority I have mentioned, if, in the meantime, the city had not chosen to pay them ; and then, of course, the same proceeding I have mentioned in the former case, the usual proceedings, would be taken—the officer in command of the troops would sue to recover the amount of money paid.

Mr. MONK. Do I understand the hon. minister (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) to say that no claim has been received from the military authorities in Montreal for the pay of the militia ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I said that up to Saturday last no accounts, no claim of any kind, had been received here at headquarters.

Mr. MONK. There is one thing that is certain now, and that is that during the difficulties that occurred in Valleyfield in 1900, in the early part of the fall of that year, the troops were paid by the government. We have that now as a certainty. And I may tell my hon. friend (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) that, like many other members of the committee, I was quite aware of the provisions of the law to which he has referred. But my hon. friend slid very rapidly over those provisions of the law which require the government to make demands afterwards on the municipality that has caused the calling out of the militia. My hon. friend is familiar no doubt with that part of the law also. But, since 1900, there has been an election in Valleyfield. During the campaign that preceded that election, one of the topics discussed was the question as to whether the government would or would not insist upon the payment by the town of Valleyfield of the cost of calling out the troops, which amounted, if I mistake not, to between $5,000 and $8,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. A little over $4,000, I believe.

Mr. MONK. That question was very much discussed. And I am informed that assurance was given during the heat and

fever of the election—assurance of the most positive character—that there would be no exaction of the payment of this indemnity from the town of Valleyfield. Is that correct ? Is there anything in the department which warrants me in making that statement ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No ; there never was any assurance given by the department.

Mr. MONK. Was there any correspondence ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. MONK. Was any assurance given by any member of the government that this claim would not be pressed ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not aware of it. Of course, I am only speaking for the Militia Department.

Mr. MONK. I see the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) knows something about the question.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Nothing ; but I am keen to be enlightened.

Mr. MONK. I did not see the hon. Minister of Justice in the municipality at that time, but he has a very long arm, and he may have reached some knowledge of the matter.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have nothing to say.

Mr. MONK. There were other ministers there. The assurance that I speak of, that the government would exact nothing from the town, had great effect. And, as a matter of fact, since 1900 no demand has been made upon the town for this amount. I am not mistaken there. There has been no demand on the department by the town of Valleyfield for this amount ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I presume there has been the usual demand.

Mr. MONK. Has there been any ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I believe there has. I cannot speak more positively than that. The commanding officer, of course, must——

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister will undoubtedly be able to find out if there has been such a demand.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman says that he has carefully studied the law. He knows, then, that it is the commanding officer that brings the action.

Mr. MONK. Who instructs him ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He does not require any instruction ; he is obliged to bring action under the law.

Mr. MONK. But these officers are under the control of the department; and it should not surprise the committee if, under the circumstances of this case of the town of Valleyfield, I should claim that it is the duty of the government to see to it that these soldiers who served in Montreal are paid without delay, and also that a different rule should not be applied to the city of Montreal from that which has been applied to the town of Valleyfield. The mere fact that there happened to be a by-election in one place and not in the other should not make a difference in the application of the law. I do not ask that Valleyfield should be obliged to contribute to the pay of the militia, but I do find it unjust that the city of Montreal, which contributes more to the revenue of this country than does the town of Valleyfield, should be subjected to a different rule from that which was applied in this other case.

Mr. CLARKE. I wish to enter a protest at this stage about this matter. If the militia were called out in Valleyfield to suppress a riot and the government paid the cost of the maintenance of those soldiers while on duty, the same rule should apply to the city of Toronto. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is quite right in demanding that no exceptional treatment should be given any municipality. Some time last summer, I think it was, the militia were called to do duty in the city of Toronto owing to an anticipated riot because of a street car strike, and the city of Toronto was called upon to pay the necessary expenses in connection with the presence of those troops there. Now, this unfortunate trouble in Valleyfield took place about three years ago. I presume that the men were paid immediately after their service. Surely some officer of the department instructed the commanding officer to proceed to collect this money. Or, are we simply bandying words about this business ? It is time that we should know whether one rule is to be applied to Valleyfield because a by-election was coming on, while another rule must apply to other municipalities. If the law is that the municipality is to pay for the troops, that law should be enforced.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will see that there is no way by which the commanding officer can force a municipality to immediately hand over the money if the municipality does not see fit to do so. In the case of Toronto, evidently the city authorities felt that they were bound to pay and they did pay. That has happened in a great many other cases, in the city of London, for instance. The town of Valleyfield —and the same has happened in other cases —there was hesitation and delay about paying. Of course, the men had to be paid, and,

under the authority given in the Act, the government advanced the money.

Mr. CLARKE. But three years have elapsed since the money was paid, and surely some steps should be taken, if it is the duty of the municipality to pay.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Here is what the law says. In the event of the money being advanced by the government out of the consolidated revenue fund, then the commanding officer shall at once, in his own name, proceed against the municipality for the recovery of such sum.

Mr. CLARKE. Then is the officer commanding the troops who were called out still in command ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not quite sure whether Colonel Gorden, who is the officer commanding at Montreal now, was in Montreal at that time. I think he was in South Africa, and that Colonel Roy was commanding at that time. But I will get a statement upon this point, and bring down the exact condition of affairs, when the estimates next come up.

Mr. CLARKE. Will instructions be issued that this money shall be collected ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My impression is that steps have already been taken to collect it.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I am not satisfied with the answer of the minister. I do not find fault because the government paid the money, it is a proper thing for the government to pay in the meantime if the municipality does not. But now nearly three years have gone by, and we are voting the estimates to-day, and the minister does not know. I do not accept his statement that it was none of his business. It is not only his business, but it is his duty as head of the Militia Department who are out this money, to take steps to collect it. I go further, and I say that we have no right to remit the money, and if any such steps were taken at the time as have been spoken of, they were taken beyond the authority of the law. The government could not pay this by Order in Council. Therefore, I do not accept the minister's statement that it is not his duty to know. Is it to be understood that when a municipality refuses to pay, the government is to assume the debt ? Supposing Toronto had declined to pay, suppose Montreal should decline to pay now, the government should promptly see that the proper steps are taken to collect the money. It is not the duty of the commanding officer, because he is immediately under the control of the Department of Militia and Defence, he is only acting as the trustee of the government, or of the department. Therefore, when these estimates come up we have a constitutional right to insist upon this explanation. I was surprised at the trivial answer of the Postmaster General, or the Minister of Labour. Everybody knew that he had no business to answer, it was not his place to do so. It was his place to say, the Minister of Militia and Defence is not here to-day, let the matter stand, and it would have stood as a matter of course. Then if the Postmaster General, or the Minister of Labour, had not interfered to give that answer, the Minister of Militia and Defence would have given us the information and we would not have been compelled to ask the government for it on another occasion. I say the language of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) is none too strong in characterizing that answer as unsatisfactory and trivial. Look at the result. If he had communicated with the Minister of Militia and Defence and informed him of what had happened, the Minister of Militia and Defence would have inquired and this discussion to-night would have been avoided. Now, I must say that since I have been in opposition I have not engaged in any obstruction; but I want my hon. friend to understand that I propose to be severe in my criticisms when necessity calls for it, and when the government endeavour to trifle with us I wont stand it. So far as I am concerned, if the minister will give us this information it will be satisfactory, but I do not accept his explanation that it was not his fault that the answer was given in that way.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I certainly will do as I promised, and bring down a statement with regard to this matter.

Mr. CLARKE. Will he bring down a statement as to whether his department or the Justice Department, or the Labour Department, has instructed the proper officials to proceed against the municipality to collect this money ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There was no need of any instructions under the law.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the minister bring down a memorandum explaining exactly how the matter stands, so that we may know what steps this House may take, if necessary, to have that money collected ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The money of the country is controlled by the Minister of Finance, and the moment the Minister of Finance consents to an extraordinary expenditure of this kind, he debits somebody with that amount of money and he never rests until he gets that money back. He calls on the Department of Militia and Defence at least once a week to know whether they have recovered that money. If the business of the department is conducted in this careless fashion, what will be the result whenever there is a disturbance in any town ? Im-

mediately the troops will be requisitioned to keep the peace, and immediately that municipality will repudiate its obligation and oblige the government to pay the troops. That will be a serious condition of affairs. I say the law is a good law, and ought to be administered and carried out in a way to compel these municipalities to pay their just debts. The Minister of Militia and Defence, or the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Justice—because he is involved in it—somebody has to institute legal proceedings to recover this money, and the responsibility for doing so cannot be shifted on to the commanding officer of the militia. Somebody in the government is responsible, I think it is the Minister of Finance, and he ought not to rest until that money is returned.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend, although like myself not a lawyer, knows something probably of the glorious uncertainties and the inglorious delays of the law. He knows that if an individual or a municipality wishes to repudiate its debts it can occupy a good deal of time. Now, I am correct in stating that there is a suit pending, and has been pending for some time against the municipality of Valleyfield for this money, that it is being pressed forward as rapidly as possible.

Mr. BENNETT. When was the writ issued ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot say, but I will get the particulars.

Mr. MONK. I deemed it necessary on this item to bring the question to the notice of the government. I do not blame my hon. friend the Minister of Militia so much as the whole government collectively. Those who have any knowledge of what took place in 1900 in the town of Valleyfield know perfectly well that the organization which was supposed to be an organization of labour, but which was in reality a purely political organization, provoked a strike just on the eve of an election. In some way or other through the instrumentality of some one of the same political faith as the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, the militia was called out at Valleyfield just before the election, and the whole blame of this was, through some instrumentality, laid upon my friend Mr. Bergeron, so that he lost his election in consequence of these manoeuvres. Now we find that the government comes down and pays for the calling out of the militia, the sum of $4,480 and there is no further question raised whatever until a by-election comes on, and then, when the by-election comes on and when the question of this organization by which Mr. Bergeron was defeated in 1900 is threshed out before the people, we find that ministers of the Crown—I do not say the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick), although he appeared to me to be pretty well aware of what was going on ; it may have been the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) because he came down there—ministers of the Crown came down and gave the electors of the town of Valleyfield the complete assurance that they would never be called upon to pay a cent of this large sum which was employed as a political manoeuvre. Now, I leave that aside, but what I would ask is this : What is going to be the rule ? We know the law, but is the law going to be applied ? If it is going to be applied in that way I say we must reimburse the city of Toronto for the money that has been expended there, and that it is unfair that these men who have been doing duty in the city of Montreal should not have been paid in full. I know many of them have suffered from not being paid. I know that many of the officers have been disagreeably situated on that account. But, I go further and say that you must apply that rule to the city of Montreal as well, and if there are $15,000 or $20,000 to be paid there, it should be paid by the government. All I want is that justice shall be done, that the same rule shall be applied to everybody and that the machinery of the Militia Act and the Department of Labour shall not be used in any way for political purposes. It is proper that we should bring this matter to the attention of the House and the country.

Mr. LOY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow the statements which have been made tonight to go uncontradicted. I took part in that election. I attended every meeting at which any of the ministers were present, and I never heard one single member of the government give any assurance to the electors of Valleyfield that that amount would not be collected from them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOY. There is another point which I think it well to contradict, and that is the statement in respect to the labour union being a political organization. If it was a political organization it was composed of both Conservatives and Liberals. There is also another statement that I wish to deny, and that is that the strike at Valleyfield was provoked by the labourers. In my own opinion, if an investigation were held, it would prove to the entire satisfaction of those who would be honest enough to admit proof, that it was the Montreal Cotton Company which was responsible for the strike of their employees.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Loy) is giving himself a great deal of trouble contradicting what I did not say at all. Certainly, I am surprised that my hon. friend who has been some years in politics, should suppose that the ministers would go down to Valleyfield and state publicly that

they would give the town of Valleyfield $4,480. What I said was, and what I repeat is, that the statement was made by somebody in authority on the eve of the by-election and my hon. friend was elected.

An hon. MEMBER. Who made it ?

Mr. MONK. I did not attend the committee meetings or the private meetings where that assurance was made, but it was made and it had that effect. Nor did I say that the labourers of Valleyfield had provoked the strike. Why does the hon. gentleman take the trouble to contradict what I do not say ? The labourers of Valleyfield I know as well as my hon. friend does. I never treated them as my hon. friend treated them when he brought their affidavits into this House to read them, but what I say is that the organization which brought about that strike and called upon the mayor to call upon the troops, was conducting a political manoeuvre. We have proof of it to-day in the fact that the account has not been collected. The city of Toronto and the city of Montreal ought to stand in just as fair a position as Valleyfield, yet Montreal and Toronto are treated in the way in which we know they are treated. This is the proper time to raise the question. Let the hon. minister give us an assurance that even justice will be dealt out to all before we vote this $391,000. It is only fair and I think we have a right to exact that.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have no hesitation whatever in giving the assurance that we shall proceed under the law and that we will do our best. It is not always possible to do it, but we will do our best and see that even justice is given to all.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the hon. and learned Minister of Justice when the writ was issued and who was the solicitor acting for the government in the endeavour to collect the money from the town of Valleyfield ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not aware that a writ issued nor am I aware that there has been a solicitor appointed to act for the government, because, as I read the statute, action must be taken by the commanding officer. He alone has the right to bring suit and he alone has control.

Mr. MONK. The hon. Minister of Justice knows perfectly well that although the commanding officer is the party who claims the amount, he is entirely under the control of the Department of Militia and Defence and of the government. At any rate I wish to make my own position clear in view of the statement of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Loy). What I demand and what I think we have a right to exact from the government is that the same treatment should be meted out all around. I believe, as the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) said, it might lead to grave abuses if this practice is adhered to, because, the hon. Minister of Justice will, himself, admit that abuses would be easy. Upon the slightest trouble of any kind whatever you could requisition the militia and cause considerable expense and profit to certain individuals and the municipality, being on the right side, probably, would have nothing to fear. I believe the law is a good one, but it has to be administered in the same way for all parties.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman will see that it is the city authorities themselves who make a requisition for troops ; therefore, that seems to safeguard the question of improper expenditure.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Loy) has just told us that the militia were brought to Valleyfield on the requisition of the Montreal Cotton Company. Is that right ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, no.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman, as I understand, said that.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, that was not the fact any way.

Mr. EMMERSON. He said that the strike was caused by the Montreal Cotton Company.

Mr. CLARKE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, then. But it all goes to show how necessary it is that we should understand where we are in this matter. If a strike is caused by a company whose head office is many miles away from the scene of the disturbance, and the local authorities are requested to bring the militia out for the purpose of awing the strikers, it should be clearly understood that the expenditure for the maintenance of these troops should be borne by the municipality. The gravest possible abuse may arise in the calling out of troops here or there where their services are not required. If the precedent is established in this case, that for certain reasons a municipality must not bear the responsibility of its action in calling out troops, then other municipalities may call out troops when their services are not required. It would be scandalous if one rule is applied to Valleyfield, and another to Montreal, and another to Toronto. We are entitled to know what action the government purposes taking to spur on the commanding officer of that regiment to do his duty. It appears to be one of those cases where it is nobody's business to act. The militia were entitled to be paid for their services, and the government having disbursed $4,000 or $5,000 of the money of the people, they should take steps to collect that money from the municipality if the law says the muni-

cipality is responsible. Will the Minister of Militia tell us whether he will give the proper officer instructions to proceed forthwith to collect this money from the municipality of Valleyfield ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is not a case of the minister giving instructions, but I certainly shall inquire to ascertain why this officer has not done his duty, and then it will be my business to deal with the officer.

Mr. CLARKE. Quite so. If it is the duty of the officer to protect the public treasury as well as life and property, and if it is his duty to collect the money from the municipality, surely he is guilty of a gross dereliction of his duty if he does not proceed forthwith.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think so.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the minister take cognizance of that ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly I will.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Minister of Justice evades his responsibility and the responsibility of the government who profess to be the watch dogs of the treasury by casting the blame upon some officer. I, for one, am not willing that this question should pass until there is an assurance from the Minister of Finance that he considers it his duty to recover that money at the earliest possible moment. We have been told that irregularities in connection with the Militia Department are to-day the subject of inquiry by special commission. Here is work for another special commission. I don't know that I have ever heard before that money can be paid out of the treasury without warrant, and that no steps are to be taken to recover it from the municipality which owes it. I will not be satisfied until I have a statement from the Minister of Finance that as guardian of the treasury, and as the custodian of the people's money, he intends to get that money back. It is nice to see the Minister of Justice laugh at the idea of the government being custodians of the money of the people. It is a joke. Open the bag boys and pass the money around ; that's their idea of it. The men who have the public money to guard, occupy a sacred trust, but these gentlemen on the treasury benches do not seem to understand that. I want an assurance that the Minister of Finance does intend to get that money back, that the Minister of Justice will assist him in getting it back, and that the Minister of Militia will insist on the commanding officer doing his duty in the premises.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I certainly would not have spoken again were it not for the attempt by the government to fasten the responsibility upon the commanding officer, and I am surprised that the Minister of Militia should allow such a thing to be done. As soon as the men are paid, the commanding officer has no further interest except that the law says his name shall be used in an action for the recovery of the money. If the Minister of Militia is going to hold the commanding officer responsible for the collection of this debt, I am satisfied that every militia officer in the country will resent such a thing, and that not one of them would serve an hour longer. It is absurd to contend that a commanding officer should be put to the expense and risk of entering a suit to recover such money for the Crown. If that is the law then there is not one officer out of ten who would take such a responsibility. For my part, I would not. Does any one mean to say that the Minister of Militia is going to stand up here in the face of the militia of Canada and say that this officer is neglecting his duty. Why the thing is absurd. I would resign my position as Minister of Militia, much as I might pride in it, before I would allow such a principle to be laid down. The Minister of Justice cannot disclaim his responsibility. When I was Minister of Militia, if such a thing occurred, instructions would have been sent to the Justice Department to collect the money, and then the responsibility would be upon the Minister of Justice. If the Minister of Justice received such instructions he is responsible, and he is doubly responsible as a member of the cabinet, because the whole cabinet is responsible in a sense for the proper administration of any one department. It is absurd to say that it is the duty of the commanding officer to move without the initiative of the Minister of Militia, and then the action should be taken on the responsibility of the Minister of Justice. I do not believe that on consideration, the Minister of Militia will take the responsibility of saying that the commanding officer in this case is in any way responsible for the neglect to collect this money. We are given to understand that it is the duty of the commanding officer to take action, but the Militia Department should be behind him, so that, even if he is in South Africa his name can be used. I agree with the hon. member for East York that the most important question is whether the responsibility is to be shifted from the department to the officer.

Mr. LOY. I think it well to state that so far as I know a demand was made on the town of Valleyfield for the payment of the expenses in connection with militia being called out. I know that the town refuses to pay the whole amount demanded. I do not know whether it assumes the responsibility of part of it; but I think it does. I know that the demand was made on the town.

Some hon. MEMBERS. By whom ?

Mr. LOY. By the Militia Department or by some one authorized by the government; but I think the town is resisting the claim, or a part of it. I think it is only right for me to say that, in respect to the charge which was made, that some one had been authorized to promise that the amount would not be collected. For my part, I assisted at nearly every meeting, and I do not know of any person being authorized to make any such statement. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would give me the name of the party who made that statement.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if in his opinion this debt is going to be collected from the town of Valleyfield, or if it is not going to be collected ?

Mr. LOY. I may say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that the town claims that it was not responsible, because the strike was provoked by the employees of the Montreal Cotton Company.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman inform us at what date that demand was made ?

Mr. LOY. I cannot tell the date.

Mr. WARD. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia to a short discussion which took place on this item last session. On page 4260 of 'Hansard' I find the following :

Contingencies—further amount required, $4,500.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is simply to reimburse the department for the amount paid over to the troops in connection with the Valleyfield riots. Proceedings were taken to collect that money from the town, but in the meantime the men had to be paid and were paid out of contingencies. There was no other way of paying them.

Mr. WILSON. From whom are you trying to collect the money ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. From the town. From that it would appear that proceedings were taken at that time, and I think we should be told by whom those proceedings were taken, what was the result, and what is the reason for the delay since last session. I am sure the hon. minister will be able to give us that information.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have no information. I have no doubt that what I said at that time was absolutely true, and was said after I had made inquiry in the department. I did not expect that this question would be asked to-night, and I am not prepared with the dates: but I have no doubt whatever in my own mind that proceedings have been taken and are going on to recover that money, and we propose to recover it if it is possible to do so. My hon. friend from South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) did not quite apprehend my meaning when he assumed that I proposed to throw the whole responsibility upon the commanding officer. What I said was that I would cause inquiry to be made to see why the officer had not performed the duty assigned to him under the statute. I said nothing about his responsibility, or about his paying the money out of his own pocket, or paying the cost of the suit, or anything of the kind. The statute prescribes a duty for the commanding officer to perform, and I said that I would inquire and ascertain why he had not performed his duty—that is all.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think the first thing to be done is to ascertain the fact before we proceed to pass judgment on what has occurred. The first thing to be ascertained is whether or not the commanding officer has performed the duty assigned to him by the statute. If he has, then it would be a matter of inquiry, I apprehend, to ascertain whether or not he has proceeded diligently or has been remiss in the performance of his duty. If he has not performed the duty assigned to him, then it seems to me that it is properly within the jurisdiction of the committee to inquire why he has not performed his duty. But let us start by knowing whether or not anything has been done. When we ascertain the fact, then we can apportion the blame and determine on the responsibility. I would like to make a statement of the law, as I understand it, with regard to the calling out of troops by the civil power. It is a matter of statutory duty. The government is absolutely without power to interfere, either to call out troops or to prevent them being called out. The very moment peace is disturbed within the limits of a municipality, those who represent the civil power in that municipality have a right under the statute to call on the military authorities for assistance, and it is the duty of the military authorities to give those who represent the civil power that measure of assistance which they think necessary. Up to that point the government cannot interfere in any way. When the civil authorities make their demand, they make it upon the senior officer in the district, who in the exercise of his discretion calls upon such number of the militia force as he thinks necessary under the circumstances to give to the civil authorities the measure of aid they require. In that he acts within his discretion. After he has performed his duty, and the services of the troops are no longer required, the question of remuneration comes up for consideration. It is then the duty of the commanding officer to apply to the civil authorities who are responsible for his action in the premises, to liquidate the obligations which he has contracted towards the militia. If there is any default or hesitation on their part, the statute provides that he can apply to the government. The funds are then taken out of the consolidated revenue fund for the purpose of liquidating this obligation to the militia; but that is only a temporary

expedient. The duty still remains on the commanding officer in his own name to proceed against the municipality—I am reading from the statute—'for the recovery of such pay, allowances and cost of transport, and he shall, on receipt thereof, pay over the amount to Her Majesty.' Therefore, hon. gentlemen will see at a glance that the duty in the first instance is on the commanding officer. If he fails in his duty, then it is for the government to consider how far they can interfere, using his name, to force him to recover the amount, or to recover the amount by direct action. The first thing is to ascertain whether or not he has performed his duty in the premises. That is a matter of inquiry, and the Minister of Militia will be in a position to inform the committee when his estimates come up to-morrow.

Mr. MONK. I understand that the question was put in the Senate to-day by the Hon. Senator Landry, whether judicial proceedings had been taken to recover from the town of Valleyfield the amount paid by the Militia Department for calling out the troops, and what was the amount paid by the department? To these questions the Hon. Mr. Scott replied that the amount paid was $4,480, and that a suit was pending for that amount.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Then I am out of it.

Mr. MONK. I do not think that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will claim that it is now the duty of the government to study the question and find out whether it is possible to get this officer to urge his suit. No doubt this officer is performing a statutory duty under the direction of the government. I do not want to blame that officer, but I want equal rights, and I will put this last question to the Minister of Militia and Defence: Will he give us the assurance that he will not press this claim against the city of Montreal until he has settled the Valleyfield business? That affair is three years old, and if he will make this promise, I shall not criticise any further.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The only assurance I can give is that the letter of the law will be applied in the case of Montreal as in every other case.

Mr. SPROULE. As in the case of Valleyfield?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. That may be very satisfactory for Valleyfield and Montreal, but I would like to know where Toronto comes in. I think that we should have the assurance of the hon. minister that he will send a department cheque to the city of Toronto for the moneys that city contributed to pay for the calling out of the militia. If Valleyfield and Montreal are to go scot free, Toronto should be reimbursed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am afraid I have not the power.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. Minister of Justice, in the graphic way in which he has explained the mode of procedure, seems to throw the responsibility on the commanding officer. But to my mind the commanding officer is simply a figure head. Who has to supply him with the sinews of war to carry on a lawsuit, if it be not the department?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is not I who am throwing the responsibility on the commanding officer, but it is the statute which puts the responsibility both on the government and on him. The statute puts the responsibility on the government of paying, in case of default by the municipality, and then puts the responsibility on the commanding officer of collecting the money, just as absolutely as it puts upon him the responsibility of calling out the troops when requisitioned to do so by the civil authorities. With regard to legal expenses, there has never been any request made to the government to come to the assistance of the commanding officer under the circumstances. When he seeks to collect the amount due, under the conditions described, the expenses are very trivial, and I have never known a commanding officer to apply to the government for aid, but if he did his request would be favourably considered.

Mr. KEMP. It is not in the usual order of things that a lawsuit for $4,000 or $5,000 can be carried on two or three years without involving heavy costs.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This case is not without a precedent. My hon. friends from Quebec will not forget the case that occurred at Pontiac in 1895.

Mr. MONK. That was under another government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In this case it is quite clear that if the commanding officer has not done his duty and does not wish to do it, there must be some means by which we can recover from the municipality the amount we have paid to liquidate an obligation it is under to the militia.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it be possible for the commanding officer to issue a writ without the knowledge of the Minister of Justice?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, he would retain his own counsel without any reference to the department.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any correspondence respecting the issue of a writ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I could not possibly answer now. There is a lot of work done in the department without my

personal knowledge. I shall let my hon. friend know everything we have in the department.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. minister give us the correspondence regarding the payment of the militia at Valleyfield ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I suppose the same delay will be given Montreal as the town of Valleyfield ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We will ask Montreal to pay as promptly as Toronto did.

Annual drill and musketry, $520,000.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. What is the number you propose to drill ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Last year the report indicates that the system of what is called skeleton drill was adopted, and the camps were composed very largely of officers, non-commissioned officers and a very few men. This year it is proposed to send more men, but still to continue the skeleton drill, which the general officer commanding seems to think works very well. The best selected men from the different companies will be taken into camp, about twenty-two men for each company.

Mr. WARD. I wish to ask if any provision will be made this year for increased pay to the men ? The hon. minister knows how difficult it is to procure men under existing conditions. I would be glad to know if, should the Bill be brought down this session, or by any other way, provision will be made for increased pay.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may say to my hon. friend that even if the Bill should be brought down this session there would be no provision in it with regard to pay. It is not proposed to include in the new Bill a scale of pay as is done in the present law. That would be left to the executive and to parliament to settle from year to year. I hope, however, that a solution of the difficulty may be reached in this way. Beginning at fifty cents for the first year, for every additional year that a man serves, up to say five years, there should be given good conduct additions of five or ten cents, as is done in the North-west Mounted Police. We have not actually adopted that scheme, but it was recommended by the former general officer commanding, and I think the present general is in favour of it. And I must say that it appeals to me as being one of the best ways, perhaps the most effective way, in which we could deal with this question.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I understand, then, that this is purely an estimate, that it is not based on actual numbers ?

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I understand that neither numbers nor rates of pay have been settled. I see the men are ordered out in June——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The rate of pay will be the same as last year.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Will the other questions be dealt with in the supplementary estimates ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. And information will then be given and we shall be free to discuss——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Absolutely.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. But this is not intended to cover that—it will be in the supplimentary estimates ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. minister intend to hold a camp at Niagara this year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. When I was at home last week, they told me they had received no word about it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is to be a camp.

Mr. LANCASTER. In June ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would urge upon the government, in view of what the hon. minister has said, the necessity of increasing the pay to the young men who go out to the camps. There are a number of very fit young men who should be in the camp at Niagara, but, it would be altogether too much to expect them to go out for fifty cents a day. The commanding officers tell me that it is almost impossible to get them, that it is asking too much of the young men, when they are so busy with their fruit-growing and other things—the very best class of young men, well fit for drill and willing to go, but quite unable to leave their duties at that time unless fairly paid. So, if the hon. minister has not determined the rate of pay he is going to give these young men, I would urge him to materially increase it. Considering the way things are going now and the rates of pay men are receiving working at other things than learning drill in order to serve their country, these young men should be paid considerably more than is paid now.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is as well, perhaps, to say a word or two on that point. There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) says. But the hon. gentleman will see that if we undertake to pay a man what you might call adequate, reasonable fair wages, we would at once practically double the militia vote—more than double it. Well, now, I really don't think that is necessary. Much as I would like to increase the pay, I think we have a right to expect now and in the future what we have had in the past—a response to this demand for military service on the part of young men who have a taste for it and are willing and anxious to undertake it if they are only indemnified for actual money loss. I believe that a very large percentage of the young men who turn out do not go for the money. Otherwise, at this moment, it would be very difficult to get men to go into camp no matter what you might do, because they are so busy with their own personal affairs. It would take a very large sum of money to tempt them if it were not for this love of the service, this strong military ardour. I do not think it is largely a question of money at all. I believe that we shall get the men as we have done in the past. Forty years ago when I first joined the militia of my own province, no such thing as pay was talked about, and we had in the province of Nova Scotia as large a militia as we have now in the whole Dominion of Canada. The men turned out without a dollar—turned out because they liked it and because they felt it to be a duty. I do not think that we should hold out to the young men of this country the expectation that this parliament is going to vote them any very large sum of money. Rather I would expect them to do, as I said a moment ago, now and in the future, what has been done by our young men hitherto, that is, give their services, provided the government indemnifies them for actual loss of money. I think that we should give them more than we do now. But I do not think there should be a very material increase.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. minister, perhaps, has not understood me. I did not wish to say on behalf of these young men that they want to make money out of their military service. There are two extremes to this matter, and perhaps we are at one extreme to-day. What I mean is that at the present rate of pay they are not indemnified for actual loss, and would not be at three times the amount. What I submit is that there ought to be a better average struck. There is no lack of military ardour, but the fact remains that these young men are simply unable to pay their debts and give their time to this military service for so small a sum as fifty cents a day. They do not ask to be even fully indemnified, but they do ask to be better indemnified than they are now, and I think they should be.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is a fair question.

Mr. WARD. I confess that I am somewhat disappointed by what the hon. minister has said with regard to the paying. I doubt, even if the pay were increased by the small ratio the minister suggests, that it would be satisfactory. I wish to call the minister's attention to one thing which militates against the regiment which I have the honour to command in securing men. There are two other arms of the service in the county from which my regiment is recruited, the artillery and the cavalry, and each is allowed a dollar a day for a horse. That is, a horse is counted to be worth double what a man is. When these young farmers can get $1.50 a day by taking a horse, they much prefer the arms of the service that offer that opportunity. I think, notwithstanding what the minister says about patriotism and all that sort of thing, that the men who give their services to the country for these twelve days in the year are entitled to a better treatment from the government than they receive. It seems to me that, when only half the number of men of each company are to be taken out, a small advance might be given in the pay of those who are going to serve. I would strongly urge upon the minister to reconsider this matter and, if possible, to consider it in the light of the increase of the facilities the country has for obtaining money. It seems to me that when the revenue is so large, the militia should obtain a little benefit from it. I trust he will give his consideration to the case, and I am sure it would be greatly to the benefit of the militia if he would do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister tell us at what time in June the camp will assemble in Niagara ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it is the 23rd, but I am not absolutely certain.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It is the 9th, I believe.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, I think it is later than the 9th. There is a camp on the 9th at Deseronto.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). At Niagara.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) is right. It has all been published in the newspapers.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I was discussing it the other day; I feel safe in saying that it is the 9th.

Mr. WARD. There also was to have been a camp in Kingston on the 16th. I would like to ask why that has been changed to the 23rd ? It is a less convenient date, be-

cause the troops are kept in camp on a holiday, the 1st of July, which they would prefer to spend at home. If the camp at Kingston could be arranged for the 16th, the men would arrive home before the 1st of July. I am sure, however, it would be much more satisfactory if the camp were held on the 16th.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. All I can say is that it is a detail, as my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) will appreciate, which the military branch control and settle, and they do it after corresponding with the district officers commanding in the different districts. I do not interfere in the slightest respect, but since the matter has been mentioned, I will have great pleasure in bringing my hon. friend's observations to the notice of the Adjutant General.

Mr. MONK. Is there going to be a camp at Laprairie this year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I believe not.

Mr. MONK. What is the reason the department has ceased to have a camp at Laprairie ? I think it has been now some time since we have had a camp at Laprairie.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Two years, I think. The reason the camp was not held at Laprairie two years ago was because of an outbreak of small-pox. It became necessary to secure another camping ground, and a very favourable place was found at Three Rivers, and at a reasonable cost. A camp was held there last year, and I believe will be held there this year. The General Officer Commanding was very much pleased with it, and he again selected the place for a camp this year. The hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Monet) has spoken to me with reference to this very matter, and I assured him that very likely next year a general camp would be again held at Laprairie. There is only one camp being held in the whole province of Quebec, at Three Rivers, which is the most convenient place, and the cost of transportation is somewhat less at that point. It is more central than Laprairie. Nevertheless, the Laprairie camp was a very good one. I think it is desirable that these camps should be changed from time to time. The whole militia of the province of Quebec camped at Laprairie three or four years ago, and there is no reason why it should not do so again.

Mr. MONK. Had the member for Laprairie made these representations before the minister had determined upon Three Rivers for the camp this year ? Is there any correspondence ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, I think not. He spoke to me about it only to-day.

Mr. WARD.

Mr. MONK. Is it the intention to have the camp at Laprairie next year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is probable. I may explain that these are matters which are settled chiefly by the staff here, the General Officer Commanding and the Adjutant General, with the officers he has around him, with the assistance of the officers commanding the different districts. I never interfere with recommendations of this kind that are sent to me, because I think these gentlemen know the most about it. Still, I do know that Laprairie is a good ground, and I think it probable that the General Officer Commanding will recommend that a camp be held there, perhaps next year.

Mr. MONK. Small-pox is the reason why the camp was not held there two years ago?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. There was no reason why we did not go there last year except that we had a good ground at Three Rivers.

Salaries and wages, $95,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I want to ask the committee to allow me to divide this item. The money provided here is for the purpose of paying the stores branch of the department, and also for the care of buildings, rifle ranges, &c. It is intended on the 1st of July to place the stores in the military branch under the supervision of the General Officer Commanding. That has been decided upon since the estimates have been made up, therefore, I want to transfer out of this vote $45,000 to the vote for pay and allowances.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. What distinction do you draw ? This covers salaries, wages, superintendents of stores, inspectors of clothing and miscellaneous employees. Are you going to take miscellaneous employees out and leave the stores alone ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman knows that we have a chief superintendent of stores at Ottawa, who has a considerable number of officers and clerks under him. He also has a stores branch and a superintendent of stores in every military district in the Dominion. Now it is proposed to create a department of ordnance, with the chief superintendent of stores as a military officer at the head of that department. He will be called the director-general of ordnance, and his department will then become military, and will be paid out of the fund for pay and allowances. I wish to transfer that portion of this vote, and to carry to the officers and men of the stores branch to the pay and allowance vote, so that they can be paid from that vote instead of as in the past.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It will take all the employees of the stores into the military branch.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Exactly.

Mr. MONK. Is that change provided for in the new Bill ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is not necessary to provide for it by statute. The present law is sufficient.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I forgot to ask the minister whether we will have that Bill down before the supplementaries are taken up, because if we are going to have a general discussion then, we ought to have all the information.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly. I intended to say to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), in reply to an observation he made, that I am prepared, when the general discussion is taken up, to state, and perhaps before that, what we intend to do with reference to introducing the Bill this year. I have given notice of the Bill, but there are some reasons why it has been impossible to go on with it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to transfer $45,000 of this vote to number 74. It will be a permanent change. This vote will be reduced to $50,000. It is a matter, perhaps, for the clerk to settle how it shall be done, but surely it would be possible to divide this vote into two parts, and to say 'pay and allowance, $45,000 in addition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Item 76 would then read as follows :

That a sum not exceeding $436,405 be granted to His Majesty. &c.

That would be adding the $45,000 to the $391,405 for pay and allowances.

Mr. MONK. That is not the best way to do it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, I do not think so.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Say in addition to pay and allowances $45,000, and then you would have the $50,000 for other purposes. I notice there is an addition in that vote of $5,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, it is due largely to the additional number of caretakers. We are building armouries, drill halls and new rifle ranges, and the employees in connection with these will be paid out of this vote of $50,000.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Where are you appointing these new caretakers ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Take military district No. 11, for instance; there is an increase of $631 owing to the appointment of W. L. Davis, as caretaker, at a salary of $540. In district No. 9, which is in Nova Scotia, there is a clerk, Major Black, appointed at a salary of $540.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. What is he required for ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He does work for the district officer commanding. I may explain in regard to this officer that he was the brigade major when I came in, a very deserving man, but he was stricken with illness and rendered unfit to do that work. He is able, however, to do clerical work. He could not come under the pension law and as he was not very well provided with this world's goods it seemed a public duty that we should make some provision for him. Then, there is a man named F. R. Hiltz, who was employed as caretaker of an armoury at $1 a day, and John Potter who is employed at the armoury in Cumberland county, also receives $1 a day. That makes an increase of $1,277 there. So I might go through the whole list.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. What I want to know is if these men are employed where new armouries have been provided, or are they additions to the staffs in localities which are already supplied ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, they are employed at new armouries.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I mean all through—the balance of the additions.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, pretty much. There are some cases of increased wages. There are increases from $1 to $1.25, and from $1.25 to $1.50 a day.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. minister if these soldiers who went out to South Africa and who were in the employ of the government have all been taken back since they returned ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as I know. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) will remember that a return was moved for and that return, I know, has been prepared by every department and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. MONK. I wish to invite the hon. minister's attention to the case of a man named Herbert Cottee, who writes me from 257 Bolton street. As I understand his communication he was ten years in the service of the government. He went out with the 4th contingent, joined as a private, was promoted to be lance corporal and has not been taken back since his return.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What department was he in ?

Mr. MONK. He says :

I have been in the employ of the government for over ten years and was the only one to my knowledge that did not receive his position back on returning from South Africa. Then, I know others who received full pay when absent

who volunteered when I did. I trust you will do what you can for me.

I remain, respectfully,
(Sgd.) HERBERT COTTEE.

I really think the case of this man may have been overlooked.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will be very glad to look into it.

Mr. MONK. He is very deserving, I should judge from his communication, and perhaps, when we continue the discussion of these estimates, the hon. minister will have looked into the case and will see that justice is done to him.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If my hon. friend will send me the papers, I will give him an answer tomorrow. I may say though, that I think Mr. Cottee is mistaken in saying that in the last contingent in which he was, any officers were paid their salaries. I may be wrong. In the first and second contingents that was done, but latterly I do not think it was done, although I will not be absolutely positive.

Mr. MONK. He may be mistaken as to that, but I think in other respects his claim may be worth looking into.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will look into it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think it would be well that we should amend the phraseology of item 76 so as to read that:

A sum not exceeding $95,000 be granted to His Majesty for salaries, wages, pay and allowances.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. That would leave it uncertain. It seems to me that we should divide it into two items.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It could be made to read in this way: 'Salaries and wages $50,000; making one item, and then another item saying: 'Pay and allowances $45,000.'

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That will do.

Item as amended voted.

Military properties, $190,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is the usual vote. There is $35,000 for maintenance of drill halls, &c., and rentals and renewals of military properties generally; rent of buildings and rifle ranges, $10,000; fuel for buildings and rifle ranges, $10,000; lighting, $12,000; water, $1,000; sundry expenses, $2,000. There is a certain amount required annually in the different districts for repairs and it is proposed to divide it in this way: London, $8,000; Toronto, $10,000; Kingston, $8,000; Montreal, $8,000; St. Johns, $5,000; Quebec, $10,000; Fredericton, $8,000; Halifax, $5,000; Winnipeg, $2,000; Victoria, $2,000; Charlottetown, $2,000, and Ottawa, $5,000. For putting up armouries generally, $5,000. There is $20,000 to keep the historic walls of Quebec in some sort of respectable shape. We have been voting this money for the past three years, and they are in a much better condition than they were. There is $8,000 for general repairs for the cartridge factory; repairs to the Wolseley barracks, London, $5,000; repairs to Stanley barracks, $2,000; Toronto cavalry quarters, $1,500; extension of drill hall at Ottawa; Royal Military College, installation of fire protection; Quebec, heating officers' quarters, general repairs to store buildings, painting and general repairs to R.C.R.I. barracks; general repairs at Levis; levelling grounds for Bedford rifle ranges, $5,000; new sidewalks around drill hall, Halifax, $2,000.

Mr. WARD. Last year the same sum of $190,000 was voted for this purpose, but it would appear from the Auditor General's Report that $268,000 was spent. What is the explanation of that. There was $315,000 spent for the annual camps out of a vote of $520,000. Would the excess expenditure on one vote come out of the balance left from the other.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It ought not to. I cannot give the information now, but I will make a note of it and give the explanation later.

Mr. WARD. I see that there was an under expenditure of about $23,000 for pay and allowances last year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That happens almost every year in connection with that vote.

Mr. WARD. There is a statement as to the lapsed amounts in the Auditor General's Report, but that item does not appear amongst them. For annual drill and musketry there was $520,000 voted last year and only $314,000 expended. However, the minister says he will get the explanation.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That item includes stores and equipment of all kinds and last year we added considerably to the equipment and stores and the balance of the vote was expended in that way.

Mr. MONK. It does not seem as if any of these repairs at any place have been done by contract. That is very regrettable. The citadel of Quebec seems to have been stormed every day since the celebrated battle of the Plains of Abraham. Twelve thousand dollars of work seems to have been done by the day.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it would be impossible to do that work by contract. I am so advised.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid the minister has got among very bad people in my own province; it makes me feel doubly sorry to say

so. None of these repairs amounting to over $5,000 seem to have been done by contract. This naturally excites some curiosity. What are the repairs to the citadel to the amount of $20,000 to be done this year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Militia report, at page 22, he will find all the details.

Mr. MONK. I think it is sufficient to look at the public accounts of last year to see that a great saving would be effected by giving most of these things out by contract. The plumbers seem to have held an orgy last year, and if we pursued the rule we would have more money for the militia.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. All new plumbing work is given out by tender, and I assure the hon. gentleman that wherever possible we ask for tenders; but for such work as repairing these old walls it is impossible to get tenders, and I think it is in the public interest to pursue the course we have been pursuing in that respect.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is any truth in the report which reaches us from time to time to the effect that the government intend to establish a new military depot in the city of Montreal ? I believe that the establishment of such a depot would be productive of much good, and, as the hon. gentleman is aware, deputations have come to Ottawa several times in connection therewith. We have no small-pox there at present. I mention that because I see the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Monet) here, for I believe the camp has been taken away from there because of small-pox. But we have none in Montreal, and we would be glad to have a military depot there.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot make any positive announcement now; but if the hon. gentleman will carefully scan the supplementary estimates, he may be pleased with what he will see there.

Mr. MONET. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has alluded to the small-pox at Laprairie, as having caused the removal of the camp from there to Three Rivers a few years ago. But I am glad to know that next year we may have the camp at Laprairie again.

Mr. MONK. That was the explanation of the camp being taken away in the first year, but it did not apply the second year.

Mr. MONET. There was still some small-pox there.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid that my hon. friend seeks an excuse, that is not to be found in disease, except another kind of disease.

Mr. MONET. There were two or three cases there.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman has assumed too much from what the minister said, in saying that the camp will be brought back to Laprairie next year.

Mr. MONET. I said I hoped it would.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to know whether any provision has been made by the Militia Department or the Public Works Department for completing the work on the Toronto drill shed. I feel it incumbent upon me to bring the matter to the attention of the minister. I have already on several occasions, as the minister is aware, brought it to his attention and also to the attention of the Minister of Public Works. It is after all a serious matter, in which both this government and the previous government are involved, and it should be disposed of in one way or the other. As the minister knows, we have three or four fine corps in Toronto. I believe he has authorized additions to the cavalry corps, and, in view of this fact, it is the duty of his department or the Department of Public Works to take the necessary steps to complete this work. Three or four years ago this matter was brought up formally by the city of Toronto. A resolution was adopted in 1899, setting forth the conditions under which the drill shed site was granted, and calling on the hon. Minister of Militia to proceed with the erection of the armouries for the cavalry and artillery, as shown by the government plans and as formerly intended. The matter has been discussed recently, as the hon. minister is aware. I believe His Worship the Mayor of Toronto brought the matter to the attention of the government when he was down here a short time ago, and there has been some correspondence published recently in the newspaper press respecting the conditions under which the city of Toronto provided the $150,000 for the site. There were two letters respecting this matter published in the Toronto 'News' of Saturday, the 9th of May—one from Col. George T. Denison, the other from Col. J. H. Mead. Col. Denison has been for a life-time connected with the militia. He was formerly commander of the Governor General's bodyguard, and was very active at the time steps were being taken to procure the passage of the money by-law for purchasing the site. Col. Denison is a reputable citizen and a militia officer of very high standing, and I shall take the liberty of reading his letter because I cannot put in stronger language the obligation which I conceive to be binding on the government of completing the work which the government pledged itself to perform when the citizens voted $150,000, and purchased the site.

Heydon Villa, Toronto, October 1, 1902.

My dear Howland,—You were asking me about the understanding as to building the cavalry quarters as well as the artillery quarters along

with the armouries. I remember well the circumstances. The plan prepared by the government and shown to the officers commanding corps included accommodations for the infantry, cavalry and artillery. It was all one proposition, one building really and for the whole force, and we were told and we informed our men and our friends that if we could get the by-law passed and the money voted for the purchase of the land that the building would be built by the government. We all worked for the by-law and voted for it, and have paid our share of the taxes for the land upon that understanding. When the land was got, a portion only of the building was put up—the infantry were provided for and the cavalry and artillery done out of theirs.

I have been enforcing criminal law for twenty-five years, and have sent down hundreds of criminals to the penitentiary or Central prison for fraud and obtaining money under false pretenses, and the moral wrong has often been no worse than the wrong done to the cavalry and artillery, whose taxes have been paid for years to buy land upon the false pretense that they would get certain specific rooms and quarters.

Yours very truly,
GEORGE T. DENISON.

That is a pretty strong indictment to make against the government of Canada. I happened to be the chief executive officer of the city at the time this bylaw was voted, and I know that had it not been for the active co-operation of the officers and men of the militia in the city of Toronto, the citizens would not have voted the sum of $150,000 to purchase this site. They had the assurance of the Minister of Militia that if the money were voted, the required building would be furnished by the government. The citizens, in good faith, voted the money and purchased the site—a magnificent site in the heart of the city. The militia force of Toronto are cramped for accommodation, as the Minister of Militia well knows. The Department of Public Works and the Militia Department are in duty bound to keep their part of the bargain. There was an understanding that if the citizens of Toronto would purchase the site, the government would put up a building to accommodate the various branches of the service, and it is only fair that the government should keep faith and provide accommodations for the artillery and cavalry. There is also a letter from Colonel Mead. Colonel Denison was the commanding officer of the cavalry, the Governor General's Body Guard, and Colonel Mead was the officer commanding the Toronto Field Battery. Colonel Mead wrote as follows

Toronto, October 3, 1902.

To His Worship the Mayor, Toronto.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that I was in command of the Toronto Field Battery of Artillery at the time negotiations were in progress between the government of Canada and the city of Toronto, respecting armouries for the accommodation of the militia force of this city. A plan was prepared by the government, showing accommodation proposed. This comprised a drill shed for the infantry, and a riding school for the mounted corps. In this latter building, there was a satisfactory number of rooms for armouries, and squadron rooms for the cavalry, a gun shed and rooms also for the artillery.

I believed the plan submitted formed part of the agreement between the city and the government, and under this belief and as the riding school contained adequate accommodation for my corps, I approved of it. Similar approval having been obtained from the other officers commanding corps, the land was purchased by the city and, as I understood and believed, the government undertook to complete the two necessary buildings to accommodate the mounted corps of the city.

I constantly urged the completion of the arrangement, as ever since the construction of the one building for the infantry, the artillery has suffered greatly from want of adequate accommodation.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Yours very faithfully,
(Sgd.) J. H. MEAD,
Major-Lt.-Col.

I cannot put this case any stronger than the gentlemen whose letters I have read, have put it to the public and the government. It is a notorious fact that the militia has not sufficient accommodations for its stores. It is also notorious that two or three years ago the officer commanding the district, Colonel Otter, made application to the city of Toronto for the use of a portion of St. Andrew's market buildings for the storing of certain material. Two years ago Colonel Otter wrote to the chairman of the property committee of the city hall in Toronto, and I shall put this letter on record again, in the hope that it may have some effect on the Ministers of Militia and Public Works. Colonel Otter, commanding district No. 2, wrote as follows:

Stanley Barracks,
Toronto, March 22, 1901.

Sir,—I have the honour to make application on behalf of a portion of the local militia force for the temporary use of the 'Arcade,' St. Andrew's market, for the purpose of storing guns, wagons and harness.

With the present strength of the city corps, it is impossible to find enough accommodation in the armouries, and pending the provision of such, I am compelled to appeal to the municipal authorities, as no place adapted for the purpose in view can be obtained.

I sincerely trust your committee will see its way to recommending my application to the council, and that a favourable answer may be granted.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
W. D. OTTER, Col.,
Comd'g M. D. No. 2.

The Chairman of the
Property Committee,
City Hall, Toronto.

The committee, upon receipt of this letter, made the following report to the council:

Temporary Use of Arcade in St. Andrew's Market for Storing Guns, &c.

Application has been made to your committee by Col. Otter, commanding M.D. No. 2, on behalf of the local militia force, for the temporary use of the Arcade in St. Andrew's market for the

purpose of storing guns, wagons and harness. In his communication, Col. Otter states that with the present strength of the city corps it is impossible to find enough accommodation in the armouries, and pending the provision of such he is compelled to appeal to the municipal authorities, as no place adapted for the purpose in view can be obtained.

Your committee, after due consideration, beg to recommend that the temporary use of the Arcade in the St. Andrew's Market be granted to the local Militia force for the purpose indicated, the council reserving the right to terminate this arrangement upon giving one month's notice to Col. Otter, or to such officer as may be authorized to carry out the duties now performed by him.

Two years have elapsed since the council of the city of Toronto provided the additional accommodation necessary for the storage of this military equipment, and nothing has been done, although repeated demands have been made on the government, to provide the requisite accommodation. I telegraphed to-day to the City Clerk of Toronto to ascertain if the military authorities were still using St. Andrew's market for storage, and I have his reply: 'Yes, two rooms in market annex for storage.' This reply was sent by Mr. Littlejohn, City Clerk. Surely we have the right to ask the government to put up the necessary buildings and afford the accommodation required for the Toronto militia on the site which the people of Toronto have furnished out of their own pockets. Surely if one of the parties has lived up to its contract, the other is in duty bound to do so. We are not asking a favour, we are demanding a simple right. We are very proud of our militia. Many of them made considerable sacrifices to keep up their corps, and the government should treat them reasonably and fairly by fulfilling its pledge and keeping faith with men who are doing so much, as these young men are doing, in connection with the militia corps in Toronto to maintain the esprit de corps of the militia force.

I think we have the right to demand—I do it most respectfully, but as firmly as I can—that faith should be kept with the city of Toronto. I myself had something to do with getting that money voted. I had to carry out the work of getting that site expropriated, and I feel a good deal on this matter personally. We have fulfilled our part of the arrangement and provided a site at a cost of $150,000, that our militia forces might be provided with the accommodation necessary to make them reasonably comfortable. I have had sent to me clippings from the 'Globe,' the 'Mail' and other newspapers, with respect to the accommodation provided at Buffalo, Malone and other places in New York State for the local militia companies, and they certainly put us to the blush. The accommodations in Buffalo armoury for one regiment are greater than the accommodations in the Toronto armoury for three or four. I hope it will not be necessary to bring this matter up any more. I think we are not asking anything unreasonable when we ask to have this shed completed at once; and I would appeal—and I do appeal with a good deal of confidence—to the present Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) and the present Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) that this be disposed of, and that accommodation for the cavalry and artillery be provided at the earliest moment.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) says that there is nothing unreasonable in his asking that additional accommodation be given to the people of Toronto——

Mr. CLARKE. The militia.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. For the militia. There is certainly nothing unreasonable in it. It is the hon. gentleman's duty to do so, and I am bound to say that he has performed that duty very faithfully. But my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will not complain, I think, if I tell him that I do think it is not reasonable for him to hold my hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works and myself responsible for the failure of his own friends to fulfill their obligations. Now, I have always looked upon my hon. friend as one of the fairest, straightest men in this House or any other House. But I do think he might have said to this committee, when he is putting all this on record in 'Hansard,' that the indictment which he read, penned by Colonel Denison, was an indictment against the late administration.

Mr. CLARKE. All the worse for the late administration. And all the more creditable to the hon. gentleman, if the late administration was derelict in its duty, that he should perform the work which it failed to perform.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is a legacy which has come to us from the late administration. But, notwithstanding the letter that Colonel Denison has written, let me, to some extent, come to the rescue of my hon. friends, and let me tell him that I have diligently searched for one particle of evidence to show that there was any written understanding—and surely the business men of Toronto would not enter into an agreement to purchase $150,000 worth of land upon an agreement with the government without having it in writing—not a particle of writing that I have been able to find, not a single plan, or letter, or statement, or agreement of any kind or description, to show that the government of that day bound itself to do anything in particular with reference to the drill hall of Toronto. There is, apparently, an opinion abroad among the military people there that certain promises were made, but the plan to which my hon. friend has referred, I have never been able to procure, though I have asked for it. But let me dismiss that

view of the case. I have agreed with my hon. friend on this floor before, and I agree with him now, that there should be increased accommodation given to the garrison of militia in the city of Toronto. Moreover, I do not care what the agreement was with the late government, or whether they kept their agreement or not, it is absolutely a fact, and I admit it, that the city of Toronto to-day requires a very considerable amount of increased accommodation for the militia of that city. I agree with all that my hon. friend has said as to the excellent character of the militia of the city of Toronto. In the time of trouble we would look to that city almost before any other place to respond to the call, if it were necessary to call the militia to arms ; and they would turn out and would do their duty as they have done their duty. Now, let me say a word as to the concrete question. I have made a recommendation to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, which he has now before him, and I sincerely hope that we shall be able to make provision for the additional accommodation which is greatly needed, which has been too long needed, in the city of Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE. I was very careful to say, in speaking of this matter that it was the government of Canada that was responsible. I did not attempt to throw the responsibility upon the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) or his colleagues. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House I have not hesitated to draw attention to the laches of somebody in connection with this matter. The fact that the site was selected and approved of by the Department of Militia and the fact that only half of that site is occupied with a building, is evidence that the intention was to erect a further building to afford the necessary accommodation for the various branches of the service. The land that was expropriated was exceedingly expensive land. The city of Toronto would not expropriate a site double the extent of the present building if the citizens had not what they deemed to be a reasonably satisfactory assurance from the militia authorities that that land would be required and the necessary buildings erected. The construction of the present building was not completed until about the time when the late government left office. The same representations would have been made to them that are being made to hon. gentlemen opposite, had they remained in office. I do not know whether those representations would have been more successful, but certainly we could not have been much worse off than we are at the present time. The late government, whatever its faults, certainly carried out part of its contract with the city, for it erected the present splendid shed, and representations were being made to the late government to complete that work. Governments, apparently, are very slow to move in matters of this kind. I do not desire, Mr. Chairman, in bringing this matter up, either to remove responsibility from the late government in the first place or to throw any undeserved responsibility on the present government. But the Minister of Militia admits the fact that there is nothing like sufficient accommodation for the militia of the city of Toronto. The hon. gentleman, in his administration of the department, has increased the cavalry corps. There is, therefore, greater need for additional accommodation. I think I am justified in calling attention to this matter. And, if the hon. minister thinks that he will be relieved in any way by throwing the responsibility on his predecessors for not completing the building in one or two years, I am not at all concerned about that ; I am satisfied that he should do that, provided he will do what I think he admits is reasonably and fairly his duty in the premises by insisting that the building intended to be put upon the site shall be completed and that our various regiments shall have the space and accommodation they ask for and absolutely require.

Mr. MONET. I did not understand the Minister of Militia as answering the question put by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) about the establishment of new divisions of the permanent corps. The rumour is that there are to be three. I would be glad if the hon. minister would tell us whether that is true, and where these new companies are to be situated.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is rather anticipating matters, but I may say that there will be a small addition to the permanent force. Just where the additions will be located I am not in a position to say because it has not been finally settled, and I do not think it would be proper to speak on the subject.

Mr. GALLERY. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence on what grounds the department charged the city of Montreal for calling out the militia ? This matter has been discussed in the city council of Montreal, and as I am also a member of the city council, I would like to get that information.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend, I suppose, did not hear the discussion that has taken place this evening. It was pointed out that under the statute the government had no direct responsibility in the matter at all. The Minister of Justice pointed out with great clearness that if a riot is threatened the mayor of the city may call upon the commanding officer of the militia in that district to turn out the militia to assist the civil authority. The law further provides that the municipality shall pay the militia, and that in the event of its not doing so, the government may take the money out of the consolidated revenue to pay the troops, and the commanding officer who called out the

troops shall immediately proceed to collect the money from the corporation.

Mr. GALLERY. But I want to point out to the minister that the property which was threatened belongs to the government, the city of Montreal cannot collect five cents in taxes upon it, and has nothing to do with it. We wanted to tax some sheds there recently, and took the case down to Quebec, and it was decided against the city. Why should not the government protect their own property now the same as in years gone by ?

Mr. MONK. Perhaps my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Anne, (Mr. Gallery) was not here when we had an assurance from the government that the city of Montreal would not be called upon to pay. I understood the Minister of Militia to say clearly that he would only call upon the city of Montreal to pay after Valleyfield had settled. My hon. friend knows, therefore, there is no danger of Montreal being called upon.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As a matter of fact, I said nothing of the kind. I want to say this, however, to my hon. friend, that it does not matter to whom the property belongs when a riot is threatened, whether it belongs to the Dominion government, or the provincial government, or the city. The corporation of Montreal is bound to see that order is maintained within its borders, and the law provides how that may be done and at whose expense.

Mr. WARD. Before we leave this item, I desire to call the attention of the minister to a peculiar item that I find in the Auditor General's Report, page Q—44. It is an item in connection with the expenditures on military properties, and is very peculiar. I find some gentlemen named Coté Freres did some work repairing walls, and they received $376.98 for supervision. You would imagine that having received that much they would have sharpened their own tools. But I find here an item for sharpening and repairing 728 dozen of tools at fifteen cents a piece. That is 8,726 tools at fifteen cents a piece, $130. It seems to me out of all proportion for the work done, and I hope the minister will make an inquiry and find out what these tools were.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I give it up, but I will make an inquiry.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Militia and Defence, House adjourned at 12 o'clock, a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, May 28, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE PATENT ACT—AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 184) further to amend the Patent Act. He said : In introducing this Bill, I think that perhaps a short explanation is due to the House. The immediate necessity for the passage of an Act of this character is due to the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada last December in the case of Power vs. Griffin, the effect of which decision has been to alter materially the practice of the department, and in some cases to throw a doubt upon the validity of certain acts of the department in the past. The Bill provides for various other amendments to the Patent Act which have been asked for by the applicants for patents and by those who are practising as patent solicitors in Canada. The Bill provides first of all, to remove doubts raised by the decision of the Supreme Court as to the powers of the deputy commissioner of patents or the acting deputy commissioner of patents. While the decision of the court itself did not involve any question as to the powers of these two officials, still there was an expression of opinion by some of the judges that the deputy commissioner and the acting deputy commissioner had been performing certain acts which they considered to be only within the purview of the commissioner himself.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What are these acts ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The granting of extension of time for manufacture in the country, and extension of time for importation under the Patent Act. The Bill also makes an important amendment as to the duration of the existing Canadian patents. At present, under our patent law, all Canadian patents cease, determine and are void whenever a similar patent in a foreign country becomes void for any reason whatever. That is a relic of by-gone patent legislation. It has already been removed from the law of Great Britain and the United States and other foreign countries, and those who are connected with the administration of the patent law in Canada believe that Canadian patents ought not to become void simply because of the voiding of the same patents in a foreign country. This amendment will make the existence of the Canadian patents entirely independent of the life of the same patents in foreign countries. We have found in the administration of the patent law that certain difficulties have arisen in the way of the voiding of patents because of non-manufacture

in this country. There is a pretty large class of patents, the manufacture of which is practically impossible until a demand arises for them. A patent for a graving dock is an example. There might be no necessity for the building of a graving dock in Canada for many years after the period of the patent had expired because of non-usage. There are other patents for processes, the manufacture of which is not necessary unless the article, the use of which the process is required for, is manufactured in the country. It seems to be an injustice to the patentee that because of the non-use of the patent in this country the patent should become null and void. In Great Britain they have adopted a system of licensing, and this Bill proposes to apply the British license system to this class of patent when the owner of the patent applies for it, and when, in the judgment of the commissioner of patents, it is a proper patent to allow that licensing system to prevail in regard to, instead of the patents becoming null and void because of the non-use or non-manufacture of the article in this country. Then, as the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada has shown that certain acts of the deputy commissioner of patents and the acting deputy commissioner of patents were beyond their powers, this Act will render valid acts which have been so performed by these officers. We further propose to revive certain patents which were void, either through failure to manufacture in the country, or by reason of the permission not to manufacture having been given by the officers of the department in a way which this decision of the Supreme Court says was illegal and ineffective.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How far do you make your ex post facto legislation valid, and to what cases does it apply ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will explain that further in detail. I was going over the Bill first. Then we propose another radical amendment in the administration of the office, which has really not occasioned any great trouble, but might do so at any time. The present patent law provides that all papers in connection with patents should be open to public inspection. That provision applies to applications for patents before the patent has been granted. There is no doubt that under that interpretation of the law there is a danger that a person who has filed an application for a patent, a paper which ought to be confidential, might have his patent stolen from him by reason of that fact. We remove the applications for patents from the operation of that section of the law, and make them confidential just as caviats are, until the application has been dealt with and passed upon by the department. There is also a provision, not to change, but to make clear the tariff in regard to the fees on the re-issue of a patent. These have been a subject of dispute, and patent solicitors who appear before the office have generally considered that the ruling of the office was not indicated clearly by the wording of the Act, and I wish to make the wording of the Act so as to indicate more clearly the ruling of the office, which has been sustained and upheld. There is also a clause to extend the time within which the Commissioner of Patents, under certain circumstances, may be able to give a permit for an extension of time to import. We have clauses conserving the rights of people who may have acquired rights through the decision of the Supreme Court, the results of which by this Act are to be modified to a certain extent. We propose to retroactively maintain and make valid certain patents which at the present time are null and void. We conserve the rights which were acquired during the period in which those patents were not valid. The hon. member (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has asked me particularly in what way we make the Act retroactive. I think the first clause, which deals with that is clause 9 :

> The validity of any extension heretofore granted or assumed to be granted under subsection 2 of section 37 of the said Act, of the period of two years limited by that section, or by that section as heretofore amended, for the commencement of the construction or manufacture of a patented invention, or of the period of twelve months thereby limited for the importation of the patented invention, shall not be open to impeachment, because——
>
> (a.) Such extension was so granted or assumed to be granted by the Deputy Commissioner of Patents, or, as acting Deputy Commissioner of Patents, by a person performing the duties of Deputy Minister of Agriculture under the provisions of the Civil Service Act in that behalf, instead of by the Commissioner of Patents; or because
>
> (b.) In the case of the invention to which such extension relates, there had been granted or assumed to be granted a previous extension or previous extensions of the period of two years or the period of twelve months, as the case may be, so limited.

The Supreme Court of Canada has decided that while one extension of time may be permitted, no more can be granted by the Commissioner of Patents. It had been the practice of the department to grant more than one extension. This Act will make valid the extensions which have been granted, but, of course, the practice of the department will now change, and only one extension will be granted in each case.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How about rights acquired by the voiding of a patent ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a general provision carefully preserving all acquired rights under the law.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose a patent lapsed this year, could that be revived in two years from now ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. The Bill only makes valid the patents which have lapsed up to the period when

the new practice of the office will commence, and on the ground that the practice of the office has changed. In section 10 there is a retroactive provision. It provides as follows :

10. The validity of any patent heretofore granted shall not be impeached by reason of the failure of the patentee to construct or manufacture the patented invention, provided such patentee within the period of two years from the date of the patent allowed for such construction of manufacture, or within an authorized extension of that period, became, and at all times thereafter continued to be, ready either to furnish the patented invention himself or to license the right of using it, on reasonable terms, to any person desiring to use it.

2. In the case of any patent the validity of which is protected from impeachment by subsection 1 of this section, it shall be incumbent upon the patentee, or his legal representatives either (a) within six months from the date of the passing of this Act to commence, and after such commencement to continuously carry on in Canada, the construction or manufacture of the patented invention in such manner that any person desiring to use it may obtain it, or cause it to be made for him, at a reasonable price, at some manufactory or establishment for making or constructing it in Canada, or (b) within such six months apply for and thereupon obtain an order of the commissioner under section 7 of this Act making such patent subject to the conditions set forth in that section and upon his or their failure so to do such patent and all the rights and privileges thereby granted shall cease and determine, and the patent shall be null and void.

This is dealing with an old decision of the Patent Office made in 1877.

Mr. INGRAM. Are you changing the old Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the reading of the old Act is entirely different because the decision of the Supreme Court completely controverts and overrides Dr. Tache's decision of 1877. And because the Supreme Court holds that the decision upon which the patent law has been administered ever since was erroneous and incorrect. This section provides that the patents still in existence, the holders of which have complied with Dr. Tache's decision, shall be rendered valid, provided that within a fixed time they do what the new reading of the law requires. It is only right that those patents which have become void through the patentee following Dr. Tache's decision should be given an opportunity of being made valid again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How will you give the patentees notice ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That would be a matter of administration. But I should think that the passage of the law and its appearance in the statutes would give most people sufficient notice.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It gives technical notice, but I mean actual notice.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We could undertake, though it would be great labour, to send notices to the patentees, whose addresses we have, but there are a great many with whom we have had no communications and whose addresses we do not know.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many patents are voided by this decision of the Supreme Court ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are so many patents voided on one ground or another that I could not tell off hand.

Mr. INGRAM. In the case of a patent, the manufacture of which has not begun at the expiration of the two years, does this extend the time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It gives them six months to comply with the new reading of the law. This Bill also makes valid patents which have expired through the expiry of foreign patents. That is another way in which it is retroactive, of course providing the safeguard of acquired rights. There is a general clause in the Bill giving protection to acquired rights under every provision of this measure, and the Department of Justice and my own deputy minister, who is a lawyer, considers that the clause, as it is drawn, will preserve any acquired rights under any retroactive provisions of this Bill. I may say that this decision of the Supreme Court was quite unexpected, that the jurisprudence of the Patent Law had been maintained on the lines I have been discussing some 26 years, and it was only last December that a change was made. I may say that the Department of Justice and my own deputy minister concur fully in the ruling of the Supreme Court, but at the same time I think that the continuous existence of a condition of affairs based on a wrong reading of the law in the department, proves that it was high time that an experienced lawyer was made deputy minister, and I am very glad that I was able to secure the services of an experienced and sound lawyer for the position. I am satisfied that such an appointment will conduce to the more satisfactory administration of these branches in which legal knowledge is required.

Mr. INGRAM. Will it be necessary to come forward with a private Bill in order to renew lapsed patents ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Most of the private Bills which come before the House to make valid lapsed patents owe their existence to the neglect of the patentees themselves. This Bill does not deal with any case in which the patentee has been simply neglectful, but we are trying to remedy a condition of affairs, the existence of which is due to the action of the department and not to the negligence of the patentees. The House will still have the power to pass a private Bill in order to make valid any patent, but this Bill only

affects certain classes of patents which have become void owing to the action of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he had appointed a lawyer as Deputy Minister of Agriculture. Does not the work of the patent officer devolve almost entirely on the chief clerk ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the work of the patent branch is directly under the deputy commissioner of patents, who is also the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. True the chief clerk has charge there just as chief clerks have in other branches, but at the same time it is first of all the minister acting through his deputy, the commissioner of patents, who has direct responsibility and control over the work. One of the chief parts of the work of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, as now constituted and for a long time back, is to deal with these non-agricultural portions of the work of the department. As my hon. friend knows very well, experts and specialists have charge of the various agricultural branches of the Department of Agriculture, but there has not been anybody of that character in the non-agricultural parts of the department. Therefore it is necessary that somebody should be able to deal with these things as a deputy minister.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

GEORGE ROY, INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is Mr. George Roy, of Quebec, in the service of the government as inspector of leather and hides ?
2. If so, when was he so appointed ?
3. What is his salary ?
4. Is it a new position
5. What are the places in which he performs the duties of his office ?
6. Since his appointment, has he done any inspecting in connection with his office ?
7. If so, when, how often, and where was such inspection done by him ?
8. Is he allowed, over and above his salary, any travelling expenses when moving about on inspection ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) :

1. Mr. George Roy, of Quebec, is in the service of the government as chief inspector of hides.

2. He was appointed under authority of subsection three of section two of the General Inspection Act on the 12th July, 1897.

3. $1,500.

4. It was a new position.

5. Under his letter of instruction, he was to supervise the inspectors of hides at Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, London and other points, as occasion might require.

6. Since his appointment he has supervised the inspectors at various places.

7. Whenever occasion required, or whenever he was specially instructed so to do from the department.

8. He is allowed actual travelling expenses when absent on duty.

SALARIES OF COUNTY COURT JUDGES, MANITOBA.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. Has the honourable the Minister of Justice received from the County Court judges of Manitoba a memorial or petition asking that their salaries be increased by one thousand dollars ?
2. Is it the intention of the government to introduce at this session such legislation as will provide for a more adequate salary to the judges of our high and county courts of Manitoba and the Territories ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) :

1. I have received such a memorial.

2. The matter is now under the consideration of the government, but nothing so far has been finally decided.

CONCILIATION BOARDS.

Mr. BELL asked :

1. How many 'conciliation boards' have been registered under section three of the Conciliation Act, 1900 ? (b) How many of such conciliation boards are still in existence ? (c) In how many instances have the services of such conciliation boards been invoked for the settlement of labour disputes ? (d) In how many instances have such services been invoked successfully ?
2. In how many instances have inquiries as to labour disputes been instituted by the Minister of Labour, under subsection 'a,' clause 1, of section 4 of the said Act ?
3. How many applications have been made for the appointment by the Minister of Labour of conciliators, under subsection 'c,' clause 1, of section 4 of said Act ? 1. By employers ; 2. By workmen ? (b) In how many instances have such applications been acted upon ?
4. In how many instances has application been made to the Minister of Labour for the appointment of arbitrators, under subsection 'd,' clause 1, of section 4 of the said Act ? (b) In how many instances have such applications been acted upon ?
5. In how many instances has a memorandum of the settlement of a labour dispute, as a result of the appointment of such conciliators or arbitrators, been filed with the Minister of Labour, under clause three of section four of the said Act ?
6. In how many instances has the Governor in Council, under section seven of the said Act, appointed a commission to take evidence under oath respecting labour disputes ? (b) In how many instances has application been made for the appointment of such a commission ?
7. In how many instances has the Minister of Labour appointed a person to promote the establishment of conciliation boards, under section nine of the said Act ? (b) How many conciliation boards have been established as the result of such action ? (c) How many of the conciliation boards so established are still in existence ?

8. What has been the cost of administering the Conciliation Act, 1900, in each year since the said Act has been in force ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. There have been no conciliation boards registered under section three of the Conciliation Act, 1900. This will answer all the subdivisions of question one.

2. The Minister of Labour has never had occasion to institute inquiries into labour disputes under the subsection of the Act in question.

3. Since the establishment of the Department of Labour twenty-four applications have been made to the Minister of Labour for the appointment of a person to act as conciliator in case of industrial disputes. (1). Of these, two applications were made by employers or their representatives, and twenty-two by employees. (b). The department has taken action in all of these applications.

4. There has been no case of application by both parties to a trade dispute for the appointment of an arbitrator under subsection 'd,' clause one, of section four, of said Act.

5. In no case has a memorandum of the settlement of a labour dispute, under the Conciliation Act, been filed with the Minister of Labour, other than in the form of an official report of the action of the conciliator, published in the 'Labour Gazette' for the month following.

6. There have been no instances of the appointment of a commission under section seven of the Conciliation Act and no application has been made to the department for the appointment of such a commission.

7. There have been no instances of the appointment of a person by the Minister of Labour to promote the establishment of conciliation boards under section nine of said Act.

8. No separate account is kept in the Department of Labour of the cost of administering the conciliation provisions of the Conciliation Act, the only items of disbursements limited exclusively to conciliation proceedings being for travelling expenses of the officers of the department which amounted as follows :—

1900-1	$ 250.30
1901-2	1,010.33
1902-3, to May 1st	496.20

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, BATHURST, N.B.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

Is the Customs Department aware that P. I. Veniot, collector at the port of Bathurst, N.B., absented himself from his office forty-nine days, at various dates, commencing June 12, 1902, and ending March 28, 1903 ? Had the collector leave of absence for the above time ? Is the department aware that Veniot is an active political partisan ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Prefontaine) :

1. The Customs Department is not aware that P. I. Veniot, collector of customs at Bathurst N.B., absented himself from his office forty-nine days, at various dates, commencing June 12th, 1902, and ending March 28th, 1903.

2. The collector had only the usual three weeks leave of absence from duty from the department during the above time.

3. The department is not aware that Veniot is an active political partisan.

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

1. Has Dr. Mehan been removed from the meteorological service at Bathurst, N.B.?
2. If so, for what cause ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Prefontaine) :

1. Yes.
2. Discontinuance of the station.

HARBOUR MASTER, BATHURST, N.B.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

1. Has Michael Daly been dismissed from the position of harbour master of the port of Bathurst, N.B.?
2. If so, for what reason ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Prefontaine) :

1. Yes.
2. In the interest of the public.

PILOT NAZAIRE HATCHERY.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

1. Has Pilot Nazaire Hatchey been appointed harbour master ?
2. If so, is he legally eligible as pilot to hold such position ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

1. Yes.
2. He is not disqualified by being a pilot.

BUOYS IN BATHURST HARBOUR, N.S.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

1. Why was contract for placing buoys in Bathurst Harbour taken from P. J. Burns ?
2. Has this contract been given to Nazaire Hatchey without tender ?
3. If so, why were tenders not called for ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

1. The contract was not taken from Mr. Burns, it terminated on the 12th of March last.

2. Mr. Nazaire Hatchey was appointed harbour master of Bathurst harbour in the early part of April, and he was instructed as an officer of this department to take charge of the buoy service, the cost not to exceed the former contract price, and to provide vouchers for the work.

3. Tenders were not called for because the work was put in the hands of a government officer who is also a pilot and understands where the buoys should be placed in the

interests of navigation. An improved system of inspection of the buoy service on the north side of New Brunswick has been introduced, by sending a steamer specially from harbour to harbour to see that the work is properly done and to prevent complaints about the service. This system will admit of changes in the number of buoys from time to time if necessary without interfering with contract prices, as would be the case if a contract was made.

LIGHT-KEEPER AT MISCOU, N.B.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

1. Was Robert Rivers dismissed from the position of light-keeper at Miscou, N.B. ?
2. If so, is he receiving superannuation allowance ? What is the amount ?
3. And has any one been authorized to receive any portion of such allowance by Rivers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

1. He was not dismissed.
2. He was superannuated and is receiving $250 a year.
3. Not so far as this department is aware.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASE OF LAND IN TOWN OF LEVIS.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Pope—asked :

1. Did the government, in the year 1900, or thereabouts, purchase from A. H. Murphy, or from Miss Murphy, a certain lot of land situate in the town of Lévis, for the purpose of extending the land already owned at the said place by the government, for the use of the Intercolonial Railway, or for other purposes ?
2. What was the price per foot paid for said lot of land so purchased from A. H. Murphy, or Miss Murphy ?
3. How many cheques were made out in payment of the price paid by the government for the said lot of land ? To whom were same made payable, and what was the amount of each cheque ?
4. What was the total price paid by the government for and in connection with the said purchase ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes.
2. $1.75 per foot was paid for the land taken.
3. Two cheques. One in favour of Laura Murphy and E. Lemieux, agent of the Department of Justice, for $7,336.40; and the other in favour of the estate of the late Sir J. A. Chapleau and E. Lemieux, agent of the Department of Justice, for $8,252.60.
4. The total price paid for the land taken was, $15,589.

USE OF GOVERNMENT STEAMER 'MINTO.'

Mr. BELL asked :

1. Was the government steamer 'Minto' sent from Pictou to Magdalen Islands, on May 18, to convey certain passengers ?
2. Were the passengers in question engaged in any matter for the government ?
3. Did the regular mail boat leave on same day ? If so, why was the government steamer 'Minto' used to convey the persons in question ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. I don't know.

APPOINTMENTS TO OFFICE OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many members of the House of Commons, or ex-members of the House of Commons, have been appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown since 13th July, 1896 ; (b) what are the names of such members, or ex-members, of the House of Commons ; (c) to what offices were they so appointed ?
2. How many members of the Senate, or ex-members of the Senate, have been appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown since 13th July, 1896; (b) what are the names of such members, or ex-members, of the Senate ; (c) to what offices were they so appointed ?
3. How many members, or ex-members, of the House of Commons have been appointed to the Senate since 13th July, 1896 ; (b) what are the names of such members, or ex-members, of the House of Commons ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would ask the hon. gentleman to move for a return.

REPORT OF COLONIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to mention to the Prime Minister a fact that I have already brought to his attention. So far as this House is concerned, no documents whatever relating to the colonial conference have ever been brought down. It is true that a few members of parliament have been able to procure a copy of the documents which were laid on the Table of the Imperial House, but so far as this House is concerned, it is in absolute ignorance of any of the results of that colonial conference, unless the documents have been brought down some time during my absence. I mentioned this to the right hon. gentleman some time ago, and I understood from him at that time that there was no objection to bringing down the documents so that every one of them might be available and in the hands of every member of this House. It seems to me that is a very reasonable proposition. I would like, therefore, to ask the right hon. gentleman whether there is any objection to that. Also I would be glad if he would bring down any such documents that have not been laid on the Table of the imperial parliament and that may particularly concern the interest of this country as represented at the colonial conference. I would also ask that when the documents are brought down they should be printed with as much expedition as

possible, so that they may be in the hands of hon. members on both sides of the House before the conclusion of the session.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that there are no other documents to be brought down or in existence than those contained in the Imperial Blue-book. With regard to the advisability of having the blue-book printed for the information of the members of the House, that is a reasonable request, and steps shall be taken immediately with that object in view.

SUPPLY—THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I propose, with the permission of the House, before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, to make a general statement, as has been customary, respecting the Intercolonial Railway. In doing so, let me first make reference to the operations of the railway for the past year. The earnings of the road for the year ending 30th June, 1902, were as follows :

RECEIPTS, 1902.

Passengers	$1,770,941
Freight	3,644,513
Mails and express	255,921
Total	5,671,385

For the purpose of comparison I give the receipts for the year ending 30th June 1901 :

RECEIPTS, 1901.

Passengers	$1,607,166
Freight	3,121,006
Mails and express	244,063
Total	4,972,235

This shows an increase for the year ending 30th June, 1902, over the year previous, of $699,150. There were in operation 1,314 miles of railway in both years. The earnings per mile were, for the year 1902, $4,313, and for the year 1901, $3,782, or an increase in the earnings per mile of $531. The gross earnings per train mile for 1902 were $93.46, as against $79,39 for 1901. You will observe from this statement that the increase in the passenger traffic in 1902 over 1901 amounted to $164,000, while the increase in the freight receipts over the year 1901 were $523,500, making a total increase of about $700,000 in the results of the business for the year.

I have here a comparison between the receipts for the year 1902 and those in the year 1896, which was the year preceding that in which I took charge of the department :

RECEIPTS IN 1896 AND 1902 COMPARED.

	1896.	1902.	Increase for 1902.
Passengers	$ 971,000	$1,770,941	$ 799,600
Freight	1,788,800	3,644,513	1,855,700

This shows that the freight receipts in 1902 amounted to about $200,000, more than double those of 1896, while the passenger receipts fell only $174,000 short of being double those of 1896. Now, in order that the comparison of the volume of receipts between the two years may be absolutely fair, I have added the percentage of increased mileage so as to place up the receipts of 1896 on the same basis as those of 1902. The increased mileage was fifteen per cent ; and allowing for that, I find that the increase of 1902 over 1896 was, for passengers $653,822, and for freight $1,587,379. The receipts from mail and passenger express services, of course, are relatively small, and the difference in favour of 1902 is $28,921. If you allow for the fifteen per cent mileage, showing in favour of 1902 under this head would be something less than that amount.

Now, let me turn to the statement of the gross earnings and working expenses and compare these. As you have heard, the gross earnings for 1902 were $5,671,385. The working expenses for that year were $5,574,563, leaving net earnings for the year ending 30th June, 1902, of $96,822. A comparison of the working expenses of 1902 with 1896, making the addition for the mileage of 1896 to bring it up to that of 1902, produces the following results :

Working expenses, 1902	$5,574,563 02
do do 1896	3,464,751 00
Increase, 1902 over 1896	2,069,812 00

Mr. CLANCY. Would that include the rentals ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That includes rentals in all calculations. I will give you later the figures showing the items of working expenses, particularly that portion which goes to the maintenance and betterment of the road. However, the details which I am now about to furnish will answer the purposes of my present statement. The chief items in this general branch of expenses include all moneys expended in the maintenance of the roadway and the works connected therewith, repairs to locomotives and cars, their renewal, and all other expenses which maintain and improve the character of the road and its equipment. These expenses in 1902 amounted to $2,030,930, while in 1896, adding the fifteen per cent mileage to make the comparison absolutely fair, the total amount expended for these purposes was $1,532,077, or a difference in round figures of $500,000. That is to say, in the year 1902 we spent out of the earnings of the road in the betterment of the road, in the improvement of its equipment and in those directions which go towards enhancing the value and capacity of a railway, half a million more money

than was expended in 1896 for the same purposes upon an equal amount of mileage. And we did that and at the same time, at the end of the year, we came out with a surplus of $96,000 and upwards.

Now, let me depart for one moment from a further examination of the conditions and operation of the railway for the past year, to give you a statement, so far as, and down to as late a period as, it is possible to make it out, of the operations for the current year. The statement which I am about to furnish brings us down to the end of the month of March. We have not yet received a statement of the results down to the end of April. I give them to the House as far as they are available. Our earnings for the nine months just past of the current year run up to $4,745,000. The receipts for the corresponding period of last year were $4,184,000, an increase of $561,000 in the gross earnings for the nine months of the current year. For the same period this year the working expenses were $4,775,000, as compared with $4,187,500 for the corresponding period of last year, an increase of $570,000. The earnings for the nine months were $4,745,000, the working expenses for the nine months were $4,775,500. The excess of working expenses over earnings was $30,500. On the 31st March last year, we had a deficit of $60,000, while on the 31st March, 1901 we had a deficit of $130,000, and yet at the end of the fiscal year 1902, we had the surplus which I have stated of $96,800. Now, I may, perhaps, take a moment to furnish the House with a little explanation as to why this ordinarily occurs.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before passing from that would the hon. gentleman say what was the amount expended upon capital account up to March 31st ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must beg my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) not to interrupt me on the question of capital at this stage. The question of capital does not alter this statement nor its bearing to the extent of a hair's breadth.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It was just for my own information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not taking into account one copper of capital outlay in any particular.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It was for my own information, and not for the purpose of affecting the hon. gentleman's argument at all. If the hon. gentleman has it, I would like to have it, but if he has not, I do not wish it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not hesitate to give it to the hon. gentleman now, but it would be very inconvenient to break into the statement and speak about the amount expended upon capital account. I will give the hon. gentleman the information in due course.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I wish to apologise to the hon. gentleman. He was giving the amount expended and the receipts, and I thought perhaps, in the same table from which he got the information, the officers of the department would have given the total amount of the expenditure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am endeavouring to give a statement of the amount which goes into consolidated revenue account, or in other words, the gross earnings of the road on one side and the expenditure incurred in the operating of the railway on the other, and so far as the question of capital expenditure is concerned, it does not in the remotest degree affect the matter one way or the other. If we had spent less money in maintaining the railway, and if a comparison had been made between previous years and this past year, and it appeared from that comparison that I had expended less money in the maintenance of the road, and that I had taken money from capital account and spent it for the purpose of keeping up the road, then I could understand the relevancy of my hon. friend's desire to get this information. It does not bear upon it in any particular at all. I have shown that we spent upon the actual operation of the railway out of earnings, not out of capital, $500,000 more than was expended in 1896, which is a fair average year under the hon. gentleman's administration. I claim the benefit of the comparison. I have shown that we were in a much better position in operating the railway in 1902 than my hon. friend was in 1896.

When my hon. friend interrupted me, I was about to offer an explanation. There is a portion of the year in which the road is more expensively operated than in other portions of the year, and when the business is not as flourishing as during other months. It happens that during the winter months, December, January, February and running into March, it costs more to maintain and operate the line, and that the business is not usually so large; so that every year you make a poorer showing to the end of March than you are able to make when the year closes, because, after that, your expenses for maintenance are less and your receipts are larger. We were able in 1902 to convert what had been a deficit of $60,000, on the 31st March, into a surplus of $96,800 on the 30th June. My estimate is that at the end of the present fiscal year we will be able to show, everything going well, and from present indications I think I can speak with some confidence, a surplus of at least $125,000. It is fair to call the attention of the House to the important and significant fact to which I have just pointed, that out of the earnings which came from the traffic of the

railway in the year 1902, we spent in the same proportion which had been spent under the previous administration, and we had out of these earnings $500,000 more which we were able to spend in the same direction for the betterment and improvement of the road. If we had spent no more, and I want to impress that fact, because it is a significant fact, upon the attention of the House—if we had spent no more in the maintenance and in improvements upon the road and its equipment than had been spent by our predecessors, I would have been able to come down to parliament and say that instead of having a surplus of $96,800 I had a surplus of $596,000.

My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) laughs at that, but there is no ground upon which he can ridicule that statement. Where did the money come from? It did not come from the skies. It did not come from capital; it did not come from the issue of bonds; it was not given to us—it was earned; earned by the carriage of the traffic upon the road. We earned $500,000 more or we would not have been able to expend $500,000 more. That is a significant fact, therefore, because the road is better by $500,000. Mark you, when I speak of the $500,000, I am not speaking of money that has been spent in earning the receipts which come from the carriage of traffic; I am speaking of money that has been spent upon the equipment and the betterment of the road. And if we had the money to spend it must come out of the earnings, and if it came out of earnings, as it undoubtedly did come, then we must have been able to manage the road and carry the traffic upon the road under more favourable conditions than my hon. friend (Hon. John Haggart) was able to do. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) had spent $500,000 upon betterments and improvements in 1896, he would have had a deficit of $555,000 instead of a deficit of $55,000. There is no getting away from that; the fact is too clear to need elaborate argument to support it.

If there were no other fact to which I could call the attention of this House and of the country in pointing to our efficient administration of the Intercolonial Railway, I would be able to claim from this fact alone that the Intercolonial Railway had certainly come under an improved management, and is showing greatly improved results. But, before I conclude, Sir, I hope to be able to point to a number of other convincing facts which will serve to impress upon the mind of parliament and upon the mind of the people of the country, the fact that the condition of the Intercolonial Railway has been, under our management, improved year after year until it presents a more favourable spectacle to-day than ever before in its history. Let me give some of the details which go to make up this item of working expenses and which are entirely included within that class of working expenses which mean the improvement of the roadbed and the improved equipment of the railway. I have calculated these upon the basis of the same number of miles operated as in 1896, because I want to be absolutely fair to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart). I want to treat him as though he had been handling a railway of exactly the same mileage as I am handling. Any other comparison would not be fair, and I do not want any comparison which is not fair, because being unfair it would militate against the value and force of the statement which I shall make. I take the actual expenditures which the hon. gentleman made in 1896 for the purpose of improving and maintaining the railway, and I add to that expenditure 15 per cent, which is the difference between the mileage then and now. Taking the different items of these accounts which I will read to the House, and comparing them with my own, I will be able to show where the improvement comes in.

COMPARATIVE EXPENDITURES, 1896 AND 1902.

	1896	1902
Repairs and renewals of engines, tenders, &c.	$265,000	$375,000
Repairs of water tanks, pumps, &c.	35,000	40,000
Renewals and repairs to passenger cars.	74,750	117,400
Postal and baggage cars.	22,000	31,200
Freight cars, &c.	235,000	304,000
Maintenance of the road.	406,000	492,000
Rails and fastenings.	62,100	69,500
Ties.	110,000	192,500
Timber, lumber, bridges, cattle-guards, &c.	94,870	181,000
Buildings and platforms.	71,000	100,000
Tools.	9,500	17,500

Under these different headings I have given the amounts chargeable in 1896 and chargeable in identically the same way in 1902, and they show that there was $526,000 more expended in 1902 than was expended in 1896.

Mr. BELL. How much more in 1902.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $526,800 to be accurate. That is out of earnings, outside of what may have been expended out of capital. Out of the money that was earned on the Intercolonial Railway in the carriage of freight and the doing of business, there was $526,000 more expended in 1902 than in 1896. But that is not the case for the year ending the 30th of June, alone. That has been done year after year. We are improving the character of the road. I do not care who the man is who uses that road he will say that it never was before in the condition that it has been in for the last few years, and it is improving every year.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I claim that the Intercolonial Railway is improving year after year, and without making an unfounded boast, I can claim that the road is a credit to the gov-

ernment of the country, and to the people of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a credit to us, both in respect to its roadway and in respect to its equipment, and for the information of hon. friends opposite, I will say that it is going to be better still.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have been surprised to hear one hon. gentleman opposite who is a keen critic of the Intercolonial Railway, and of the railway administration of the government, and who has had, as I am informed, a good deal of experience with regard to railway administration in some form or other; I was surprised to hear him state that in his opinion it cost $1.10 to earn every dollar that is earned on the Intercolonial Railway. Perhaps that statement was not made seriously and perhaps the hon. gentleman did not intend it to be taken seriously, but he made the statement with all seriousness in appearance, and I think he was not unwilling that the impression should be entertained in the country this government railway was in the lamentable condition that the more business it did the worse it was off, and that for every dollar we earned on the road we were actually laying out $1.10. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can throw some light upon that matter now. But, if the statement be true, let us see what is the result of it. In 1896 with $3,000,000 worth of business, there was a deficit of $55,000, and his conclusion would be that with the same amount of money expended in proportion upon the road, and upon equipment, and in various other ways in connection with the operating of the railway, we might properly show, without being subject to criticism, a deficit of $110,000 on $6,000,000 worth of business, figuring on the results obtained on the Intercolonial Railway during the last year of the Conservative administration. If with $3,000,000 of business there is a deficit of $55,000, with $6,000,000 of business there should be a deficit of $110,000. But what was the actual result? It was not, as my hon. friend, with his $1.10 theory, would have us believe. If his theory was correct, and if on $3,000,000 of business, $55,000 was a proper deficit, then on $3,000,000 more business, you would have to add $300,000 more deficit—a total deficit of $355,000. My hon. friend would have us believe that that might have been the result of the administration of this railway by the government. The actual result, however, for the year ending the 30th of June last, was $96,000 of a surplus, after $520,000 odd had been expended for betterments and improvements over and beyond what was laid out by my predecessor, and $55,000 to be added as representing the deficit which the hon. gentleman had in 1896. You can thus see, without going into any further figures or making any closer inspection of the situation, what the difference was between the two administrations. $670,000 is the difference between the operation of the railway under existing conditions, and its operation under the conditions which my hon. friend experienced.

Now, it is only fair to say that it may be held while it costs you a certain amount of money to operate the railway with gross earnings of $3,000,000, it ought not to cost you relatively as much when you are earning $6,000,000, because the fixed charges would be only very slightly increased in earning the additional $3,000,000. I want to put the case quite fairly, as my hon. friend would put it. While some allowance would have to be made for that consideration, in the case of an ordinary corporation railway, it is not true to any considerable extent with respect to the Intercolonial, and I will tell you why. A corporation railway has its bonds and its stock dividends to pay; its bonded obligation is a fixed charge, which does not increase with the increase of business. Therefore, it would not be fair to expect such a railway to show equally favourable results on a small business as on a large. But in the case of the Intercolonial, we have no bonded obligations.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No interest to pay.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no interest to pay; there are no fixed charges or, if there are any, they are very trifling. The general head office expenses are the only fixed charges which would remain whether the business increased or diminished. But these would amount to a very trifling sum and would not be sufficient to vary or alter the calculation in any material degree. But I maintain that I am entitled, in the judgment of any person who is at all disposed to consider this question with a fair mind, to have him ask, To what is it due that these larger results have been achieved? Why is it that these large expenditures out of earnings have been possible? To what is it due? That is the question. I have pointed out that it is not due to any sum of money which the government have borrowed on the public credit and handed over to the officers of the Intercolonial to be expended. I have shown you that there was but one source from which the money came—the surplus earnings over the cost of carrying and handling the goods; and I am entitled, I think, to claim some credit for that, and I will show you where and how and why these improved results have been achieved.

One of the reasons is, I frankly confess it, because we have made a connection with Montreal. That the connection has been made is, I think, due to the more favourable view which the government have taken of the Intercolonial Railway than was taken

by our predecessors. For the readiness with which the government took up that project and made the effort to bring about better results on the railway, I think we are entitled to credit. That extension has already begun to bear fruit, though not to the full extent which we have a right to expect in the future. But the railway has made progress, and has achieved large results, and one of the means by which this has been brought about has been the extension to Montreal. Another has been the improvement or modernization of the road. That has done perhaps more than any other one thing to produce a larger percentage in the earnings over the cost of carrying and handling the freight. Let me just pause for a moment to show in one particular how much the modernization of the road has done.

The putting of larger locomotives capable of hauling heavier loads upon the railway has cut down enormously the cost of carrying and hauling the freight. I cannot too strongly enforce on the mind of parliament or on the people of the country this conviction, which is founded on absolute verity, that when the Intercolonial was running with little engines of from 45 to 50 tons, capable of hauling only 180 or 200 tons of freight, they required the same staff and practically the same cost of fuel and management that is required to carry from 800 to 1,000 tons. The margin of wages is a large and most important item in the whole account. When I tell you that in the outlay for working expenses, which has been stated to amount to $5,700,000 for last year, labour amounts to $3,500,000, you will see how large an element the question of wages is in this matter ; and when you are able to handle and carry freight in much larger quantities with the same expenditure of labour, you are beginning to achieve results that can be achieved in no other way. When I think over the matter, I become alarmed at the possibilities which lay before the Intercolonial if the condition of things which existed down to 1896 had been suffered to continue.

If the same volume of business we are now carrying had then been forced upon us, and if we had been compelled to handle it with the same kind of equipment and under the same conditions as then existed, our deficit would have been more likely a million per year instead of $55,000. With the extra equipment we have provided, we are able, on the same mileage, to do to-day a larger percentage of business and make a larger profit. My hon. friend was short of cars. In saying this I have no desire to cast any reflection upon his management, for nothing else could have been expected. But he certainly had not sufficient to do the business, because I find that he was paying from $60,000 to $80,000 per year, if my memory does not fail me, on car mileage to other companies. We have changed that. To-day we pay a little car mileage but very much less. I think we pay $50,000 per year less than the hon. gentleman did. We pay this much less because we have the cars. We had to get them and we bought them very largely on capital account, but it paid us to do so. Calculate three per cent on all the cars we have bought, and you will find that we save in car mileage sufficient to pay the interest on what these cars cost, which I think is very good and defensible business. My hon. friend had a balance of car mileage against him, and I had for some time also a balance against me, of from $60,000 to $72,000 per year. That represents what we had to pay other railway companies for the use of their cars when we had not sufficient of our own. During my hon. friend's administration and during a portion of my own, that amounted to from $60,000 to $72,000 per year. Well, Mr. Speaker, last year we had $16,800 to our credit on this account, so that we had made enough to wipe out the deficit in respect to car mileage and leave us $16,800 besides, making a total saving of $82,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that there was a balance of $60,000 to $72,000 per year against us ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not say against my hon. friend's administration alone because I had the same experience during some years, but as fast as we were able to get the new cars and put them on the line, the balance was lessened. We had to get the cars or we could not do the business, but the business we did warranted the expenditure, because last year we had a surplus to our credit, on the car mileage account of $16,800. Adding $16,800 to the average balance against us in the years I have referred to, and you get $82,000 as the actual saving effected between the former period and the present, and $82,000 comes very near paying the interest on $3,000,000 on freight cars alone.

Incidental to our putting ourselves in a position to do the business that was offering and to do it without absolute loss, we not only had to get heavier engines, but all the other essentials to placing heavier engines on the road had to be attended to. We could not begin to economize in our management until we got heavier rails, stronger bridges, longer sidings, larger engine houses, larger turning tables, improved equipment in all respects, and in addition put on a dining service with a better class of cars, which has borne results of a most fruitful character. But all this cost money. The results are the strongest possible proof of the wisdom of the policy we have adopted. They show that had we not pursued that course, we would have covered ourselves with absolute discredit as respects the ownership and the operation of the Intercolonial Railway.

I have by no means exhausted the extent of the showing which I am entitled to claim. I had furnished me by the general manager a carefully prepared statement of the conditions which existed in 1896 as compared with 1902, in regard to the cost of material, supplies, wages and other items, which go to make up working expenses. In 1896 the same number of employees, the same quantity of material, and all the other matters of expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway cost, compared with 1902, much less, and if I can prove this, I am entitled to all the benefits resulting from such comparison. I show you a surplus for the year ending 1902 of about $96,000, and I am able to do this notwithstanding the fact that we paid in wages last year on the Intercolonial Railway $240,000 more money than was paid in 1896 in respect of precisely the same number and class of employees. I am not seeking to make an unfair comparison, but am comparing the wages of exactly the same number and the same class of employees as the hon. gentleman had in 1896; and I tell this House that, in respect of that same number and that same class we took out of earnings in 1902, $240,000 more than he did in 1896 and distributed it among the employees. If we had not shown better results than my hon. friend was able to show—and this is the point I wish to make—we would have had a deficit of about $140,000 instead of any surplus whatever. The wages we pay are not excessive; no man will say that we pay more than we ought to pay or more than other railways are paying. But, if we paid $240,000 more in 1902 than the hon. gentleman paid for the same number and class of employees in 1896, I am entitled to claim that our showing for last year is $240,000 better than his would have been under the same conditions. Now, I come to the item of coal. On the same quantity of coal that was consumed on the road under my hon. friend's administration, we had to pay $150,000 more than he had to pay. That is so much additional charge on the road. If things were not improved in the administration some way or other, we should have been that much behind. And I would ask you to consider this point in this connection—and perhaps I should have mentioned it before—there has been no increase in the rates. We are earning no more for carrying a ton of freight than we did before; the charge is the same. The business may increase, the cost of material may be enhanced, wages may rise, but the tariff for carriage of traffic on the Intercolonial Railway remains stationery, and we must figure it on that basis—we cannot raise it because our expenses are higher. Hon. gentlemen opposite and their supporters and their press would be the first to raise an outcry against us did we add anything to the tariff of the Intercolonial, and the political consequences, the disadvantages to us and the advantages to them, would be so important that no government would think of undertaking it.

Mr. BELL. Do I understand the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) to say that rates are no higher now than they were in 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I do. I state to my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) that the rates are no higher now than they were in 1896. There may be an instance or two, some trifling particular, in which, in view of special circumstances, they are changed; but I am making a general statement with respect to this, and I say without fear of successful contradiction—I think I ought to know if it were otherwise—that the rates are the same practically now as they were in 1896, in fact the same as they have been ever since the Intercolonial was established and put into operation. They may be a little lower in some particulars than they were at first, but they certainly are no higher. I have stated that we spent $151,000 more for coal than did our predecessors. Then, for stores and supplies of the same quantities and kinds that were procured in 1896, the prices in 1902 applied to that quantity would have caused an increased expenditure of $131,000. So, we have these three items—$241,000 for wages, $151,000 for coal and $131,000 for stores. Add these to the $521,000 spent in bettering the road and you have over a million dollars actually paid out in the year 1902 over and above the proportionate expenditure of 1896. And they had a deficit of $55,000 while we, notwithstanding all, have a surplus of $96,000.

Now, it may not, perhaps, be of great interest to the House, but I would like to make the statement that, if my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) as head of the department that had to employ on the Intercolonial in 1896 as many men as the increased traffic has made it necessary for us to employ in 1902, the amount he would have had us pay over his actual expenditure would have been not merely $240,000 but far more. Mr. Pottinger had a very careful examination made and he tells me that applying the rate of wages of 1896 to the present entire staff of the Intercolonial for the current year, the total amount of our increased payments of wages is $1,075,000—a very significant fact indeed.

Now, there is, no doubt, a very widespread impression with regard to the Intercolonial, that, because it is owned and operated by the government, it must necessarily be a failure so far as financial results are concerned—that no government can hope to make a good financial showing with regard to the operation of any railway it owns. I hold that no such sweeping condemnation is justified by anything that has ever occurred with regard to the management or operation of the Intercolonial Railway. It is unjust to the Intercolonial, and I do not

think the people of the country wish to form any unjust opinion, or to condemn the government railway unjustly, but would be glad to welcome facts which would disprove and disabuse their minds of any such erroneous view. It is not fair to condemn the management of the Intercolonial because large financial results have not been achieved in times past—and I include my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and his party in this general statement—because it is a government railway and is managed under government supervision. I do not think that the general idea prevails now to any extent which did prevail so largely, that political influences and political pressure and all these pulls that were alleged to exist upon the government railway, exist at present. In the first place I deny that they exist, but suppose they do exist, they are not reflected in any material degree in the results of the operation of the road.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend says hear, hear. He knows that so far as it is humanly possible, the Intercolonial is not a political machine, it never has been a political machine to my knowledge within the past six or seven years. The officers of the Intercolonial are not allowed to issue passes and distribute them at election times to one political party, or to any political party. People who want to use the Intercolonial, whether Liberals or Conservatives, during election times are treated precisely upon the same basis, and they have got to pay for their excursion tickets if they want to travel over the road. There is no discrimination, and as regards political influence the operations of the railway suffer very little harm indeed from that cause. I will tell the House why In nearly all the branches of the management of that railway the staff is organized upon a basis that recognizes seniority and merit for promotion. You have got to start at the bottom. You cannot put one man over the heads of other men who are his seniors in service, or who have more merit. That system exists today in almost the entire service. Therefore, the field for political influence is very limited, except in respect to appointments for the first places, and there it is legitimate and proper. But when recommendations are made to the officials of the road by our friends to fill vacancies that may occur, before any of these people can be appointed they have to submit to a test to show they are qualified to discharge the duties, and if they are not, I do not think they are retained in the service. So you cannot say that political influences are in operation.

But if political influences are so harmful as they are alleged to be in the government management of railways, how is it that government railways are so frequent in other countries ? Not only are the sweeping inferences which people draw with regard to the inefficiency of government management not warranted by the facts, but I will prove to a demonstration that even if there were political influences, they are not reflected in the financial results. If government railway management of railways is successful in other countries, why should it not be so in Canada? What is there in the condition of Canada that makes it an exception to all rules ? Why is it that government railways can be operated in the four corners of the world, in Europe, Asia and Africa, in Italy, in Germany, in the Australian colonies, where governments own roads and operate them successfuly, and they cannot be operated successfully in Canada ? Take Australia ; the government railways show a profit of three and a half or four per cent upon the cost, and their railways as a rule cost twice as much to build as the Intercolonial has cost this country. Why is it that other countries can do this successfully ? Will anybody pretend to argue that there is not as much political pressure brought to bear in the management of government railways in Australia, or South Africa, as there is in Canada ? Why, Sir, there can be no justification for any such statement. There is no reason in the world why Canada should be singled out, why any one should say that while in all other parts of the world government railways are operated successfully, they are not operated successfully in Canada. The assertion that here political influence is detrimental to the efficiency and utility of government roads is not founded on fact ; it is a delusion, it is a prejudice. I would like to see that prejudice rooted out, because so long as it exists it is injuring the country, it is injuring our own institutions, and it is calculated to do a great deal of harm to Canada in the future.

Now, somebody may say : Why, in Australia the people were so dissatisfied with the government management that they changed the system and put their railways in the hands of a commission. Well, I believe some of them did so, but not all. There was dissatisfaction, but they did not propose to give up control of their railways altogether ; they proposed that the people should continue to hold them. But what occurred in Australia and New Zealand was this—I know it occurred in New Zealand. They found that under government administration they were building more railways than were really needed, they were building them in portions of the country where they were not self-sustaining, where there was not sufficient business to justify their construction. The public decided to try the experiment of putting the management in the hands of a railway commission. They tried the experiment and continued it for a few years, but not finding any better financial results, the consequence was that in 1893 the people came to the conclusion to go back to government management, and that is where they are to-day. All the time, how-

ever, whether the roads were under government management or under a commission, the result was that they paid a substantial return, sometimes larger and sometimes smaller, a substantial percentage of interest upon the outlay. I said that the railways in Australia cost twice as much to build as they do in Canada. In some cases they have cost $75,000 to $80,000 per mile, as compared with about half that cost on our own railways.

Now, when I am told that the Intercolonial does not pay, that as a general thing there is a deficit, that the income hardly ever meets the working expenses, I ask: Do you think that is due to the fact that it is a government institution? If you do, figure out what other roads are paying on the cost. We will say they are paying three or four per cent. Some roads, the Canadian Pacific Railway for instance, I suppose is paying five per cent. Why does not the Intercolonial pay an equal return upon the cost, somebody may ask. Well, three per cent upon the cost of the Intercolonial would amount to something over $2,000,000. Sir, will any sane man suppose, after reflecting a moment, that the difference between operating that road by the government and operating it by a company, maintaining the same rates, would amount to the sum of $2,000,000 in net results? Is there anybody so intensely prejudiced against the management of the Intercolonial by the government as to suppose that if this road were in the hands of a private corporation, and if that private corporation could not charge any heavier tolls than the Intercolonial does, that instead of having a surplus of $96,000, it would have a surplus of over $2,000,000?. In other words, $2,000,000 and upwards a year is wasted by reason of government ownership and because of political pressure. That is what it means. If it does not mean that, what does it mean?

I am going to ask the House to follow me through an examination of the question because I think it is of such importance as to warrant an examination, and we will see how much more economically other roads are being operated than the government road and what greater results they show than the government not only at present, but in times past as well. I am not going to distinguish against hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and in my own favour in this statement I am about to make. We paid $5,574,000 last year for working expenses. The political enormity, the devastation which results from government ownership must find itself somewhere within that $5,574,000 of working expenses because the working expenses would have to be reduced by $2,000,000 before you could get any $2,000,000 results. These $2,000,000 must represent the extravagance, waste and mismanagement necessarily incident to the operation of the railway by the government.

Now, let us see where that is going to land us. The earnings of the Intercolonial Railway were in round figures $6,000,000. Ordinarily the railways of this country which are operated successfully by railway companies think that they are doing very well if they get 40 per cent of net earnings out of their gross receipts, and putting our earnings at $6,000,000 we would get around to the $2,000,000 basis I spoke of a moment ago, provided our working expenses were one-third of what they ought to be, and provided that this road was being operated under conditions which would apply if a company were operating it, and under which the government is absolutely unable to operate it according to the criticisms which are passed. The working expenses, as you see, were more than would produce that, and they added up to $5,574,000. Where has this money gone to? I am going to give you a statement showing precisely where these working expenses have gone. I am going to give you the different classes of expenditure, and I think I can give them to you in such a way that you can see clearly the conclusion to which I am pointing, and I think you will agree with the conclusion at which I shall arrive.

First, we have paid $5,574,000 in working expenses. Let us deduct by the process of elimination. The first item that goes to make up that $5,000,000 and upwards is the item of wages, and the item of wages sums up $3,537,000. I have said, and I repeat that the wages of all the employees on the Intercolonial Railway, except those of two or three at the head and except the clerical staff, amount to $233,000, are scheduled and classified, at a rate according to a year after year increase and length of service, and scheduled by agreements which have been arrived at with the different organizations to which the men belong. I say that we do not pay any more than we ought to pay, taking into consideration the present cost of living. We cannot cut them down. You could not attempt to take any portion of this $3,537,000 and point to any of the items and say there is room for economy there, there is waste here, there is extravagance somewhere else. You will have to go into some other field if you are going to find wasteful and extravagant expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway under government ownership as compared with corporation railways. You would not find any field in the item of wages in which to operate in the way of making a reduction. If you take $3,500,000 out of $5,500,000 you have only $2,000,000 remaining. Now, you have to get in all your fine work in the way of this political influence within that $2,000,000. Let us see what is the next big item. The next big item is coal. We pay over $1,000,000 for coal. I say we do not pay one dollar more than we are compelled to pay—not one dollar. We ask for public tenders and competition and we buy our coal at the lowest figure we can get it for. and there are many members of parliament

who know that to be a fact. If we can we take the coal companies by the throat and make them reduce their price, but if we cannot, we have to pay them what they demand. There is no field within the area of the coal item, for exploiting these economical ideas and explaining where political influence, corruption, pressure and wrongdoing hold high carnival. Therefore, you must take off three and a half millions for wages and you must take off another million for coal, and that makes four and a half millions. That leaves you only a million. Now, you will have to find this waste and extravagance within this million. What goes to make up this million ? We pay for printing and advertising $50,000. We may possibly pay a little too much for advertising. We may possibly advertise a little more freely than we ought to, but it is only a mare's nest after all. It does not go very far towards explaining about this $2,000,000. It does not reach out far in that direction. Fifty thousand dollars at all events is paid, and $50,000 will continue to be paid, or in that ratio, and I want to say right here that other railways are just as much subject to the pressure of their friends and outsiders in the way of advertising as the Intercolonial Railway is. You ask railway men and they will frankly acknowledge it to you. They are not free from this sort of pressure. They want to accommodate their friends, they want to stand well with the public, they want to stand well with the different great corporate bodies and with parliaments, and they show to those people with whom they want to be on friendly terms a good deal of consideration. They are just as subject, just as open to pressure and influence as the Intercolonial Railway or the officers who may be connected with it. Now, we have rentals amounting to $140,000. There is no field for economy there. We pay $67,000 for our ferries and we pay for land damages some $20,000. We leave, therefore, for general stores and covering the other outlays $750,000. Now if it were all waste; if the whole $750,000 for stores were not required, and we threw it all away, it would still be a long distance from explaining the difference between the 3 per cent, the earnings on capital of the corporation railways, and the results on the Intercolonial Railway. I have an explanation to make with regard to this item for stores. I venture to say that we buy our stores by public tender and by open and public competition to the extent of nine-tenths of the total quantity. I am hazarding a conjecture there, but I think I am not far astray when I say that nine-tenths of our stores are bought in that way. Now I speak with knowledge on the question, and I say that if the railway companies will allow anybody access to their books, who has curiosity enough to inquire, as to how they conduct this department, I will challenge a comparison between what we pay for our stores and what is paid by other railway companies for their stores, and I hold that the comparison will be favourable to us. People seem always very anxious to supply the government and the competition is exceedingly keen amongst them, and no tenders are accepted at a higher rate than the lowest offer provided the articles are up to our specifications. I am proud to say that this branch is managed by officers who are most economical and careful men. I do not think it would be possible to find in the service of any of the railway companies, more competent, more careful, more economical and more cautious men than those gentlemen on the Intercolonial Railway to whom the purchasing of these supplies is largely entrusted. There is no field for any considerable reduction in that respect. There will, of course, always be little things come in, but take it from first to last, I do not think there would be a difference of $100,000, even including such things as additional stations which we give for the accommodation of the public more than would be supplied by private railway companies. I say without fear of successful contradiction, that all this talk about the management of the Intercolonial Railway by the government, being wasteful, is a mere bugaboo and will not bear scrutiny.

Mr. CLANCY. Why does the hon. gentleman not show results then ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will show a little patience I will show him results which will make a favourable impression on his mind, whether he will acknowledge it or not. There is no more efficient test as to whether the government is managing the railway extravagantly or wastefully, or whether it is managing it as economically as other railway companies, than can be found in the sworn returns which according to law are furnished by the railway companies year after year, and which returns are open to inspection by any one who desires to inspect them. Out of curiosity, I have had a careful abstract made of a comparison of the different items on the Intercolonial Railway with the two great railways, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will give the House the result of that comparison and let the House judge if these figures are not potential in favour of my argument.

The proportion of the earnings of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway to each one hundred dollars of operating expenses is as follows :

	G.T.R.	C.P.R.	I.C.R.
Proportion of earnings to each $100 of operating expenses..	$154	$161	$173

Take that into your minds please, and keep it there. For every $100 of operating expenses, the Canadian Pacific Railway gets $61; the Grand Trunk Railway, $54, and the Intercolonial Railway, $73 on the results

of last year. This sworn return gives the cost of operating, and the expenses and charges in the different branches, and the following is the result :

	C.P.R.	G.T.R.	I.C.R.
Total operating expenses per train mile..	$1 11	$0 93	$0 91

There is a slight fraction to be added to the cents in these figures, but they show that on the Intercolonial Railway it was less than the Grand Trunk Railway per train mile, and a great deal less than the Canadian Pacific Railway. It shows that we have operated the Intercolonial Railway at less cost—and that includes the working expenses; not capital, not interest, not dividends, nothing but the actual handling of the trains—we operated the Intercolonial Railway at less cost than the Grand Trunk Railway, and at a good deal less than the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is there any evidence there that the management of the Intercolonial Railway has been defective or that it does not compare favourably with these other lines? These figures show that we are not wasteful and that we operated our trains with as much economy and indeed with more economy than the other two great railways.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When you come to the maintenance of way works and the buildings per train mile, we find the following results : The Canadian Pacific Railway spent twenty-six cents and a fraction; the Grand Trunk Railway spent twenty cents and a faction, and the Intercolonial Railway nineteen cents and a fraction. We were not very wasteful there at all events. We are about on the same standing as the Grand Trunk Railway and quite a little better than the Canadian Pacific Railway. For every mile of railway we compare favourably with these roads in both these directions. Now let us take the working and repairs of engines per train mile, and we find that it cost the Canadian Pacific Railway thirty-five cents and a fraction; the Grand Trunk Railway thirty-two cents and a fraction; and the Intercolonial Railway thirty-three cents and a fraction. The cost of working and repairs of cars per train mile was as follows : Canadian Pacific Railway seven cents and a fraction; Grand Trunk Railway eleven cents and a fraction; Intercolonial Railway ten cents and a fraction. The cost of general operating expenses was as follows per train mile : Canadian Pacific Railway forty-one cents; Grand Trunk Railway twenty-eight cents and a fraction, Intercolonial Railway twenty-eight cents and a fraction. Under all these different headings the figures of the other railway companies, given in sworn returns, do not make an unfavourable comparison with the results on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. gentleman give us the comparison of the earnings per train mile ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have given it to you.

Mr. CLANCY. You are giving the expenses, I want the earnings.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am furnishing the hon. member with the return as it is required to be handed in by all the railways according to law. I am not picking one thing out of one place and another out of another and putting them together. I am giving the return just as it has been brought down.

Mr. CLANCY. What I understood the hon. minister to give us was the relative proportion of expenses. I am asking him if he can give the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway per train mile in comparison with those of other railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No ; I am just giving you what has been returned. I think the earnings per train mile will be in the same proportion, or perhaps less than those of other railways. I am not stating that as within my knowledge, but simply as my present judgment warrants me. Now, in view of such statistical and reliable facts as I am presenting, it is a fair conclusion that the Intercolonial Railway has no right to get a black eye, or to be treated in the sneering way in which it is generally spoken of, as a failure, because it does not produce the same net results that other railways do ; and it is unfair to ascribe these consequences in any material degree to political pressure or to government operation. I think that if any gentleman, knowing the conditions that exist on the Intercolonial, were to converse with the managers of any other railway on this subject, they would say that it is a mistake to suppose that the government road is in an exceptional position in that regard, or is more subject to the influences to which reference has been made. I had a conversation with a prominent railway man, a president of one of the railways in the United States, only a few months ago, and in the course of the conversation I opened up this subject. I told him that the government railway was rather prejudiced in the minds of the people because it was said : You cannot resist pressure, and that must always be detrimental to the management of a government railway. He said : 'I do not know to what extent pressure of that kind exists in your country, but I can tell you that we in the United States are not by any means free from it. Although we are operating a company railway, we are subject to it. Do not run away with the impression

that corporation railways are exempt from such disabilities ; they exist with respect to them just as you say it is alleged they exist with respect to your government railway.'

Now, the earnings and working expenses of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway for the year ending the 30th of June last were as follows :—

	Grand Trunk.	Canadian Pacific.
Gross earnings	$22,211,813 80	$36,866,875.14
Working expenses ..	14,397,692 81	22,823,200 39
Net earnings	$ 7,814,120 99	$14,043,674 75

If we were to earn a couple of million dollars in excess of our working expenses, our showing would be relatively as good as theirs. Well, I am going to come down to the kernel of this matter, and I am going to show you why we do not earn that much. I am going to show you that the fault does not lie in the management of the road, nor in the fact that it is owned by the government. The fact is not due to any wastefulness, extravagance or wrong-doing of any kind, nor to any causes that are not incidental to other railways as well as government railways. There are two causes. One is a greater cause than the other. I will refer to the minor cause first, though it is not very much inferior to the other. The minor cause is the location of the railway. There is no question that the Intercolonial was not located with reference to business or commercial considerations. I have remarked before, and I remark now, that there was one particular in which political considerations did fatally injure the Intercolonial Railway. That injury was done, not merely once, but for the entire life of the railway. The location of the Intercolonial was most unhappy from the point of view of achieving financial results, and was due entirely to those considerations of state—imperial, if you will—war considerations, large and potent considerations, which were thought to overbalance altogether business considerations. As everybody knows, the location is very unfavourable, not only because of the enormous distances between important points and between the termini of the railway, but because of the inferior character, from a productive business point of view, of a large portion of the country which it traverses. A large portion of the railway does not yield returns at all commensurate with the cost of its operation. That important portion between St. John and Halifax is, I think, paying quite a handsome return over its cost and the expenses of operation ; but the rest of the railway is not, and that is due to the enormous distances over which the traffic has to be hauled, to the small amount of local traffic which comes to the road, and to another consideration of a very potent character, which is, that at almost every important point on the road, at all events from Halifax nearly to Montreal, it has to face water competition. The Intercolonial Railway has settled land only on one side of it ; it has water on the other side. It is a one-sided institution in that respect, and it suffers under that disability.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). And the Canadian Pacific Railway on the other side.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and the Canadian Pacific Railway on the other side. But that is not all. That disability cannot be removed. I doubt if the other can be removed. I had a careful study made and a careful statement furnished to me by the traffic officers of the Intercolonial Railway, as to the general traffic, of tolls and freight charges which govern on the Intercolonial Railway and those which govern on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway; and the result of that statement, keeping well on the safe side, is that the rates upon those two railways are from fifty to one hundred per cent higher than those upon the Intercolonial Railway. I am not going to suggest that the rates upon either of the two other roads are higher than they ought to be. I have not the requisite knowledge which would enable me to pass an opinion. But I do know that the rates on the Intercolonial Railway are even lower than I have stated, when you consider the question of distances and the question of scarcity of traffic. It goes without saying that it costs no more money to carry a thousand tons of freight at $10 than at $5 per ton. If then you add fifty per cent, which is the minimum excess of the rates of freights on the other roads as compared with the Intercolonial Railway, to the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway in the carriage of freight, our revenue would be increased by that amount and our expenditure would not be increased one farthing. Let me make a calculation. The gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway on its traffic, not including passenger traffic, for the year 1902 were $3,900,000. Add fifty per cent to that to bring it up to this minimum excess, and you get $1,950,000 of addition. In other words, if we could have collected on the Intercolonial Railway the minimum rates charged by other railways, we would have had $1,950,000 more revenue from freight than we did, and this would have brought our total earnings up to $7,600,000, including passenger traffic. And our working expenses would not have been increased. Deducting working expenses, we would have had a surplus for 1902 of $2,046,000. My hon. friend smiles, but these figures cannot be gainsaid.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I smile when I think of what we have missed by not putting up the rates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would smile on the other side

of my face if I were asked to put up the rates. We have no right to put up the rates. Nobody expects it. If my hon. friend were in charge, he would not put them up, or if he did, he would take them down again. We cannot put them up. The rates on the Intercolonial Railway are no higher than those which were imposed at the time when part of it was owned and operated by the government of Nova Scotia and another part by the government of New Brunswick. The rates are, I think, substantially the same. When confederation was formed, the Dominion took over the road under the conditions and rates then existing, and from that time down the people of this country, the government and parliament, have all agreed that these rates and conditions should continue, and they exist to-day. Another reason why it would not be possible to raise the rates to any appreciable extent is to be found in the fact that the Intercolonial Railway is subjected at every point to a keen and active water competition. If you were to raise the rates, you would find that you would not get the business. I repeat that we would have $2,000,000 better results if we were to be treated upon even less than the present basis upon which the other two systems are conducting their business. This is a material and fair argument, because those who condemn the management of the Intercolonial Railway do not condemn it because it does not put up its rates. They do not look at that side of the account. They condemn it on account of wastefulness and extravagance and wrong-doings which they never specify and cannot indicate, and because the financial results do not make any kind of comparison with those of the other great railways. You have therefore $2,046,000 which would have gone into the treasury of this country if the rates on freights had been fifty per cent higher than were charged last year. That would have shown forty per cent earnings to sixty per cent working expenses, and everybody would have exclaimed 'what marvellously good management and administration.' You can always furnish evidence of that. All you have to do is tax the people a little heavier, make them pay a little more if possible, and you have this evidence of splendid administration. $2,046,000 would have paid three per cent nearly on the whole cost of the Intercolonial Railway, which is just as good as either of these other companies are doing. Take the rates in the Australian colonies, and you will find that they are a good deal higher than the rates on which I based my argument.

Mr. CHARLTON. Higher than our rates with fifty per cent added ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, higher than the minimum excess over ours. $2,000,000 might have been brought into the treasury if we could have added fifty per cent to our rates, but that money remained in the pockets of the people who have done business over the Intercolonial Railway. They have been taxed that much less, and if the Intercolonial Railway has relieved these people of $2,000,000 taxes and contributed besides in a material degree to the general improvement of business and the development of the country, I am not so sure that the people have not reaped as good results as if that money had gone into the treasury. So beneficial are these results that if the people were thoroughly cognizant of the advantages which have accrued to them from using the Intercolonial Railway—and these advantages are not confined to any one province by any means—they would never cavil at the results. And they would only wish that it had occurred to somebody in times past to construct a railway through their portion of the country instead of aiding to build railways to be owned and managed by private corporations. In making this defence of the Intercolonial management I appeal to the judgment and opinion of those who do business with the road, and I am sure that they will say that they are well satisfied with the manner in which they have been served and that they would be truly sorry if any change were made under which the tolls were changed so as to lay an additional burden on the traffic that is carried.

Now, Sir, I have pointed out these advantages, and I will here endeavour to give to the House a thorough and complete statement of the actual existing conditions. I do not know that, as respects this question of rates and tolls upon the road, the people of Canada have been as fully informed before as I have now informed them. I do not think there is any disadvantage in the people knowing these facts ; I think they are entitled to be apprised of them. And I believe that when they realize all that has been done by the government railroad in the development of these portions of Canada, and the increase of traffic with the other provinces, that the connection it affords has brought about, and when they realize that all this has been done at such a moderate cost to the country and has imposed so light a burden upon the people, I think they will realize as they have not realized before the magnificent property they possess in the Intercolonial Railway of Canada. I do not think they realize it now, but I hope they will come to that realization.

I am not making, I hope, any personal or individual claim in regard to these results. Only in a very small measure should I be entitled to do so. If I were to award credit for the showing we are able to make, I would award the greatest share to the good men and true, faithful in their duty and loyal to the public, who give their best attention and employ their best energies in the discharge of the duties connected with the Intercolonial service. I think they

are entitled to great credit, indeed, I venture to say that you cannot travel over any railway in Canada on which you will find a better class of men, more attentive, more courteous, or are more deeply interested in their work and in the welfare of the road they serve. I am bound to say this in justice to the employees of the road, for so I have heard them spoken of by many who have travelled over the Intercolonial Railway. To these men I would award their proper measure of praise. I am only claiming for the government that we realized what the necessities of the hour demanded, we realized what would be desirable—nay, what would be imperative—if we would rescue the Intercolonial Railway from the alarming condition in which it was ; if we were to escape a continuance not merely of half million deficits, but of deficits far in excess of half a million ; realized that it was necessary that we should go to work in a business like way, that we should adopt modern methods, that we should act as men who knew that good results were to be achieved only by adopting the means necessary for the economical working of the railway and the carrying of its traffic. It was only because we were impressed with the importance and necessity of going about the working of the Intercolonial Railway from that point of view that I claim we are entitled to credit from the people of this country.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). The Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) began his statement concerning the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway with a comparison between the management of the present day and the management of 1896 under my regime. He accounted for a good deal of the large expenditure on revenue account by showing that large sums had been spent in the improvement and maintenance of the road. He made a comparison of the sums spent on maintenance out of revenue account last year and in 1896 which appears very favourable to his own administration. I could not take down all the items, but I shall have an opportunity later on of examining them, and, perhaps, of discussing them more in detail than it is possible for me to do just now. Fancy the minister charged with the management of the Intercolonial Railway, having nearly double the locomotive power and car accommodation that his predecessors had, claiming the extra amount expended in repairs to locomotives, tanks, cars and so on, as an extra sum spent in improving the road and enabling him to compare his management favourably with that of his predecessor. Then he goes on to say that the higher rates of wages paid to keep the road in repair makes a certain aggregate sum over that spent in 1896, and, assuming that the same amount of work is done per day by each man, the whole is to be counted as paid for the improvement of the road and is in favour of the management of the present day in comparison with that of 1896. The whole comparison is about as absurd a one as it is possible for a minister of the Crown to make. Because he spent $500,000 more than his predecessors in repairs to passenger cars, stations, roadbed, and so on, he claims this whole amount as an improvement of the road and a benefit to the country, and so much in his favour as compared with his predecessor. The whole thing was simply a part of the hon. gentleman's advocacy of the idea of the government road being extended from the present terminus perhaps of Georgian bay, perhaps to the prairies of the west, perhaps to the Pacific coast. I hear many supporters of the hon. gentleman voicing that opinion. But, before I am done, I think that if they are ready to take the Intercolonial Railway under its present auspices as a basis of judgment as to this proposition, they will hardly be so favourably impressed with it. Let me show what the hon. gentleman has expended on the road since he got into power, in 1897. I gave the figures a couple of years ago, but I would like to put them again before the country. If the country can calmly contemplate such an alarming expenditure—I am not going to say extravagant expenditure—on one of its important works as that which was made for the purpose of having the Intercolonial road extended to a terminus in the city of Montreal, and if they submit to it without complaint, it is their fault and not ours. Our duty is simply to draw the people's attention to the enormous expenditure which is being made by the hon. gentleman in the management of the Intercolonial Railway. In 1897 he expended on capital account, $145,142 over and above the receipts of the road. In 1898 he expended $252,367.20, in 1899, $1,081,929.94 ; in 1900, $1,796,348.29. In that year he purchased the Drummond Railway, for which he paid $1,459,000. In 1901 we find the expenditure still going up, for he expended on capital account $3,633,836.57. In 1902 he expended $4,665,590.80. Giving him credit for the $92,000 which he claims this year, there was a loss in operating the road of $418,029.39. Subsidies to the Victoria Bridge, $500,000. Now it was not for the purpose of interrupting the hon. gentleman in his remarks that I asked him for a monthly statement of the receipts and expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway, because I knew he had it, at least he ought to have it. He has a monthly statement of the amount which is likely to be expended, and the probable receipts of the next month. He gave us the expenditure on revenue account on the Intercolonial Railway until the 1st of March last, and the receipts from that road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not get any monthly state-

ment, I get a monthly estimate of the actual expenditure on working accounts, and on earnings. I get no such monthly statement, except that when the accounts of the month are made up I get a statement of the working expenses of the month. I get the weekly statement of the earnings, and when the month is up and they are able to complete the statement, they send it forward as soon as they can. That will show both the earnings of the month and the working expenses. That is the only monthly statement I get.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentle not get the total expenditure on the Intercolonial during the month ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. Does the hon. gentleman say he was in the habit of getting it ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so, except for working expenses of operating.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then it is left entirely to the officials down in Moncton to discriminate between the earning expenses or what should be attached to the revenue account and what should be attached to capital.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly, that is fixed in the appropriation.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Railways knows perfectly well that when I was Minister of Railways hundreds and thousands of items, amounting to sums of thousands and millions of dollars were charged to revenue account which are now charged to capital account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are wrong.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What I asked from the hon. gentleman was this. Surely he has a monthly statement of the receipts and expenditures on the Intercolonial. That is what I wanted. Then I wanted to know what was the amount of expenditure upon capital account up to the 1st of March last.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will get that for the hon. gentleman, but I do not carry it in my head.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I asked him in the politest manner, I thought perhaps he had it before him when he was making his explanations. I am trying to show to the people of this country what has been expended, or what will be expended on the 1st of June next, on capital account, and what the deficits will be on the Intercolonial.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will give the hon. gentleman the information to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, he has got it then ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, but I can get it. There is no difficulty in getting it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then I am obliged to go to the estimates. I will give as nearly as possible the expenditure for the year. The amount voted for the Intercolonial for 1902-3 was $3,200,000, of which I see, appropriation not required, $978,800. I am debiting the minister only with what he has expended of that amount. It is possible that in the supplementary estimates a provision will have to be made for an expenditure during the year further than what is stated in these estimates, and I am pretty certain there will. However, the amount would be $2,281,200 that was expended on capital account last year. He has expended on the Prince Edward Island Railway, on capital account, $2,736,200, that is, adding the deficits from 1897 up to the present year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman complain of that expenditure ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am simply making a statement of the expenditure the hon. gentleman has made on railways. The hon. gentleman interrupted me a while ago, and he said that what I was saying did not affect the argument. What pertinence has it to the argument whether I object to the expenditure or not ? The amount expended, then, is $2,736,200. But there is besides a large amount, I see, to be added to the capital account in the current year, there is a large amount asked for the Intercolonial and a large amount for the Prince Edward Island Railway. We pay to the Grand Trunk Railway a certain sum every year, $140,000. Deducting the $140,000, which the hon. gentleman has a right to take to his credit the amount capitalized at 3 per cent which has been paid out of the revenue of the Intercolonial for the present year, is $4,526,607. So there was actually expended in cash, $18,798,670, or adding these two amounts together, $23,325,331, from 1897 down to the first of June next. Supposing, Sir, we had a government railway stretching from Montreal across to the Pacific, and supposing it was under the management of the Minister of Railways, what would be the amount expended in five years on capital expenditure on that road ? What position would the country be in with a like expenditure as upon the Intercolonial ? The hon. minister may talk, but these are the bald, naked facts that stick out to view. They came into possession of the Intercolonial Railway with a capital account of a little less than $44,000,000, and at the present day it is nearly $69,000,000. The hon. gentleman talks about the improvements he has made to the road and he says that the amount of rolling stock and the number of locomotives that he found upon the road when he took possession were not sufficient

for the working of the road. I have from his deputy who sits beside him here, his trusted and efficient man, and from the manager of his road down there of whom he speaks so favourably, a statement that there were more than sufficient locomotives and rolling stock for the Intercolonial Railway and that if I acquired the Drummond County Railway, there was sufficient to run it without purchasing more rolling stock. The hon. gentleman says: Look how efficient the Intercolonial Railway is. The balance of mileage instead of being against us to the extent of $80,000, is now $15,000 in our favour. Does the hon. minister know the effect of the statement he is making? What is the reason? Simply this; that it is notorious in every part of the country that he has a superabundance of rolling stock, and that it is being used by every railway in every section of the country. That is the cause of the balance being the other way. I put a notice upon the paper in regard to that question, because I had heard that no railway down near the Intercolonial Railway purchases rolling stock at all. They rely upon running their roads with the locomotives of the Intercolonial Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway borrowed eight locomotives from the hon. gentleman. Nearly all the passenger coaches and freight cars used by the different roads in that section of the country belong to the Intercolonial Railway, and then the hon. minister gets up and boasts of the balance of mileage being in his favour to the extent of $15,000 a year.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, before six o'clock I was dealing with the comparison which the Minister of Railways had made between the expenditure for maintenance upon the Intercolonial Railway in 1902, as compared with the expenditure under my administration in 1896. He spoke of the increased rate of wages at the present day compared with what it was in 1896, but it never seemed to have occurred to the Minister of Railways that if a man did the same work in 1896 that he did in 1902, the increase in wages would be an argument to the minister's disadvantage, because if the rate of wages is $1.25 now and I paid $1 a day in 1896, then if the same man did the same day's work I got for $1 what the Minister of Railways is expending $1.25 for. I do not wish to use any term which might be considered in any way opprobrious, but I think I may say that to my mind the argument of the Minister of Railways is an absurdity. Before six o'clock I spoke of the enormous expenditure which the people of this country were called on to make, a sum of about $23,000,000, for the purpose of extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. Why, Sir, that amounts to nearly the whole surplus of this country in the time of its prosperity, and it could have been better spent in works of utility which would have been beneficial to Canada. We could have had a government railway, if necessary, from the province of Ontario to the prairie lands of the North-west for nearly the same sum of money which the hon. gentleman has expended in improvements on the Intercolonial Railway. I have no objection to improvements on the Intercolonial Railway, providing the expenditure is used for the advantage of Canada, but the position of the Intercolonial Railway to-day is no better than it was in 1896. It may have increased accommodation and a good many things that way; it may have better cars, but the road in 1896 was one of the best roads on the continent of America, so far as roadbed is concerned. My instruction to my officers of the department was to keep up the rolling stock to the fullest extent, so as to make the Intercolonial Railway of the highest standard amongst all the railroads on the continent of America. And it was, too. It had rolling stock sufficient for its purpose. When the hon. gentleman came into power he made the statement that the expenditure he would make on the Drummond County to extend the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal would be repaid to the people of the country through the benefits that would be derived from the increased business of the Intercolonial Railway. But the hon. gentleman has a new system of book-keeping. The Intercolonial Railway is in a different category from any other railway in the country in that respect. Other railroads have to pay interest on their bonds and other securities, but the anomaly and paradox in reference to the Intercolonial Railway is that it is government money that is going into it, and it is not expected to pay interest at all on the investment that the country makes in it. We are not only to keep the promise that we made with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick at the time of confederation, but we are to go on with interminable expenditures until the capital account in that road alone is $68,000,000, and it is not expected that the country is to be recouped in any way for that expenditure. It is to be for the benefit of the people down there, in cheaper freights, in the cheaper carrying of passengers, and it is all done without any political bias or political influence at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am glad to hear that the Minister of Railways states that no political influence enters into the administration of the Intercolonial Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It was so in my day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes ; it was so in my day, and the hon. gentleman says it is so in his day. It is possible, however, that on some great occasions tickets may have been given under his regime to electors for the purpose of enabling them to reach the polls to vote in the right direction.

In consequence of the lights in the Chamber having gone out, Mr. Speaker announced that the sitting of the House would be suspended for half an hour.

House resumed at 8.55.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, when the lights went out, I was speaking about the protest of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals against the suggestion that any political influence was exercised in the control of the Intercolonial Railway. He assured the House that no political influence was allowed to interfere with it in any manner, which he intimated was in strong contrast with the management of the railway under his predecessors. Well, if the hon. gentleman does not use political influence in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, he has changed his mind since a short time after he became Minister of Railways and Canals. In the town in which I reside there were two bridge tenders employed, and when the hon. gentleman came into power he dismissed these men without a single complaint being made against either of them, and appointed political supporters of his in their places. In addition to that, he sent a letter to Mr. Frost, at present a senator, who was at the time representing Leeds and Grenville, stating that there were fifteen employees on the Rideau canal—a good many of them were old sergeants, some of whom had been in the British service for twenty years or more—and asking the hon. gentleman to recommend successors to these men. Mr. Frost stated in this House that he had received that letter ; but he had enough honour in his composition not to accept the proposition of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and he refused to name any successors to them. This is the hon. gentleman who declares to this House and the country at large that no political influence is being used in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. He has changed his mind and his method since he came into power, and it is a good thing for his party that he has done so, after that slap in the face which he got from one of his strongest supporters in this House. What has become of the hon. gentleman's promise ? He asked and obtained from this country over $18,000,000 in cash for the purpose of extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, besides an amount which capitalized would equal $4,000,000, making altogether $22,000,000. He gave authority to the right hon. gentleman who leads the House to make the statement in Sohmer Park, Montreal, that the Intercolonial Railway would recoup to the people of Canada the extra expenditure that was incurred in extending the railway to Montreal, and that the era of deficits would cease. How has he performed that promise ? He comes here to-day and claims a nominal surplus of $96,000. How does he arrive at that surplus? By charging to capital account items which ought to be and which formerly were charged to the ordinary revenue of the Intercolonial Railway. He comes here with a statement which does not compare with those of his predecessors, because his system of book-keeping is entirely different. He does this notwithstanding the fact that the leaders of the Reform party in the House claimed again and again that it was time that the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway was changed. So it is ; it is time the people of Canada knew the difference between cooked balances on the Intercolonial Railway and the real loss that the running of that railway imposes upon them. The real loss to the country from 1867 up to the present time in the running of the Intercolonial Railway is $23,000,000, and the railway is the better to the extent of the extra rolling stock that it has, the Drummond Counties Railway, and the terminal facilities in Montreal. The hon. Minister of Railways has done more to prevent the people of this country embarking in a government railway than any other man. He has pointed out what the result would be if the Intercolonial Railway were extended to the Pacific ocean. What would be the result if the charges to capital account on such a railway were in the same proportion as those he has made on the Intercolonial Railway ? The whole revenues of this country, I will venture to say, would not supply the deficits of such a railroad conducted in the same manner as the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman states perfectly correctly that the government can obtain employees for a government railway as cheaply as any corporation in Canada. He states also, what is true, that the supplies for such a road could be got as cheaply by the government as by any private corporation.

An hon. MEMBER. Except ties.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Ties could be got just as cheaply too, if they were bought by public tender and contract. In my experience of the management of the Intercolonial Railway, I found that people who were furnishing supplies or labour of any kind would rather deal with the government of this country than with any railway corporation, and that the railway could be run as cheaply by the government, if properly managed, as by any corporation. In Germany nearly £15,000,000 sterling is contributed to the general expenses of the country out of the surplus earnings of the state-managed railways ; and similar results have been achieved in other countries. But, un-

fortunately, in this country, under the management at present in vogue, there has been a totally different result. Under efficient management, however, I believe that a government road could be carried on as cheaply as any railway managed by a corporation. I believe that to be possible, but it would require that the men at the head of the administration should have no political bias, that they should not, at election time, put on large numbers of persons who are not required for the running of the road, and that they should not, in one season of the year, buy 1,300,000 ties, when it was impossible to use more than 500,000 or 600,000. They would have to run the road as economically as a corporation would do it. As I have said before, the hon. gentleman has, by his maladministration, put into the background the possibility of building a government railway from Montreal either to the Georgian bay or the western prairies or the Pacific coast. That may be unfortunate or it may be a good thing for the country, but, in either case, the result of the present management of the Intercolonial Railway is to put an end to any policy of government constructed railways in this country. Evidently, however, the whole tendency of the hon. gentleman's speech was to show the advantages of government ownership of railways, and the extension of the Intercolonial Railway. That same opinion we find voiced in the Railway Committee and expressed in this House again and again, and I noticed how carefully the right hon. the First Minister dealt with this particular point the other day. He was on the swing between subsidized roads and a government road. The government had not determined on a policy and pressure was evidently being brought on the right hon. gentleman by members of his own cabinet and by the government rank and file for the purpose of having a government road erected from Montreal to the Pacific, but I venture to say that if such a scheme be ever suggested to the people, they will be nearly unanimous against any such burden being imposed on the finances of the country as would be entailed by the construction of any such undertaking.

The hon. gentleman went into details with regard to the running of the Intercolonial Railway. He said that if the rates charged for the carrying of freight and passengers by the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway had been adopted on the Intercolonial Railway, he would have had a surplus of nearly $2,000,000 instead of $92,000. The rates, he said, charged on freight by the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway were from 50 to 100 per cent higher than those charged by the Intercolonial Railway. That must be comforting to the residents along the line of the Intercolonial. But I think that if the mileage is looked in to, we will find that the freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway are nearly as high as those charged on the other two lines, and the reason the latter appear higher by comparison, when the totals are taken into consideration, is because the hon. gentleman has attempted to divert against nature the products of the North-west and Manitoba to St. John over the Intercolonial Railway. These products he is carrying at a loss, but the rates on this enter into the general estimates and calculation of rates which the hon. gentleman has made, and that is why the rates on the Intercolonial Railway appear so low. I venture to repeat what I have already said, that by no legislation, by no government road, can you divert traffic from that point where it will secure the cheapest means of transport to the place of consumption. No matter what rolling stock you may purchase or what improvements you may make, you will never divert the traffic of the North-west and Manitoba over the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax and St. John. By no legislation or railway construction can you make traffic go by a route to the seaboard, which is more expensive than another route, and the people of this country will not be content to run a railway year after year that shows heavy deficits in order to obtain a result which is not economically correct.

I have not had an opportunity of going into the details of the different matters which the hon. gentleman has brought before the House, but what I wish to protest strongly against is the enormous expenditure, uselessly laid out on the Intercolonial Railway, of $23,000,000. What would $23,000,000 do ? And this is not the end of it. Take the capital account of the Prince Edward Island Railway, you will find votes on that account in the main estimates, and there will be further votes in the supplementary estimates. As the hon. gentleman says, the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway is not at all closed. He complains that he has not sufficient rolling stock to handle the freight. If he would keep the rolling stock, which he says is yielding a revenue to the people of $15,000 per year instead of the adverse balance of $60,000 which formerly existed—if he would keep that rolling stock on his road, he would have sufficient to handle the traffic. If the hon. minister understood his business, he would know that the balance should go against the railway on this account, because that would show that nearly the whole of his rolling stock was being employed on his own line. What do other railway companies pay the Intercolonial Railway for the use of its freight cars ? They pay twenty-five cents per day for the first eighteen days, and then they pay a fine of one dollar if the car is not returned, or you will get from them six cents per day for the use of a freight car which costs on an average $900. Where is there a railway in any section of the country—especially

the small roads in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—which would not rather give the hon. gentleman his $15,000 balance in his favour in order to utilize his rolling stock ?

Let me point out further that the increased receipts on the Intercolonial Railway are due to the increased local trade in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The results attained by building the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal have not fulfilled one-fiftieth part of the hon. gentleman's expectation. Where does he get his increased freight from ? He gets it through the increased development of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, his own province, but the doubling of the amount carried of one single article—lumber. The hon. gentleman states that he has had to contend with enormous difficulties in getting his surplus of $96,000; he has to pay so much more for labour, so much for supplies, so much more for coal. Why does he not start a coal mine of his own ? I know the difficulty the hon. gentleman has to contend with—a combine amongst the coal mine owners of Nova Scotia. I had to contend with the same. They fix the price and divide the quantity to be furnished the Intercolonial Railway according to the output of the several companies, and they—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) never paid over $2.10 a ton.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That may be. But I had to pay more than the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk for the same coal. The hon. gentleman has virtually told us that he pays for coal far more than he ought to pay. He and his department simply do not use sufficient means to get the product of the mines delivered to the road at reasonable prices. If I remember rightly, we paid nearly $2 per ton at the pit's mouth, which is nearly double the price it ought to be, and I think the hon. minister pays nearly $3. Of course, that helps to account for the large expenditure on the Intercolonial. I have just said that the hon. gentleman has had the benefit of the development in the maritime provinces which did not exist in 1896. And what is the cause of that development ? The cause is the policy of his predecessors, the building up of manufacturing industries and the expansion of the steel and iron manufacturers as well as the increased production of coal resulting from the duty preventing competition from abroad. We started all this development which has reached its climax in Cape Breton and which has given the hon. gentleman as he tells us, the best paying branch of the road's business, carrying freight and passengers between Halifax and Cape Breton. Besides that, the hon. gentleman has had advantages which he shares with every other road on the continent of America. This has been a growing time. There has been abundance all over the continent. There is enormously increased passenger traffic and freight traffic as well—far in excess of any time with which the hon. gentleman makes a comparison. He has advantages of the best times which this country has ever known. And what is the result ? By an expenditure of at least $2,000,000 which he ought fairly to have charged to revenue account, he is able to come down with a surplus of barely $96,000. Is this carrying out the promise to the people that he would put life into the old road ? Is this carrying out what he told us when he said that expenditures such as these he was making were like those of a man moving from a back street to a main street, and spending money to increase his business—that the increased expenditure would justify itself by increased revenue ? After all this enormous outlay at the expense of the country, he comes before us with a nominal surplus of $96,000, a surplus which can be manipulated at any time by those who have control of the financial statements of the Intercolonial to show a deficit or a surplus according to the wishes perhaps of the officers of the department, or even of the head of the department himself. The hon. gentleman need not make comparison with 1896, for as I have said, times are different. My expenditure on capital account for the six years in which I had charge of the road, including loss on working, did not amount to one-third of that under the hon. gentleman.

I have spoken longer than I intended to speak at this time. I shall have an opportunity to go into details when the estimates are before us. The information which I expect and hope to get at that time will enable me intelligently to discuss these details. There are other gentlemen in this House who are more fully conversant with these things than I am. But the bold, hard fact sticks out, and meets the view of the most casual observer, that in his management for the last six years the hon. gentleman has shown nothing but an absolute increase of debt upon the road of nearly $18,000,000 in cash, besides $4,000,000 of an obligation to the Grand Trunk. Yet we have heard the hon. gentleman speak in many parts of this country in advocacy of government railways and of further expenditure for that purpose by the people of this country. This, to my mind, is too ridiculous. He may get some of his friends who have no other politics, but further expenditure in the provinces which they represent to approve his policy. But we have a different and higher view. We are in favour of the advancement of this country and are ready to advocate the expenditure of any sums necessary for the development of the country as a whole; but we are not ready to fling further enormous sums into the sink hole that he has made of the Intercolonial Railway to-day.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). I had not intended to say anything on this subject to-night, expecting, at a later stage, to go into the hon. minister's (Hon. Mr. Blair's) figures in some detail. But, as the hon. minister has made a rather pointed allusion to myself, or rather to the criticisms which I made upon his accounts last year, and the year before, I think I may be permitted to say a few words now in reply to his general observations. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, does not himself need that I should say one word in answer to the argument which he has made this afternoon. But his remarks seemed to meet with so much applause from hon. gentlemen behind him, that I may be excused if I say a few words to show how utterly fallacious is his argument in making, or appearing to make, a comparison between the operation of the government railway and that of other Canadian railways. I do not think I need occupy much time in showing that, but I think I can show it rather effectively. The hon. gentleman is perfectly aware—I have pointed it out to him before this—that the system on which he keeps his accounts is one which prevents the people from making any attempt to compare his operations and the percentage of his working expenses with those of other railways. I pointed that out more than once, and the hon. gentleman is as well aware of it as I am myself or as any person can possibly be. But, before I take up a few of the items in which the hon. gentleman so far departs from the ordinary system of keeping accounts, I wish to point out the results of the hon. gentleman's operations as he has shown them himself. In his report—and I have taken the few figures I have here entirely from his own report—he shows that the gross earnings of all the railways of this country during the year for which this report was made up, amounted to $83,666,502. He shows that the working expenses of all these railways, including the government railways, amounted to $57,343,592. Now, in order to ascertain exactly what the working expenses of the other railways are, apart from the government railways, I deduct his own working expenses and earnings, and the result shows that all the railways outside the government railways have earned during the year $77,747,513, and their working expenses were $51,482,494. Now, Sir, the result of that is that all the railways of Canada, big and little, in new districts and old districts, taking all their operations, earnings and expenses, have on the average worked at sixty-six and one-fifth per cent, while the government railways—I am including the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island Railway—the operation of which the hon. gentleman is so proud of, were worked at, what do you think, Mr. Speaker? Ninety-nine per cent. The hon. gentleman earns for this country $1 for every $100 that he takes in. The result of the operations of the two railways is, even according to his own statement, and omitting hundreds of thousands of dollars that ought to be charged to working expenses, the result that the hon. gentleman has given us as something that he is entitled to be proud of, is $57,891, or a little less than about one-thirteenth of one per cent upon the capital invested; and this is the wonderful result that was applauded by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, it may be quite true as the hon. gentleman says, that his traffic is worked at a lower rate than the traffic on other railways. I do not accept unreservedly the hon. gentleman's figures in this respect; though I will do so for the moment; but it does strike me that it is a most extraordinary statement—and I presume the hon. gentleman was speaking on behalf of the government—that we should hear from the government that this railway is worked at such rates that there are $2,000,000 lost every year in railway operation in order that a section of the country should get low rates at the expense of the entire community. I do not know whether that will be a pleasing thing for hon. gentlemen to announce to their constituents; I should say that it was a most extraordinary statement. The hon. gentleman tells us that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway have certain rates that he says are not unreasonable, and that if he charged those rates upon the railway under his administration he would have earned $2,000,000 more, and he would have had that surplus. Yet the hon. gentleman, having an opportunity to thus earn $2,000,000 a year, and save something of the many millions he has been expending during the last six or seven years on capital account, prefers to take that money out of the public funds of this country and let the people in the eastern provinces get ahead of the rest of the Dominion by just so much per annum. That is the result of the hon. gentleman's statement.

Now, I hope it is not quite so bad as that. I think perhaps the hon. gentleman has occasionally been carrying freight to St. John, where he has been spending so much money in recent years, at less than cost. I think that is very probable, but I doubt whether the hon. gentleman is carrying all his traffic at these wonderfully low rates. All I can say is that if he has, the rest of this Dominion have got something to say in the matter. We surely have a right to contend that the business on that government railway should be so conducted that if $2,000,000, or $1,000,000, or $500,000, can be earned at reasonable rates, that money should be earned, and the capital expenditure the hon. gentleman is making year by year should be reduced accordingly. Surely that is a plain business proposition.

But I want to show that the hon. gentleman's working expenses are not the working expenses as they are understood by

all ordinary railway companies. And before I show that I want to point out that the hon. gentleman's working expenses as they are in his accounts to-day are not at all those of his predecessor, they do not mean the same thing at all. The hon. gentleman's predecessor charged to working expenses many things that the hon. gentleman is now paying out of capital account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. BARKER. I beg your pardon also. I am speaking of that which I know, and I can say this, that not only is the hon. gentleman charging differently from what his predecessor charged, but he is charging differently from what he himself charged the first couple of years of his administration. The hon. gentleman got new light as he went on. His predecessor, when he put in new rails on the government railways to replace old rails worn out in service, charged the whole cost to working expenses. The hon. gentleman knows that, he cannot dispute it, his officers will tell him that is so. Not only that, but when his predecessor put in heavier rails he charged the whole cost, even of the additional weight of metal to his working expenses. He was not obliged to do so, it was against himself. When the hon. gentleman began his operations in 1897 he followed the very same course that his predecessor did. But since then, what has the hon. gentleman done ? Why, he takes up the sixty-seven pound rail that was there before, which was worn out by use, and which it was his duty to replace by another sixty-seven pound rail at the cost of his working expenses, and he puts in a new eighty pound rail. He would be entitled to charge only thirteen pounds, but he charges the whole eighty pounds to capital. I showed that last year and the year before, I gave the figures, I worked it all out on the figures in the hon. gentleman's own report. I showed that the hon. gentleman had charged to capital $436,000 for steel rails, every dollar of which ought to have gone to working expenses. I have not made up the figures in his report for this year to see exactly what amount the hon. gentleman ought to have charged against revenue that he has charged to capital. But taking the same proportion as in the previous year the hon. gentleman ought now to add about $400,000 for rails to his present working expenses. The hon. gentleman for this year 1901-2 obtained a vote of $600,000 for rails. I have not gone through the accounts closely enough yet to see exactly how much he expended, but he got that appropriation on capital account, and he insisted that he had a right to charge that to capital. It was protested against last year and the year before. The hon. gentleman did not answer the argument but he stuck to his flag and insisted upon getting money on capital account. If the same proportion has been expended there will be $400,000 which should have gone to his working expenses and the $57,000 that he claims as a surplus, does not exist at all. He has a deficit instead of a surplus. I should say here that last year we had Mr. Pottinger, the general manager of the railway, in the witness box before a committee of this House and I put a question to Mr. Pottinger, as the hon. minister will recollect. I said, Mr. Pottinger, do you as a railway man pretend that you are justified in charging the whole cost of these new rails, replacing old rails, to capital account ? The hon. minister knows what Mr. Pottinger's answer was. I quoted it last year and I will quote it again from Hansard. I asked Mr. Pottinger what he thought of charging to capital account all the cost of replacing rails. Mr. Pottinger's answer I quoted then and I quote it again.

Why should I object so long as parliament votes the money ?

That was the reply of the hon. gentleman's chief official whom he lauds here to-night. Why should these railway officials object to parliament voting them money for capital expenditure that they ought to charge to working expenses ? No railway official would object to that. Mr. Pottinger from his answer never pretended that this was a proper way of charging the money. He never pretended that any other railway company would charge it in that way. Mr. Pottinger admitted inferentially that it was an improper charge, that he had no right to charge it to capital when he said : Why should I object when parliament votes the money ? What could more clearly show that the hon. gentleman is improperly charging to capital what he ought to charge to working expenses ? He is by his method misrepresenting to this House the true state of the account and the true result of the operations of the railway.

There is another feature of the hon. gentleman's accounts that I pointed out last year, and it appears again this year, but in an exaggerated form. I pointed out last year that the hon. gentleman was buying rolling stock, buying cars on capital account that he ought to provide out of working expenses. He had a large number of old cars on hand condemned as unfit for traffic. The hon. gentleman's duty, as would be the duty of any railway manager, as any railway manager acting for an ordinary company would be compelled to do, was to replace these cars out of his working expenses and he should not have been allowed to charge one car, one dollar on capital account, until he had replaced every car that had been worn out in the service, out of his expense account. What did he do last year ? The hon. gentleman had 364 cars, I think, condemned. These cars would have cost him to replace out of his working expenses, $250,000. But the hon. gentleman did not charge them to working expenses.

He just left them as condemned cars and used capital from parliament to enable him to substitute others for them ; and they are there in the condemned list still. I will show that from the report which the hon. gentleman has just issued. The hon. gentleman started his year on the 1st July last with 364 condemned cars. These are the ones that last year I said it was his business to replace out of working expenses before he bought new cars out of capital. The hon. gentleman has had condemned during the year 272 more cars, making a total of 636 condemned cars. He has rebuilt only sixty-one, leaving 575 condemned cars in his stock to-day. Of course, as the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says, he could not be lending cars to the railways in the neighbourhood at twenty-five cents a day if he had 575 dead cars and did not replace them. What did the hon. gentleman do ? It is all here in his report. He purchased during the year on capital account 1,342 new cars. No wonder the hon. gentleman does not do his repairs, and it is not much wonder that he can show $57,000 profit on the operation of the road. If the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway would only manage their accounts in that way they could pay very rosy dividends to their stockholders. I think the Grand Trunk Railway would be able to pay dividends on its common stock. The hon. gentleman has a simple method, he gets a vote in parliament. The hon. gentleman obtained a vote of $2,000,000 for rolling stock on capital account. He provided 1,342 cars out of capital, and he has 575 cars, lying there condemned and out of service. It is the simplest kind of book-keeping in the world. If the hon. gentleman was subject to an auditor acting for shareholders against officials, that auditor would have told the hon. gentleman that 767 of these 1,342 cars should be charged to capital and 575 to working expenses. The hon. gentleman knows that perfectly well. I suppose it is one of the elementary principles that a going concern must maintain its property out of revenue and not out of capital ; and the hon. gentleman has never made a pretense of showing to this House any justification for this sort of thing that has been going on year after year. The hon. gentleman thought he had me in a corner when he asked on a previous occasion : Did you look into the state of the rolling stock when I took it over ? I told him I did and I gave the status of the rolling stock as handed over to him by his predecessor ; and there was a very small number of cars at the time out of service. I pointed out to the minister year after year he had gone on increasing in a very large degree the number of dead stock on his hands and that all the time he had been adding to the rolling stock out of capital account. When the hon. gentleman boasts, as he did boast a few hours ago, of what he had been doing and when he said that he had not been borrowing money, that he had been doing all these things out of the results of the operation of the road, the hon. gentleman must have overlooked his charges to capital for cars and steel rails. The hon. gentleman has added about $20,000,000 to the debt of the country since he has been operating this road. In seven years he has put nearly $12,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway proper and yet the hon. gentleman thinks he is not borrowing anything while operating the road. He reminds me very much of that gentleman in Dickens who, when he gave a promissory note, said : Thank Heaven that is paid. The hon. gentleman thinks when he has expended money on capital account he has not borrowed it, that it has fallen from the clouds. Anything he can stick into capital account just helps to make so much apparent profit in his operations and so much more applause from the hon. gentlemen behind him. Then the hon. gentleman speaks about the economy with which he is buying his stores. Well, I think he must have a wonderful opinion of the short memories of the hon. gentleman behind him. Has the hon. Minister of Railways utterly forgotten what appeared last year in the reports of his own officers about the purchase of those 1,300,000 ties ? The hon. gentleman did not require to put in more than 500,000 ties in any year, and yet in that wonderful season, when the general election was on, he bought 1,300,000 ties, and, according to the reports of his own officials, many of those ties had only four inches face, and were more like scantlings than railway ties. That is his economy ; that is the wonderful management that the hon. gentleman claims credit for. I will say this for his officials, that they ferreted this thing out. The manager—I do not know whether it is the gentleman who has just left the service or not—that gentleman insisted on an inquiry, but it does not appear from first to last that the minister was very active in the investigation. The manager insisted upon the inquiry, and up to a certain point it was carried out at the instance of the official, but if it had not been for that inquiry made, we perhaps would have never have heard of this thing at all. All we do know about the minister's part in it is that at one stage of the proceedings he gave a certain pencil order to one of the contractors. So far as that inquiry did go it disclosed a most disgraceful state of affairs in purchases on the Intercolonial Railway. The minister gave us some details about train mileage and other matters of that kind, which I shall take the opportunity of going into in more detail on another occasion. I will only say now, that the minister knows as well as I do that cost per train mile depends to some extent upon whether the train mileage is excessive ; whether he is running fewer cars or lighter trains, or more frequent trains, than would be run by any ordinary manager,

that he may, by making more train mileage than is necessary in the operation of the road, reduce his cost per train mile down to the standard of other roads. But it does not follow that what he is doing would be considered good management on another road. If all this wonderful management has been in existence for years upon this road, it certainly should have shown some better results. It is absurd to tell us that this government road, running with all the advantages that the minister representing the government of Canada has ; with all the credit he has in buying stores ; that it cannot be worked on better terms than it appears to be worked. The minister knows that there are many items of expense that an ordinary railway has to bear that he never hears of. An ordinary railway manager has to meet the interest account all the year round on the money he requires for his operations, but I take it that the minister has behind him a proprietor who supplies him with all the money he wants without interest—I am not speaking of interest on fixed charges ; I am speaking of the ordinary interest charges that are incident to any trade or business. The minister has no taxes to pay ; he has every facility ; he has the command of all the money he can possibly need at any time, and yet he apparently is unable to compete with ordinary management, which has to meet taxes and all other charges. Yet the minister boasts, as if it were greatly to his credit, that he works at 99 per cent of his gross earnings, when all the other railways in the country can work at 66⅔. It is only necessary to state that simple fact to show that there is nothing whatever in the minister's report that he can boast of.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. I only want to make one more remark. I do not know myself about the hiring of cars to other companies. The hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says they are hired at 25 cents a day. I can only say this, Mr. Speaker : that if railway companies can hire freight cars at 25 cents a day, no company in this country is very likely to be so foolish as to buy cars while the minister will supply them at that rate. Surely it must be a mistake. It seems to be absurd. It means simply that a railway car lent out by this government is supposed to run from twenty to twenty-five miles a day. I hope that the hon. gentleman will be able to contradict the statement because if he is hiring these cars, and we can only get that rate out of them, the sooner we get out of the business the better.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). After the able criticism on the present management of the Intercolonial Railway, which was delivered by the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), it is unnecessary for me to take up the time of the House at any length. However, Sir, there was a statement made by the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) which is so contrary to the real facts of the case—facts that are within my own intimate knowledge and within the intimate knowledge of every person in the province of New Brunswick at least—that I must raise my voice in protest against that statement. I refer to his statement with respect to non-interference on the part of officers of the department and on the part of himself with the franchise of the employees of the road. Never in the history of the Intercolonial Railway has there been so much interference with the franchise of its employees as there has been under the management of the present minister. Why, Sir, not content with interfering with the right of the men to vote as they please in federal elections (for which there might be some excuse on the ground of political exigencies), the minister has interfered with their freedom of voting in provincial elections, a thing that was never known of until he took charge of that department. He, or his satellites, has gone so far as even to interfere with the men voting in municipal elections. We had a provincial election in New Brunswick only a few months ago, and the minister came himself in his own private car and took a very stiff hand in that election, with a result which was no doubt very satisfactory to himself. He went to two different points, the city of St. John and the city of Moncton, both large railway centres, where there are a large number of employees who are voters, and in both places he used to the utmost his influence to induce and force and compel the men to vote against their consciences, many of them, for the candidates which the minister favoured. That is a matter of common and notorious knowledge in the province of New Brunswick. He was successful in the constituencies in which these two cities are, and then went to a third place. In that constituency there were no railway employees under his control, and there he was not so successful. The gentleman whom he opposed there had a majority about twelve times as great as his majority in the previous election. Whether that was on account of the presence of the hon. gentleman, I know not ; but that is the fact. I merely make this statement in order that the House may not lie under the wrong impression which the hon. minister attempted to create this afternoon—an impression which could not be made in the province of New Brunswick, where the facts are so well known.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he knows of his own knowledge that I personally used all sorts of pressure and influence in order to coerce the men employed on the Intercolonial Railway to take part or vote in an election. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to understand that that is his statement ?

Mr. FOWLER. That is the statement I made, Mr. Speaker, and I reiterate the same statement now. Any person who read the speeches of the hon. gentleman in St. John and Moncton will know that my statement is exactly in accordance with the fact. The vehemence which the hon. gentleman displayed this afternoon when he was trying to urge his followers to applaud him—which as a matter of fact they seemed very loth to do—was as nothing to the vehemence he exhibited on the platform when he was attempting to coerce those employees to vote in favour of his candidates in the late provincial election.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has the hon. gentleman any evidence or any personal knowledge of the facts other than what he says appears in reports of my speeches in the newspapers to support the statement he has made ?

Mr. FOWLER. Those I think should be sufficient; but if they are not, I may say that the common rumour throughout the province is to that effect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOWLER. Common knowledge. Common rumour has a very great effect, you know, and is generally founded somewhat on fact, too.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of saying that what the hon. gentleman has said is absolutely and entirely without the slightest foundation. I invite the hon. gentleman to take an early opportunity of reading to this House the reports of the speeches which I delivered, and I venture to say that they will not corroborate the statement he has made.

Mr. FOWLER. Why, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman's reputation were not so well known throughout the province of New Brunswick, the people would be shocked and surprised at the statements he made this afternoon. But knowing him so well as they do, they simply shrug their shoulders and say nothing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman will accept my invitation, I will abide by the result.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I listened with the greatest possible attention to every word that fell from the lips of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals when he made his explanation this afternoon. I sympathized a good deal with the hon. gentleman, because he had a very difficult task in explaining the results of his management of the Intercolonial and other government railways during the past six or seven years. He quoted a great many figures as to the increased traffic, the increased sums paid for wages, the better position of the road, and a whole lot of things which to my mind did not throw very much light on the situation. He was asked by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) during the early part of his speech to give the House some information with regard to the capital expenditure made on account of the railway, during the time he has administered the affairs of the department. I am not aware that he vouchsafed the information asked for; but there are two or three facts which stand out prominently in the administration of the hon. gentleman which cannot be too frequently impressed on the House and the country. The hon. minister made a comparison between the administration of his predecessor in the one single year, 1896, and that of himself in the year 1902. A more unfair and misleading comparison could not have been made, because, as the hon. gentleman knows, the conditions existing in Canada during the past twelve months as compared with the conditions which existed in 1896 rendered it impossible to make a fair comparison between those two years. For an hon. member to try to justify the administration of the Railway Department over which he presides, by making a comparison of the year 1896, a year of unusual depression not only in Canada but throughout the world, with a year of redundant prosperity, especially in that part of the Dominion served by the Intercolonial Railway, is certainly not what we might expect from a gentleman who has had the long parliamentary experience of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways. If he desired to be fair, he would have compared the six years during which my hon. friend from South Lanark administered the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, with the six years during which he has managed them. I appeal, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. gentleman himself and to every hon. gentleman who supports him, whether, if he had desired to do simple justice to the hon. member for Lanark, he would have confined his comparison to one single year ? Let me state two or three facts to the House, and I will leave the hon. gentleman to make an explanation of them. Since 1897, when the hon. gentleman assumed the management of the Intercolonial Railway, how much has he expended on capital account ? Is it not a fact that during the past six years he has expended on capital account on the two government railroads $13,890,542 ? Will the hon. gentleman deny these figures ? I obtained them from official documents, and I challenge him to say whether they are correct or not. During the previous six years, when the hon. member for South Lanark was administering those roads, how much was expended on capital account ? $2,835,691. The colossal fact stands out, and it cannot be contra-

dicted or challenged, that during the past six years the hon. Minister of Railways has expended over $11,000,000 more on capital account than his predecessor did during his six years. And what has been the result? A colleague of the hon. Minister of Railways boasted in Toronto a few years ago that when this administration came into office they found that the western terminus of the Intercolonial Railway was in a ploughed field, and their policy was to bring the railway into the great metropolitan city of Montreal. We all hoped for good and great things from that policy; but what has been the net result of the operation of the road since then? During the six years in which the hon. member for South Lanark operated it, the deficits in the receipts as compared with the operating expenses amounted to $949,784. If we were justified in incurring the enormous expenditures which we did in bringing the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, and in equipping it with gilt-edged plant of all kinds, what have we reaped as the result? During the past six years in which the hon. gentleman has been administering the Railway Department, the receipts on the railway have been actually short of meeting the operating expenses by no less than $886,763. All we have gained in those six years in net results, as compared with the previous six years, has been the miserable sum of $60,000, notwithstanding the enormous expenditure on capital account.

The hon. gentleman's deficits in operating expenses during the past six years have just been $60,000 less than the deficits in operating expenses during the previous six years, when the business conditions of this country were not nearly so prosperous. That is all the hon. minister can take any credit for; and if he thinks parliament was justified in voting these enormous expenditures on capital account in order to save in six years the sum of $60,000, he may take what comfort he can from that opinion. These are facts that cannot be controverted. During the past six years he has spent $11,000,000 more on capital account than did his predecessor in the previous six years, when there was not that revival of trade which has since characterized all parts of Canada; and he has only succeeded in reducing the balance against us, as between receipts and operating expenses, during the whole of that period by $60,000. But he pleads that there are exceptional conditions in connection with the location of the Intercolonial Railway, which make it impossible to pay as well as other roads. There is the water on the one side and competing lines on the other But did not the same conditions exist before that hon. gentleman assumed the administration of the Railway Department? Did not his predecessor have precisely a similar condition of things to contend against? In my humble judgment, the hon. gentleman himself is between the Devil and the deep sea in his endeavour to invent some plausible explanation, and when the people have time to read carefully his arguments, they will come to the conclusion that the administration of our railway affairs during the past six years has been extravagant, unwise and prodigal, and that they have not received the value they were entitled to from the enormous expenditure made by the hon. gentleman. Let me emphasize what has been so well said by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). He pointed to the argument of the hon. minister that if he had charged as high rates as other roads—which rates he admitted were not unreasonable—his revenue would have been much larger. H admits, therefore, that notwithstanding the fact that this country has run into debt $16,000,000 during the past twelve years, through our capital expenditure on the Intercolonial, yet the freight rates have been lower than they might have been. In other words, that he has failed to earn money that he should have earned in reduction of this huge capital expenditure. What will the people of the other provinces think when that statement goes to them? Should we not expect better things from this business administration than that they should have persisted in running the Intercolonial Railway at a loss? Had we not a right to expect some better management by the hon. minister than is shown by this humiliating confession, that although he is running the road at a heavy loss, the rates charged on the traffic are from 50 per cent to 100 per cent less than those charged by other lines? That is a most astounding admission; and I would point out to the hon. gentleman, with all possible respect, that it is his duty, under the circumstances, at the earliest possible moment, to so readjust the rates on passenger and freight traffic that at least the expenditure will not exceed the receipts. If the public debt of the country is being added to by millions every year for the purpose of operating the Intercolonial Railway, the people have a right to insist that reasonable rates should be charged; and if the rates charged are not fair and reasonable, they should be readjusted so that the Intercolonial Railway system may cease to be a sink hole into which millions of public money are being thrown every year. I did not intend addressing the House, but I felt compelled to emphasize the fact that while, under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, the debt of this country for the operation of the government railways has been increased by the enormous sum of $14,777,305, we have, so far as these two reads are concerned, practically nothing to show for that expenditure.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Among the different charges, Mr. Speaker, made by the hon. member for Lannark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) against the manage-

ment of the Intercolonial Railway, there is one in particular which I think should be specially emphasized and discussed. That is the charge that the hon. Minister of Railways is deceiving the country by a false system of accounts. If that charge be true, surely there is not an hon. gentleman sitting behind the hon. Minister of Railways who would support him in this wrong-doing ? If the charge be not true, then it seems to me that my hon. friends from Lanark and Hamilton ought to withdraw it. The charge has been made by these two hon. gentlemen flatly and unequivocally that the Minister of Railways has brought down cooked accounts, and that, by a system of false book-keeping, he has endeavoured to deceive this House and country. One can hardly imagine a more serious charge, and I sincerely hope that the hon. minister will either controvert it or frankly admit that he has done wrong and promise to do better in the future. My hon. friend from Hamilton states that all railway companies properly administered charge to working expenses, the renewals of rolling stock. For instance, if a railway company, at the outset, spends a million dollars on rails, it charges that amount to capital account, but whenever a rail is worn out and has to be renewed, the cost of the renewal is charged to working expenses. The wisdom and propriety of such a course are evident even to one who is not conversant with the management of railways. But if a different system is followed on the Intercolonial Railway, if the renewals are also charged to capital account, then, in the case, for instance, of the renewal of a rail, you will have two rails charged to capital account, one of which is worn out, but both are assets. Such a system of keeping accounts is certainly not honest, and from it you can obtain an accurate idea of the value of our assets. The same contention holds with regard to the purchase of cars. If when a freight car, which was originally charged to capital account, is worn out, another is purchased to replace it, and the new car is also charged to capital account, you have two items against capital account which are represented only by one asset. If you spent a million dollars on cars, in the first instance, and then spent another million dollars to replace these, and charged each expenditure to capital account, you have a capital account of $2,000,000, which is represented only by an asset of $1,000,000. If the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway are kept in this manner, the report of the Minister of Railways, instead of being called a blue-book, should be called a cook book. When one thinks of this parliament, the highest court of the land, voting improperly on capital account, moneys which should be charged against working expenses, and when we find a leading official of the road declaring that he is compelled to falsify his books in order to make them agree with the parliamentary vote, surely parliament has no reason to be proud of what it is doing. Surely not even the most ardent supporter of the Minister of Railways will argue that it is proper for parliament to do that which, if done by a humble clerk in a financial institution, would cause him to be sent to one of our provincial penitentiaries. I am not making any charge against the hon. Minister of Railways, because I do not pretend to be conversant with the facts, but when so serious a charge as that of cooking accounts s made against him, the hon. minister should either refute it and show that he is not keeping his books in a manner different from that followed by other railway companies, or else bow to the inevitable and adopt a proper system of book-keeping.

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). The protests that are annually offered against the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway seem to me unworthy of the Canadian sentiment that ought to prevail in this parliament. I have no desire to refer to the Intercolonial Railway from a sectional standpoint, for that railway has not been, in any sense, devoted to the interests of one particular section of this Dominion. It has contributed more to the interchange of thought and the interchange of trade between the different provinces of the Dominion than any other factor we have had. In former years the people of the maritime provinces traded to the south of them across the Bay of Fundy. The building of the Intercolonial Railway contributed to the bringing together of the people of Ontario and Quebec and the people of the maritime provinces. That seems to be forgotten; and it seems to be forgotten, as well, that the manufacturers and the merchants of Toronto and Montreal, have, by means of the Intercolonial Railway, been enabled to find a very large and profitable trade. The protests which are made against the rates that are charged on the Intercolonial Railway are based on the idea that this is a sectional advantage. But surely the benefit of any such lessening of charges is for those living in Ontario and Quebec as well as for those living in the maritime provinces. We forget, seemingly, that the Intercolonial Railway was built for a certain purpose. It was built largely as a military road, and I presume it was built where it was built because of political exigencies at the time. But it was built as part of the compact of confederation, and as a national highway, and should be treated in the same way as other highways of the country. How is it that I hear no word of protest from my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) with respect to canal charges ? Only the other day a very large and influential delegation waited upon the right hon. Premier and, in the interest of trade and commerce, in the interest of the people of this Dominion,

demanded that the tolls on these canals should be entirely removed. Is there any protest against that? Do you hear any protest on the part of hon. members from the east with respect to the large expenditures made upon the canals and not a dollar realized to the revenues of the Dominion arising from them? It seems to me that this is slightly unfair. It was not my intention to take part in this discussion; but when I hear hon. members refer to expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway and insist that these expenditures are largely political, I, as one having some knowledge of that field, cannot remain silent. Political influence, you say, is exercised to the detriment of the management of the Intercolonial Railway. Why, if political influence is being exercised, it is being exercised by the same men who, for eighteen or twenty years exercised that influence when their friends, hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. Fault is found with the book-keeping on the Intercolonial Railway, yet the book-keepers are the same men who were there from 1879 to 1896, and the system of book-keeping is the same as it was during that period.

Mr. BOYD. A different minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is the same manager, the same accountant, the same chief book-keeper—the same men from top to bottom; there has been no change. I am not reflecting upon these men at all in making that statement; I simply say that when you charge against this administration or against the Minister of Railways and Canals, the exercise of political influence you are speaking of something that does not exist. I remember well when there was a change of government in 1878 and, from the head of the Intercolonial, the late C. J. Bridges, down to the very hod carrier in the railway yards at Moncton, they went out by wholesale. The general manager, also Mr. Luttrell, the chief superintendent, were removed and hundreds of men in the shops were thrown out of work. And why? Because of political influence. That continued down to 1896. Any man who was suspected of having political leanings in favour of those then in opposition soon found that he had to seek some other means of livelihood, for he was not allowed to remain in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway. But, has there been a change since then? The same men who were in the employ of the road when the change of government came in 1896 are employed there to-day. There has been no change in the officials, no change in the workmen. I am sure that those who are conversant with the actual facts also know this—that in matters of promotion in the Intercolonial Railway it is not only men who are friends of the administration now in power who are recognized, but all, including those who have been working tooth and nail at every election—as I know from a personal standpoint—ever since 1878, and even down to this year of grace, against the party with which I have been allied for all these years. I say that political influence, if any has been exercised, has been exercised against the present administration, and I say this as the representative of the county of Westmoreland and as knowing whereof I speak. Therefore, I protest against any idea going abroad throughout this country that the administration of the Intercolonial Railway is in any way coloured or tinged with partyism and political influence. If there is such a tinge and colour, it is not with the 'rouge,' as they say in the province of Quebec, but rather with the other colour.

Now, as to the rates on the Intercolonial Railway, they are the same as have been in force since 1878; there have been no material changes; certainly there has been no increase, and, as the hon. minister explained, the conditions are such there, by reason of water competition, that if any attempt were made to charge higher rates it would only result with loss in advancement to the road. The question of political influence is always raised against government ownership of railways. Now, there are many kinds of partisan influence, and I question whether the people of this country should denounce simply the political influence if such does exist under government ownership, as against the political influence that may be exercised in a very different way and by a very different method. I am sure the people of Canada would prefer to have the party in power exercise its political patronage—and I care not what government may be in office—rather than be throttled by great corporations which have a peculiar method of exercising political influence, a political influence which is even recognized within the precincts of parliament. In your committee rooms when bills are under discussion, and in parliamentary debates, you recognize that political influence, and it does not arise out of, nor has it any connection with, party institutions, but it arises from the corporations of the country. There are none who know this better than hon. gentlemen opposite. It is known throughout the country, and the newspapers of the Dominion, especially the independent newspapers, teem with articles day after day pointing out these influences. I say it is far better in the interests of Canada that we should submit to any disadvantages, to any evils if there are such, arising from the government ownership of railways, than to be bound down by the pernicious influences, I would almost say the damning influences, resulting from the control of great corporations. Hon. gentlemen may wish to make a point against the administration of the Intercolonial, but they all recognize that what I am now stating is true. They all recognize that it would be far better to

submit to political influences in the exercise of patronage by government in the administration of a railway, than to submit to these other influences to which I have referred and which I need not elaborate.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman make the charge that members of this House are influenced by corporations in their deliberations in this House ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly not. I am sure no hon. member would be willing to say that any such influences could be exercised.

Mr. CLANCY. Then what does the hon. gentleman mean ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I mean exactly what I say. There may be an exercise of influence, of course, in a proper way, in a parliamentary way, and without any results that might be termed unpleasant ; but I am referring to the influences that are abroad in this country arising from the power possessed by great corporations. I make the point simply to show the contrast between any disadvantages there might be in connection with government ownership of railways, and the disadvantages which arise under the system which has largely prevailed in this Dominion and which prevails to a great extent in the United States. If I were to attempt to make an argument for government ownership, I might refer to a great many things which I should not mention now, but which I may have an opportunity to mention later on.

But I cannot permit this occasion to pass without entering my protest against some references which have been made against the maritime provinces. During the course of this debate there have been insinuations made that the construction of this railway and its management have been wholly in the interests of the maritime provinces and in the interests of Quebec through which the Intercolonial runs. This is my third session in this parliament, and I have listened to many discussions on the Intercolonial, but not yet have I heard my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) the leader of the opposition, get up and express his views with respect to the rates on the Intercolonial, and with respect to these denunciations which we have heard against the Intercolonial and its management as a government road. As that hon. gentleman represents the city of Halifax, it would be interesting to have an expression of his views on the points which have been raised in that direction. There are other hon. gentlemen coming from the maritime provinces whose opinions we would like to hear on these questions. They remain silent, as does the leader of the opposition, and say nothing in answer to the charges which are thus made. If the canals are established in the interest of trade and commerce, and if no tolls are charged upon these canals, why do we not hear hon. members coming from a particular section of the Dominion make that fact a subject of complaint ? I want to say that we do not hear hon. members from the extreme west indulging in any such denunciations, but they come from a confined circle, and I am thankful to say it is a confined circle. I hope that the individual members belonging to that particular circle will broaden out in their views, and look upon this matter from a national standpoint, as a railway that is serving the interests of Ontario as well as those of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island ; I hope they will look upon it from the standpoint of a united Canada. Because there may be some things in the management of the Intercolonial which may not meet the views of hon. members, that does not justify them in attacking the Intercolonial as a sink-hole of expenditure for the whole Dominion. It is unfair to the policy which has been pursued by successive governments, it is unfair to the founders of confederation who agreed upon that railway in the interest of the whole Dominion. They established it with the idea that it would cement together the several provinces, and it has resulted in much good in that direction.

The Intercolonial to-day is, in my judgment, the best asset that the Dominion of Canada has. We have been told that the public debt has been increased to the extent of $23,000,000 by the Intercolonial. What have you to show for it ? You have your road and your rolling stock as a splendid asset. I do not pretend to be a prophet, but I believe from the bottom of my heart that within a few years it will be one of the best paying properties belonging to this Dominion. But do those hon. gentlemen who complain about the increase of the public debt on this account make any complaints against the exceedingly large outlay that was made in subsidizing the Canadian Pacific Railway ? The Intercolonial I believe represents about $60,000,000 of public money expended on its construction—and in its maintenance, if you will. But the moneys that were paid out in subsidies for the Canadian Pacific Railway exceed that sum by a very large amount, without taking into account the countless acres of land which were given in land grants to that road, lands which to-day are selling for $6 or $7 an acre and sometimes higher. We hear no complaint about that. Yet we do not own to-day a spike of that great highway, we do not own a foot of the land. The money is gone, and we are paying interest on it, and there are no complaints. I say it is manifestly unfair to the people, detrimental to the harmony that should exist between the different provinces, to make these exceptional complaints against the Intercolonial Railway.

Hon. members as a party would reflect greater credit upon themselves, and they would stand better in the country if they looked upon this subject in the way the people of the country look upon it, in the

way that the people of Ontario, the rank and file of the voters, look upon it. One hon. member said, and he made the statement very positively, that these railways were maintained for a section of the people. I protest in the strongest language possible against utterance of any such opinion on the floor of this parliament. There are travelling, I venture to say, at this moment in those maritime provinces, hundreds of commercial travellers representing whom ?—representing the house, perhaps, of the hon. member for one of the Torontos (Mr. Brock) and representing other great mercantile establishments. Why are they there ? To secure the trade which exists in that section of the country. The Intercolonial Railway largely interferes with the wholesale business of the cities of Halifax and St. John. Why ?—because the intercommunication between Ontario and the country in the east was made easy, and the trade came here. The rates on the Intercolonial, no doubt, contributed very materially to the building up of that trade. Yet, these same hon. members from that section of the Dominion that is particularly interested in building up that trade will stand up in their places in parliament and give utterance to such sentiments as those to which I have referred, and hon. members around them, having the same interest in that trade, will applaud the idea. I say that such a thought in this parliament is unworthy of parliament and unworthy of the great province which some of these hon. members represent. Now, I shall not enlarge upon the question which has been raised in respect to the ownership of government railways, but I do say that hon. members of this House must not run away with the idea that any of the evils resulting from the management of the Intercolonial Railway are due to the exercise of political influence in favour of the party now in power.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, in connection with the working of the Intercolonial Railway, I put a question on the Order paper some little time ago which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) asked me to replace by a motion for papers which he said would be brought down immediately it was moved. I do not think these papers have yet been submitted. May I ask the hon. minister if he has submitted the return asked for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I brought it down at once.

Mr. BELL. Well, it has not been reported to me. That would be of importance and I would be very glad to look at it in connection with the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in reference to the matter of rates. I am very much in sympathy with the view held by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) and I feel that we members from the maritime provinces cannot very well remain silent if it be broadly stated here in parliament that that part of Canada is receiving an unfair advantage in having a railway conducted at the expense of Canada generally, which is to confer some special benefit upon us. I really feel that to a very large extent in fairness to our friends from Ontario it must be borne in mind that the remarks that have been made here tonight have been elicited by the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals himself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How ?

Mr. BELL. Because he made the statement very broadly that the rates charged on the Intercolonial Railway were 50 per cent less than those charged by other lines in Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. By the two railways, the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the rates charged in Ontario by the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway were from 100 to 150 per cent in excess of those charged on the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I said from 50 to 100 per cent.

Mr. BELL. It strikes me that an examination of the figures showing the freight rates that are charged on the Intercolonial Railway will scarcely bear out the statement made by the hon. minister. In respect to a very large part of the traffic and the revenue of the Intercolonial Railway it is quite evident that his remarks do not apply at all. That is in reference to the passenger traffic. In reference to the receipts from passenger traffic which form a large part of the revenue, I think, we in the lower provinces are paying just as much as they are in any other portion of Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As to what ?

Mr. BELL. The passenger traffic.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I confined my remarks distinctly to the question of freight rates. I emphasized that.

Mr. BELL. I am simply calling attention——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Or rather I eliminated passenger rates from the receipts.

Mr. BELL. I think the hon. minister did that, but I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that so far as passenger traffic is concerned, the people of

the lower provinces are not unduly favoured. They are paying rates at least as high as the rates paid in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will at once see the force of this. Except that all passengers from any point on the Intercolonial Railway, Moncton and east will get to Montreal for exactly the same rate, no matter how much greater the distance, as they can get to Montreal over the Canadian Pacific Railway; or from St. John over the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, a passenger is carried on a ticket for exactly the same price as the Canadian Pacific Railway charge.

Mr. BELL. Of course the point of the hon. gentleman's observation is that the Intercolonial Railway is somewhat longer, and that the passenger is carried a greater number of miles for the same figure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BELL. That is a feature which characterizes all railways in Ontario, and everywhere else throughout Canada. I think that compensation has to be made by railways that are working in competition, one with the other. Accepting the hon. minister's explanation which is entirely in accordance with my understanding of the matter, I say that so far as passenger traffic is concerned, the lower provinces are not receiving any advantage at the expense of the rest of Canada. If the people of those provinces are unduly favoured it is in reference to freight rates, and I think in so far as local rates are concerned it will be found that they are not very much lower than they are in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes.

Mr. BELL. It has been said by the last speaker that the tariff of freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway has been the same for a number of years. I think the hon. minister will scarcely agree with that statement. He must recollect, and the country generally knows perfectly well, that when a gentleman named Mr. Harris was placed in charge of the Intercolonial Railway he raised the freight rates very considerably, so much so that the effect was a strong protest from every province where the Intercolonial Railway was doing business, and if I am not mistaken, and I am a customer of the road to a large extent, and pay freight to a large extent—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With what result ?

Mr. BELL. With the result that there was a great deal of dissatisfaction created.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With the result that the rates came down.

Mr. BELL. In some cases they did, but in other cases they remained where Mr. Harris put them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in stating that as a general proposition. There was a rise in rates upon certain classes of merchandise made by Mr. Harris or what was equivalent to it in the way in which the impost was made. So violent was the public clamour against that action from all parties and all sides that the tariff was reduced, put back to practically where it was before in the manner in which the carriage of the goods and the arrangement of the traffic was adjusted.

Mr. BELL. I must accept the minister's statement because it is a matter which is entirely within his own department, but I think it is a matter of common opinion in Nova Scotia that the rates on certain classes of freight are considerably higher than they were when the minister took charge of the Intercolonial Railway. There can be no question that the freights both upon sawn lumber and logs are considerably higher now than they were before. I think it will be found that the reason why the Intercolonial Railway is making a fairly good showing to-day—and I am not at all going to abandon the argument made by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker)—it will I think be found that the good statement made by the minister is very largely owing to the manner in which he has adjusted his revenue and his capital account. There is no answer at all to the argument made by the member for Hamilton on that point. Still, I believe that the good showing which the minister is able to make is largely because the hopes he expressed when he took over the Drummond County Railway as part of the Intercolonial Railway, have not been realized, and that he has never succeeded in developing that large through-traffic in grain and other products which he expected. If we examine his report for the last year, it will be found that the large increases of business on the Intercolonial Railway have been made in local traffic, and that in many departments that through-traffic to which the minister looked with great confidence is diminishing. His good showing is due to the fact that he has not continued to develop the through-traffic which was being conducted at an unprofitable figure, but that he has the advantage of the enormous development in the business of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, and in the lumber business of the lower provinces generally, which has been carried at profitable local rates. A very large proportion of the great expenditure charged to capital upon the Intercolonial Railway was made for the purpose of developing through-traffic and not for the local traffic at all. It is a reasonable criticism made upon the minister by railway men, that the

heavy engines and equipment which he introduced were not at all adapted for local traffic. The result was to place upon the road rolling stock which the road was unable to carry and which involved an enormous expenditure in the direction of improving the track, enlarging the buildings, strengthening and replacing the bridges. What is there in the circumstances of the Intercolonial Railway that would justify such criticisms as are resented by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson)? They are unquestionably not the fact that the Intercolonial Railway was being conducted from year to year either with profit, or at a comparatively small loss to the country. During the regime of the present minister there has been a period of unexampled prosperity—as regards Nova Scotia at all events—during which for a large part of the time the Intercolonial Railway was in a state of congestion, when the sidings for hundreds of miles from the seat of activity at Sydney were filled with traffic awaiting its turn for movement, and yet in the face of all that extraordinary prosperity and that enormous inflow of business the fact remains that in the matter of deficits the present minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) shows a betterment over the history of the last six years of the Conservative regime of only some $60,000. Now, we do not like at all in the lower provinces to have any unkind criticism addressed against us or against the railway management of the Intercolonial Railway. We do not feel that it is pleasant to us to have a feeling engendered in the minds of the people of Canada generally, that the Intercolonial Railway is being conducted in such a way as to unduly favour the people of the lower provinces at the expense of their fellow citizens in the rest of Canada. Therefore it is of the highest importance to the people of the maritime provinces, that the Intercolonial Railway should be economically and efficiently managed, because the result of anything short of first-class management is to evoke this criticism. No people in Canada are so directly interested in the able economical and efficient management of the Intercolonial Railway as are the people of the lower provinces. We are deeply interested in the success of the Minister of Railways, and so far as we are concerned, we would like him to meet with the very highest possible degree of success in maintaining that road in a high state of efficiency, and presenting to this country only such favourable balances as would entirely prevent any criticism of a local character by the representatives of the people of Canada in this House. While we are ready to stand up for the Minister of Railways and to urge him to give us in the lower provinces efficient management and favourable rates, I am afraid that the protestations which the minister has made so strongly to-day in reference to the total absence of anything of a political character from the management of that railway are not altogether borne out by the facts. I do not believe that it is possible for the Minister of Railways to make the people of the lower provinces, who are familiar with the management of that road, believe that there is an absolute freedom of anything like political pressure so far as the employees of that road are concerned. It is perfectly true, as the minister has said, that in the case of quite a large proportion of his employees they are protected against political interference by their own associations. Their orders and their brotherhoods protect them to a certain extent from the pressure which the minister may feel disposed to bring to bear upon them. I would not go so far as to say that the minister himself personally interferes, but I know that the gentlemen who represent the Liberal party in some constituencies in the lower provinces, do habitually interfere with the employees of the Intercolonial Railway, not only in Dominion elections and provincial elections, but in municipal contests, where we elect our representatives to our county councils. They do that, and they can do it successfully simply because the people of the county in which I live and of some adjacent counties, have got the impression on their minds that when a local politician or a defeated candidate writes a letter or brings pressure to bear upon the trackman or the sectionmen or the employees of the railway generally, behind that local politician is the authority and the influence of the Minister of Railways. I would not for one moment doubt the minister ; I am perfectly willing to accept his statement, and I would like him to supplement it by making it perfectly understood throughout the lower provinces, and particularly in my own county of Pictou, that no man need be afraid of any threat addressed to him by any local politician or partisan. I trust the minister will make the people understand that behind that threat is not the authority or the power of the Minister of Railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have caused that to be made known upon more than one occasion.

Mr. BELL. I am perfectly willing to accept everything that the minister says, but at the same time I am aware of circumstances in my own county where men have been moved about and placed at a disadvantage, when it could have only occurred because it was done in such a way that it did not reach the knowledge of the Minister of Railways, for had it been done with his knowledge he could not acquit himself of the charge of allowing political pressure to be brought to bear upon the employees of the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will take this opportunity of stating the fact, that personally I gave

most explicit orders during the last Dominion election to the general manager, to notify all the officers and employees of the road that they were to be free to come and go; that every facility was to be afforded to them irrespective of their politics to get to where they wanted to vote, and to vote according to their own wishes. The general manager had instructions to that effect from me in the most direct and positive manner during the last Dominion contest.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman state why Mr. Russell left the service of the government railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He wanted to go, I do not know why. I did not dismiss him.

Mr. INGRAM. Did he not state that political influence was used against him?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He never stated or communicated that to me.

Mr. INGRAM. He stated so publicly in the press.

Mr. BELL. I am perfectly willing to exonerate the minister, and I am familiar with the fact that he did take the course he has indicated here. Still others, using the weight of his authority, I will say entirely without his consent or desire, have brought pressure to bear to induce the electors not only to vote, but to do extraordinary things. I will give him an instance that occurred in the last provincial election in Pictou. The law in Nova Scotia prevents Dominion employees from voting in provincial elections. That law was adopted by the anti-confederation party in 1868, and it has been in force ever since; and during the time the Conservative party was in power, no man who was a Dominion official or had been in receipt of emoluments from the government railway for fifteen days previous to an election ever tendered his vote. In the last election unwilling men, knowing that they were employees of the Dominion government, were forced to go to the polls and tender their votes in the face of the statute designed to prevent them from voting; and in some cases they actually took the oath which was put to them by the officials in polling places, and practically, as far as I may judge, had to commit perjury in order to do so. Does the minister suppose that these railway employees would have done that extraordinary thing unless they were doing it under the force of great compulsion? It is not at all likely, and I would like the hon. gentleman to devote a little of his time, if he can do so, to an inquiry into the circumstances I am now mentioning, in order to satisfy himself whether or not the system of the Intercolonial Railway is as entirely free from political pressure or interference as he has given the House to understand that it is. I am presenting this statement without the slightest desire to give offence to the minister. I am assuming that he is absolutely truthful in what he has said; but I wish him to understand that his name and authority have been used to induce the railway employees under his control to vote in a way in which in many cases they are most unwilling to vote. Now, I do not altogether blame the minister if he finds it impossible to be everywhere, and to know everything that is being done on the hundreds of miles of railway under his control. But if he will devote himself carefully to an inquiry into the management of some parts of the system which are not protected by the system of brotherhoods, he will find that there is absolutely no other criterion for the appointment of men on the railway than their political partisanship. I do not know one Conservative appointed on the Intercolonial since 1896.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am told that there have been a good many, but I am not aware of any. I do not know their politics.

Mr. BELL. I am not aware of one. So far as the county of Pictou is concerned, the hon. gentleman's preserve is not invaded at all. But it is a matter of current statement that men are introduced into the service in a way that was utterly unknown in the time of his predecessors. Instead of the appointments being made from headquarters, in many cases they are made by local political managers, and men are put to work on the road without receiving their appointment from headquarters. I am not making charges against the minister; I am assuming that in many cases at any rate these things are done without his knowledge. But I would like to guard him from making statements such as he has made here today, when it is a matter of common knowledge and belief in the counties through which the railways run, that there is no other influence exerted in appointing or maintaining in office employees of the railway than political pressure. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend at this time to say anything further in criticism of the hon. minister's remarks. I shall be very glad indeed to have the return, which I understand he is to bring down, and I think it will tend to prove that any good showing made by the Intercolonial is entirely due to the fact that the business of the road has not developed in the direction that was expected by the acquisition of the Drummond Counties Railway, but that while the profitable local traffic has been developed, the unprofitable through-traffic has not been allowed any longer to make adverse balances for the minister.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest to this debate, and if the statements which have been made are true, I think that both parties must have badly managed the Intercolonial Railway, and it is time that that railway were placed under a commission

so that we would not have this quarrelling for a whole day about its management. Now, I understood from the minister that it is not the intention to allow the government roads to be controlled by the commission which is about to be appointed. The discussion which we have had to-day has shown us plainly that the commission should have control over that railway, above all others. It seems that the book-keeping is not properly done ; but in that case one party says to the other, you are another, as the book-keeping was done in the same manner under the old regime. If that be so, it is time the book-keeping were done properly. To charge steel rails, locomotives, cars, and all that class of material which is continually wearing out, to capital account, seems to me to be a fallacy. I might as well charge to capital account my binder that is worn out in ten years, or my plough or my harness. These things must be charged against the revenue of my farm. So all those things on the railway that become worn out, should be charged against the revenue. I know something of the history of this road. I remember over forty years ago, when the Trent affair occurred, and troops were sent over from England and landed in Halifax, this country was obliged to bring them in the dead of winter through a thousand miles of snow.

The British army was brought up from Halifax to defend our country against a threatened invasion, and the government of that day very properly considered that they should build a railway from the frontier, over which the troops might be brought at any time without interference. That was the origin, as I understand it, of the Intercolonial Railway. I do not think it was ever pretended that that road would pay from a commercial standpoint, but I do think that the same rates per mile for hauling should be charged over it as are charged over other roads. I do not think that the Intercolonial Railway should carry merchandise cheaper than other roads carry it, but it seems to me that the only remedy for this state of affairs would be to take the road out of the hands of the government and place it under a commission. I am strongly in favour of a railway to the Pacific being built by the government. I think that it is time that this government had energy and force enough to help the people in the west out of the difficulty they are under of getting their produce to market. We know that they are severely overcharged now, but no doubt, if the Grand Trunk Pacific obtain a charter and subsidies, the men who take hold of the scheme will expect to make fortunes out of it. For my part, I do not see the need of any more Lord Mount Coxes or Lord General Booths, but we want the people to own the railway and get the benefit. With regard to the Intercolonial Railway, it seems to me that both parties have made mistakes, and it is no use in their casting slurs at each other. We had better right about ship and manage the Intercolonial Railway better in the future, and not have it said that every man who works on it must vote Grit or be discharged. We are told that, no matter how good a man may be, no matter how well he may work, he cannot get a position on the Intercolonial Railway or hold it unless he votes Grit. That sort of thing I despise. I care not what may be the religion or politics of a man who works for me, if he does good work. I do hope that these discussions will take place in a better spirit. This afternoon I felt very sorry to see the spirit exhibited by the hon. Minister of Railways. I felt sorry for him, as I do for anybody who gets so angry when he speaks, and I hope it will not occur again.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

Intercolonial Railway—to increase the accommodation at Sydney, $97,000,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not understand why these estimates are being taken up. Inquiry was made last night as to what business would be done to-day. There seemed to be some difficulty among the ministers, but finally they arrived at the conclusion that the Minister of Railways should make his statement, and after that the militia estimates would be taken up. As there was some confusion, I inquired of my right hon. friend the First Minister, and he informed me that the Minister of Railways would make his statement and then the militia estimates would be taken up. As some gentlemen have gone away who are interested in the railway estimates, I think we should not go on with them just now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not aware that there was any such statement made. I supposed that in the ordinary course, after I had made my statement, we would go on with the railway estimates. But if the hon. gentleman believes that a different impression prevails and would desire that the estimates should not be gone on with, I should be very sorry indeed to persist.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The facts are exactly as I have stated them. Not only were we told this in the House last night, but the same thing is stated in a personal letter to me from the Prime Minister received this morning. It may be that we can employ the time by discussing amounts as to which my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is ready, but we would not be ready to go on with estimates of the road generally, because my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) went away on my representations to him of what was stated last night and to-day. We can go on with some items.

Mr. BARKER. As to this first item, to increase the accommodation at Sydney, I

would ask the hon. minister—I think I asked him the same question last year—whether this $97,000 will complete all the works he intends to construct at Sydney ? On one or two occasions before, the minister was not able to say at all definitely whether he would or would not require more money. This is a revote of money asked for a year ago, and I think the department ought to be able to say whether or not they will require more money for this service. I would like a definite answer on that point—whether this will finish the works in Sydney and what is the probable extent of those works.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps it would be better, in order that I may keep on safe ground, that I should defer answering, because my impression is that this covers the work that is now under contemplation. But I could not say that it might not be found necessary to do some additional work at Sydney at an early day, unless I were fortified by the information of the general manager. I know of nothing further in contemplation at present, but there may be.

Mr. BARKER. Of course, I do not mean to say that the minister should be called upon to promise that in three or four years there might not be some further works to be done. But these are large expenditures to provide terminal accommodation for the road. It is a usual, and, I think, very proper rule, that the engineer, or whoever is responsible for the work, shall lay out all the works at a point, and that there shall be an understanding at the department of what works are to be undertaken and what the cost is likely to be. If you do not follow that course you may drift into an enormous expenditure which you would not undertake if you knew from the beginning what was involved. Were the House to vote money year after year for a place like this, we ought to have an announcement from the minister that he has obtained a statement from the proper officer of the department as to what is likely to be required and whether the money voted will cover the works in contemplation.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Coming from the town where the money now being voted is to be spent, I may be allowed to say a few words as knowing a little of what is required for the Intercolonial Railway at that place. I would like to say to the hon. member (Mr. Barker) and the committee that the amount now asked for is not by any means sufficient to afford terminal accommodation for a place like Sydney. Being the eastern terminus of the Intercolonial, we should have the facilities of a water terminus. That has not been provided for, and it would take much more than this vote, even if this were intended, for that particular purpose, whereas, I understand, it is not intended to provide by this vote water terminal facilities for that port. I wish to say to the minister here that a much larger sum will be required to provide proper and suitable facilities for the Intercolonial at the town of Sydney.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may explain to the hon. member (Mr. Barker) that these items are not part of a provision for a general scheme. The items which go to make up this $97,000 are self-contained and require no explanation beyond their own sphere.

Mr. BARKER. What are they ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The new station house, covered platforms, coal house, car repair shops, a larger electric light plant and so on. These are within a compact area and are part of the necessary station facilities for the end of the road at that point. I have not considered the questions that may be involved in the project of a deep water terminal which my hon. friend (Mr. Johnston, Cape Breton) has spoken of. If that should be undertaken at a future day, it cannot be said that any part of this work could have been left undone. The other would be a question which would stand entirely by itself and would be taken up as a separate and distinct matter.

Mr. BARKER. Will this $97,000 complete that station and all the matters connected with it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is my opinion.

Mr. BARKER. And this is not a blanket vote for Sydney, but is a total of estimates in the minister's hands and is required for particular works ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, exactly.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister place on record what the items are ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have stated them.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not hear the hon. minister do so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimate placed in my hands of the items making up this $97,000 is as follows. New station, $60,000; covered platform, $6,000; coal house, $4,500; car repair shop, $7,000; heating for car repair shop, $1,000; electric light plant, $7,000; fittings and furniture, $1,000; engineering, inspection, contingencies, etc., $10,500, total, $97,000.

Mr. LENNOX. All new work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Entirely.

Original construction, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is the ordinary item.

Mr. BARKER. It is not for anything specific ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

To strengthen bridges, $165,100.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am obliged to ask for a revote of $77,000. Owing to the contractors being unable either to procure the material to construct, or, at all events, not being able to furnish us with the bridge structures. We had an appropriation for 1902-03 of $225,000. We expended from the 30th of June, to the 30th of January, $88,489. It is estimated that before the end of the current year we will be able to lay out over $58,000 of that original vote, which will leave $77,711 to be revoted. The balance due on bridges as tendered for is $31,000. The plans will cost $4,000, painting, $1,400; false work, $4,500; doubling up of bridge, $35,000; inspection, $1,311,100. There is, you will observe, an additional amount included in this estimate of $87,388. The purposes for what that amount will be expended are: To pay for the bridges already tendered for, in addition to those mentioned, $44,300; doubling up bridges, $33,900, the balance being for painting floors and engineering.

Mr. BARKER. Would the hon. minister tell us where those bridges are ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot at this moment, but I will get the information.

Mr. CLANCY. Of what kind of material are those bridges made now in existence ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Probably most of them are iron, they were all built many years ago.

Mr. BARKER. Is the hon. gentleman charging to capital the whole cost of the new bridges ?,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I am using the old bridges. The hon. gentleman may recall the explanations I have made on two or three occasions with regard to these. I am taking up the bridges which are weak and doubling them. That is, take a weak bridge on a certain stream called 'A;' take another weak bridge on a stream called 'B;' take the bridge that is over 'B' stream and put it alongside the bridge over 'A' stream, doubling up the latter. That bridge then becomes of added weight and added strength, and is a complete and satisfactory bridge. I put in a new structure of the proper weight in the place which has become vacant by the removal of the first bridge.

Mr. BARKER. Are there any places where these old bridges are put in for the first time ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no knowledge of any instance where they do not take the place of old bridges. The bridges which were placed on the Intercolonial when it was constructed were uniform in type and character, so we have no trouble at all in doubling them up.

Mr. BARKER. Do you mean to make a double tracked bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, if you put up two spans, one alongside the other, you get double strength and weight.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the minister give us a statement of where these bridges are ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. On whose advice was this method of strengthening followed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On the advice of the chief engineer.

Mr. BELL. What instances could the minister cite of bridges strengthened in this manner ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There have been dozens of them, pretty nearly over the whole line, I should judge.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman say what is the length of the spans of bridges of this character ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not from memory.

Mr. BELL. Are they long or short spans ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will get the information.

Mr. BARKER. That item will stand, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You can bring the question up again on another item.

Mr. BARKER. Let it stand only for this explanation, there will be no comment on it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I fancy we will have something in the supplementaries on which this matter may be brought up again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It might be as well to let it stand as a reminder to the hon. gentleman, and then we will have the information.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the minister if this process of doubling up has not been carried on for some time. I think he has been asking this House to vote sums year after year for this same purpose. The hon. gentleman says this work is being done over the whole line, speaking in general terms. I think three years ago the hon. gentleman asked a vote for the same purpose.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have continuously.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it because these bridges are becoming weak through use? He has been using them in the meantime with heavy engines, I presume. Have they ceased from use to have the strength they formerly had?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There has been no change in the system. We have pursued this system since we found it necessary to strengthen the bridges. There have been quite a number done every year.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman know of any other railway in this country that has adopted that method of strengthening bridges?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not made the inquiry, but I should be very much surprised if there were not others. The hon. gentleman may have a superior knowledge to any that our engineers possess on this question; but I cannot imagine anything that would be more defensible than doubling up these bridges. The iron is perfectly good, the only trouble is that the bridge is not as strong as it ought to be within the limits of safety. We have been using upon the line now for two full years, and perhaps a good part of the third year, heavy locomotives, and we have in cases, over portions of the line which have these lighter bridges, been obliged to shore them up, to put bents under them and strengthen them before we could run the heavy locomotives over them. I think the general character of the alterations and of increasing the bridge structures has been of the description I have mentioned with the exception of two or three crossing large rivers such as the Miramichi and Restigouche. They are exceptions, because, of course, we could not in the same way use these spans for strengthening these bridges. The narrower rivers and streams are crossed by these other bridges, but we have two or three large rivers such as the Miramichi and the Restigouche, or perhaps the Metapedia, where these spans are not used.

Mr. INGRAM. That plan has not been adopted in regard to the Miramichi bridge, because I see that the Dominion Bridge Company put in an estimate for six spans which would be erected according to a different method altogether.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, a different method. It may turn out, when I make inquiry about the bridges that a large portion of this appropriation, or the whole of it may apply to the Miramichi bridge. In that way, I want to qualify the statement I made that it would be a joining of two bridges together. The prevailing mode of alteration over the whole Intercolonial Railway, with the exception of these large rivers, if my memory serves me, has been that which I have mentioned.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose there is a written report from the engineer recommending these works?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARKER. Would the hon. gentleman have any objection to bringing down that report and laying it on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will bring it down, if I have it.

Mr. BELL. In the case of the Miramichi bridge, I suppose the separate spans of such a bridge are sometimes used in this doubling up process?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we are putting the Miramichi bridge, one span or both, over the Hillsborough river in Prince Edward Island. It is a splendid bridge, it is as good as ever it was for the weight which would be required to be carried there.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the hon. minister if in placing these new bridges at the points where they are required the work is done by day labour or contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where we are putting two bridges together, we do it by our own workmen. If we are putting up a new bridge it is done by the company under contract.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When I say the company, I mean the company which has the contract. The bridges are put up to public competition. There are the Dominion Bridge Company, the Canadian Bridge Company, and I am not sure but that there is another. One of the Canadian companies get the contract, and they complete the structure.

Mr. CLANCY. Do their contracts include the removal and doubling up of the spans, and the building of new work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, if we are putting two of the older bridges together we do it by men that we have in our own employ. The bridge company, speaking within my best recollection now, have nothing to do with removing one of these old bridges and joining it to another bridge. Their contract covers the construction of the superstructure itself and putting it up.

Mr. CLANCY. That work has to be done while the trains are running, and there are necessarily two parties concerned?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. And the railway traffic must go on as best it can, and get over these places with care ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman not been required to employ additional hands on occasions of that kind ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I dare say some of our railway hands may be employed. I think this work is done uniformly on Sunday.

Mr. INGRAM. I may say to the hon. minister that they can construct a bridge while traffic is going over it, and they are doing it every day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have no disturbance at all from it.

Mr. BELL. There must be no Presbyterians in that part of the country.

To increase accommodation at Lévis, $72,000.

Mr. BARKER. The same question arises there as to how far we are to go. Is this to go on year after year, or has the hon. minister a report from the engineer showing what has been spent there and when this is going to end ? That certainly is a place where a particular work must cover the whole of the requirements. It is not a terminus. It is a station yard or something of that kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. I presume that work will not be done without a general report from the engineer showing what was to be done. Could the hon. minister tell us whether this will wind everything up, and if not what more we are to expect ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My impression in regard to that is that this covers the estimated cost of what is required to be done there. It is a very congested point as everybody knows who has been through Lévis.

Mr. BELL. There was $75,000 spent last year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I dare say.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was the work done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. There was a vote of $75,000 in 1901-2, a vote of $22,000 in 1902-3, and now the hon. minister is asking for $72,000. It does not look as if he had quite known what he wanted ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARKER. Why do you expect to spend $72,000 this year, when you only spent $22,000 last year ? One would have expected it to be reversed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The work was all contemplated at the outset. The sum which I am asking it is estimated, will complete what we will have to do.

Mr. BARKER. It will complete all the station works ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does it involve—the building of a new station ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the station is already built. The situation is a very awkward one. I do not know whether all the hon. gentlemen who are within hearing are acquainted with the situation there or not. In times past, and up to the present, it has been a very dangerous situation. The station has been on the right hand side of the track, and people have been obliged to cross over these tracks to get to and from the ferry. A very great many people, particularly on the arrival and departure of trains, are going and coming across these tracks. It was found necessary that we should transfer the station to the other side. Fortunately, the present station is one that we require and may use to great advantage for freight and office purposes, so that in putting the new station on the other side, we are not by any means failing to utilize the building which has heretofore been occupied as a station. We have put the other over on the water side of the track and we have provided an overhead bridge which will enable the people to get to and from that station without crossing the tracks and without any personal risk or danger. In this item of $72,000 we estimate what the works contemplated will cost. The estimate is as follows New baggage room, $12,000 ; overhead bridge, $10,000 ; concrete platform, $14,000 ; stone curves, $1,105 ; roofs for the platforms, $30,000 ; tank, $1,850 ; engineer, $3,000, making a total of $72,000, which I am advised will complete the work.

Mr. BARKER. Are they let under contract after tender ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, sir.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the minister no architect in his own department ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have engineers, and as a general rule they draw the plans of all our buildings.

Mr. INGRAM. I see that there is $1,000 paid to an architect for drawing the plans of the Lévis station.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have no man in the department who would probably describe himself as an expert architect. It was expected that we would put up a nice presentable station at Lévis, and it was thought better to secure an architect of standing and reputation to draw the plans.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There was considerable correspondence last year between the Auditor General and the minister as to the mode of auditing the accounts, which I suppose referred to the charges to capital and revenue accounts. The minister agreed to change the mode of auditing the accounts. Would he kindly say what changes have been made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That correspondence had no reference to the question of revenue or capital account. The Auditor General seems to have been very much impressed by the remark made by a gentleman of the opposition in the Public Accounts Committee last year, who thought it was the business of the Auditor General to audit the accounts which were paid at Moncton. The Auditor General, on looking at the statute, came to the conclusion that it was broad enough to enable him to claim the right to withhold payment of any bill until the audit had taken place by himself personally or by some officer that he might appoint. I had several conversations with the Auditor General, and I pointed out to him that this would result in a great deal of inconvenience and no public advantage, because, as the result of many years' experience at Moncton, nothing had transpired to show that the officers at Moncton had failed in the performance of their duty. I pointed out to him that we had a large auditing staff at Moncton which had been there for many years, whose sole duty it was to audit these accounts, and that if he were to audit the accounts, there was no sense at all in paying for two different audits of the same account. I submitted to the demands of the Auditor General, as we could not carry on the business of the Intercolonial Railway unless I did. He is apparently the only person in this country who is to be trusted to properly supervise expenditure and to judge as to what ought be the proper functions of government, and so I submitted with as good a grace as I possibly could. Since then there has been a great deal of inconvenience. For instance, if a sheep happens to be killed on the Intercolonial Railway and the officers inquire into it and report that the sheep ought to be paid for, it not unfrequently happens that correspondence ensues and papers are called for.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And a doctor's certificate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes; a doctor's certificate has to be forthcoming, and these papers oscillate between Moncton on the one hand and the Auditor General on the other; further investigations are made, and the whole staff is set in motion in order to afford reasonable assurance to the Auditor General that this sheep is actually dead or has been seriously injured.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Or ever had an existence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. It is under those circumstances that the correspondence took place.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it not a fact that the Auditor General, in reply to the hon. member for Hamilton, stated that large sums of money were paid as to which he had absolutely no knowledge? Did not the correspondence arise out of larger matters than the Minister of Railways refers to?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am free to admit that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is responsible for the present condition of things, because his remark led the Auditor General to take this view of his duties. If the Public Accounts Committee should meet again at an early date, I wish my hon. friend would withdraw the remark, so that it may be possible for the officers who are engaged in this work at Moncton to do business in a business-like way upon the Intercolonial Railway. I confess that a great many things much larger than that have to be dealt with. I mention this to show what capacity can be found in a faithful and zealous public officer to grasp a needle as well as to strike at larger objects. One of the difficulties which we have is to get bills passed or paid at all. For a long period of years, ever since I have known anything about the Intercolonial personally, and from what I could gather from others who knew it before I came into the department, there was a recognized system of audit for printing done in connection with the Intercolonial. The Auditor General has since last session insisted that accounts for printing shall be audited and paid on the same basis on which the printing is done at the Printing Bureau. An examination of that system shows that no charge is made in connection with the investment, the cost of plant, or any of the hundred and one things that are outside of the actual labour and paper; and there has not been for a year past a single account settled or adjusted by the Auditor.

Mr. CLANCY. Can this printing not be done at the bureau?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It cannot be done at the bureau, for it is too far away, and it has never been thought reasonable that it should be done there. The claim is not that the work should be done at the bureau, but that it should only be paid for at bureau prices.

But printers cannot print at those prices ; they ought not to be asked to do so, and the law is not different to-day from what it has been for years. Under the law as it is now, and with the same knowledge of what it is, the Auditor has authorized the payment down to the current year of bills at the reasonable commercial price.

Mr. REID (Grenville). After that explanation the hon. minister cannot find fault with us. He knows that the Auditor General was appointed by the Liberal government, and if he is now putting the brakes on in that way, it must be because he has not the same confidence in this government that he had in their predecessors ; and if we are suspicious in that regard, we certainly have much more reason to be so than he has. However, I would like to ask the hon. minister, whether in case of capital expenditure, for instance for rails, the old rails are disposed of and the amount for which they are sold is placed to the credit of capital account ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. I would wish to make a remark or two on the subject of the audit. The hon. gentleman knows that the points on which the discussion occurred in the Public Accounts Committee were not at all of the nature that he has alluded to. There was no question of deciding upon a claim on a calf being killed or anything of that kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what it developed into.

Mr. BARKER. I am speaking of what occurred in the committee. In one or two cases we found that after parliament had authorized the government to spend a certain sum of money at a particular place the government spent twice that sum, without any authority whatever, and I asked the Auditor General how it happened that he had passed those accounts. He said that they were all paid before he knew anything about them. Out of that arose a discussion on the question whether there was a sufficient audit. There is a departmental auditor at Moncton, but that gentleman is precisely in the position of a staff officer on a railway who can be dismissed at any time by the manager. He simply looks after the details between the departments. Such an audit is no protection to the proprietors of the railway, nor would such an audit be a protection to the people of this country. We want somebody to audit the accounts as between the public and the railway department, not a gentleman who will object to a particular item at the peril of the loss of his situation. The hon. gentleman knows that the Auditor General cannot be dismissed by the government, and for that reason matters such as I have alluded to should be audited by him. We should have the protection of such an officer's endorsement of the expenditure, not the endorsement of some gentleman down at Moncton, who knows that he must do exactly as he is told, who will audit a particular account, but who will not criticise the government if it is spending two or three times what it is authorized to spend. That was what led to the discussion in the Public Accounts Committee, as the minister knows perfectly well.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Postmaster General, House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 29, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 185) respecting the Canadian Steel Company.—Mr. Fraser.

Bill (No. 186) to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—The Minister of Inland Revenue.

Bill (No. 187) to amend the Electric Light Inspection Act.—The Minister of Inland Revenue.

Bill (No. 188) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.—The Minister of Inland Revenue.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

That from this date to the end of the session government Orders have precedence on Mondays after Private Bills and Questions to be put by members.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). I would remind the right hon. gentleman that last Monday he promised that an opportunity would be given to bring up the Fruit Marks Act.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not forgotten that promise, and should this motion carry I shall ask the House on Monday to take up the two Bills relating to this subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). This motion takes away our right to make any private motions whatever, such as motions for returns. Is that necessary ? For instance yesterday a question was put by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) asking how many members or ex-members of the House of Commons have been appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown since the 13th July, 1896, and also how many members or ex-members of the Senate, and he was directed to move for a return. But should this motion carry, it will be impossible for him to do so. There seems to be a remarkable discrimination made between questions put on this side of the House and

those put on the other side. I called attention to this early in the session, and was told by the hon. Minister of Customs that no such discrimination was intended. But let me point to two instances of such discrimination during the session. In the 'Hansard' of March 26th, the hon. gentleman will find a long return given by the Minister of Customs in answer to a question put by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes)—a return which takes up the greater part of the page. I called attention to this and was assured by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs that no discrimination was intended. No doubt the question was asked by the hon. member for West Huron, at the request of the hon. Minister of Customs, and with this I am not finding fault, but what I do object to is that we should find in 'Hansard' an answer to such a question and that hon. gentlemen on this side should have to move for returns which would not be any more voluminous than the one given in the answer to which I have referred. Another extreme instance is to be found on the 30th of April in 'Hansard.' A certain question was put by the hon. the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), at the request, no doubt, of the hon. Postmaster General, and nearly two columns of 'Hansard' are taken up, without the slightest demur, giving long statistics with regard to three different subjects. Yet when my hon. friend from Marquette asks a question, the answer to which would not take up nearly as much space, my right hon. friend tells him to move for a return. I do not want to unduly complain, but I think that my right hon. friend should make an effort to have the one rule applied to both sides, and I am sure that if that were done, we would not find the condition of affairs to which I have just drawn attention. My right hon. friend must admit that the answer to the question of my hon. friend for Marquette could not possibly involve anything like the lengthy details given in answer to the question of the hon. member for West Assiniboia, but even if it should take a half a column or two columns of 'Hansard, what difference is there? The minister of the Crown has to bring down the information, and the only difference between bringing it down in reply to a question and bringing it down in reply to a motion, is that in the one case he reads it, and in the other he lays it on the Table. It does not seem to me that so many cases should arise in which so many gentlemen on this side are asked to obtain information by way of motion. A very inconsiderable portion of some of the business of the House at least has been concluded up to the present, and it is quite possible that we may require information which will be obtainable only by an address or Order of the House, and it seems to me that the right hon. gentleman ought to reserve some opportunity at least to hon. gentlemen on this side for obtaining information which they can only obtain by way of motion. I do not think therefore that my right hon. friend should press the motion in its present form.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must say to my hon. friend that if there has been any discrimination, I was not aware of it. I would be the last man to try to take an adadvantage over the other side. It may be, however, that sometimes an answer may more readily give the information than a return in reply to a motion, but there are other cases in which the form of a motion may be more suitable. For instance, with regard to the question of the hon. member for Marquette, I have no objection to give the information desired, but I wish to introduce an amendment and bring down some further information so as to avoid discrimination. Perhaps as the question will involve discrimination, a motion to which I would add an amendment would put all parties on an equality.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That can be accomplished by having a question put on that side.

The PRIME MINISTER. It would be as well accomplished by having my hon. friend from Marquette move a motion and then moving an amendment to that motion, so that the motion and the amendment would go together. We have come to the time of the session when such a motion is usually moved, and I am only following the usual practice. When we have reached a certain period of the session the government takes possession of all the days in order to facilitate, or rather to accelerate, the business of the House. This year, I think, there ought to be no objection at all by my hon. friend to this motion, for, I have only to recall to his mind that, at least of late, on days reserved for private members business, the paper has been gone over, we have been able to finish all the business standing in the nature of private members that was ready to be dealt with and to reach the business of the government. I have no objection that on Mondays, even though this motion is carried, the motions which are not debatable should be called and passed without any objection. Also, we can take up the Bill of my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) and the Bill of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). I think that ought to satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. ARCH. CAMPBELL (West York). I would call the attention of the right hon. the First Minister (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the fact that I also have a Bill before the House, a very important measure, Bill (No. 20). This has been kept back largely at the request of the government, that they might have an opportunity to consider it. If all the Mondays are now taken by the government, there will be no opportunity to consider this Bill. The Bill has been referred to a special committee. I would

ask the Prime Minister if he would not allow that also to be taken up.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is not on the Order Paper. It will be called later on when the committee reports.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I would draw the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister to the fact that, no matter what the period of the session, this motion was seldom made until the main estimates were all passed. At present the estimates of a good many of the departments have not been even touched. Information may be wanted by members of the opposition to enable them intelligently to prepare for the discussion of the estimates. For instance, three or four points concerning which I have notices on the paper came up in the debate yesterday. I was without accurate information on the subject and could only speak on the facts that I gathered outside. Opportunity should be left the private members of the House to move motions to get the information necessary for the discussion of the estimates.

The PRIME MINISTER. With the permission of the House, I would say that I do not agree with the statements of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that this motion is generally made only after the main estimates have gone through. It is not only proper, but it is the invariable rule, that all information necessary to the discussion of the estimates should be given, even if not moved for. If it is not furnished, the opposition have a very easy way of enforcing it, and I do not know but that they have availed themselves of that power on occasion even during the present session. With reference to motions of which notice has been given, they will be called up by consent. But even if the motions referred to by my hon. friend are not called up, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has promised that the information shall be brought down before his estimates are completed. There will be no trouble on that score. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) shall have the information which he requires.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, we ask for information when the estimates are under discussion and yet it is almost impossible to get it. The minister may promise it, but he may forget, or for some other reason it is not furnished anyway. There is nothing left for us of the opposition but to do as the right hon. gentleman (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) suggests, and declare that the item shall not pass until the information has been given.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I would suggest one thing, if Monday is the only day we are to have. I notice that when these unopposed motions are called, some member of the government is apt to call 'stand,' for some reason best known to the government themselves. The effect is to prevent the putting of the motion. They could do so with a motion of any kind, and so no opportunity would be afforded to the member who has given notice of a motion to have it passed by the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will tell my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) why the government call 'stand.' When a motion is called and the member in whose name it appears is not present, if nothing were said, the order would be dropped Many debatable questions have been called up in this way, and the hon. member who has given notice not being present, I have called 'stand' so that the notice might remain on the Order Paper. But on Monday all the motions will be called and those which are not debatable can be passed. For instance, the motion of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) which stands on the Order Paper is a debatable question and would not be called. But all motions moved for the production of papers will be allowed without any objection.

Motion agreed to.

I.C.R.—WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). With the unanimous consent of the House, I would move for :—

The interim report of the commissioners appointed to investigate the accident on the Intercolonial Railway near Windsor Junction at 23 o'clock, April 11, 1903.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table the interim report of the commissioners to investigate the accident on the Intercolonial Railway near Windsor Junction.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY TRAFFIC RATES.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). In the course of his remarks, as will be found at page 3654 of 'Hansard,' he referred to—

—a careful study made and a careful statement furnished to me by the traffic officers of the Intercolonial Railway as to the general traffic of tolls and freight charges which govern on the Intercolonial Railway and those which govern on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Might I ask if that paper can be laid on the Table of the House. It would furnish valuable information in connection with the discussion that may arise as to the rates on the Intercolonial Railway. I presume the hon. minister has no objection to lay that report on the Table.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I shall be very

glad to consider the matter and let my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) know. I would say to him that I should be very glad to show the report to him if he wishes to see it, but I am not quite clear at the moment that it would be desirable to lay on the Table a memorandum prepared for my own information. I will consider that point.

Mr. BELL. I should have supposed that the minister, having read from the document and used in accordance with his speech, the document becomes the property of the House.

TREADGOLD CONCESSION COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called I would ask the Prime Minister whether or not the terms of the commission inquiring into the Treadgold concession have been settled, and whether the commissioners have been appointed ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The terms of the commission have been settled, Mr. Speaker, and I have reason to believe that we shall be able to lay the document on the Table on Monday—not later than Tuesday.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the right hon. gentleman propose to permit the House to have an opportunity of discussing the terms before they are settled ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No ; I will bring down the Order in Council.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. AULEY MORRISON (New Westminster). I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has been informed of the influx of a large number of Japanese into the province of British Columbia within the last fifteen days, and if so, whether the Japanese Consul at Montreal has been communicated with, with respect to the arrival of these Japanese.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have not received any communication upon this subject. This is the first intimation I have had of it.

THE RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 3, subsection 1,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I stated to the committee the other evening that I would consider the suggestions which had been made to include the express companies within the scope of this Act and to place them under the jurisdiction of the railway commission. I have given that subject consideration, and I am not able to see that it will be of any advantage to the Act ; on the contrary, I think it would impair its value if we were to make the change which is proposed. I am of opinion that it would be necessary, in order to cover the ground fully and to make the legislation effective, to bring in a separate Bill.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Does the minister consider that the Bill gives any control at all over the rates charged by express companies ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Bill gives absolute control over the rates which are charged in respect of all merchandise carried over railways, where railway carriage is concerned. There can be no question about that.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Do I understand that the commission will have control over the whole route covered by express companies in carrying merchandise that is carried on a railway, or only over that portion of a route over which the railroad charges express companies for hauling their goods ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All charges which are incidental to the carriage of goods over a railway and which would be made in respect of railway carriage, are subject to the control of this tribunal. What is not subject to their control, and what I think cannot be properly made subject to their control, unless we have a separate Act, are the charges which the express companies would make beyond the railway charges. I stated that the other day. I do not think such charges would come within the jurisdiction of the railway commission under this Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would not the result be that wherever the express charge includes anything beyond or in addition to the charge of carriage on the railways, it will not come under the control of this commission ? Because I do not see how you can divide it up. Suppose you have an express charge covering transmission by a certain railway and covering further a certain distance by coach or by boat, there will be only one charge for the entire distance made by the express company. How can you determine what is the proportion of railway charge and what is the proportion of coach charge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that could be very well worked out so as to exercise control over a portion of the charge with respect to another carriage. To do that I think would require a special Act which, to be comprehensive, would have to take control of the rates and charges of express companies in respect to any portion of the route over which it carries goods. I am not dis-

posed to do that in this Bill, I cannot do it comprehensively in this Bill without encumbering the Bill. At another session perhaps the subject can be taken up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman suggests that this additional legislation called for is impracticable. But was there not some such legislation introduced by way of amendment to the Railway Act in 1900, on account of a difficulty which had arisen between the Yarmouth Steamship Company and the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company ? It seems to me that what the hon. gentleman has just stated was attempted by legislation of that kind ; whether it was actually carried out, I do not know.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so, I think that dealt exclusively with the rates charged in respect of what was railroad rates in the ordinary sense on goods carried from one point to another, a part of the distance being covered by water carriage. The steamship company had received freight to be taken to some point on the Dominion Atlantic Railway and to be carried by that railway. Then parliament gave to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council power to control that rate, and provided that there should be a declared rate in respect both of water carriage and rail carriage. But there the railway company was the contracting party, or the party who engaged to receive and carry this freight. Now an express company is not in the same position. An express company contracts with its patron to receive a package of goods, not to carry it all the way by rail necessarily, but to carry it to a certain point, and the company is the party which undertakes the carriage. The company may take a portion of it by steamer, it may take a portion of it by carriage over an ordinary highway, and it may take a portion of it by railway. When it gets upon the railway, then, the charges which are made in respect to the carriage of that merchandise will be subject, as I clearly understand this Bill, to the control of the railway commission, because, the railway cannot by any arrangement or understanding that it may have with an agent, or with some other company, or outside party, permit, or secure to itself, any higher rates to be imposed on such carriage than the law through this commission shall declare.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I recollect the case now to which I referred a few moments ago. The difficulty there was in respect to a railway company which also had a line of steamers which connected with Boston. The Yarmouth Steamship Company was a rival company. The allegation was that the railway company had imposed altogether too high a charge for railway carriage on freight routed to Boston by the Yarmouth Steamship Line and in that way had subjected the Yarmouth Steamship Company to an unjust discrimination. The hon. minister's position, I understand, to be this : The express company is a separate corporation undertaking business by any means within its power, and that business can be accomplished partly by railway, partly by carriage over highway and partly by boat, and therefore it does not come within the scope of this Bill to control the rates beyond those which shall be charged by the railway. Well, that brings us back to the position that practically where the express charge covers conveyance beyond the railway we have no control at all. It does bring us back to that conclusion does it not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not disputing the hon. gentleman's position; I am just endeavouring to find out where we are.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then it is a question of policy whether we should undertake to do more and the hon. gentleman thinks we should not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not in this Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When the hon. gentleman says : 'not in this Bill' does he intend to convey any meaning beyond that, that he has in mind the preparation of any other legislation which would control matters of this kind ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not hesitate to say that if any difficulty arises in respect to the control and regulation of the tolls or rates of express companies I would not be unwilling to examine into the subject and see whether legislation might not be proposed in another Bill. I would be disposed in my own mind to favour legislation which would give to the public protection against excessive rates being charged by express companies. That is a fair matter for consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Chairman, I understand the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to say that express matter carried over a railway would be under the control of this commission as far as the rates go ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As to the railway carriage.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume this Bill is modelled largely upon the legislation in the United States under which the American Railway Commission proceeds ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice in some decisions on that question given by the Inter-

State Commerce Commission that this rule is laid down :

Express business, conducted as a branch of the business of the railroad company, held to be subject to the Act.

Express business, conducted by an independent organization, acquiring transportation rights by contract, held not to be described in the Act with sufficient precision to warrant the commission to taking jurisdiction thereof.

They hold that it would be required to be expressed in the Act in such a way as to bring it under the control of the railway commission.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The whole principle of the Acts which provide for the appointment and jurisdiction of a railway commission in the United States and the whole scope and basis of those acts are entirely different from this Bill. I think there is no similarity at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I think they are different so far as they are entitled to exercise control over express companies, charges where carried on a railway whether carried by an independent express company or carried by an express company which is part of the railway company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will find there legislation giving control of charges to the commission as respects merchandise handled by a common carrier. That is not the principle of this Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be a little clearer in regard to a matter that was under discussion when the committee rose the last evening upon which this Bill was under consideration. When the committee was sitting on that evening upon this clause, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was kind enough to tell me that if I read clause five of this Bill I would find that it did apply to express companies in regard to a case that I put to the hon. minister; that is a case where goods are shipped by express over a railway that is not within the jurisdiction of this Bill and not within the scope of section three which is before the committee now. I gave the example of an electric railway which runs through the county of Lincoln, entirely a provincial railway, which does not cross any other railway, which does not come within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada and I pointed out to the hon. minister that these goods shipped by the railway I am speaking of from Beamsville to Ottawa or, say fruit shipped from Beamsville to Ottawa or Montreal, changed hands at Hamilton, were taken from a railway not within the scope of this Bill and given over to the Canadian Pacific Railway which is a railway coming within the scope of this Bill. The hon. minister told me that if I read section five carefully again I would find that it covered that question, that section five showed that goods that would be carried by express over these two railways, one not within the scope of this Bill, and one within the scope of this Bill, being handed over from the former to the latter in the middle of the journey, would be covered by this Bill. I want to understand this legislation before I vote for or against it. I may be lacking in ordinary intelligence. The hon. minister seems to think that I should read the Bill over three or four times more before I understand it. I would ask the hon. minister to explain how section five meets a case of that kind. Section five reads as follows :—

All the provisions of this Act relating to any subject or matter within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, and for greater certainty but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms, all provisions relating to railway crossings and junctions, highway crossings, through traffic, offences, penalties and statistics, shall apply to all persons, companies and railways, whether otherwise within the legislative authority of parliament or not.

It seems to me that no words in that section can possibly apply to express companies unless they are the words 'through traffic.' I do not think that the hon. minister will say that the words 'railway crossings and junctions, highway crossings, offences, penalties and statistics,' will bring any express company within the operation of this Bill in the way in which it was said this Bill would apply. I would now ask the hon. minister whether he means that the words 'through traffic' do cover express companies in cases of that kind, because, if they do, I suppose it follows that the Bill would cover express companies generally, and there seems to me to be a great deal of misunderstanding and a great deal of misconception between the hon. minister and hon. members of this House as to how far these express companies come within the operation of this section. I think it would be well if the hon. minister would point out how section five covers the carriage of express goods by a railway which does not come within the scope of this Bill and which are handed over to a railway which does come within the scope of this Bill. That cannot be covered by this Act at all. The minister said that if I read section five I would find that it covered this exact case, but it can only cover it if it is included in the words 'through traffic.' Will the minister tell us in plain language if the words 'through traffic' include express business on railways such as I speak of.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman referred to merchandise which started on one railway and was taken up by another and carried to its destinatiton. That is through-traffic, and that is provided for by section 5. It is perfectly clear from that section that when a railway company is constituted by the

legislature of a province it does not become subject to the legislative jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada ; whether this is so or not, if that traffic was through-traffic in the way he described it, it would become subject to this Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. Shipped by express.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not care whether shipped by express or not, so long as it is carried over the two railways as through-traffic. I can understand that a doubt might arise if a person in Sarnia were shipping to Ottawa and he sent his goods to Toronto, took them off the train, and some one took hold of them and reshipped them to Ottawa, thus making two distinct shipments. A doubt would probably arise there as to whether the first railway, not being subject to the jurisdiction of this parliament, would be under the control of this commission. But if there is a through shipping over two different railways, and if there is a rate arranged for at first to carry the goods to their destination, then they would become 'through-traffic,' and as such, whether express or not, they would be subject to the provisions of this Act, in my opinion.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). It is not clear yet to a great many of us whether this commission will have power over the rates charged by express companies. As I understand it, the Act will only protect express companies as against the railway companies. The only control this commission would have over rates would be on the railways, and that is but a small part, scarcely half the charge made by the express companies. The express companies make charges for teaming in cities and towns, for the time of their messengers on the train, and for other services, which make up more than half the charges of the express companies, and, so far as I can see, the control which this commission would have over the rates charged by express companies would be of no use whatever to the shipper. Has the minister taken fully into consideration the points mentioned the other night by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), who stated that Mr. Staunton, an eminent lawyer who considered this matter carefully, had declared that by the insertion of a very few words the express companies could be brought fully within the scope of this Act ? Why should not the minister put a private individual in the same position as an express company, and have it declared in this law that a private individual can ship his goods upon a railway upon the same terms as an express company can ? If that were embodied in the law, it would meet the complaint of shippers of express goods, and of the fruit-growers in particular, who ship the greater part of their products by express, and who are very much concerned about this matter. When the fruit-growers interviewed the minister last winter they never dreamed for an instant that express companies would not be brought under this Act. I can assure the minister that they have always taken it for granted that the express companies would come under the operations of the Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what these gentlemen may have taken for granted, but I think they will find that this Bill will afford them a great deal of relief if they have any grievances of which they can justly complain. At all events, it makes it possible for an independent body to investigate and determine as to whether or not the charges that are made in respect to the railway carriage of these goods are reasonable charges, and if they are not they can reduce them. I read from 'Hansard' the question put to me the other night by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). He asked :

> Now, the question I want to put to the minister is this : Suppose some constituent of mine ships his fruit on that electric railway to be carried to Ottawa. It is to be carried by the Dominion Express Company that starts on the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway, and is then transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is a railway within the provisions of this Act ? Now, what does the minister say about that express business ?

That is a question of through-freight beyond any doubt, and I answered the hon. gentleman accordingly. I told him that the law provides for that case just as fully as it provides for any case in which business is being done by express companies, and the fact that the initial road was not under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada did not prevent it being brought under the provisions of this Bill as a carrier of through-traffic by the fifth clause, which says :

> 5. All the provisions of this Act relating to any subject or matter within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, and for greater certainty but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms, all provisions relating to railway crossings and junctions, highway crossings, through-traffic, offences, penalties and statistics, shall apply to all persons, companies and railways, whether otherwise within the legislative authority of parliament or not. 51 V., c. 29, s. 4, Am.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As I understand the minister, all freight carried by express companies on railways is under the jurisdiction of the commission. As my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) has pointed out, that is of benefit solely to express companies and is of no benefit at all to the private shipper. The charges made to the express companies by the railway can be regulated by the commission. But here is an express company which perhaps receives its incorporation from the provincial legislature and over which the Dominion government has no control whatever. It makes a contract with an individual to carry goods by express over the railroad at a greater charge than the commission allows the railway company to

make. I do not see how under this Bill we could exercise any control over the express company in a case of that kind. I do not say that it ought to be so ; but the Bill affords no remedy at all to a shipper by an express company, and I do not know whether you could in an Act like this make regulations that would do so. Take the case of freight initiated on a road of a purely provincial character like an electric tramway between St. Catharines and Toronto. This Bill provides that the Dominion parliament shall give the commission power to regulate freight charges ; but in a case of that kind, I do not think such a clause is worth the paper it is written on. What right has the parliament of Canada to take control over a company which receives its entity and corporate power from the local legislature, and say that it shall only charge so much for the carriage of goods ? It has no control or jurisdiction whatever over it. I am perhaps with the minister to this extent, that it is rather a difficult job to embody in a Bill like this provisions giving the commission power to regulate express rates, for a good many reasons. Most of the business done by express companies is done under special contracts and at prices which could not possibly be regulated by a commission. For instance, the express companies carry money for banks from the different agencies to the headquarters or to central points, and they make special arrangements with the banks under which they receive for the carriage of that money perhaps ten or twenty times the ordinary rate of freight. That is a perfectly legitimate transaction. The express companies are entitled to a large remuneration for the risk they run. Why should we prevent them making such an arrangement, and attempt to provide in a purely railway Bill, that they shall receive no more than is charged for carrying ordinary freight ? I can see the difficulty of the minister in making these provisions apply to express companies. But he could make them apply very easily by adopting the suggestion of the hon. member for Lincoln, which would remedy the whole grievance ; that is, to provide that a railway which carries freight for an express company shall carry the goods of an individual on the same terms and at the same rates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think my hon. friend would support a motion of that kind.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not say that I would.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. There is another important consideration in support of the argument of the minister and the hon. member for South Lanark. People are not bound to go to the express companies at all. We must not forget that this is a general Bill for a specific purpose, and a very broad purpose ; it is a Bill for railways alone. We have other general Acts of various kinds ; and if you want to regulate express companies, you can only deal with them intelligently and effectively by means of a general law with respect to express companies, which are different creatures from railways. I think that is logical. We should be very careful, in passing a general Act of any kind, not to incorporate in it things which have no relation to its object. It would be unfortunate, I think, in the interests of the shipper if express companies could not operate in such a way as the hon. member for South Lanark mentions. I do not know what banks or others similarly situated would do. We are prepared to pay extra rates if we want our goods rushed from one point to another by an express company. We often pay for quick expedition in the carriage of goods, and we are willing to pay. If we are going to regulate express companies, my idea is that we should do so by a general Bill dealing with express companies.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I agree that we are quite willing to pay a higher rate for an extra rate of speed, but the express companies do not give it to us. It is the railway companies that give us the speed, because they carry the goods. I would like to ask if there is any provision in this Bill which entitles shippers to demand from the railways the same rate of speed and the same charge for the carriage of their goods which the railways give to the express companies. If so, that will solve the difficulty. In many cases the shipper could dispense with the extra services for which the express company charges the shipper. For instance, he could transfer his goods to and from the railway in his own wagon, and he could dispense with a messenger accompanying the goods on the railway. I would ask the minister if there is anything in the Bill to enable shippers to get the same treatment from the railways as the express companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend will hardly expect freight to be carried in the same way as a parcel of goods is carried by express. Freight and passengers are not carried together, but an express car is attached to a passenger train, and in that way goods are carried at an express rate of speed. There is no provision in the Bill which I think would compel a railway company to carry ordinary express freight, as it is called, at the same rate of speed as carriages containing express goods are conveyed in passenger trains. There is no provision in the law especially authorizing them and I do not know that there is any provision in this Bill which by implication would authorize it. As at present advised I would not favour the introduction of any such clause. By this Bill we confer upon the commission power to determine what is just, fair and reasonable, and we impose penalties of a serious character on a railway company or its officials or anybody connected with it who

would disregard the orders and regulations of the commission, but we cannot undertake to ramify through all the channels of railway operation and discrimination and provide some superabundant power which will meet every possible contingency that may occur to anybody's mind.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. There is another point. The express companies are responsible and not the railway companies. They have to pay an allowance to each railway company. We give them their charters, believing that they serve a useful purpose, and you need not go to an express company unless you please. They are separate corporations, with special powers and are responsible. I am not satisfied that a railway company can undertake this class of business. They may often refuse it. I remember an instance of a railway company wanting to prevent an express company operating on its line, and it was only under a clause of the Railway Act that the company was compelled to do so. The railway company said: 'We will not take that business at all,' but they found they had to. If the express companies were taking advantage of the public, that would be another question, but the more I consider the point raised, the more I think that it would be an unfortunate experiment to deal with it in this general Bill.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). With regard to the statement that railways cannot do this business, the railways in England are doing it. They carry goods at a rapid rate of speed, and if they do not get their cars in on time, they have to pay a fine. Suppose a shipper had a carload of fruit to ship to Winnipeg. He does not want any messenger to go along with it, but is willing to take the responsibility himself. It goes the same way as ordinary freight, except that it goes in a swifter train. If there is no other way of controlling the express companies, why should not the shipper, if he signs a contract to take the responsibility, have the same rates as the express company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that the passenger trains on English railways carry express goods. They run special fast trains for what they call express freights, but these trains do not run as fast as our express trains. The conditions are quite different.

Amendment (Mr. Maclean) negatived.

Mr. BARKER. I have asked on one or two occasions on what grounds government railways are excluded from the jurisdiction of this proposed commission, and have not yet been able to obtain an answer. Up to the present moment the only reply I have been able to obtain from the hon. gentleman is that he does not wish it. He has given no reason for his wishes. I wish to point out the relative importance of the government railway mileage. Take the hon. gentleman's report, I find that the total number of miles of steam railway in the Dominion is 18,868, and electric railways, 558 miles, making a total of 19,426. The hon. gentleman said the other day that 95 per cent of the railways would come under this commission. He may have meant 95 per cent of the companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I gave the off-hand opinion that 95 per cent of the provincial roads, incorporated under provincial Acts, and which ordinarily would not come under our jurisdiction, had come under it by virtue of the legislation of this parliament from time to time.

Mr. BARKER. I am not holding the hon. gentleman down to 95 per cent. But in a general way he spoke of bringing 95 per cent under this Bill. As I understand, the Canadian Pacific Railway will not come under it, so far as the mileage of its main line between North Bay and Vancouver is concerned.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. From Callander to Vancouver.

Mr. BARKER. After looking at the time table, I find that the mileage west of North Bay to Vancouver is about 2,542, and that the government railway mileage is 1,552, making a total of 4,094 miles excluded from the jurisdiction of the commission. That would mean that instead of only 5 per cent being excluded, there would be nearly 22 per cent of the mileage of the railway companies excluded from the jurisdiction of this commission. I think that that is a very serious subject for consideration, and while I admit that the hon. gentleman possibly cannot get over the difficulty with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, it does not follow that he should not have the 1,500 miles of railway operated by the government brought under this commission. I think there is no line of railway which is so important to have under the jurisdiction of the commission as the railway owned and operated by the government. For, this is really the terminal railway. We are discussing in this House the question of adding to the transportation facilities of this country for the purpose of ensuring that the products of the great west shall be directed through our own territory to the sea. The major portion of that traffic may go over the government railway—that is the pipe through which the most of the grain may go. It is of immense importance to those in the west, and to those in the other provinces as well, that the commissioners who control and regulate rates and various other matters as provided in this Bill, should have jurisdiction with regard to this terminal road, the great government road which leads to the sea. There are 1,552 miles of government railway. I admit that

that includes a couple of hundred miles of the Prince Edward Island Railway. But there are over 1,300 miles of the Intercolonial alone, and it is a very important matter that this control of rates by the commission should not be limited so as to exclude that mileage. We are entitled to have from the government something more than their mere wish on this point. There may be reasons why the commissioners should not be allowed to regulate charges upon the Intercolonial, but I believe that the public and that every member of this House will think just the other way. I think that all the discussion we have had in this House, even the elaborate speech with which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) favoured the House yesterday with regard to his own operations, shows if it shows anything, it is of immense importance to this country that somebody outside of the mere political head of the department should have an opportunity of knowing what is going on in connection with that railway. We are told by the hon. minister that a great discrepancy exists and must exist between the rates charged on the government railway and those charged on other railways. Surely this strikes at the very root of the appointment of this commission. Rates should be fairly regulated, and a shipper should know what rate he is to be charged, not only for a portion of the haul, but for all of it. I persist in the request I have made, and, as I have not had an answer, I move that section 3 be amended by striking out the words 'other than government railways.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should have answered, or at least made an effort to answer, the question which the hon. member (Mr. Barker) put to me the day before yesterday, but that we came to a conclusion about the business of the House very shortly after he had spoken, and before I had an opportunity to respond to his appeal. I recall very well the line of argument he addressed to this committee—practically the same as he used to-day—in which he suggested that there was apparently only one reason, or that he had concluded there was only one reason, why this clause should stand as it does in the Bill, and that was that the Minister of Railways and Canals did not want to hand over the management and operation of the Intercolonial road to the commission, but wanted to continue to be in charge of it himself if he remained in the department. I can only presume that the hon. gentleman speaks under a misapprehension as to the intended scope and purpose of the commission. This commission is not to engage in the management of railways at all; it is a commission constituted to keep the railway companies in check. It seems to me that upon the very surface a good and sufficient reason is to be found why this Bill should not include the government railway. I do not specially, or even largely, rely upon the fact that in constituting the Railway Committee of the Privy Council it was thought well not to give that body the same measure of jurisdiction and control over the Intercolonial that was given it over other railways. But it does occur to me that there are the strongest possible reasons why control over the Intercolonial might have been given to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council as constituted, and yet the strongest possible reasons why that control should not be given to this commission as it is to be constituted. If the government owned all the railways operating in the country you would never have heard any appeal or demand for the appointment of a commission. Why ? Because the grievances of which the people complain would never have existed. And, if they did exist the people would have in their own hands a very ready and very efficient means of remedying their grievances. They would hold the government of the day responsible for the perpetuation of such wrongs as those of which many people in Canada complain to-day with respect to the operation of other railways. It is not for the purpose of preventing the Intercolonial Railway from imposing excessive rates upon the people of this country that the railway commission proposed to be created, it is not for the purpose of compelling the Intercolonial Railway to obey this or that law or this or that regulation that the cry has arisen for the creation of a railway commission ; it is because the other railways of the country have apparently been so conducting themselves, or, at all events, in the course of their operation, have created such a sentiment in the public mind, that some control of this kind is necessary to be exercised as regards those railways. Now, it is always enough in legislating to remedy the grievances which you know or believe to exist. There is never any advantage in undertaking to remedy conditions which you think may in the future become grievances, but which have not become grievances and are not crying for remedy. The fact that the government of the country owns and operates the Intercolonial and is answerable to public opinion for its action and conduct for such administration, is the best reason in the world why you do not require to set up a tribunal outside of parliament for that purpose. It would strike almost any person at first blush, I think, that it would be a great mistake to confer upon any body of men, I do not care who they might be, control, beyond the reach of parliament or the government, of the management of any public institution and particularly the managment of a railway. You cannot reach them as you can reach the government. They would not be as responsible as to time, and would not be as ready to answer to any demand of public opinion upon them. They might possibly even do something more. Give to this railway commission the powers to fix and determine what the rates are, and they

would have it in their power to compel the people who are doing business over the Intercolonial to pay higher rates than they are paying to-day. I do not see how they could avoid it. They have the power to make uniformity of rates. Here are the standards, they cannot regulate in any way. Here is a standard tariff, here is a special tariff and here is a competitive tariff. They have got to be governed exactly under the same conditions. If you put all railways under the jurisdiction of this commission there is no discretion on their part to except any one from the operation of the law. I do not think the people of this country are prepared to hand over the power which they now possess through parliament, to any tribunal to interfere with the rates which are charged upon government railways.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that the function of that commission would be to fix what would be a just tariff. Therefore, if they fix a just tariff on other railways, why should the hon. gentleman except any railway from coming under a just tariff ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a question of public policy whether or not this parliament is prepared at this moment to make the change proposed. Are there any reasons why the condition of things which has existed ever since we have been a Dominion, when the different provinces agreed to enter into this union, should now be rescinded and that arrangement relating to the Intercolonial be dissolved ? Hon. gentlemen have got to think these things out in their minds a little better before they plunge into amendments of laws which have been on the statute-book ever since this Dominion has been in existence. They must stop and think where they are landing. I do not think the members of this House are prepared, from a national point of view, to make that change. The people of Ontario who do business over the Intercolonial, who sell their goods, manufactured and imported, in the maritime provinces, who do nine-tenths of the wholesale business which is done in the maritime provinces, I do not think they are prepared to say that any advantage will accrue to them by making the rates on the Intercolonial uniform with the rates on all the other roads. I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that the result would be anything but disastrous.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The commission would not have power to raise the rates, if they are now sufficiently low on the Intercolonial, even though they had power to raise them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman will read the Bill, he will find that the commission has not only power to do this, but it is their duty to make such rates in respect of all traffic over any and all railroads as it thinks are just and reasonable.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That only applies under the Bill to maximum rates, and the railroad cannot charge less.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all ; there is no maximum business about it. The hon. gentleman has not read the Bill. He will not find the words 'maximum rates' in the Bill as applied to any measure or scale of tariff.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Am I to understand that the rates charged on the Intercolonial now are less than those charged on other railways in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite sure that they are less than are charged on the two great railways of this country, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and always have been. The tariffs are divided into three classes. There is the standard freight tariff, the special freight tariff and the competitive tariff, provided for by section 260 :

> The standard freight tariff or tariffs where the company is allowed by the board more than one standard freight tariff, shall specify the maximum mileage tolls to be charged for each class of the freight classification for all distances covered by the company's railway. Such distances may be expressed in blocks or groups, and such blocks or groups may include proportionately greater distances for the longer than for the shorter hauls.
>
> The special tariffs shall specify the toll or tolls lower than in the standard freight tariff to be charged by the company for any particular commodity or commodities, or for each or any class or classes of the freight classification, or to or from a certain point or points on the railway, greater tolls not being charged therein for a shorter than a longer distance, the shorter being included in the longer.
>
> The competitive tariffs shall specify the toll or tolls lower than in the standard freight tariff to be charged by the company for any class or classes of the freight classificaion, or for any commodity or commodities.

Now, the standard freight tariff is settled in one of two ways. The company may make out its tariff and submit it, and if it is approved, then it becomes the standard freight tariff ; if it is not approved, the board may make out specifically such tariff as they please, and which should be designated as the standard freight tariff.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The argument I was making is this, that the commission seemed to fix the maximum tolls, and it was left to the company to charge any tolls under that. The hon. gentleman stated there was no maximum price fixed at all by the commission.

Mr. LANCASTER. The explanation of the minister, if it can be called one, has not warranted me in coming to the conclusion that the amendment of my hon. friend from Hamilton is wrong, and has not convinced me that I was wrong in seconding his amendment, and unless I have better evi-

dence than I have now to show why these government railways should not come under the control of this commission, I must vote for that amendment. Now, we are all obliged to the minister for giving us the advice he does, but I think charity begins at home. Let the minister himself take some of his own advice and think a little more carefully about these matters which he asks this House to sanction. The arguments made by the members on this side of the House are made in the interests of the country, because they understand that people want a railroad commission to be a railroad commission in reality, and to attend to the business that it is proposed to submit to it, not to do a patch here and a patch there, not to attend to one section of the Dominion or to one locality to the exclusion of others, but to attend to freight shipped from any part of the Dominion to any other part. A little while ago the minister told us that it was not right that goods shipped from the Niagara district to Ottawa should be under the control of the commission, whether shipped by express or otherwise, but that it is quite right that the whole journey should be dealt with as through-traffic. I understand him to say that the words 'through-traffic' in section five are to apply to that. What is the principle that the hon. gentleman has in his mind in regard to that? Surely it is that there should be no difference whether many or few railways handle the goods. Surely it is that people shipping goods from one part of Canada to another shall deal with the commission in regard to the whole matter and not in regard to any particular part of it. They are not going to be supposed to have a special rate in regard to one railway that the commission cannot control, and another in regard to another railway that the commission can control. If there is any merit at all in the hon. gentleman's Bill it is in that sense. To enlarge the illustration that I gave, suppose any one shipped goods from Halifax to Toronto or from Toronto to Halifax or St. John and these goods are going to be carried by the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway part of the way and by the Intercolonial Railway the rest of the way. What harm is there in the Intercolonial Railway being under the same jurisdiction and having the same authority over it as that placed over the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway? Suppose that the people in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are not satisfied with the rates, and in view of the discussion that took place in this House yesterday, I can well understand that some of them would be dissatisfied, suppose that they think the rates should be adjusted; if there is any merit in the commission there is just as much merit in applying its supervision to the rates charged on the Intercolonial Railway as to those charged on any other railway. If the Intercolonial Railway is to be dealt with as a business proposition why should its business not be properly carried on and why should not this commission have jurisdiction over its rates in the same way as it is proposed that it shall have over the rates of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway? We suppose that the Intercolonial Railway is doing a railway business. It seems to me that the hon. minister is afraid that the rates will be increased on the Intercolonial Railway. I do not know that it would do very much harm if they were increased a little. Perhaps they would not be paying out so much on capital account if they were increased. I suppose that the people would be willing to pay reasonable rates. The hon. gentleman evidently believes that the commission would increase them. I am not at all sure that the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is not right in saying that it is the maximum rates that are to be dealt with. Suppose that the rates charged on the eastern portion of the journey on goods shipped from Toronto to Halifax are altogether inadequate, and we say that the commission shall have no power over the Intercolonial Railway but that they may adjust the rates on the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Pacific Railway, surely the members of that commission could not exclude from their minds the rates which the Intercolonial are charging. If they had power to enforce any order that the Intercolonial Railway rates were too high or too low if they could apply that order to the other end of the journey and if they could arrive at a reasonable conclusion, they could the more readily satisfy the shippers and purchasers of those goods. The hon. minister says that he does not think we should legislate for grievances that do not exist, but that we should only legislate for those that do exist. Well, if they are the same kind of grievances they are likely to exist and why should grievances that may exist be excluded from the operation of the Bill. The hon. minister surely does not want full power to do what he thinks the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway ought not to do. I do not suppose the hon. minister wants us to understand that he desires power to do that. If these grievances exist on the large trunk lines, on the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway, and if the Intercolonial Railway is going to spread out (and we hear talk about extending it), is there any harm in asking that the rates on the Intercolonial Railway shall be controlled in the same way as they are to be controlled on the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway? Are not the same grievances likely to exist on the Intercolonial Railway? They may not have arisen at present. They may be only about to arise. The hon. minister, for all I know, may expect them to arise next year. If they do arise they will need to be dealt with

by this commission, and there is no harm in the commission having control over the rates on the Intercolonial Railway. In regard to the handing over the power that the hon. minister speaks of, I do not see how that remark applies to the case at all. I do not understand that this commission is to manage the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think the hon. minister means us to take him seriously when he says that by giving the commission control of the rates on the Intercolonial Railway we would be giving the commission power over the management of the Intercolonial Railway. That is practically what he says. I think there is nothing that will so much cause hon. members on this side of the House to think that the motion of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is right as the weak defence that has been put up by the hon. minister as to why it should not prevail. Upon consideration of all that the hon. minister has said I am firmly of the opinion that the Intercolonial Railway ought to be governed by this commission the same as other railways are, and I shall have to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Hamilton.

Mr. FRASER. I noticed a few days ago that when the government announced that the canals should be made free that everybody could carry anything he wanted through them without paying a cent, there was not a word from the hon. members on the other side of the House.

Mr. LANCASTER. What has that to do with it ?

Mr. FRASER. We have spent as much money on the canals as we have spent on the Intercolonial Railway, and everybody can carry everything free through them. We, in the lower provinces, when we travel or when we ship goods, have to pay for doing so.

Mr. LANCASTER. What has that to do with the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. FRASER. It is now admitted, that, if, under the Bill, we applied the commission to the Intercolonial Railway it would be treated like any other railway.

Mr. LANCASTER. Certainly, why not ?

Mr. FRASER. The Intercolonial Railway was built for the purpose of securing to this Dominion the lower provinces, and it is as much a part of our constitution as if it were written in. We know that the maritime provinces would not have entered into confederation if the promise to maintain the Intercolonial Railway as a government railway had not been given and carried out. It is as much a part of the constitution as if it were a section of the British North America Act.

Mr. SPROULE. That did not imply that the goods were to be carried for less than the service was worth.

Mr. LANCASTER.

Mr. FRASER. It implied that the government must always be in charge whether it be Liberal or Conservative, that it must always be a government road because it was built for the purpose I have named. That condition must always be carried out so that our interests shall be protected in accordance with the promise given. We do not desire that goods shall be carried free, although you have your canals absolutely free.

Mr. SPROULE. I always thought the building of the Intercolonial Railway was to unite the lower provinces.

Mr. FRASER. It was the condition under which we came in. It was not to unite the provinces. The lower provinces would never have entered confederation had not the Intercolonial Railway been built. We saw the difficulties that would occur, we saw that on everything that we brought from the upper provinces we would have to pay a large price, we saw that the tariff, small as it was then, would be increased and that this new country would be able to build up a large trade in the lower provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it not for the same reason that we asked to have the tolls taken off canals—so as to permit of the carrying of goods at a cheaper rate ?

Mr. FRASER. The rates still remain on the Intercolonial Railway. You must take things as they are.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the hon. member (Mr. Fraser) if he is afraid that this commission will do wrong with the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. FRASER. No, but if they are honest men they will raise the rates on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. What does that mean ?

Mr. FRASER. I have no doubt that it will be found that the abolition of tolls upon canals is going to be a good thing in the interests of the trade.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to ask the hon. member (Mr. Fraser) a question. Does he not know that one of the chief objects in making the canals free is to give the maritime provinces the advantage of cheaper goods from the western provinces ?

Mr. FRASER. That is very kind indeed. That is a kindness that we accept with the greatest satisfaction possible. But, coal is not sent through the canals and we do not receive anything in the lower provinces through the canals. Everything we get in the upper provinces comes by the railways, Intercolonial Railway included. What comes through the canals is what goes to foreign parts.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No.

Mr. FRASER. Excuse me, I would like to know what we get in the lower provinces that comes through the canals.

Mr. HUGHES. Flour.

Mr. FRASER. Excuse me, flour does not come through the canals.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Flour will go.

Mr. FRASER. You are always speculating as to the future. I am talking of present conditions.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Flour is going.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does not the wheat you get go through the Welland canal.

Mr. FRASER. We don't use any wheat to talk of. You grow the wheat and you grind it and you grind us by compelling us to pay a duty on it if we buy it any where else. We have no mills down there except a small one in New Glasgow, and I don't know whether it is going or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are some mills grinding native wheat.

Mr. FRASER. We have the ordinary mills grinding native wheat, but we get no wheat from the upper provinces and consequently the abolition of canal tolls does not benefit us one cent. If you put the Intercolonial Railway under the commission then if they are honest men they will deal with the Intercolonial Railway exactly as with other roads.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. Would this commission not do a good service to the people of the eastern provinces by preventing discrimination between these people on the part of those who manage the railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There never is discrimination.

Mr. FRASER. I speak in the presence of Conservative members from the lower provinces and I say that the railway rates are largely in the interest of Conservatives, because they are the large producers. If the Nova Scotia Steel Company or any other company wants a special rate because they ship in large quantities perhaps it is given to them, but so far as the ordinary business man in the lower provinces is concerned whether they be Liberal or Conservative they are all treated alike. Hon. gentlemen opposite want the Intercolonial Railway put under control of the commission, and if the commissioners were honest men they would treat the Intercolonial Railway exactly as they would other railroads, and then we would have the magnificent spectacle of Ontario men getting the benefit of the $80,000,000 we spent on the canals and we would have no benefits from the Intercolonial Railway. They would have free canal tolls and we would have high railway rates. Is that broad statesmanship. The condition under which the lower provinces entered into confederation, was that the Intercolonial Railway would be built to cement the provinces together, to give us an opportunity of consuming western products and to give you an opportunity of consuming our products, but you take very little of the things we produce. It may be a speculation to say that our coal comes up here, but I notice that some hon. gentlemen opposite, not all, are clamoring that even the duty be taken off coal so that they can get it from the United States when the freights would perhaps be one-third of those on Nova Scotia coal. I care not whether the government of Canada is Liberal or Conservative, I want that government to hold the Intercolonial Railway, to judge what the rates on the Intercolonial Railway shall be, and thus carry out the cementing process that was understood when we entered into confederation.

Mr. HALE. I have always thought, Mr. Chairman, that it would be in the best interests of the section of the country I represent that the Intercolonial Railway should come under the control of this railway commission. Ever since the Intercolonial Railway has been in existence it has been operated in direct antagonism to the best interest of the western part of the province of New Brunswick, because the rates on that road have been so low that the products of the upper provinces are carried to the cities of St. John and Halifax for less than we have to pay to carry freight from the county of Carleton and the river counties into these cities. The western produce is thus enabled to come in to competition with the produce that we raise in our section of country. I have thought for a long time that something ought to be done to regulate that. Many years ago I brought this matter to the attention of the late hon. Mr. Pope, then Minister of Railways and Canals, but nothing has ever been done to relieve the situation so far as we are concerned. I believe that it is just and fair that the Intercolonial Railway should come under this commission and that if they are good honest commissioners who will regulate the rates on that road, we will get justice for our section of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I never understood that it was part of the terms of confederation that we should build a railway to carry freight for less than the cost of handling it. I do not think that you will find in the British North America Act or in the debates on confederation anything that will justify that contention. The argument of the member for Guysborough in favour of that proposition is decidedly unique.

Mr. FRASER. It has often been advanced in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard it repeatedly stated in this House by members from the

maritime provinces that they were charged as high freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway as on other railways in Canada and that they got no advantage. But the member for Guysborough seems to have the idea that the removal of tolls on the canals is for the benefit of the upper province people and that forsooth because of this, the Intercolonial Railway should carry freight below cost for the people of the maritime provinces.

Mr. FRASER. What I said was that the condition that has existed on the Intercolonial Railway since confederation should be maintained.

Mr. SPROULE. The conditions on which the maritime provinces entered into confederation has been kept to the letter, but it never was part of the compact that freight on the Intercolonial Railway should be carried below cost, or that the rates should be so low as not to afford a reasonable profit. Let me tell my hon. friend that the reason why the tolls were taken off the canals was to enable the freight of the west to be carried down to the maritime provinces instead of having it sidetracked off to New York and Boston and other American ports. It was for that purpose and that purpose alone that the canal tolls were removed. The member for Guysborough says that one of the aims should be to carry the coal of the maritime provinces into Ontario.

Mr. FRASER. I did not say what one of the aims should be. I said it could not be done, and the fact that they were asking to take off the duty on coal in Ontario indicated that it could not be done.

Mr. SPROULE. I would remind the hon. gentleman that it not only has been done, but it can be done, and that Nova Scotia coal has been carried as far west as Belleville.

Mr. FRASER. Then there is no need of taking off the duty.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the principle has always been enunciated and supported by the Conservative party that the duty should be kept even on coal, because that was part of the national policy. It is not the Conservatives who are in favour of taking off the coal duty. If the contention was that that duty should be taken off, that was put forward by his own friends in the upper provinces, and not by the Conservative party as a party. As to whether or not the Intercolonial Railway should come under this commission, I have always held that if the commission is expected to do what is right and fair—and we assume that they will be men of intelligence and honest intention—then I cannot understand why there should be any valid objection to the Intercolonial Railway coming under that commission any more than any other railway in Canada. If it were expected that they would not do what is right and fair, I could understand it; but it is expected that they will do what is right and fair—not that they will compel any railway to carry freight at lower charges than will pay, but that they will not allow any unfair discrimination in regard to the short haul and the long haul or between one shipper and another.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Last night the hon. Minister of Railways explained to the hon. member for Pictou that the rates on the Intercolonial Railway were exactly the same now as they were when the men now in opposition were in power. There was then no word about the rates being too low. But I want to impress on the public outside of this House that the disposition of the opposition, as expressed by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) last night, was to increase the rates on the Intercolonial Railway for both freight and passengers. There is another view of this subject that has been overlooked altogether, that is, that the carriage over the Intercolonial Railway is not for the benefit of the maritime provinces alone. Hon. members must not forget that the people of the west get the advantage of these low rates in shipping goods to and from the West Indies and Great Britain in the winter season. I think it would be just as well to leave the management of the Intercolonial Railway in the hands of the hon. Minister of Railways, who has done so well with it during his term. I am sure the hon. member for West Toronto would find the hon. member for Pictou in opposition to his suggestion to increase the rates.

Mr. FRASER. And the leader of the opposition.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The leader of the opposition has been very silent on this subject, because he is not in accord with his own supporters when they advocate an increase of the rates on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that I never made the statement that the rates on the Intercolonial Railway were too low or too high.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I did not at all attribute anything to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. The contention on this side of the House has been that the fact that the Intercolonial Railway is not a paying concern, is due to improper management, not to too low freight rates. We have never, as a party, dealt with the question whether the rates were too high or too low. Personally I have never said that they were too low.

Mr. FRASER. Then you cannot vote for this amendment, which says they ought to be raised.

Mr. SPROULE. The resolution is that the Intercolonial Railway be included in this commission. It does not say a word about the rates, whether they are too high or too low.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister, if this commission had control over the rates of the Intercolonial Railway, and it found those rates too low, would it have power under this Act to increase them ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no doubt about that. I have not any hesitation at all in expressing my opinion. I read the sections which show that the railway commission has absolute power to determine when the rates are just and reasonable, and to impose those rates ; and after it fixes a tariff, until it changes that tariff, you cannot make your rate any more or any less. That is the rate you have to pay.

Mr. BLAIN. That is to say, the commission would have power to increase the rates if they found them too low ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that hon. members from the maritime provinces are unduly excited over this question of rates. I understand that one of the great objects of this railway commission is to secure for the public a general reduction in rates. The contention is that our railways on the whole are charging too much, and our express companies also. In the face of that, why will hon. members from the maritime provinces suppose for one moment that the commission would act directly in opposition to the great purpose for which the commission is being inaugurated ? To my mind, the maritime provinces will be protected under this commission, if the general policy of the commission is what I have stated, and I believe it is. It would seem to me that to make the system uniform all over the country, the Intercolonial Railway should be brought within the scope of this commission, and I, for one, fail to see any cause for alarm on the part of the members from the maritime provinces. While their rights on the Intercolonial Railway will be preserved, I think they will be aided by this commission in securing low rates over other railways from the west. I do not apprehend for one moment that there will be any interference with the special privileges which the maritime provinces now enjoy.

Mr. CLANCY. I think if there was any doubt in the minds of the members of this House as to the necessity of having the Intercolonial Railway placed under the jurisdiction of this commission, that doubt has been dispelled by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). My hon. friend has told us that the express terms upon which the maritime provinces came into confederation were, first, that there should be an Intercolonial Railway built—which is admitted—and second, that they should be exempted from paying the same rates of freight as are paid by the balance of the people of Canada. That is specifically neither more or less than what the hon. gentleman has told us. Well, I am not prepared to believe that any Minister of Railways will lay down a rule of that kind. As an illustration of his argument, our genial friend from Guysborough pointed out that if the Intercolonial Railway came under the jurisdiction of this railway commission, the Nova Scotia Company would be in a worse position than it now occupies.

Mr. FRASER. I said there might be special rates, and I instanced the Nova Scotia Steel Company as large shippers who would be entitled, on that account, to special rates.

Mr. CLANCY. Either they are entitled to special rates or they are not.

Mr. FRASER. Like all other large shippers on any railway.

Mr. CLANCY. Let me suppose that there will be, as we all hope there will, an institution of the same magnitude at Sault Ste. Marie, which will have to compete at a point half way with the Nova Scotia Steel Company, will the hon. gentleman argue that the latter company would be entitled to the advantage of exceptional rates over the Intercolonial Railway to that competitive point which the other industry could not obtain over the other railways that come under the commission ? Yet that would be the logical outcome of the hon. gentleman's argument. The hon. gentleman also pleads that the tolls are being reduced or entirely wiped out on the canals without protest from anybody. But it seems to me that the amount of these tolls is so insignificant as not to be worth considering. By the abolition of canal tolls, the country is losing the large sum of $315,425 per year, or less than six-tenths of a cent for each person in Canada.

What I wish to impress on the hon. Minister of Railways is that if we are to have a railway commission, it should not be a meaningless one. The object of a railway commission is to correct the inequalities in freight charges and excessive charges where there is no competiton. Does the hon. gentleman propose that this work of the commission shall be confined to those railways in Canada which are not government railways and that, while all other railways may be forced to do what is fair and reasonable, the Intercolonial Railway is to be exempt from any interference ? The people of this country have contributed large sums for the obtaining of railway

facilities. Are we to handicap these railways which have been aided by Dominion, provincial and municipal bonuses ? Should we not give them a living chance as against the Intercolonial Railway or any other railway that may, according to my hon. friend's contention, be run in the interests of any particular section of the country ? What amount of bonuses has been paid ? The Dominion has contributed to railways in Canada at the rate of $9,083 per mile. The provincial governments have contributed at the rate of $1,177 per mile, and the bonuses given by municipalities have amounted to $892 per mile.

Mr. FRASER. And we paid equally with you.

Mr. CLANCY. That does not touch the fringe of the question. What I say is that the people of this country have contributed large sums in order to get railway facilities. My hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Hale) has pointed out that even in the maritime provinces, certain sections are put at a disadvantage by reason of the lower rates charged by the Intercolonial Railway to other competing sections. How can you expect a private enterprise to supply railway facilities in any section of the country, if the people in that section are getting lower rates on the Intercolonial Railway than are charged by any other railway in Canada ? How can you expect private enterprise to invest in railways, if these railways are to be swamped by the rates charged on the Intercolonial Railway ? It is all very well for the government to tell the people that they are getting lower rates on the government road. That is a mere electioneering dodge, which may be resorted to by whatever government may be in power. If you charge lower rates on the Intercolonial Railway than the goods can be carried for, or than a private enterprise could carry them at with a reasonable profit, you are simply taking money out of the pockets of one section of people for the benefit of another. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways has told us that had he charged the same rates of freight on the Intercolonial Railway as are charged by other railways, and he went further to emphasize the fact by adding that the rates charged by other railways were not, in his opinion, excessive.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I expressed no opinion as to that.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend was especially prudent on that occasion. He was careful not to express an opinion, but he must have assumed that they were not excessive, or he would have expressed an opinion to the contrary. He told us that if he charged on the Intercolonial Railway the same rates as are charged on other railways, there would be $2,000,000 more in the treasury. Well, what is he doing? He is piling up a capital account of immense magnitude. The people of this country are paying on that capital account not less than half a million dollars per year for interest. The hon. gentleman boasts of a magnificent surplus of something like $96,000, but he forgot to tell the people that he is taking out of their pockets half a million dollars in interest on the capital added to our public debt for the purpose of producing this surplus. Is that surplus really an economy or is it not a fiction ? It is the purest kind of fiction, a mere juggling of figures, a mere deception on the public, a brazen attempt to make the people believe that they have saved $96,000, whereas in reality they have been bled to the tune of half a million dollars. If we are to have a railway commission, I can see no reason why the Intercolonial Railway should not come under its jurisdiction. It certainly should, if we are to do every section of our people the same justice. Suppose that the dream of the hon. gentleman were to be realized, in which he indulged when out to the Pacific coast last fall. Suppose the hon. gentleman were to do what he is hinting at as possible, and build a transcontinental line at the public cost. That road, being a government road, would not come under the jurisdiction of this commission. So, the hon. gentleman would be able to say to the people : Being beyond the control of the commission, I can do as I like with rates, and I will give favourable rates to those sections which support me, and unfavourable rates to others. It is impossible not to see what the effect of such a state of affairs would be. We have devoted millions to the subsidizing of trunk lines to the Pacific coast, and the government road would have no right to become an unfair competitor with those lines, and to use for the purpose of competition its advantages in the way of freedom from taxes and from the obligation which rests upon railways of earning interest upon the cost of construction. Nothing could be more destructive of our great national outfit, our railway system of which we are so proud. It would be contrary to justice, contrary to common sense, contrary to every business principle. There is no reason why there should be a lever in the hands of the government to give favours that cannot be given to the people in common. What do we hear with regard to other classes of trade ? There has been a cry that convict labour should not be allowed to come into competition with the honest wage-earner. I say that is a good contention. To act upon the contrary principle would be useing public institutions against private interests ; and I say that it would be wrong to use the Intercolonial Railway or any other road owned by the government to injure private interests. It might yield apparent advantages to a section of the people, but advantages which must be paid for dearly by the people at large. I say again that I know nothing more contrary to rea-

son, common sense and business principle, than the suggestion that the Intercolonial Railway should not come under control of this commission.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has asked a question. But first as to what the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Hale) says. I can understand him when he says that the produce from the province of Ontario comes through his county, carried on the Intercolonial Railway at cheap rates, and comes in competition with the produce of the farms of Carleton. But the public of the lower provinces know that the county of Carleton cannot supply them with everything they require, and so they want others to come in and supply them. And—even though it be considered small—they are of opinion that it is better that the county of Carleton should suffer to a limited extent rather than that the whole of the lower provinces should suffer. Referring to the lower provinces, I desire to say one thing, and in this I speak for Nova Scotia alone. Nova Scotia has given more per head to build railways, either to compete with or to feed the Intercolonial Railway than has been given for railways by the people of any other province in the Dominion. Moreover, Nova Scotia has received less money per head voted by the parliament of Canada for railways than the people of any other province of the Dominion. The return was brought down to this House which proved it. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has got away from the fact of the canals. Whatever the rates are on the Intercolonial Railway, at least this year we have a surplus. But we have never had a surplus on the canals. And this year we are adding two or three hundred thousand dollars as a free gift to the people who benefit by those canals, to be added to the deficit. There would be judicious management of the Intercolonial Railway whether the Conservatives or the Liberals were in power. And we must not forget the long distance between the lower provinces and Montreal, which is covered by the Intercolonial Railway. Cannot we trust the making of the rates upon this road much better to a government that can consider broad questions of the public interest than to a commission that must rigidly enforce the law, and that must insist upon rates——

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) permit me ?

Mr. FRASER. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Is he presuming that the commissioners will be enforcing an unjust law ?

Mr. FRASER. That has nothing to do with it. I say you can trust the government, whatever party that government may represent, to fix the rates in the best interests of the country. There is also the consideration that the Intercolonial Railway was built to bring about confederation, a fact that has been stated in this House a dozen times in my hearing and never contradicted until to-day. Any government will do better in the interest of the whole country than a commission that must simply follow the law, caring nothing for the people. The rates on the Intercolonial Railway have been substantially the same since the road was built—do not hon. gentlemen think that we can reasonably expect that road to carry out the same in the future ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) looks at it from the Ontario standpoint, but he forgets to take into consideration the canals which were built largely for the benefit of Ontario, and which never had a surplus and never will.

Mr. CLANCY. We on this side have never defended or condemned taking off the canal tolls, or expressed ourselves on that subject. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) look to his own friends for that.

Mr. FRASER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) does not favour the removal of the canal tolls he has the opportunity to express his opinion, and, as a member of this House, to move that they be not taken off. The fact that he expresses no opinion and moves no motion on the subject, ranks him with those who are in favour of the change.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) is simply putting up a man of straw and knocking it over.

Mr. FRASER. We have heard now from two prospective ministers, for the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), if I am to judge, must be in any government formed by the leader of the other side. If these hon. gentlemen had their own way they would increase the rates on the Intercolonial Railway in the lower provinces. If their attitude means anything, it means that. We understand it now ; that is the way our Conservative friends would treat the Intercolonial Railway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The question before the committee is simply this—shall the Intercolonial Railway come under the jurisdiction of this commission or not. As an argument to the contrary, the hon. Minister of Railways states that, being responsible to parliament and to the people in fixing the rates, the people would have better control than if the commission were given jurisdiction over the road. I stated that the commission had nothing to do with fixing the rates on the Intercolonial Railway. They only fix the maximum tariff, and under that maximum the minister could make any charge he liked. The minister contradicted me when I stated that. He asked me if I had read the Act, and stated that the commission had the right to fix the tariff of

tolls and that the government would be obliged to exact those tolls from any one using the Intercolonial Railway. There was no one on this side who said that the tolls charged on the Intercolonial Railway were less than those charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway. It was the hon. Minister of Railways himself, when he was appealing to supporters from the maritime provinces. He turned around to them and said: 'I could have a surplus of $2,000,000 if I were allowed to charge the same rates on the Intercolonial Railway as are charged by the other railways.' I would like the hon. gentleman to point out in what respect the charges on freight traffic or the charges on passenger traffic are less on the Intercolonial Railway than on the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Pacific Railway.

Let me mention the passenger freight rate on the Intercolonial. You pay three cents a mile, and if you get a return ticket you get it for one and a half the full rate. Isn't that the same custom on every railroad of the Dominion? Don't you pay the same when you travel on the Intercolonial as we do here? There may be a couple of mines from which coal is carried to Halifax, there may be exceptional cases where freight is carried lower on the Intercolonial than elsewhere; coal is carried from particular mines to Halifax or to some favoured lumberman at specially low rates. But the poor farmer, the industrious man, the traveller in every portion of the maritime provinces pays as much for the user of the Intercolonial as we do for the user of our railways in the western part of Canada. That is why the control of rates on the Intercolonial should come under a commission. As I said last night, the reason of the apparent reduction of rates on the Intercolonial, the reason of the loss in carrying freight, was an effort on the part of the minister to carry freight which would naturally follow other channels, and to divert it in an unnatural course to St. John or to Halifax. We will have a comparison of the freight rates before the estimates are through, we will have a comparison of the passenger rates, and I venture to say that my statement will be found correct. The hon. gentleman is indulging in parish politics of the lowest kind. He is appealing to his followers on the back benches, saying: Look at the glorious things I have done for you in the management of the Intercolonial; look at the envy it has excited throughout the Dominion. I am giving you cheaper passenger rates and cheaper freight rates, and these people in Ontario and in the west, if they had the power, would impose upon you rates entirely different. The minister is perfectly correct, and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is correct; there has been but little change in the rates on the Intercolonial from its inception, either under the Conservative government or the Liberal government. But the rates are fair, they ought to pay, and possibly, if through rates were imposed, there might be a greater return to the people. All we ask is a fair rate for passengers, a fair rate for freight. That fair rate is being imposed upon the people. Under good management and economical management the Intercolonial, instead of being a drag and an imposition on the people, would give us a fair return for the expenditure. We have no wish to impose on the people of the maritime provinces. When we talk about the management of the Intercolonial we are not finding fault with the charges that are made on passengers and on freight to people using the road locally; we are only asking that economical management should be exercised.

But to return to my question. What objection is there to the appointment of a commission whose principal object and work would be to fix and control the rates and tolls? Surely the minister does not think that the rates and tolls fixed by a commission would be less than those that he now charges on the Intercolonial. Then what has he to fear? There may be arguments advanced on both sides of this question. My hon. friend thinks that under the absolute control given to the commission they would have power, not only to control the rates, but the appliances to be used, the speed to be observed in the running, the rolling stock and everything else. Perhaps it would be better. We know the powers of commissions appointed by governments in other countries for the purpose of dealing with railways. It is the commission which steps between the individual and the railway company, as a sort of arbitrator, to say what is just and right in reference to the dealings between the general public and the company. My own opinion is that it would be better for the Minister of Railways and Canals to be directly responsible to this House and to the people. I would not like him to have a further opportunity to shield himself behind a commission. If he does wrong, let him come here where he is responsible to this House, and we will talk to him and find out all about it. In a government railway, I think that the controller of it should be directly responsible to the people of the country and to parliament, and that there is not much call for the interference of a commission.

Mr. KENDALL. We have been told on this side of the House by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Intercolonial is an institution which is run in the interests of the maritime provinces.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Nobody said so.

Mr. KENDALL. Well, I have heard some hon. gentleman say that the deficit incurred by the Intercolonial in the maritime provinces was paid by the people of Canada generally, and for the express advantage of the people of the maritime provinces. Now, I think that hon. gentlemen opposite will recollect that a few months ago the board

of trade of the city of Halifax passed a resolution calling upon the government to hand over the Intercolonial to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think that was exactly the tenor of the resolution. The resolution asked the boards of trade throughout Canada to consider that question.

Mr. KENDALL. Yes, and I suppose there was never a greater storm raised among the boards of trade throughout Canada than that very resolution of the Halifax board of trade. How did they take it up? The boards of trade in Moncton, in St. John, in Quebec, in Montreal, and the board of trade of the city of Toronto, which I presume has the confidence of hon. gentlemen opposite, passed strong resolutions condemning the proposition to turn over the Intercolonial to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I presume that the board of trade of the city of Toronto represents fairly well the manufacturers of Canada, the manufacturers of nearly everything in which iron enters, the manufacturers of textiles. It represents the millers of Canada, who send hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of their products to the maritime provinces every year; and they recognized that the working arrangement between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial in the maritime provinces affords them protection against the excessive rates which might otherwise be charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway which runs to the city of St. John. I presume that the board of trade of Toronto did speak with some authority for the great manufacturing classes of Canada when it said that it was thoroughly satisfied with the administration of the Intercolonial. The hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) suggested that the rates might be raised on certain commodities going over the Intercolonial. He intimated that certain privileges were being granted to the lumbermen. I wish to point out that only this year, when the lumbermen of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick approached the Minister of Railways and Canals and asked for certain reductions in the freight on lumber to the seaport, that request was refused, and I think we will all say very rightly refused. If, two years ago, those lumbermen could make money when deals were selling for $9 and $10 a thousand, they must be making more money to-day when they are bringing $13 or $14 a thousand. I would not be opposed to seeing the rates on lumber carried by the Intercolonial raised to a certain extent. The hon. gentleman intimated too that coal was carried at too low a rate. That may be correct, but it is a pretty serious matter for this House to say that the rates on coal should be raised, serious for the consumers of coal in Quebec and Montreal. I recognize that the coal companies of Nova Scotia are charging the consumers of coal too much for their coal, but how are you going to benefit the consumers of coal by raising the price of the carriage of coal to Quebec and the eastern part of Ontario. I think if the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) were again entrusted with the responsibility of being Minister of Railways and Canals he would hesitate, because numbers of his supporters would call upon him to hesitate, before he would raise the rate on the carriage of coal. We in the coal mining districts do not get the benefit of these rates, but the people in the west do.

Mr. SPROULE. I failed to hear any one on this side of the House contend that coal was carried too cheaply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) is not doing quite justice to this quesion when he speaks of the origin of this discussion in regard to freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) made this statement in the House when he was presenting the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway to parliament.

> That important portion between St. John and Halifax is, I think, paying quite a handsome return over its cost and the expenses of operation.

Now, I suppose this statement is only consistent with fair rates being charged. In so far as I am concerned it was news to me yesterday to hear the announcement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals which I am about to read. I am sure the people of the maritime provinces do not want the Intercolonial Railway conducted on any system which is not fair to the people of the rest of Canada. They do not want the Intercolonial Railway conducted on a principle which would make the people of the rest of Canada pay any portion of the freight charges which should be paid by the people of the maritime provinces. At the same time they do have regard to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway was part of the terms of confederation and there may be circumstances which would justify the reduction of freight rates upon that railway to a point perhaps lower than those charged upon some other railways. These are conditions which should be viewed just as much by commissioners as by the government of the day in the administration of the Intercolonial Railway. They ought to be considered by the commission just to the same extent as they are supposed to be considered by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. Therefore, it seems to me, that a large part of the discussion in regard to whether the rates should be controlled on the Intercolonial by the commission or by the government is beside the question, because exactly the same consideration should apply to dealing with this matter by the commission as to dealing with it by

the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. Now, I think it is most unfortunate that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should have made the statement which he did make in the House yesterday unless he is absolutely sure that the facts are as he states them. As I said before, I have no means of knowing whether the facts are as the minister has stated them. I will read to the committee the remarks of the hon. minister which led to this entire discussion and which, I think, placed the people of the maritime provinces in a false position in regard to the people of Canada as a whole. I suppose that the hon. gentleman by stating that the rates on the Intercolonial Railway afford a fair return as between Halifax and St. John, and a certain portion of the maritime provinces has stated that these rates are fair rates. I do not know what else the statement means. If they afforded a fair return on a portion of the road in a fairly thickly inhabited district surely they must be regarded as fair rates. The hon. gentleman has made that statement, but notwithstanding that, he goes on to say this :

> I had a careful study made and a careful statement furnished to me by the traffic officers of the Intercolonial Railway as to the general tariff of tolls and freight charges which governs on the Intercolonial Railway and those which govern on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway; and the result of that statement, keeping well on the safe side, is that the rates upon those two railways are from 50 to 100 per cent higher than those upon the Intercolonial Railway. I am not going to suggest that the rates upon either of the two other roads are higher than they ought to be.

Well, if the rates on the Intercolonial Railway in Nova Scotia afford a fair return and if these rates to which the hon. gentleman refers in Ontario are from 50 to 100 per cent higher, I think the hon. gentleman ought to be able to form an opinion upon them, although he says he has no opinion whatever. I think it is important that the hon. minister should place upon the Table of the House the information upon which he relied when he made that statement, and which I do not think does justice to the people of the maritime provinces as far as the Intercolonial is concerned. I have a great deal of doubt, with all deference to my hon. friend, as to whether or not his statement as to the rates being 50 to 100 per cent higher will be found to be exactly borne out by the facts. I am not impugning the varacity of my hon. friend, but I must say that I shall have my doubts until the information is placed upon the Table of the House as to whether or not that statement is correct. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether or not it is a fact that these rates have to be submitted to him as Minister of Railways and Canals or to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Is it not a fact that these rates cannot be raised until he has approved of them ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Freight rates are subject to approval by the Governor in Council. Until they are approved they are not collectable, or they are not supposed to be collectable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, it seems to me that my hon. friend has placed himself in a somewhat curious position, by stating that the rates on the Intercolonial Railway afforded a fair return between Halifax and St. John because he has, I would think, as a logical result, said that these are fair rates ; and then he has stated that the rates in Ontario are from 50 to 100 per cent higher. If these rates have been approved by him it seems to me he has placed himself in the position of having approved of rates that are altogether too high. There should be some escape from that position. Of course, the hon. minister will explain it if there is, but it seems to me that these two statements on that point leave him in somewhat a dilemma. The Intercolonial Railway was a part of the terms upon which both provinces entered confederation and the Intercolonial Railway, I think, is entitled probably to some special consideration so far as rates are concerned, whether that consideration be given at the hands of the government or at the hands of the commission. As I said before it seems to me that exactly the same considerations would influence the commission if the commission were dealing with the matter as those which influence this government and presumably influenced the late government in dealing with that road. The Intercolonial Railway as it was constituted at first was intended to bridge over the gap which existed between the more thickly settled portions of the maritime provinces and the great provinces of Quebec and Ontario. It was a means devised of bringing scattered communities together just as now we are seeking by the same means to bridge over the gap which separates the eastern part of Canada from the fertile prairies of the west. In all these matters I suppose there must be some consideration of the special circumstances such as I have suggested. We cannot deal always too strictly with these rates or from a purely business standpoint. We must have regard to the fact that there are portions of the country which are sparsely settled and communities which are spread over great distances and for the purpose of bringing these communities together, for the purpose of bringing them into closer touch with each other, it is sometimes necessary that we should overlook purely business considerations and make allowances in fixing the rates which possibly might not be regarded as fair under other conditions. I do trust that my hon. friend will place the information upon the Table of the House in regard to the statement which he made and that we shall have a full opportunity of knowing whether or not that statement is exact-

ly accurate in the way in which he put it before the House. I do not think the people of the maritime provinces want anything in the way of charity from the rest of Canada. They simply want fair play from the rest of Canada. But in asking that fair play, I think they have a perfectly legitimate right to ask the people of Canada as a whole, to consider the matters that I have very briefly placed before the House; having regard to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway was a part of the terms of confederation; was for the purpose of bringing together scattered communities, and that in fixing the rates upon that railway some regard should be had, at least to some extent, to these considerations. I know that the people of the maritime provinces have not always been pleased with the rates which my hon. friend the minister has fixed. It was stated to me by leading business men of the city of Halifax two years ago that the minister fixed a rate from the city of Montreal to the town of Sydney—or shall I say the city of Sydney, because if not a city it very soon will be—which was no higher than the rate on freight from Halifax to Sydney. I know there was a good deal of feeling in the city of Halifax at the time, and I must say in justice to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals that I believe that after the matter was brought to his attention some remedy was found at a very early date with regard to that. Let no one in this House suppose that there is not dissatisfaction now and then in the maritime provinces with regard to the rates charged on the Intercolonial Railway. My hon. friends from both sides of the House who are familiar with the question of Intercolonial rates in the lower provinces, know that there is more or less question with regard to these rates now and then, but as I said before, the people of the maritime provinces—the people of Nova Scotia for whom I feel more particularly capable of speaking—are not desirous of having any charity from the rest of Canada at all. They want simply fair-play, but in asking that fair-play they think they are not out of place in demanding some consideration for the reasons which induced them to come into confederation; some consideration for the reasons which, in the first place caused the building of the Intercolonial Railway; and that having regard to the fact that we have coal and iron products in Nova Scotia, and many other products which are desired by the people of Ontario, and that we on the other hand take from the people of Ontario a large amount of their manufactured products—that there should be some reasonable consideration in regard to rates, particularly long distance rates, for the purpose of continuing and promoting that intercourse which is so beneficial to all parts of Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not been quite clear this afternoon during the discussion, as to whether my estimates were under consideration or whether the Railway Bill was being dealt with. The debate has passed from one theme to the other, so that it was almost impossible to discriminate as to what was in the minds of the gentlemen who are addressing the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. You did the most of that yourself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the committee hear my hon. friend deliberately and coolly state that I occupied the most of the time of the House ?

Mr. SPROULE. The question was started by the minister's own friends and replied to from this side of the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that I spoke more than once or twice when I was called up by members of the committee.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And then you were worse than the Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall be very glad to furnish to the committee the information which has been supplied me in regard to this question of the freight rates upon the Intercolonial Railway. I was, however, amazed to hear the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Haggart) state that the local rates are the same upon the Intercolonial Railway as they are upon the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway in other parts of Canada. I felt very much like turning the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) over to the tender mercies of the member for Carleton (Mr. Hale) who complained that to his knowledge the Canadian Pacific Railway charges on freight from Woodstock to St. John were so much higher than the Intercolonial charges for the same kind of freight that it was a serious handicap for their business and that the people of the county of Carleton and the river counties were not able to place their goods in St. John in fair competition with the goods carried over the Intercolonial Railway. I leave my hon. friend (Mr. Hale) to deal with the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and to tell him that he was not really well informed as to what was doing on the Intercolonial Railway when he was head of the department. At my request one of my officers has supplied me with a statement which will show the difference between the rates which are in force on the different railways, and I will furnish that to the committee. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not studdied the Bill perhaps as attentively as I

should, but, is it a part of the scheme of this Bill that railways should be prevented from giving lower rates than those fixed by any one of the tariffs referred to in the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes; except incompatible with the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN. It is part of the scheme of the Bill to prevent a railway company from giving a low rate if it wants to.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is what he said.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only way in which a railway company can make a lower rate is by submitting the tariff and having that considered and passed upon by the commission; otherwise there would be no end of opportunity for all sorts of unfair discriminations. The tariff would have to be established and approved by the commission.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They may go lower than the tariff.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No; because that is one of the fruitful means of affording opportunities of discrimination, and discrimination is the thing that the country is crying out against.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do I understand the minister to say, that applies to the competitive tariff and to the maximum tariff, both.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That applies to the question of tolls. The competitive tariff will not under this Bill have to be submitted and approved before a lower rate can be charged.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILS.

ERIE-ONTARIO POWER COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 134) to incorporate the Erie-Ontario Power Company.—Mr. German.

On section 11,

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the Minister of Railways was to confer with the promoter of the Bill and have a clause recast.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is the clause, but I do not think it has been recast.

Mr. SPROULE. If the promoter of the Bill is not here, would it not be well to postpone it until he is here ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We can pass the clause, and leave the Bill in committee.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Militia transport and freight, $40,000.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. We were promised some information about the commission.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman asked the other evening for some information about the appointment of Mr. Martineau. I had not then the particulars, but I have them here now, but I think it would be better to defer the discussion of this subject until the report of the commission is laid on the Table. The report is in the hands of my hon. colleague, the Finance Minister, who will be back in a day or two, and I think it will be much better to postpone discussing this matter until that report is before the House, more particularly as it affects the Department of Finance as well as Militia. In reply to my hon. friend, however, I may say that Mr. Martineau was employed first on the 22nd of August, 1901, and continued in our employ until he was arrested. He was a junior second class clerk, paid at the rate of $800 per annum. He was not appointed specially to the accountant branch, but was a clerk of the civil service in the Militia Department, and was given certain duties to perform in connection with the accountants branch. No guarantee was asked, because none was required. None of the officers in the departments here—at any rate none in my department—have anything to do with the handling of money. I understand that it is only in departments such as customs and post office, where moneys are actually handled by the employees, that guarantees are required. That is all the information I have to give at present.

Mr. INGRAM. Who are the commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The manager of the Bank of Ottawa, Mr. Burn ; the Deputy Minister of Finance, and Mr. A. L. Kent, a prominent accountant of the city of Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. When will that report be laid on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As soon as the Finance Minister returns.

Mr. SPROULE. Of course, if we pass this item, it is understood that we will be at liberty to discuss this report on any other item ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Absolutely.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It was agreed the other night that one item would be held back on which we would have full opportunity to discuss all the other items.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I understand that there will be supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, both for the present and the next year.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It was understood that the hon. minister would not make his general statement until then, because there would be some new matters.

Mr. BENNETT. Did Martineau pass his civil service examinations ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that further information was to be given regarding claims against the town of Valleyfield—whether a writ had been issued, and when, and what is the position now.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Legal proceedings were taken on the 13th of April, 1901. The riot occurred in the autumn of 1900. The troops were paid on the 17th of April, 1901. I shall read the letter which I have found in the department, which will perhaps, better than anything I can say, show exactly the present position of the case. The letter is from Edgar N. Armstrong :

Montreal, May 8, 1903.

Lt.-Col. Alexander Roy,
D. O. C. No. 6 District,
St. Johns.

Re A. Roy and others versus Valleyfield.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your communication, this case is at present pending upon a demurrer filed by the defendant, which will be argued next week. Incidental proceedings in the matter have caused some delay. As soon as a decision upon the demurrer has been rendered, the case will be inscribed for final proof and hearing upon the merits, and I trust it may be heard at the next session of the Supreme Court at Beauharnois, where the action was instituted. I will let you know the decision upon the demurrer when rendered.

Yours faithfully,

EDGAR N. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. SPROULE. The case was inscribed in the fall of 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. And nothing more done since ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. On account of the case being fought on all sorts of technical and other objections, it is only coming to an issue now.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the paper which the hon. gentleman has contain all the information about the various phases ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. On what date was the writ issued ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have not the date of the issue of the writ.

Mr. CLARKE. A writ has been issued I presume ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, long ago—in 1901, I take it from this statement.

Mr. BENNETT. If the action was commenced in the spring of 1901, surely it could not have run until now on a demurrer to any of the pleadings or the institution of the action.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am sorry the information is not more complete, I will endeavour to get further particulars, to be given when the militia estimates are again under consideration. This file of papers was handed to me, and I assumed that it was a complete answer to questions asked the other night. At any rate, the letter I have read shows the committee that the case is now being pressed to a conclusion, and that the lawyer in charge of it expects that it will be tried finally at the approaching term of the Superior Court in Beauharnois.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Will the hon. gentleman lay on the Table the papers that he has there that we may examine them ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Is Mr. Armstrong acting on behalf of the government ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. For Colonel Roy.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). In his name?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). As I understand it, these troops were called out some time in 1900 to suppress a riot. They are young men employed as clerks and mechanics in the city of Montreal and surrounding towns. They lost undoubtedly, larger pay while they were absent from their regular duties than the fifty cents a day that they were

to be paid for their military service. Yet, have they not yet got the paltry pittance of fifty cents a day?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They got it long ago. They were paid in 1901.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am glad of that. Well, take the case of the recent threatened riot in Montreal. Young men who turned out for the suppression of the riot there lost their regular pay and were drawing only fifty cents a day for the service they rendered. Has the minister taken into consideration this aspect of the case—that troops called out for special service, for the preservation of law and order should be paid higher rates, rates somewhat commensurate with the wages they are losing in the establishments they regularly serve——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If I may interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria), I may explain that the statute fixes the rate of pay for this military service.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am well aware of that. But the hon. minister is introducing a new militia law, and I am giving him a suggestion for it. In his new militia law I think it would be very advisable to provide that troops when called out for the preservation of law and order in a municipality they should be given a little more than the original fifty cents a day. It would have the advantage of being a warning and a lesson to the municipality.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The new Bill provides for a higher rate.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I was going to suggest a higher rate of pay for all purposes. I am sorry to say that I could not be present when the item of militia pay was under discussion. But I trust that the minister purposes fixing the rate of pay for volunteers somewhat higher than it has been. It might be fifty cents for the first year, seventy-five cents for the next year and after that one dollar as long as the man remains in the service.

The MINISTER OM MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Perhaps the committee will bear with me while I say to my hon. friend that the matter was pretty fully discussed the other evening, and I said that while we had not come to any conclusion, I felt that the better way to give the increase, which I thought ought to be given, was somewhat in the way suggested by my hon. friend, that is, that 50 cents should be the rate for the first year, then, for the second year a man served, if he was a good man, he should get his increase as good conduct pay, and the third year a further increase, his pay to remain at that maximum so long as he served and was within the age limit.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

Mr. CLARKE. If these proceedings in the case of the municipality of Valleyfield were initiated by the commanding officer, how comes it that this correspondence is in the office of the hon. minister? As I understood the hon. minister's explanation to us the other evening, the government had nothing to do with the matter as it was the commanding officer who entered the suit. And yet we find the correspondence in the Militia Department.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The correspondence will speak for itself. It seems clear that the officer did not immediately proceed, and I presume he was hoping to collect the money. He waited a reasonable—or unreasonable—time, then the Valleyfield authorities refused to pay, and the officer was asked what he was doing——

Mr. CLARKE. By whom ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. By the General Officer Commanding—it was all done through the military branch. The General Officer Commanding very distinctly states his opinion, in agreement with what I stated the other evening, that it was the duty of the officer commanding the troops that had turned out to suppress a riot to begin an action in his own name.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. But not at his own expense ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Oh, no.

Mr. BENNETT. It would appear from this correspondence that the suit must have been commenced through the Department of Militia here or by others with the commanding officer, because it refers to the fact that there are others connected with Colonel Roy as plaintiffs. On the last page of the file there is a letter from the Justice Department stating that there were no steps taken through that department relative to this suit. May I ask the minister if he is aware who Mr. Edgar N. Armstrong is, and whether instructions were given by the Department of Militia and Defence to Mr. Armstrong to commence the action ? I assume from the record, that Mr. Armstrong is a solicitor in the city of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have no information respecting Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. BENNETT. It may be that some hon. member from the city of Montreal can tell us who Mr. Armstrong is.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). He is a practising lawyer in the city of Montreal, a son of Mr. C. N. Armstrong.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The proceedings seem to be carried on by direct correspondence with the commanding officer, instead of through the Justice Department. It might be open to the department to commence pro-

ceedings in that way, but I think that an examination of the precedents will show that such proceedings were formerly commenced through the Justice Department. I know that was the course under the former regime, and I think it is the proper one. I notice by the memorandum that the department instructed that proceedings be commenced by the commanding officer. It says: 'Instructions to take legal proceedings were sent to the commanding officer of district No. 5 on the 3rd April, 1901.' That is from the department——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The military branch.

Mr. CLARK. Of what?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Of the Militia Department. It does not seem to me a desirable way of proceeding, to pass over the charge of these matters to the commanding officer, who is in no way interested, as I remarked the other evening, except as a trustee for the department. Can the minister explain why instructions were not sent to the Department of Justice to proceed to collect this money? There ought to be some explanation, it seems to me, unless the minister considers that he has pursued the proper course. So far as my judgment goes, his course is irregular. We have a Justice Department here at the service of the government, which should take proceedings in the regular way, and the head of that department is responsible to the government, to parliament and to the country. But instead of that, the hon. gentleman seems to have imposed this duty on the commanding officer. Now, I think the constitutional way is to hand it over to the Justice Department. Besides, the Militia Department is not equipped to take these proceedings at all. Surely the hon. gentleman will recognize that parliament must hold the minister responsible, and therefore he should utilize the proper department of the government to institute proceedings of this sort. It seems to me an unusual proceeding.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend was here the other evening when these estimates were discussed, and he heard the Minister of Justice state that it was a matter which the law fixed, and that the department here, in the first instance, had nothing to do with it. The law reads as follows:—

When the active militia, or any corps thereof, is so called out in aid of the civil power, the municipality in which their services are required shall pay them, when so employed the rates authorized to be paid for actual service to officers, men. . . . . And in addition, shall provide them with proper lodging, and with stabling for their horses; and the said pay and allowances for subsistence and forage, as also the value of lodging and stabling, unless furnished in kind by the municipality, may be recovered from it by the officer commanding the corps, in his own name, and, when so recovered, shall be paid over to the persons entitled thereto.

Under that clause the general officer commanding, as my hon. friend will see if he reads the General's letter, instructed the district officer commanding who called out the troops, that it was his duty to act, and the department had nothing to do with it, at that stage at any rate, and have no other obligation in the matter.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. My sole object in dwelling upon this matter now is to get the minister to take a stand on what he considers to be the constitutional practice that should be followed under these circumstances. When the municipality does not pay the troops the law explains that the department should pay them—that is what happened here. Now, while the law does say that the commanding officer should, in his own name, take action, the money is not going to the commanding officer, but to the Militia Department. Naturally, as the government have paid the money, they have a right to collect it, and the commanding officer has no business to touch it. My object is to get the minister to say on his responsibility what procedure ought to be taken. I contend that under the proper construction of that law the Justice Department should enforce it and take proceedings to recover. It becomes a legal matter then, and it is for the Justice Department to see that legal proceedings are taken. I want to press this matter in order that the militia officers may understand the construction that is put upon it. I think if the officers understood that they are to take these proceedings at their own risk, on their own responsibility and at their own expense, you would very soon find them declining to act as commanding officers. I expressed myself strongly the other night on the same line, and the conclusion of the discussion was that the minister should bring down the information, as he has done, that we might discuss the question more intelligently. Now, we find that the Militia Department instructed the officers to proceed. I say that is not a proper course to follow, because the money to be recovered belongs to the country. Does the hon. gentleman know of any other similar cases that have occurred under his administration?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There has been one case in British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. How did you proceed then? Did you pay the troops?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We paid the troops, and took proceedings to recover in the same way.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Was the case sent to the Justice Department to recover the money?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. You directed the commanding officer there to do it?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, he was reminded of his duty, and he proceeded to collect, and did collect in that case, I think.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Well, I think it is time attention was called to the irregularity of proceeding in that way. I submit that is not what is intended under a fair construction of the law. The statute had to provide for some person to bring the suit. But if the practice the department has been following is according to law, the law ought to be promptly changed, and that is the reason why I am laying stress on this matter. Under the old regime, this course would not have been taken. The law is sufficient in its present form if it was carried out in a constitutional way. If the commanding officer had to pay the men himself it would be a different thing, because then he would be acting for the men. I submit that if the law is to be so construed that this money must be collected by the commanding officer, the law should be amended.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the point my hon. friend has taken is well worthy of consideration. I am not a lawyer myself, therefore I am at a disadvantage as compared with him. I assume that the practice followed in this case was the same as the practice followed in preceding cases that have happened. There have not been many, but there have been at least two before this one, one in my time and one before. My deputy minister is a lawyer, and I have a good deal of confidence in him, because he has had a good deal of experience, and I felt quite sure he was pursuing the proper course. I may say at once that I think it will be very proper to submit the question which my hon. friend has raised to the Department of Justice to have our position defined under the statute. I am not able to construe the statute. I have simply stated the construction which was put upon it the night before last by the hon. Minister of Justice within the hearing of my hon. friend. So far as the expense to be incurred by the district officer, or the commanding officer, is concerned, it does not seem to me that there is any question as to that. I do not think there could be any doubt under the statute that where an officer is compelled to do a certain thing it must be understood that the money shall be provided for him, and that he shall not be put to any expense. It does not seem to me that that can admit of argument at all, no matter what course is pursued. It cannot be presumed for a moment that a person who is compelled to bring this suit shall be expected to do so at his own expense.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think there should be any difficulty whatever in working out the statute in that case. As a matter of fact I think that in practice the pay and allowances for the men are provided by the government because usually there is some delay before a municipality pays them over. A suit in regard to a similar matter in the province of Nova Scotia went first to the Supreme Court of that province and then to the Supreme Court of Canada. There was no difficulty about it. The department hands over to the men the pay and allowances provided by the statute. Well, then, the department having done that, the commanding officer, not for his own benefit, or on his own account, but on account of the government, calls upon the municipality for the reimbursement of that amount. The commanding officer is merely the trustee for the government, because the government have paid the money and are entitled to recover it in the name of the commanding officer. The practice pursued in the case I refer to is this: The municipality declined, or neglected to pay over the money to the commanding officer, the Department of Militia and Defence simply placed the case in the hands of the Department of Justice and the Department of Justice instructed its agent to take the necessary proceedings for recovery. These proceedings were taken. A question arose as to the sufficiency of the requisition in that case, as to whether or not the requisition came within the terms of the statute. That case was eventually decided in favour of the Crown and the amount was recovered from the municipality in question. The commanding officer is a mere figure head. He is simply a trustee for the government. If he refuses to take action the government would still have a remedy. That is beyond doubt, and I do not know why there should be any difficulty in a case of this kind more than in any other case, because, the fact that he refuses should not in any way effect the right of the government to recover from the parties who are liable as the law provides. In so far as the hon. Minister of Justice makes any argument to the contrary, I am not clear as to what he means. In so far as he makes an argument to the effect that this is only a matter for the commanding officer, I do not agree with him. There cannot be any question about that. The commanding officer is simply the person in whose name the statute has authorized the suit to be brought. The object is very clear. In the first place the liability is created between the municipality and the officers and men who are entitled to their pay and allowances. It would be inconvenient for every one of these men to sue the municipality; therefore, the statute provides that the action shall be taken in the name of the commanding officer. Another provision is necessary. That is that the men shall be paid while the questions arising with the municipality are being determined by the courts. Therefore, the statute provides that the government may advance these moneys, but it also provides that this shall in no way interfere

with the liability of the municipality. Then, it says that the commanding officer shall proceed to sue, and that upon the recovery of the amount he shall pay it over to His Majesty. He is what in law is called a bare trustee for the Crown, having no personal interest whatever. There should be no difficulty in working out the statute and taking the necessary proceedings to recover the money.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I think we are entitled to know when these proceedings really were taken by the colonel of the regiment. It was on the 13th April, 1901, that Colonel Aylmer sent instructions to the district officer commanding in these words :

Be so good as to carry out the requirements of the Militia Act, as set forth by the major general commanding in his minute, No. 4, of the 4th instant, and as approved by the hon. the Minister of Militia.

This was on the 13th April, 1901, but it was not until the 24th September, 1901, that the money was paid. So that these instructions to collect from the municipality of Valleyfield were given some months prior to the date of the actual payment of the money as shown by this memorandum from the general officer commanding to the deputy minister, in which he says :

I forward herewith the papers in connection with the claim for payment of the troops employed on duty in connection with the riots at Valleyfield, and, as it will be seen from the preceding minute of the deputy officer commanding militia district Nos. 5-6, that the course prescribed in the Militia Act has been duly carried out, I recommend that the amount due, viz.: $4,442.91 be paid by the government pending a settlement with the Valleyfield municipality.

(Sgd.) R. H. O'GRADY-HALY,
Maj. Gen. Com'd'g. Can. Militia.

That is dated the 24th September, 1901, so that it cannot have been subsequent to the date when the money was actually paid. I see that the hon. minister has his deputy here. Perhaps he will tell us at what date the instructions were given to this gentleman, Mr. Edgar N. Armstrong, who is apparently the solicitor on the record, to commence proceedings. Is it a fact that proceedings were instituted through the department and instructions given direct to Mr. Armstrong, and if not when were the instructions sent by the department to the commanding officer to commence action ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In April, 1901.

Mr. BENNETT. But the money had not been paid by the department until September of that year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That did not make any difference.

Mr. BENNETT. There is nothing in the records of the department that will show ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The riot occurred in October, 1900. The district officer commanding waited until April. He failed to collect. The general officer commanding inquired what was going on and reminded the district officer commanding of his duty under the statute to bring action to collect the money. I do not know the date at which the district officer commanding began action but he was instructed in April, 1901, to bring the action. Later on the Valleyfield people, having still refused to pay, in September, I think it was, the money was paid.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not conversant with the practice in the province of Quebec, but it seems to me very odd that when the suit was commenced in April, 1901, the demurrer in the courts has not been disposed of yet.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I did not say the suit was commenced. I said that a reminder was sent to the district officer commanding that he was not attending to his duty and that was sent in April, 1901.

Mr. BENNETT. It was the whole contention the other night that this action was delayed, that no process was issued, that no steps were taken to show that the department was pressing for the payment of the claim which had been made against the municipality of Valleyfield for months, and that it was dragged on pending a by-election that happened in that county. The hon. minister must have something in his department that will show the actual date of the issue of the writ, or when instructions were given to Colonel Roy that he must press for payment by process in the court.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not able to give the date of the issue of the writ, but I will get it and complete the file of papers the next time these estimates come up.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it be unreasonable to ask the minister to bring down a copy of demurrer filed by the municipality of Valleyfield ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If it is filed I will get it.

Mr. BENNETT. The plaintiffs are Roy et al. Who were the others associated with Mr. Roy in the action.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am unable to say. I will endeavour to get the file of all the papers from the court and produce them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A very interesting case arose out of this matter in connection with the refusal of a certain com-

manding officer to turn out his corps when ordered. What are the facts of the case as determined by the court ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. You refer to the case of Col. Cole and Col. Cooke ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I would ask my hon. friend to let that stand, because I am bringing down an item in the supplementary estimates with regard to it, when the whole thing can be discussed.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I understand that the minister has declined to bring down the special report which has been made by the major general commanding. Would the minister please repeat his reasons, as I will probably have something to say about it later on.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I consider this report of the major general commanding to be of a confidential character, precisely similar to the report made by the Defence Committee in 1898 for which the House voted $5,000. That report was marked 'secret' and was intended for the use of the government and of the intelligence branch of the war office.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the war office an intelligence branch now, or had it then ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, so-called. I do not believe there is a country in the world in which reports of that kind are published.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I am not speaking of the Defence Committee report.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I say that the report of the major general commanding is precisely of the same character as the report of the Defence Committee, and I am arguing that it should be treated in the same way. I shall be very glad to submit both these reports to the leader of the opposition and to whatever members he wishes to associate with him as a confidential committee, but I do think it would be very much out of place to publish a report of that kind or lay it on the Table of the House.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The minister's explanation of what the report is——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is a defence scheme.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I quite agree that a defence report should not be published because it is a plan by which an enemy could be most successfully met, but I do not understand from the explanation of the minister that the report in question is of such a nature. I thought it was a report on what the major general believed would put the militia of Canada on an efficient footing. In his annual report, the major general says :

> With this report I have the honour also to forward another special report to which I have given a great deal of thought, and it contains a broad scheme for the improvement of the militia. If the proposals contained in it are carried out they will in my opinion conduce to the greater efficiency of the militia.

It would not appear from this that there would be anything secret about the report. There may be reasons why the minister would not carry out the recommendations in that report, the expense among other things, but seeing that the major general does not say that it is a confidential report, I do not think the minister should take the responsibility of keeping it from parliament. I have not the honour of knowing Lord Dundonald even by sight, but he is an officer of very high reputation and very great experience, qualities which commend him highly to the people of this country and to the militia force, and consequently his views on what would add to the efficiency of our militia are extremely important to the public, and I have no doubt would be very beneficial if they could be carried into effect.

With all deference to my leader, and with all the confidence that I have in him, I do not think the private examination of that report should be left to his responsibility. I think we are all entitled to get the benefit of it. At this time especially, when the relations of the colonies to the Empire, particularly in regard to defensive measures, are a live question, it would be most opportune to have a scheme devised by a man of the capacity and responsibility of the Major General Commanding, and endorsed by the government. I am one of those who have no desire for what is called militarism in the sense in which that word is generally used. I think we ought to do our share, and we ought not to be afraid to do our full share, of providing for the defence of this country, and if we do that, it may be fairly taken as our quota towards the defence of the empire. That is my idea at the present time of the distance we should go in that direction. I know of nothing that would be more satisfactory to myself, as a representative of the people, and I believe to all other representatives of the people in this House, and to the militia force, a part of which made such a splendid record for themselves in fighting side by side with the force which in case of need would help us to defend this country. I regret that the minister has taken the view he has expressed. I hope I may be able to induce him yet to reconsider his decision. In my opinion he will make a serious mistake if he does not submit the report to the public view. It will be a mistake for him in his position, for his department, and for the government, and a disappointment to the force, if we are not allowed to see that report, prepared by a great and experienced

soldier, one of the finest officers, from his record, in the British service. Let us see it and judge for ourselves. I do not think it is at all on the line of the defence report. There were most important and essential reasons why that should be secret, but none of those reasons seem applicable to a report of this sort. While the scheme may be too large and too expensive in many ways, yet I think it would be an excellent thing for us to have the views, extravagant or otherwise, contained in this report as to what will be necessary to put our militia into an efficient shape, and as to the proper size of that force. I am more than ever desirous of seeing it for this reason. So far the Major General and the minister have not shown a disposition to expend money extravagantly in the way of training the militia. They are introducing some new features. Probably from what the hon. minister says about the supplementary estimates, and about postponing the discussion until we have them before us, we may have some statements at that time in regard to those features. But in the meantime I hope he will change his mind and allow this report to be seen and judged by all the people of this country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I thought it was understood that we were to postpone this discussion; but I am afraid my hon. friend is rather inclined to anticipate the discussion on the item which I agreed to bring down later on. I thought that was the proper course to pursue, because I hope in the supplementary estimates to have some items on which a discussion of this kind can properly be raised. Of course, my hon. friend has the advantage of me in coming to a judgment of the report he is talking about, because he has never read it, and I have. Let me repeat to him that the report is in my judgment very similar to that of the defence committee which sat here in 1898. That report has been adopted by this government, and approved by the intelligence branch of the War Office, with which we must be in touch in carrying out our defensive schemes in this country. I do not think it is wise to pursue two lines of a defence scheme at once. I prefer to get rid of one before I begin with another. When the estimate which I have to bring down is brought here, I propose to take the House into my confidence, so far as I can, with reference to the contents of the defensive committee's report of 1898 and the contents of the Major General's report of a recent date.

Mr. INGRAM. What the hon. minister has just stated would rather confirm the widespread rumour that there was a difference of opinion between the General Officer Commanding and the hon. minister respecting this report; and if we look at the statement in the Militia Report, submitted by the General Officer Commanding, we shall see that he finds a good deal of fault with the way in which the militia force of Canada is conducted, for instance, in the matter of equipment. I would like to know how we are going intelligently to discuss the estimates of the Militia Department without being in possession of all the necessary information. I submit that the hon. gentleman should at least give us that portion of the report which it would not injure the militia to make public; and instead of the minister reserving his general statement until the supplementary estimates are brought down, if that statement had been made when the estimates were first introduced, we would be enlightened as to his policy with respect to the militia of this country. But not knowing what the policy of the hon. gentleman is, I fail to see how we can discuss these estimates as they ought to be discussed.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). With reference to defence schemes and confidential documents, the history of European countries shows that these are largely instruments to encourage some confidential clerk to sell them to neighbouring agents. I do not know that there should be any confidential scheme of defence for Canada. The cheapest confidential scheme would be to have all our young fellows trained to be good shots so that they could make any enemy feel that it was a rather dangerous experiment to cross the border.

Mr. BOYD. Puncture them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, puncture any enemy that would cross the border. We heard a great deal about the confidential scheme of the war office for the invasion of the Transvaal, but when the South African war broke out, there was not a solitary map of the Transvaal or Orange Free State in Britain. So far as the confidential report of the general is concerned, that has been discussed before, and I shall not reopen the discussion. I should be sorry to have anything said here which would tend to produce the slightest friction among the officers of the Militia Department. It has always been my aim and the aim of hon. members on this side to keep the issues in the Militia Department out of the arena of contentious discussion as much as possible, because we should all stand shoulder to shoulder in the upholding of our country. I have not had an opportunity of reading this famous report, but the hon. minister has expressed himself in this House as very favourable to the views stated by the general. He has told us that he and the general are in accord in all these matters. That being the case, I am not disposed to probe too deep into any little wound or any confidential reports there may be in the department, but I trust that in due time these things will be used in the best interests of the militia. I may

inform the hon. minister that it is my intention, either on the militia estimates or on going into Committee of Supply, to take up the question of training the youth of the country in the use of the rifle. My whole aim is to get both young and old men trained in the use of firearms, so that should an enemy assail us, I care not whether our cousins to the south, or invaders from any other quarter of the globe, they would hesitate before they crossed the Canadian border to face the lads of this country.

Mr. INGRAM. Does this deal with transportation going to and returning from camp?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No. This covers the transport of officers of the headquarters and district staff of the permanent corps on staff duties during annual drill—$8,000, transport of officers and men of the active militia and the permanent corps to and from the schools of instruction, also transport to and from the different stations, $10,000; freight and express charges on stores, $20,000.

Militia—grants to asociations, $38,000.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. How many of these associations are there?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This vote is divided as follows:

Grant to Dominion Rifle Association..	$10,000
Artillery Association..	5,000
Provincial Rifle Association..	8,700
Local Rifle Associations..	6,500
Bands..	7,500
Military Institutes..	300
Total..	$38,000

In round numbers, the number of men enrolled in the different rifle associations is close on 20,000. There are two classes of associations. There are the military associations in the different militia corps, the assistance given to which is 200 rounds of free ammunition per annum. Then there are the civil associations, composed of not less than forty members and up to eighty. To each of these we give 100 rounds of ammunition and a certain number of rifles. Of course we cannot spare as many rifles as we would like.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. How do you see that these rifles are cared for?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The captain of each civil association is an officer of the militia.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Would a retired officer do?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is being done with regard to the furnishing of ammunition to the various schools of the country for rifle practice? I refer to miniature ammunition.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. At present we have no authority under the law to do that, but I hope that in the new Bill we will take that authority.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If an institution were willing to purchase, would it get the ammunition at a reasonable rate?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. How much was expended last year on this item?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Forty thousand dollars.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Formerly the rifle associations obtained larger grants from the government than they do now. Why has the amount been cut down?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I was not aware that it had been cut down.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I may say on behalf of the association I have the honour to represent that we are very glad to get it doubled up again.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The same amount of money or a larger amount is expended, but it is given in a different way, in the maintenance of rifle ranges and in other ways.

Mr. FOWLER. This amount covers the grants to civil associations as well as military. In what proportions is it divided between them?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not think I could give the exact figures.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that this is a matter of some importance, that we may know how far the general public have taken advantage of this offer.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have already informed the hon. gentleman that we have 20,000 men enlisted in the civilian associations.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me there ought to be in the department information that could be given to the committee with respect to this matter. I am surprised that the minister seems to treat it so lightly. It seems to me a matter of importance to know whether persons not enrolled in militia camps are taking an interest in making up associations and becoming proficient in the use of the rifle. We have understood that it will be a very important feature if ever we are called upon to defend this country, that the young men—and old men too—should be well trained in the use of the rifle whether they are connected with the militia or not. I think the minister should be able to give us this information.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman the information. I find that, according to districts the associations are divided as follows:—

	Military.	Civilian.
District No. 1, London..	7	21
" 2, Toronto..	15	22
" 3, Kingston and Ottawa..	24	14
District No. 5, Montreal..	7	13
" 6, St. John..	..	7
" 7, Quebec..	3	2
" 8, New Brunswick	8	9
" 9, Nova Scotia ..	5	10
" 10 Winnipeg	6	32
" 11, British Columbia..	5	10
District No. 12, Prince Edward Island..	4	9
Ottawa Brigade..	1	1

Mr. FOWLER. It must be very gratifying to every member of this committee—I am sure it is to me—to know that the general public is taking an interest in the matter of rifle practice.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) for asking the question.

Mr. FOWLER. I asked it in order to bring out the information, for I may say to the minister that I think this the most valuable improvement made in connection with the Militia Department, and I was anxious to know how the people were taking hold. Would the hon. Minister tell me whether there were any differences made between the grants given to civilian associations and those to the military associations.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is no difference, except in the ammunition. The military get two hundred rounds—that is, they get one hundred rounds at the time of their annual drill and they get one hundred besides—while the civilian associations get only one hundred.

Mr. FOWLER. I suppose that in some of these civilian rifle associations there would be military members

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. They would be formed, I suppose, in rural constituencies where it would be impossible for a sufficient number of military men to get together, and would be filled up with civilians. Could the minister give an idea how many altogether are civilians and how many are military men ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am afraid I cannot. But in the province of Manitoba where we have far the largest number of civilian associations, there are very few members who belong to the militia at all. That is a very satisfactory point. In the other districts I am not able to say ; but I can say that a very large proportion of the members are civilians. Let me say one word further. We did not feel justified in making this large grant of ammunition without getting some pledge in return, and all the members of the civilian associations signed an agreement to serve in case of emergency, to join the active militia and serve their country for three years.

Mr. FOWLER. I think that is a very proper thing. I would like to know the total enrolment in these associations.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. About 20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Are rifles supplied to them ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. Unfortunately we are not able to supply many rifles, but we supply ten Lee-Enfield rifles to every 40 men of the civilian association.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the authority under which the hon. gentleman acted in supplying civilians with this ammunition ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have the vote of parliament, and we have the regulations of the militia which have been authorized by this parliament.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that so far as high schools are concerned he did not provide this ammunition to them free. But I find an exception here, the Hamilton Collegiate Institute has been supplied with free ammunition. I think that all the institutes ought to be treated alike.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I suppose in that case they are connected with one of the corps, and are over 18 years of age. We are limited by the Act, there is an age limit, and that is the reason we cannot grant clothing, money or ammunition to boys below the age fixed in the statute. In this particular case it is a voluntary corps, and the rifle has been issued under the Militia Act.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In regard to the Hamilton Collegiate Institute, I have the target returns in my possession for the senior corps. They are members of the regular rifle association and shoot over the long ranges. The junior corps shoot with the miniature ammunition. I do not know whether that ammunition has been supplied free or not. The collegiate scores are all at 200, 500 and 600 yards, seven rounds at each range. Out of a possible 105, I find the score running up to 68, 54, 46, 45, 37 and so on. This is at 200, 500 and 600 yards for boys. Then they had one match of seven rounds rapid firing at 500 yards, and I find that the scores were very creditable. Out of a possible 35 one made 26, one made 18 one made 17, 19, 15, 17, 11 and so on. The scores all through are very creditable. Although these are cadets in a collegiate institute, nevertheless they shoot with long range rifles, and at very long ranges. In the case of the junior cadets, they used miniature am-

munition and the score there for the boys from 12 to 14 years of age is remarkably creditable, and I will give it to the House later on.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the minister to get authority to supply ammunition to the different schools throughout the country ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have it already, but we have not had enough ammunition to go round, so far. It is manufactured in Quebec. Next year, on account of the largely increased machinery, we expect to be able to manufacture over 2,000,000 rounds.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it a fact that to the junior class in this collegiate institute at Hamiltion you have charged for the miniature ammunition supplied, or was it supplied free ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was not supplied free.

Mr. FOWLER. Then the reason that the others could get none was not because there was none, if you supplied it free in this case. If you supplied it to the senior class free why should you not supply it to the junior class free ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have explained that the senior class comes within the law and the regulations, and the junior class do not.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the minister to get authority to supply the juniors ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In the new Bill which has been prepared and of which notice has been given it is proposed to take that authority. I stated the other night that I would be able to say whether I would bring down the Bill this session or not, but I am not prepared to say that to-night.

Mr. INGRAM. It is a most inconsistent thing to supply the juniors with ammunition and make them pay for it, and to supply the seniors free. The reason cannot be that it is dangerous for the juniors, because it would be just as dangerous for the seniors. I am sorry to see the minister so indefinite in regard to introducing his Bill this session. Last session he gave us a promise that the Militia Act would be amended so as to give these boys an opportunity of having free ammunition. There are several other things that should be provided in connection with cadet corps. For instance, the arms are too heavy for them, as the hon. gentleman will see by his own report. More interest should be taken in the cadet corps. I hope the hon. gentleman will not overlook the importance of providing that these cadet corps should spend at least a short time in camp, perhaps for one day, subject to certain restrictions safeguarding and protecting them in such a way as that the parents of these small boys would not object to their attending camp. I trust the hon. gentleman will give this matter consideration.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I agree entirely with my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) and other hon. gentlemen who have indicated their opinion as to the importance of looking after these young cadets. At the same time it must not be forgotten that under our constitution the provinces have control of educational matters and this to a very large extent must come under their purview. I am making arrangements with some of the heads of the educational departments of the provinces with a view of trying to agree upon some plan by which we can do a little more to further the end which my hon. friends and myself have in view.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would say that this is another point I purpose bringing up when this question is discussed at greater length, but now that we are on the question, and in view of the early coming on of the military camps, I will take the opportunity of giving the hon. minister a few suggestions and like the old medicine, if they will not do any good they will not do any harm. The target practice, even under the very capable instructors that are placed over these camps is largely, to use a mild term, wasted at the present time. The riflemen go down and practice at the targets. What the hon. Minister should see carried out is that every officer not only practices shooting, but that he also take hold of the squad and instruct the squad how to carry out its rifle practice. Then, when they get through with that they should go on to the long range and the officers and non-commissioned officers in turn should take charge of the instruction, because men learn by doing. It is all right for a man to stand off and see another giving directions, but unless he gets into harness himself and has to put his men through the firing practice he is not as proficient as he otherwise would be. I have watched them frequently in camp. I watched them last year at the Niagara camp for part of a day. It was very nice—I will not say it was useless—but it was not as useful as it might have been. I just give the hon. minister these suggestions in order that if they commend themselves to him they may be carried out in the coming camps. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has considered the proposition as to placing, not only rifles with all these Dominion associations and a couple of rifles in each school in the country for the use of the school associations, but ultimately of placing a rifle in the hands of every ablebodied man in the Dominion of Canada under proper auspices.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I would be delighted to do it, but

when I have only $35,000 for rifles, I find it very difficult.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood the hon. minister to say that a portion of this amount went in aid of military bands ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the hon. minister give us some information about that ? What principle is adopted in assisting bands and what bands are assisted ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The amount given to bands depends npou the number of men in the band and its efficiency. It ranges from $25 up to $100. It is given to all the bands throughout the country and to all the corps.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is the judge as to efficiency ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The commanding officer. It may be the district officer commanding or possibly be an officer from headquarters. I think usually it is the district officer commanding.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to the cadets, what is the limit of age ; that is, how old must they be before they can enter ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Twelve.

Mr. SPROULE. From twelve up ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Even at the risk of being somewhat unpopular, I have entertained the view for some time that there is a possibility of carrying this military spirit a little too far. There is no doubt whatever that we are fast developing by our system, or conduct, a strong military spirit all over the country and that we are attracting the youth of our country from the industrial pursuits of life. I notice that these military cadets are very popular in towns and villages. It is there you would expect them to be popular, but I notice as well that the youth of smaller towns and villages and those connected with country schools all over the country are taking it up very rapidly and there seems to be a strong and growing ambition to be connected with some military organization, military cadets, or military something. Many of them are showing the strong inclination owing to that to get away to the larger fields of life where they can be more intimately associated with military life than they are in the country villages or at the country schools. We have at present, in my judgment, too many attractions to draw the youth of the country away from the agricultural pursuits of life especially. This seems to be another one that may grow to dangerous proportions in future, and I am merely throwing out this word of warning. While this is no doubt intended to be in the right direction there seems to be a possibility of starting an agitation that afterwards may grow beyond the proportions that we intended it should reach and beyond the proportions that are healthy in the interests of the country. I think we ought to be a little careful and not encourage it too much, because if it is continued and grows as rapidly in the future as it has in the past, it may be a trouble to this country, because we cannot keep it under control as we may desire to do. There is no question that this is one of the things to-day that is becoming very attractive to the youth of the country and is tending to draw very many away from home at an earlier period in life than perhaps they should be taken away in their own interests, or in the interest of their parents, or of the pursuits of life with which they are connected.

Mr. BENNETT. If there is no hard and fast rule by which the rifles of a battalion are to be kept entirely at the headquarters of the battalion, I would like to ask the consideration of the hon. minister to the request that the rifles of the two companies which have their headquarters at the town of Orillia may be kept there. In the cities it is much more easy to get up a feeling of kindliness, if I may so term it, towards the militia, owing to the fact that in cities the companies cultivate the social side of military life. In the town of Orillia one very attractive feature has been the friendly competition between the civilian corps of shooting men and those connected with the militia, but owing to the fact that the rifles are kept at the battalion headquarters at Barrie, these two companies have been without the attraction of rifle shooting that other companies have in the battalion. I would ask the hon. minister if these companies could have their rifles, and as the armoury is not as good there as might be desired, I would call his attention to the fact that in the public building used for the purposes of a post office and other government offices, there is a large room that I think is not in general use which might be used for the storage of these rifles.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I sympathize very much with the views expressed by my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett). I am very sorry indeed that a change was made in the rural battalions by making central headquarters, and I am frank enough to admit that I think it was a mistake. There seemed to be some sort of extraordinary dread, when I came into office, in the mind of the then general officer commanding as to issuing the new rifle. The officers seemed to have an idea that it should be packed in cotton wool, and that the militiaman should be allowed to see it only once a year. We have outgrown that now, but the prevailing idea then was that we must not issue the rifles until there was

a central armoury and a competent armourer. In the meantime we have constructed certain armouries, and I suppose we feel under an obligation to make use of them ; but I think that the proposal made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) is perfectly fair, and I will take it into consideration and see whether his wishes in that regard cannot be carried into effect.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The theory to which the minister refers was due to the fact that the myth was abroad that once a rifle had been fired with cordite cartridge it must be cleaned immediately. I have a rifle that I have carried in 1899 and 1900, and every year since, and it has not been cleaned once.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I may explain that it belongs to myself ; and though it never has been cleaned once, yet strange to say its bullet sometimes finds its billet. It has fired some thousands rounds of ammunition, and it is all right.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think that is the general experience.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am sorry the minister did not reply to the remarks of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in relation to the creation of a military spirit in the country. So far as I am concerned, I would have every boy and, for that matter, every girl, in Canada imbued with the military spirit, and then you would never have to dread militarism. Our permanent corps are begging Canadians to join and they will not do so, but in a district where there is a proper military spirit abroad you will find our young men joining the volunteers enthusiastically.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The reason I did not reply to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was because I felt that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) could reply very much better than I could.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me give an illustration of what I mean. Not very long ago I was passing a country school and saw a number of boys, ranging in years from nine to fourteen, each of them with a little wooden gun marching under the command of a small boy, and each with a cigarette in his mouth, puffing away for all he was worth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. SPROULE. It did seem to me that the doctrine of teaching the young idea how to shoot had been inculcated into them too early in life, and that they had associated with it other habits of military life.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have carried a gun for thirty-seven years, and I have never had a cigarette or a pipe in my mouth yet, so the two things do not go hand in hand.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. There are few like my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes), and we cannot expect the ordinary individual to be the same as he is.

Mr. INGRAM. I disapprove of the idea that we should not encourage our boys to join the cadet corps. It is not so much that it creates a military spirit as that it promotes discipline and strength of character. If the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) saw the cadet corps in connection with our Collegiate Institute, and saw those boys one day before they joined the cadets and two weeks afterwards, he would find them greatly improved.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. The cadet corps creates discipline, it gives the boys a bearing which they preserve through life, and if they should ever be called to the defence of their country it imparts to them at all events the rudiments of military knowledge. I believe these cadet corps ought to be encouraged, and I believe the parents of our Canadian boys approve of them. The gentleman in St. Thomas who looks after the cadet corps there has received very great praise from the commanding officers for the discipline which he imparts to the boys. My hon. friend will find that could they have cadet corps in villages the same as we have in cities, and if he inquires into it, he will find that instead of encouraging the boys to smoke cigarettes it would train them to habits directly the opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. If it were confined to collegiate institutes the boys would have reached more mature years, and the system would not be so objectionable. My experience is that in nearly every rural school throughout the country the spirit is becoming so prevalent that children of seven or eight years are imbued with it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Those acquainted with rural districts recognize that there are attractions in military life which draw the youth at too early an age from their quiet farm homes to the cities. We have been considering how we can prevent this depopulation of the agricultural districts. There are various reasons for it, and in my judgment this is one of them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The argument of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) defeats itself. If the policy of having all the youth of the country trained in military exercises is carried out, there will be no need of these boys rushing to the cities and towns to indulge in military

training. I can say to him, with a good deal of pride—and the gallant and learned gentleman from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) will endorse this statement—that at the time of the military review at Toronto, two years ago, some of the rural corps took second place to no corps from Toronto or any other city on that occasion.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that due to the system of military cadets inaugurated some years ago ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). To speak personally, I had the honour of leading a regiment which I think was considered second to none on that occasion, and I can assure the hon. member for East Grey that the efficiency of that regiment was largely due to the fact that many of the men had been trained in the schools before joining the volunteer corps. Fully one-half of one company and about one-third of another, were boys who had their training in the schools of the country previous to going into camp. The hon. member for East Elgin has very properly pointed out the great advantage of this training. Where do you find men with more respect for law and order than the old soldiers of this country ? You never find them indulging in disorder, except in an occasional celebration on pension day, and I am sure that my hon. friend from East Grey would not object to that. Wherever you have a strong military spirit, you have more manhood in the youth of the country. As the hon. member for East Elgin says, when you have a boy who stands with his head erect and his hands out of his pockets, you have the making of a man ; but when you see one standing with his head down and his hands in his pockets, and a streak of tobacco down his jaw, you can safely say that he is on the way to the gutter. I trust that the hon. member for East Grey will reconsider the conclusion he arrived at on seeing those boys going around with cigarettes in their mouths. I am surprised he did not stop them and read them a moral lecture. But I am sure that if he will make the school a present of a Union Jack and the teacher a present of a new bonnet for their proficiency in drill, the result will be that the boys will give up smoking.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt the hon. member is able to give a great deal of valuable advice ; but I fail to see that he has advanced any logical reason why I should change my views on the subject. I admit that a military training does make boys look more manly ; that is in the right direction. But in many other directions I am afraid it is not for the well-being of the youth of the country. The hon. gentleman suggests that the member for East Grey might have read these boys a moral lecture. Well, he is perhaps not as much in the habit of reading moral lectures to others as the hon. gentleman is, and there may be some excuse for my refraining.

Mr. INGRAM. I wish to point out that if the youth of the country are trained in the way we have been describing, the necessity will be avoided of the General Officer Commanding making such remarks as the following in his report :

> For example, at Niagara-on-theLake this year, out of 1,054 non-commissioned officers there were not less than 440 who put on the stripes for the first time. Such a force certainly does not provide the trained frame-work needed to make a citizen army efficient in time of war.
>
> As with some of the non-commissioned officers, so it is with some of the officers.

Militia—contingencies, $22,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This item is made up as follows : Printing and stationery, $13,000 ; military survey, $4,000—a survey carried on by the pupils of the Royal Military college, under the direction of a competent officer of the college, which has been going on for some years ; injuries at annual drill, covering cases of illness and accidents to men and occasionally to horses, $2,000 ; telegraphic expenses, legal expenses, and sundries, $3,000. It is the usual vote.

Royal Military College, $75,000.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I see that is just the same as the vote of last year. There is nothing new in it, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, it is the same.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see in the Auditor General's Report, at page Q—83, an item of $3,288 which was paid to R. Crawford for coal. Was that purchased by tender and contract ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Livingston & Bros. were paid $7,201 for clothing. Was that also purchased by tender ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No. It is impossible to do that, because the clothes are made to measure. We have pursued the course that has always been pursued since the college was established.

Defenses of Esquimalt, $114,703.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is the usual vote. It is based on an agreement entered into between this government and the imperial government, the terms of which were laid on the Table of the House two years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. This expenditure is spread over a term of years. How long was it supposed to run ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Ten years, I think.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There has been a good deal of discussion throughout the press, especially in the old country, as to why Canada does not get on with her general officers commanding. If we are to judge by the verdict recorded by almost every one of these generals, each one found that his predecessor was absolutely useless. Discuss the matter with any imperial officer of high standing in the old land, and he will tell you that there are three types of generals sent out to this country. One of these was the second in command of a certain regiment, and in order to avoid having to give him the command of that famous regiment, he was shipped to Canada to get him out of the way. Another was sent but because they wanted to keep him a year or two longer on the full pay list. Another was such a born crank that they had no place for him in the service in the old country and so they sent him out to Canada. And another came out in order that he might make the Canadian militia a stepping stone to the position of commander in chief in the imperial service. For the first time in history, we have in Canada a general officer who was sent here by the imperial authorities on his superior merits. I have therefore no hesitation whatever in encouraging the House to increase his pay. I am thoroughly in favour of having an imperial trained officer to command our militia, but I am also thoroughly in favour of reforming the training of the imperial officer. The fact that in many cases these officers have been failures in Canada is not necessarily due to any fault on the part of the people in Canada, but because the pay was not sufficient to attract an officer considered fit to take the position, and inferior men were sent out. This is what you will be told by officers high in the imperial service in the old country. But we have to-day a general officer commanding who is a credit to the imperial service, who is an ornament to the British empire, whether you take him as a gentleman or a soldier, and I should be very glad to see his salary increased to what it should be. If such were done, we could look forward to having the proper men sent out to command our militia.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Since my hon. friend has been in charge of the Militia Department, the pay of the general officer commanding has been raised to a figure which we thought would be an inducement to officers, such as the one we have now, to take the position. As to our former generals, I do not think that the gossip which my hon. friend heard in England is at all applicable to them, nor do I think it desirable to repeat gossip of that kind reflecting on gentlemen who are no longer at the head of our militia, but who served us well when in this country. When we discussed the question of pay, we compared the amount these officers get in the other colonies and increased ours accordingly, and I apprehend that the gentleman who is here now understood what pay he was going to get when he accepted the post, and that pay compares fairly with what is paid by the other colonies.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I owe no apology to this House or anybody else for the comments I have made. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that he was not long enough Minister of Militia to know very much about it. Take these generals, and the fact that they have all run foul against the various Canadian governments has reflected adversely on this country in more ways than one. I know that that subject has been discussed in the old country very recently, and the fact that there has been occasion for such discussion is due to no fault on the part of the Canadian people or government. This remark is applicable to past governments as well as to the present one. As regards the increases of salary, I was the first to bring that matter up and I fought it to a finish. I found that the little colony of New South Wales was giving its officer commanding a higher salary than this Dominion was giving, with its population of 5,000,000 and its immense resources. To-day we should still further increase the salary of the general officer commanding. I maintain that we can very properly increase the pay to what it should be and encourage not only this officer to remain but similar officers to come to this country.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria), takes the responsibility of saying these things for himself, of course, he bears his responsibility. But what I understood him as stating before was the gossip he heard in England. If he speaks of his own experience and sentiments, I have nothing to say about it. But, I will say that the gentlemen who have come here from England have been, as a rule, capable men, and they have served this country well by helping materially to bring our militia force to the splendid state in which it now is. And I may repeat that it will not help the position of this country, nor will it improve the opinion held of Canada in the old country, to bring these things up with regard to gentlemen who have served us for some time and have returned to their regiments and to take the rank they were entitled to at home.

Mr. SPROULE. As one who is not a military man, I may be permitted to state, how, in my opinion, this strikes a good many people throughout the country. To many it is inexplicable that nearly every general officer commanding who comes out is praised very highly for a time after he comes, leaving us to think that we have the best officer commanding that could be secured, but, after a time, there is dissatisfaction and grumbling, and these keep increasing until it must be very unpleasant

for the general officer commanding if he tries to remain throughout the natural length of his term of office. I think the impression is that we have had some good general officers, notwithstanding that dissatisfaction has been expressed before they left the country. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) said—I forget whether he intimated that it was a remark he heard on the other side of the water—that the general officers came in contact with snags over here. In defence of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, who might otherwise be thought to be one of the 'snags' I think I might ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) to whom he intended to refer by that expression.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly not to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who I regret to say, has been very sycophantic to some of the gentlemen.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Perhaps I may be expected at this point to say a single word. There is a great deal of truth in what the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) says as to the salary given to the general officer commanding. It is, no doubt, true that Canada pays less than any other colony of the British Empire to an officer of equal rank. I do not think however, that that fact makes very much difference in the class of officers——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, it does.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, I think the fact that Canada occupies a leading position among the colonies of the British Empire makes the position here sought after, and officers are rather anxious to get here. For instance, I happen to know of a gentleman who was offered a position of very much higher emolument, but declined it in order to come here. That is some proof of the correctness of my argument. That, however, is not a very good argument as bearing upon the question, whether we are paying our general officer commanding adequately or not. I think that that is a very good subject for consideration. On that point I can only refer to what I said the other night. I do do not care to be drawn into that discussion again, except, perhaps, to repeat one observation I made the other day, and that is that while gentlemen who have been sent out here have been very good soldiers, they have not been men with the kind of experience necessary to qualify them to occupy the very delicate and difficult position which the general officer commanding occupies in this self-governing country at the head of the militia force. Most of these gentlemen—all of them in fact—are regular soldiers accustomed to command in the regular army and men who have not had experience in the war office in connection with the executive of the mother country or any other country. I will not add anything more.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. minister if, in making his general statement, he intends to deal with the recommendations in the report brought down?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. By the general officer commanding?

Mr. INGRAM. And by all the officers who make recommendations?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I understand that item 83 will stand.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Item 83 stands.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). If there is no objection we will proceed with the customs estimates. But if hon. gentlemen object to that, we will not press it. Perhaps we might take half an hour at the customs estimates.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). There is nothing contentious in the customs.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Unfortunately a number of gentlemen who are specially interested in the customs estimates, and familiar with the matters involved, are not present, and, perhaps we could not make much progress to-night. But, if the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir William Mulock) is particularly anxious to go on, we might go on until eleven o'clock.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It was expected that the militia estimates would last all evening.

Customs—salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the various provinces and in the North-west Territories, $1,059,865.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $80,000 here. This surely will require a lengthy explanation.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is a very large increase, but I know that the committee will readily grant the amount asked. We must have the money to carry on the business of the department. I do not know of any objection that could be taken. The business having increased, of course it cannot be carried on at the same expense as before. I may explain that while we take $100,000 more this year than last year, it will really only be $50,000 more, because I will ask for a supplementary estimate of $50,000 for the current year. When you grant that supplementary of $50,000 it will no doubt be an increase over 1902-3, but it is necessary from the expansion of business.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman give us an explanation of what the $80,000 is composed of?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Sixteen thousand eight hundred is required to meet increased contingent expenses at various

ports. There are contingent expenses for cartage of goods and different things of that kind. There is also an increase in postage of some $6,000, owing to increased business.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman tell us what the department has to do with the cartage of goods ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is an examination required, under the Act, of one case of merchandise out of every ten. If there are ten cases of dry goods coming in, the law requires that at least one case must be taken to the examining warehouse and be examined. If there are only two cases, one of them must go to the examining warehouse for examination. The department pays for the cartage of those goods thus taken to the examining warehouse, and as there is a large increase in the importation of goods, the cartage account has also increased.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much of this is for cartage ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The contingent expenses at the port of Montreal are $3,850 more, largely caused by increased cartage owing to increase of business. There is also an additional expenditure of $2.50 per day for a man to deliver invoices from the custom house to the examining warehouse. The expenditure for contingencies at this port for eight months to 28th February, 1903, was $10,517, or at a rate of $15,775 for the year. The estimate last year was only $12,650, and we think it is advisable to raise it to $16,500. That is for the port of Montreal. I will give you some figures to show why we want this increase. The customs revenue at Montreal in 1900-1 was $8,981,787 ; in 1901-2 it was $9,965,366. So there was an increase of about $1,000,000. In the eight months ending on the 28th of February, 1903, the revenue was $7,816,620, or at the rate of $11,724,930 for the year. The cost of collection in 1900-1 was $1.72, while in 1901-2 the cost of collection was $1.55. I give these figures to show that while contingent expenses are increasing, that is entirely owing to the increase of business ; and that while we are increasing the expenditure, we are reducing it in the percentage of cost. Then there is an additional expenditure at the port of Ottawa of $500, largely for cartage.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not given us the details of the expenditure at Montreal.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not got it detailed in that way, nor do I know that I could give that. But the hon. gentleman will find it largely set out in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman lays down the principle that if there is a large increase in the sums collected at Montreal, there is as a necessary consequence a proportionate increase in the cost of collection. It is a very large sum for the city of Montreal, $16,000 more, by reason of the increase of revenue there. The details would be very important.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can the hon. minister give us the figures of the total cost at the port of Montreal for the years 1896 and 1902, the years in which he draws a comparison of the percentage ? The percentage is not a fair comparison at all. It costs no more to pass an entry for a million dollars than for one hundred dollars. The labour is practically the same. The imports may be larger in 1902, but there should be no more work for the office. There is the same amount of clerical work in both cases. What he ought to do is to give us the expenditure at the port of Montreal for the two years referred to as compared with last year, not the percentage.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are now talking about contingent expenses, in which there is an increase of $16,800, and I gave the increase at the port of Montreal as an illustration of how this sum is made up. It is not a question of the total business at the port of Montreal, but merely of what is called the contingent expenses. These do not include the salaries of officers, but merely the necessary expenses about the office they have to be provided for.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like the hon. gentleman to furnish the figures of the cost at Montreal in 1896 and 1903.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will give the figures for the port of Montreal as I have those by themselves. The hon. gentleman says that it requires no more clerical work to collect a larger amount than the smaller amount.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is where there is one entry.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I quite recognise that, but there is more than that. The hon. gentleman asks me to make a comparison between the years 1894-5 and 1895-6 and last year. Here are the figures :

Entries inwards—	
1894-5..	501,357
1901-2..	785,512
Increase 56 per cent.	
Entries outwards—	
1894-5..	90,130
1901-2..	226,382
Increase 151 per cent.	
Railway reports inwards—	
1894-5..	438,982
1901-2..	705,997
Increase 60·8 per cent.	
Railway reports outwards—	
1894-5..	135,739
1901-2..	256,475
Increase 88 per cent.	

Mr. CLANCY. What are these railway reports ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. All the manifests from the railways come in and have to be passed upon, examined and dealt with. That means clerical work.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that he was not increasing any salaries. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that this refers to the employing of clerks to do extra work ? He says that there is a large increase in the number of railway reports dealt with. Is any of this sum to pay extra clerks in the office there ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, we have had to engage extra officers, of course, as the business has gone on.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, a portion is for salaries ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Perhaps I did not make myself plain. There is an increase of $80,000 in this item, of which $16,800 is for contingencies in the various offices—increased expenses, which are called contingencies. The balance of it is for salaries and I was going to deal with that later on. I was making a distinction. I am simply now giving the increase in contingencies at the port of Montreal. It is made up by the increase in the staff of officers that has been necessitated by the extra work and the contingencies of the various offices which have increased. In the Auditor General's Report at F—16, hon. gentlemen will find a list of the contingencies given.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. minister while he has the Auditor General's Report in his hand, to page F—16, as follows :

Temporary employees..	$9,353 79
"	1,197 50
"	4,220 00
"	2,577 75

All these are temporary employees. Is there any way of avoiding that and of placing these employees on the permanent list ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. At Montreal—I have not the figures under my hand now, but I dare say there are a hundred temporary employees. Perhaps I should not say that, but there are over fifty and running up to one hundred, who are what are known as temporary employees. These are men who have not passed the civil service examination and have not been placed upon the permanent list by Order in Council. Many of them, while they are called temporary, necessarily owing to the distinction which the Act makes, are really as permanent in one sense as any of the other officers who have been placed on the permanent list. I would be very glad to place them on it also. They have urged it upon me and put pressure upon me to get on for the very obvious reason that a temporary officer under the law, as it is now, if he is taken sick, cannot receive his pay. He is not entitled to his three weeks' leave of absence, and, therefore, the temporary employees are very anxious to get on the permanent list. I have told them that if they will only pass the qualifying examination, which is requisite for that purpose under the Act, I will be only too pleased to put them on, because, as it is, it works a hardship upon these men. There are some men who have been twelve or fifteen years in the service and who are just as good and just as faithful officers as others who are on the permanent list. We have a number of men who come on in the summer and we let them go in the winter. But, I am speaking of a number of men who have been in the service for ten or twelve years or more, who are on the temporary list, and who would like to get on the permanent list. I say to them : I would be only too pleased to put you on if you pass your qualifying examination. I dare say that when they left school they could have passed the qualifying examination such as is prescribed under the Civil Service Act, but they are afraid to try it now and do not do it. But, there is only one office to which we can appoint them without passing the examination that is to the position of preventive officer. A collector at a port does not have to pass the examination. The appraiser at a port does not necessarily have to pass the civil service qualifying examination, but he has to pass a special examination, the reason for which hon. gentlemen will see as he has to be an expert as to the quality and value of goods. In many cases I have appointed some of these men who have been faithful officers to positions as preventive officers. The office has no particular, designated duties. We appoint them and assign them to this position or that position. But as long as the Act remains as it is, requiring that these officers should pass the civil service examination, I hesitate to place them on the permanent list in a general way, but I am trying to induce them to pass the examination. There are men who have been in the service a long time and who can do their duty as well as younger men who can pass this examination, and in regard to these I have felt warranted in appointing a good many of them to the position of preventive officer, although a good many of them have not been appointed in that way yet. They are virtually permanent men as far as remaining in the service is concerned. The greater bulk of them were employed before I was charged with the department, and they have remained on. One result of the disability they are under is that if they get sick, the collector must certify that they have worked so many days and he can only certify to the number of days that a man has worked and unless he gets such a certificate the wages are not

paid. This is a hardship on these men. Formerly, when the old Superannuation Act was in force, it was a matter of greater consequence than it is at present not to be on the permanent list, because, when an officer on the permanent list became aged, he retired upon the superannuation fund. Of course that does not come in now, because, with the new law, there is a certain amount retained from the salaries of the permanent employees which the government give to them with interest compound when they leave the service, but there still remains the difficulty that if they have lost time through illness they are not entitled to their wages as the permanent employee is with whom they are working side by side.

Mr. SPROULE. The reasons given by the minister are very good for not putting them on the permanent list, but the strange thing is that we constantly see civil servants appointed who have not passed the examination. To-night we were told that Martineau had not passed the examination, but he started on a salary of $700 a year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is the inside service.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the difference between the inside service and the outside service, when the Act provides that both must pass the qualifying examination ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). It can be said for the members of the outside service that many of them have passed the age when they could go up for the civil service examination. I know personally that there are many men in the outside service who are just as capable, and perhaps more capable, than those who have passed the examination in the inside service. In the case of bonded goods leaving a ship these officers are there to deliver them, and they must keep a correct memorandum of their work, and sometimes they are employed at night as well as at day. I have had some experience, and I know from personal observation that there are men who are engaged in that service who are most capable men, and as a rule they are very much underpaid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the minister come to any conclusion as to a change in the system by which the transportation companies now pay some of our customs officers for night work and overtime ? The present system, as explained to me, does not seem to be very satisfactory. I understand that objections to it have been presented to the hon. gentleman, and I would like to know whether he thinks there is any good ground for these objections.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will have to bring in a supplementary estimate to provide for that service for 1903-4. I am not unmindful of the request made a year ago by the hon. gentleman that we should estimate our expenditure more closely, and I think it is very desirable that we should when possible, and it certainly would be more convenient and more pleasant, if we did not have to ask for a supplementary estimate. The fact, however, is that the business has increased so rapidly that we have hesitated each year, and this session I will have to ask for a supplementary estimate of something like $100,000 for the purpose of paying these amounts to officers to which the leader of the opposition refers. It arises in this way : The hours for officers in the outside service are from eight o'clock in the morning to six in the evening. At all the frontier ports you must have men on duty at night to meet trains or boats, and up to the present the pay of these officers has been charged to the transportation companies. It was said to my predecessors in office, and it has been said to myself : It is the duty of the government to give every facility to trade and commerce, and as it would not be reasonable that you should ask that trains should be run between eight in the morning and six at night, you should pay your own officers for being on duty when we do run our trains. Hitherto we have said to the companies : You may run your trains and we will put our officers there, but it is for your convenience and you must pay for them. Their argument was : You recognize that it is your duty to give every facility to trade and commerce, and your officers are there to guard the revenue of the Dominion, and it is the duty of the Dominion to pay their salaries ; if you have to have your officers there at night as well as in day time, you should pay them for their services instead of making us pay. I have never been able to answer their argument to my own satisfaction, and I feel now that it is only just that we should accede to their wishes. I have always felt that it was anomalous that our Dominion officers should receive pay from transportation companies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The transportation companies pay this amount to the collector and the collector pays it out to the men who have earned it, so that the officers were not paid direct by the companies. I will have to ask for $100,000 in the supplementary estimates, but we may be able to economize, so that perhaps we shall not require to use the whole of it. Hon. gentlemen know from the conservative and prudent manner in which that department is managed that the money will not be spent if not needed. Occasionally an officer will be required by the transportation companies purely for their own convenience, and we will still make them pay in that case. For example, the Grand Trunk Railway in competition with other companies will find it to their convenience to have a Canadian officer at Boston say, who will forward goods through in bond. That offi-

cer will be for the convenience of the railway company, and we will ask them to pay for him. The United States government keep their officers in certain ports in Canada in order to afford similar facilities to passengers, and the railroads pay for those officers, but so far as I can ascertain, the United States do not charge one cent to the transportation companies for the payment of officers who perform extra service or night work. That is the point the hon. leader of the opposition has brought to my attention. That is not covered by this extra vote, but will be an addition ; and when I bring the supplementary vote it will be hardly fair to contrast the expenditure of the Customs Department, with that $100,000 added, with the previous expenditure, when that expense was contributed by the railway company.

Mr. TAYLOR. I asked the hon. gentleman for a comparison of the total cost of the Customs Department in 1895-6, and in 1901-2. As he did not give it, I will give the figures, having before me the estimates of 1895-6. For this same service for which we are now asked to vote $1,059,000, the estimates for 1895-6 were $801,580, an increase of $258,000 by the hon. gentleman since he came in to administer what he calls this economical department. Taking all the expenses together, for which he asks $1,301,505, the same work was done in 1895-6 for $874,285, an increase of $427,000, or nearly half a million—over fifty per cent of an increase. It is true, the imports have increased, the business of the offices has increased somewhat, and more money has been collected; but because more money has been collected, it does not necessarily mean that there should be half a million dollars paid to extra officers to collect it. At the port of Gananoque, where the business has probably doubled, the same officer has done the work during the past year who did it in 1895-6. There has been no increase there, and why should there be an increase in other ports ? Because a man who imported $100 worth in 1895-6, imports $1,000 worth now, there is no more work in making the entry or taking the money. My hon. friend speaks of percentages. That is a nice way of putting it. He says he collected more money at a smaller percentage of cost than his predecessor; but that is not a fair comparison, in regard to running the Department of Customs. The bare fact is there, that the hon. gentleman has increased the expenditure of his department nearly half a million dollars, and then he says it is an economically managed department.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the hon. gentleman's remarks will not commend themselves to the fairness of the committee. Does he actually think it possible to do double the amount of business on the same expenditure as before ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it possible in the hon. gentleman's business, or any other business in the country. Many merchants and manufacturers have doubled their business, but have not increased their staff or their expenses twenty-five or even ten per cent. The hon. gentleman knows that his own business has probably increased to two or three times what it was in 1895-6, but his expenses have not increased accordingly. No manufacturing concern in the country would sustain the hon. gentleman in increasing his expenditure practically fifty per cent over what it was under the late administration, in order to collect a little more revenue.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not myself been in business lately, but when I was we were doing a continually increasing business, and we found that our expenses were continually increasing, in doing it. The hon. gentleman's experience may not be the same. He has quoted the expenses of the year 1895-6; but that is not a fair comparison, because when I assumed office the estimates for the year were not sufficient; part of the expenses of that year had to be paid in the following year. But we will take the year before that, 1894-5, which was a complete year under the late controller, who I think was considered to manage the department very well. How much did it cost in that year to collect the revenues of this country ? As I said, you cannot collect $35,000,000 of revenue, which represents so many more goods arriving in the country, so many more packages to be examined and carted, so many more entries to be made, so many more clerks to be employed to do the work, at the same cost as half the amount. You must apply the rule of percentages. In 1894-5 the cost of collection was $5.13 for every $100 collected ; in 1901-2, the cost was $3.62. If we apply the rate of cost of collection of 1894-5 to the revenue of 1901-2, I would have paid $1,663.429 to collect last year's revenue. In other words, if the percentage of cost of collection last year had been the same as it was in 1894-5, I would have spent $487,405 more than I did. That is the amount of the saving. The hon. gentleman says, you do not expect the same proportion of increase in expenditure. No, we do not, but we do expect an increase. We expect this year, if the revenue keeps up, that it will be collected at a less rate than it has been collected in the country before. Any business man must know that when the revenue is doubled, there is more work to be done at the custom-houses. The habit of trade now is, with the facilities which we have for transportation, that people, instead of buying in such large quantities as they did before, do very much more in the way of repeat orders. They make smaller purchases more often renewed. That means more work and more entries. I grant that

if a clerk is working at a desk and has an entry of $1,000, if it is a short invoice, he can perhaps attend to it just as quickly as he could attend to a $100 invoice containing the same number of items. But for the extra work that requires to be done, extra men must be employed. I have not mentioned the extra ports that have been opened, I have not spoken of the increase of business in all parts of the Dominion, or of our desire to give some of our officers higher salaries, who are not paid sufficiently for the work they do. This will be part of the increase we ask, but we are keeping in mind the reduction of the percentage of the cost of collection. If we can keep that reduced to the extent we have been doing, fair minded business men will admit that the department must be fairly well managed. There is no use in saying that we can collect $35,000,000 with the same expense as $17,000,000. We cannot have the imports of the country nearly doubled without putting increased work on the appraisers staff and the clerical staff, and your landing waiters. Then there is the opening of new ports. I have now about twenty applications for new ports in places that where they say trade has so increased that new ports are required. I cannot give all the new ports demanded, but I do what I can. I can assure you that our officers are earning their salaries and that a good many of them are not paid what they should be, considering the present conditions, and while we may not be able to meet the views of all of them, we think that there are certain cases so strong that we must make an effort to do them justice.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman talks about the increased work causing increased expenditure. Let him take the port of Gananoque and he will find that although the business there has doubled, and although the amount collected has trebled, the expenses have not increased, and the staff is the same. Why should not the same result be found at Montreal and other ports ? The hon. gentleman does not want to compare the year 1895-96 with the present, but wants to go back to 1894-5, when the depression was still greater, in order to make a comparison of percentages. Well, let him take 1896-7, when he had complete control, and when he asked for a vote to pay the deficiency of the late government. With the same items that he is asking for to-day, he had the work done for $956,000 for which he is now asking $1,300,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What was the revenue last year ?

Mr. TAYLOR. That has nothing to do with it. Take the port of Gananoque, the revenue increased there, but not the expense. The fact is that at Ottawa and at Montreal and at other places, the department is overrun with labour not required, and in order to make places for hungry heelers, since 1896-7 the hon. gentleman has increased the expenditure of his department $345,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It will be $100,000 next year.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will not find fault with that, because it is taken off the transportation companies and put on the government ; but compared with 1896-7, the hon. gentleman is asking $345,000 more for the same work and the same staff, though, of course, some more taxes have been collected and more burdens have been put upon the people. The hon. gentleman compares percentages, but it costs no more to collect $1,000 than $100. In none of the departments are the officers overworked. I know the customs work that has to be done at my out port, and I know that the employees there do not do the work that is done in factories or in business offices or anything like it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are many ports where the salaries have not been advanced, owing to the fact that the officials formerly had not much to do, and could easily do a good deal more work, and Gananoque may be one of these. But where the business of ports has increased as it has done in Montreal, it must be evident that the expenditure has to be increased. It is impossible to do $1,000,000 more business without increasing the expenditure. Why, the receipts at Winnipeg, when I took office, were about half a million. They are nearly $2,000,000. It is simply impossible to have that extra work done without increasing the expenditure. Of course, we could let the work go, we could give the people their goods, but it is our bounden duty to have sufficient officers to collect the revenue. Where you have the cost of collection reduced from $5 per $100 to $3.50, that shows that the expenditure is not increasing in ratio to the increase of business. The proper test is the number of entries and the actual clerical work which is performed. If $35,000,000 worth of goods come to this country there must be nearly the double number of packages that came in when only $17,000,000 worth of goods were entered. These packages have to be opened and examined and attended to by the landing waiters. They have to be checked and entered by the clerks in the long room, and all the different branches of the department must necessarily have more work thrust upon them. Then in addition you have ports, such as Depot Harbour, where no revenue is collected, but where you must have two and perhaps three men to attend to the transshipment of grain. We must have men at Coteau when grain is going through. You have to have this, though it adds to your expenditure and does not show any revenue at all. I maintain that the department is worked as economically as it is possible to work it, to safeguard the re-

venue and collect what ought properly to be collected. If I were to be pressed further in that direction, and some hon. gentleman were to ask me: Are you sure you have enough officers at certain ports to efficiently safeguard the revenue? I do not know that I should be able to give as satisfactory an answer as I am to the question whether we employ too many of them. Do not let hon. gentlemen judge the whole service by a port like Gananoque, where at one time the officers had not enough to do to occupy their time, and where more work could easily be done without increased expenditure. The increase in such a port has not the same effect upon the expenditure as the increase in Montreal, Winnipeg and other large ports throughout the country.

Mr. CLANCY. Did I understand the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) to say that the per capita cost of collecting the customs had decreased or merely the percentage on the amount collected?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The percentage.

Mr. CLANCY. Then he does not contend that the per capita cost has decreased?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You do not judge it by the per capita cost?

Mr. CLANCY. I think the hon. gentleman, in the criticisms he made of the Customs Department some years ago when he was on this side, used as one of his arguments figures intended to show that the per capita cost had increased. Of course, if his experience has caused him to repent, he has improved to that extent since 1896.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I never based it on the per capita cost.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the hon. gentleman used that argument in his criticisms in this House.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, no. If I did, I know better now.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has learned something——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not admit that I needed to learn, and I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) could prove it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps hon. gentlemen will like a little further time to consider these items.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think we have made substantial progress, for the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) has been enabled to take about two-thirds of the time in explaining matters to us at enormous length. I admit they require explanation, but I do not think that this side have had a fair chance at the item yet. Therefore, perhaps, the hon. Postmaster General would permit the committee to rise at this stage?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And not take an item at all?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has had two-thirds or three-quarters of this item, so far as the time necessary for its discussion is concerned. The progress has been ample, I think. It is a very comprehensive item as I think the hon. gentleman will see.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is why I want it to go through.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will bring down the figures with regard to Gananoque in 1896 and 1903. Meantime I would point out to him that the other institutions of the country, such as the banking institutions, are doing double the business they did in 1896 and yet their expenses have not increased. There is hardly a bank but is doing double or treble the business it did before handling more cash, receiving and discounting more notes, yet with practically no increase in expenses.

Mr. HEYD. Somebody was asking where Gananoque was.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the hon. gentleman gets the figures from the customs he will learn.

Mr. HEYD. It was intimated here that, probably in 1896, there were twice too many employees in the Gananoque office and that is why the number has never been increased since.

Mr. TAYLOR. It has always been run by one man.

Mr. HEYD. Well, it could hardly have been run by less.

Some resolutions reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business is to be taken up on Monday?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Part of the private member's business for Monday remains, and private Bills and questions. Then there are the two Bills in the hands of private members which, I believe, have been fixed for Monday—Bills relating to the Fruit Marks Act, in the hands of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith). After these are disposed of, we shall proceed with government business, proceeding first, I think with the Railway Commission Bill, though I have not been able to see my colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals on that subject. After that, I think we shall take up Supply, proceeding probably with the estimates of the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Railways and

Canals. I do not know whether there are any government Bills to be proceeded with but I would like to have it understood that, if there are any, the government will be privileged to move them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it would be advisable, in order to expedite the business of the House, that we should have as distinct a statement as possible at adjournment of the work at the next sitting, otherwise it is not always convenient for us to arrange that the gentlemen on this side more particularly interested in the different branches of the House shall be present and ready to proceed at the proper time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that what I have outlined will pretty well exhaust the day—first there is the private members' business, then the Railway Commission Bill, followed by Supply, taking up the estimates of the Customs Department. I should think, considering the progress made this evening, that, perhaps, these items alone will be a 'pièce de resistance' for Monday. If not, we will proceed with the railway estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I understand from my hon. friend the Postmaster General is that we may expect, so far as the government business is concerned, the Railway Commission Bill, after that the estimates of the Minister of Customs, and after that, if any other business is taken up, it will be the estimates of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs thinks that perhaps the Minister of Railways and Canals may be occupied a part of the evening with a conference over his Railway Commission Bill outside of the House. If so, we will proceed with the estimates of the Department of the Interior instead. But as the Minister of Railways and Canals has commenced his estimates it would be advisable to continue them. But, there will be the estimates of the Department of Customs.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 1, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 148) respecting certain trust funds of the diocese of Moosonee.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 162) respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, and to change its name to the 'Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company.'—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 164) to incorporate the Pacific Bank of Canada.—Mr. Galliher.

UNITED EMPIRE LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 163) respecting the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Thompson (Haldimand and Monck).

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose this Bill merely means an extension of time for a year to make the deposit of the Finance Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Bill was considered by the Banking and Commerce Committee during my absence, and personally I am not acquainted with it. But I think that is correct.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No doubt it has been well considered, but——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was absent from the city when the Bill was considered by the Banking and Commerce Committee. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has any doubt, I will let the Bill stand. We might go on, and before the third reading I shall have an opportunity to consider the matter.

Mr. BELL. The Bill was thoroughly discussed in committee.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have no objection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This seems quite an elaborate Bill erected on a very small foundation. I suppose the Committee on Banking and Commerce has considered whether the usual notice given in the 'Canada Gazette' and other local papers is sufficient to cover all the amendments. But there does not seem to be very much remaining of the Bill as at first proposed. I do not know whether the attention of the Finance Minister has been directed to this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have observed just now that instead of a very small Bill, merely extending the time for making deposit, we have quite an extensive measure. No doubt it was well considered by the Committee on Banking and Commerce. But, in view of the point that has been raised, I would suggest that we go through all the Bill but the last clause, and before it reaches another stage I can give the matter my attention.

Progress reported.

CITY AND COUNTY BANK.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 172) to incorporate the City and County Bank of Canada.—Mr. Rosamond.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are merely verbal changes and do not affect the Bill at all.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 185) respecting the Canadian Steel Company.—Mr. German.

QUESTIONS.

LANDS VOTED TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. SCOTT asked :

1. With respect to lands voted to railway companies, and not earned, what is the area in each case which may yet, under existing legislation, be earned ?

2. What is the area in each case respecting which the time specified for the earning of the land has elapsed ?

3. What is the area now reserved in each case, if any, for companies that have failed to earn their grants within the time specified, under existing legislation, and what is the intention of the government regarding such cases ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. The Canadian Northern Railway Company having constructed its line from Beaver to Gladstone and from Mafeking to Erwood, has applied for the passage of an Order in Council passing to the company the land subsidy appertaining thereto, being for 46·70 miles at 6,400 acres per mile, and 22·16 miles at 12,800 acres per mile, making a total area of 582,528 acres applied for. The company may yet earn about 6,400,000 acres by construction of its line to Hudson Bay.

The Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company originally obtained a charter from the Dominion parliament to build a railway from Calgary north-easterly, and a land grant was authorized to the company of 6,400 acres per mile for a distance of about fifty-five miles. The question whether this company has. under its charter, until the 1st July, 1903, to complete the railway and if so, whether the construction and completion of the railway by 1st July, 1903, will under the Acts and Orders in Council entitle it to the land grant is before the Department of Justice.

	Acres.
Alberta Railway and Coal Company (Lethbridge to Crow's Nest Pass)....	384,000
Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company..	1,920,000
Brandon and South-western Railway Company..	108,800
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company (Macleod to International Boundary)..	287,552
Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company (Portage la Prairie to Lake Manitoba)..	102,000
Great North-west Central Railway Company (Hamiota to Battleford)..	2,550,000
Lac Seul Railway Company	115,200
Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company..	51,200
Manitoba and North-western Railway Company (from Yorkton and Russell north-westerly)....	1,417,024
Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company (from 98th mile south-easterly)..	76,800
North-western Railway Company of Canada	3,350,000
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway & Steamship company (branch to Battleford)	582,656
Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company..	384,000
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company..	1,536,000

3. A tract of land, part of which is unsurveyed, and which is estimated to contain an area of 322,500 acres, and being the tract originally set apart by Order in Council for the land subsidy to the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company, is held reserved.

SALES OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

Who purchased the large quantity of binder twine sold since the issue of circular dated May 1, 1903, giving prices for the current year; and at what price was it sold ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll) :

Names.	Pure Manilla.				King Special.	
	650 feet.	Rate.	600 feet.	Rate.	500 feet.	Rate.
Moise Cocnier, club.....	2,000	11¼	.....	.....	.....	
W. B. Comock, order.....	2,100	11¼	.....	.....	.....	
A. M. Dunsmore, order.....	.....	.....	2,500	10½	.....	
J. W. Drysdale.....	.....	.....	500	10¾	.....	
Wm. Eades	.....	.....	500	10¾	.....	
A. Malcolmson, club.....	.....	.....	3,000	10½	.....	
Jno. McDonald.....	2,000	11¼	.....	.....	.....	
Pioneer Farmers Union.....	.....	.....	20,000	10½	.....	

Names.	Pure Manilla.				King Special.	
	650 feet.	Rate.	600 feet.	Rate.	500 feet.	Rate.
Jas Allan			125	10¾		
G. W. Beach, club	1,000	11¼	2,000	10½	500	9¼
J. W. Beaudoin			400	10¾	100	9½
C. H. Brown			200	10¾		
Wm. Chapman			200	10¾		
W. S. Duffett	75	11½				
P. Z. Dube					1,000	9½
Geo. Dickie			100	10¾		
C. O. Gervais, club			4,000	10½		
D. Gavin			100	10¾		
J. J. Garneau			300	10¾	300	9½
R. Gardiner			200	10¾		
Wm. Gemmill			150	10¾		
Wm. Jamieson			250	10¾		
Thos. Kersey, club			2,135	10½		
W. T. Lucas, club			725	10¾		
Jos. Macartney			600	10¾		
Jos. Martin, club			1,000	10¾		
Frs. Art. Marcotte, club			1,165	10¾		
Jno. Montgomery, club			1,180	10¾		
Jas. H. Mountain			100	10¾		
W. R. McLeod, club	2,000	11¼				
E. McPhail			150	10¾		
Wm. Nixon, club			800	10¾		
P. O'Reilly			150	10¾		
Nazaire Pratte, club			1,000	10½	1,000	9¼
Hy. Raworth			200	10¾		
C. J. Russell			500	10¾		
S. B. Stevens			200	10¾		
All. Seward			150	10¾		
F. H. Smart, club			2,000	10½	2,000	9¼
A. C. Smith			150	10¾		
M. Tingley			400	10¾	200	9½
Geo. Wright, club	1,100	11½	200	10¾		
J. E. Belzille	300	11½				
C. Armstrong	100	11½				
Jas. Savage			100	10¾		
J. B. Daigle	500	11½				
F. H. Sadler	450	11½	50	10¾		
G. A. Palmer			50	10¾	50	9½
Wm. Fletcher			500	10¾		
Alex. Waugh			60	10¾		
S. W. T. Lewis	100	11½				
G. W. Sampkin			200	10¾		
J. O. Leroux, club	2,000	11¼				
Aug. Gagne	550	11½				
Manitoba Penitentiary	700	11½				
	14,975		48,290		5,150	

The clubs mentioned above are clubs of farmers who sent their orders through one of their members to secure the quarter cent per pound reduction in price of ton lots, and to save freight.

OFFICES OF TRANSLATORS OF DEBATES.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. Is Mr. D. V. Ranger the owner of the premises, No. 461 Sussex street, Ottawa ? If not, who is the owner thereof ?

2. Who is in charge of the offices of the translators of debates, located in said premises ?

3. Why are these translators detached from the House of Commons buildings, and by whose authority ?

Hon. Mr. CARROLL.

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

1. The lease was made with D. V. Ranger to whom the rent is paid ; officially the department do not know any other owner.

2. The offices are in charge of the staff of the House of Commons.

3. For lack of space in House of Commons building.

CENSUS OF RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS.—ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

Has the census commissioner, at any time since May 31, 1902, asked the enumerators for the city of St. John, N.B., to revise their re-

turns, with a view to correcting errors brought to the attention of the commissioner, relative to the religious classification and enumeration of that city ? If so, at what date was such revision made, and with what result ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) : On March 16 last a letter was sent to Mr. James Dillon, an enumerator of St. John city, concerning a Free Baptist church at 179½ Water street, which was entered on the schedule as having 545 communicants and a seating capacity of 494. Mr. Dillon was asked to explain how more communicants were credited to this church than the edifice could accommodate, and replying on 19th March, he said : 'The pastor of the church named gave the number reported 594* as communicants, adhering to the custom prevailing that as long as members have not asked for letters of dismissal, while perhaps not adhering to the church, he considered them communicants. To place the matter more clearly before you, he has on his church roll about 600 members. Of that number, 300 are non-resident, and he looks upon these as members and communicants of his church until letters of dismissal are asked for.' The compilation of the religions of the people in St. John city has been carefully revised, and no error has been discovered in the work.

*The number reported on the schedule is 545.

CENSUS OF RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS—GRAND MANAN, N.B.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

Has the census commissioner, at any time since May 31, 1902, asked the enumerators for the island of Grand Manan, N.B., to revise their returns, with a view to correcting errors brought to the attention of the commissioner, relative to the religious classification and enumeration of the people of that parish ? If so, at what date was such revision made, and with what result ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). No correspondence has taken place between the census commissioner and the enumerators of Grand Manan, N.B., relative to the religious classification and enumeration of the people of that parish. The compilation of the religions of the people in the Grand Manan parish has been carefully revised and no error has been discovered in the work.

CANADIAN REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth) asked :

1. What at present is the numerical strength of the Royal Canadian Regiment of Infantry ?
2. What is the pay of non-commissioned officers and men ?
3. Is it the intention of the government to increase the force and the pay ?
4. Will officers of the permanent corps, Royal Canadian Regiment, who hold a first-class long course certificate, have to pass an examination for substantive captain, under the amendment of general order No. 30, 1903 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir Frederick Borden).

1. 359 all ranks.
2.

	Per Diem.
Sergeant Major (warrant officer)	$1 25
Sergeant Major (after four years service in rank)	1 50
Sergeant Major (after eight years)	1 75
Quarter-master Sergeant	1 00
Sergeant instructors and drill sergeants (on appointment)	1 00
Sergeant instructors and drill sergeants (after three years service)	1 15
Sergeant instructors and drill sergeants (after further three years service)	1 25
The senior or specially selected instructor in each corps, having not less than six years service as such	1 25
After four years service in rank	1 50
After further four years service in rank	1 75
Sergeant drummer	1 00
Hospital sergeant	1 00
Colour sergeant	1 00
Sergeants	80
Corporals	70
Lance Corporals	50
Buglers	40
Buglers (under eighteen years of age)	30
Privates	40

3. Will be answered when the supplementary estimates for 1903-4 are brought down.
4. Yes.

APPOINTMENT OF ARTHUR MARTINEAU.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. On whose recommendation was Arthur Martineau appointed to the Civil Service ?
2. On what date was he so appointed ?
3. Had he any, and what, recommendation from previous employers ?
4. What was his previous business or occupation ?
5. Previous to his appointment to the Civil Service, had he been charged with any indictable offence ? If so, what was it, and what were the circumstances connected therewith ?
6. At the time of his appointment, was the government aware, or was any member thereof aware, of any charge which had been made against him in connection with any previous business, or employment, or otherwise ?
7. Was he appointed in accordance with the Civil Service Act ? And if not, what provision of that Act was disregarded in his appointment ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). 1. On the recommendation of the Minister of Militia.

2. Temporarily. 22nd August, 1901. Permanently, 1st July, 1902.
3. None were required.
4. Not known.
5. Not so far as known in Department of Militia and Defence.
6. No.
7. Was appointed in accordance with the law.

REBATES ON AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

Mr. ROCHE asked :

What amounts by way of rebates on agricultural implements exported from Canada have been paid for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1901 and 1902, to each firm so exporting ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. W. Paterson) :

	1900-1901.	1901-1902.
Massey-Harris Co., Ltd., Toronto and Brantford	$49,781 59	$89,696 54
Verity Plow Co., Brantford	3,165 96	1,231 16
Cockshutt Plow Co., Brantford	.....	1,224 98
J. W. Mann Manufacturing Co., Brockville	265 15	239 80
Frost & Wood, Smith's Falls	.....	1,393 37
Noxon Co., Ltd., Ingersoll	1,361 30	.....
Peter Hamilton Manufacturing Co., Peterborough	62 37	.....
Coulthard-Scott Co., Oshawa	.....	167 90

HAMILTON ELECTRIC LIGHT AND CATARACT POWER COMPANY LEASE.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

What is the amount of rental to be paid by the Hamilton Electric Light and Cataract Power Company, Limited, for the lease of the 700 cubic feet of water per second from the old Welland canal, referred to by the Minister of Railways and Canals, in answer to the question on 27th April last, reported in 'Hansard,' on page 1859 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The rental reserved in the lease to the Hamilton Electric Light and Cataract Power Company, Limited, of 700 cubic feet of water per second from the old Welland Canal, is $21,000 a year.

IMPERIAL BUILDING, OTTAWA.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Does the government occupy any portion or all of the building on Queen street, Ottawa, known as the Imperial Building ?
2. If so, what is the rent of the building so occupied ?
3. What is the duration of the lease ?
4. What is the annual rental paid by the government ?
5. Who is the owner of the said building ?

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

1. Government occupies all the building ; part is rented and paid for, occupied and looked after by the Department of the Interior ; the other part of the building is rented by this department for the use of the Agriculture Department.

2. $2,250 for portion occupied by Department of Agriculture.

3. Five years from 17th February, 1902. Part occupied by Department of Agriculture.

4. For premises occupied by the Department of the Interior, $1,950; lease expires on the 22nd August, 1903.

5. Estate of late Charles E. Pearsons.

TENTS FOR MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Is J. W. Wood, or J. W. Wood & Company, of Ottawa, now furnishing any quantity of tents to the Mounted Police Department ? If so, how many, and were tenders asked for the said tents ?

2. Did he, or they, supply any tents to the Mounted Police Department during the years of 1901 and 1902 ? If so, how many, and the value of same ? And were tenders asked for the supplying of said tents ?

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

1. No.

2. 1901, nine tents, value $348.50; 1902, twelve tents, value $269.

Tenders were not asked for these tents.

WOODS, LIMITED, OTTAWA—SUPPLY OF TENTS.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Is J. W. Wood, or J. W. Wood & Company, of Ottawa, now furnishing any quantity of tents to the Militia Department ? If so, how many? And were tenders asked for the said tents ?

2. Did he, or they, supply any tents to the Militia Department during the years of 1901 and 1902 ? If so, how many, and the value of same ? And were tenders asked for the supplying of said tents ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden).

1. No, but a rush order was placed with Woods, Limited, of Ottawa, for tents for ensuing annual training to replace tents supplied to Department of the Interior for immigrants; about 2,000, without tender.

2. No, but the then J. W. Woods Company supplied (during 1902) 100 bell tents at the old contract price, $18.50, notwithstanding the increase in price of duck.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of unclaimed balances in the banks of Canada, 1902-3.—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all papers and documents connected with the enumeration of the parish of Kars, King's county, N.B., in the census of A.D. 1901 ; including copies of all correspondence between the Rev. Joseph McLeod, D.D., and Census Commissioner Blue, in relation thereto.—Mr. Fowler by Mr. Lancaster.

Copy of all returns from the local clerks of court, or other officers of the government, in the North-west Territories, showing number, names, occupation, residence, &c., of all persons naturalized in the North-west Teritories during

the past ten years, or any portion thereof ; as well as all other information contained in such returns.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Return giving:—

1. The number of ties that have been issued in the sidings and on the main lines of the Intercolonial Railway, and charged to the capital account, for the years 1900-1 and 1901-2, and to the first of April, 1903.

2. Also, as to the number of ties purchased between the 30th June, 1902, and the first of April, 1903. The list of names from whom purchased ; and the quality and prices paid.

3. The number of ties that have been actually used in the track, between the 30th of June, 1902, and the first of April, 1903, and charged to ordinary maintenance.—Hon. Mr. Haggart.

Return giving:—

1. The total number of Intercolonial freight cars in use on connecting lines on the first day of March, 1902, and the first day of March, 1903, respectively ; or the nearest dates to these that the car mileage reports are prepared ; the list of roads using these cars at the dates named, and the number in use on each road ; and the number of days such cars have been in use on such roads.

2. The number of cars belonging to connecting lines in use on the Intercolonial on the first of March, 1902, and the first of March, 1903 ; the names of the roads owning or controlling these cars, and the number of days such cars have been in use on the Intercolonial on these dates. —Hon. Mr. Haggart.

Statement showing :—

1. The value of fruit shipped to Europe in cold storage in each of the calendar years 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902.

2. The value of fruit shipped in cooled chambers in Europe in seasons 1901 and 1902, respectively.

3. In what further steamers were cooling plants placed in the season of 1902, if any.

4. In what further steamers were mechanical ventilating plants placed in the season of 1902, if any ?

5. How much money has the government advanced to date, as bonus or subsidy to steamship companies, to induce them to put in ventilating apparatus, to enable them to carry in better condition perishable cargo, since 1896 ?

6. How much to induce them to put in cooling plants, since 1896 ?

7. How much to induce them to put in cold storage plants, since 1896 ?

8. Tracings of temperatures, as recorded by thermographs placed on ocean steamers by officers of the government, (a) in cold storage chambers ; (b) in cooled chambers ; (c) in ventilated chambers, if any ; (d) in other parts of steamers, if any, naming location.—Mr. Smith, (Wentworth.)

Return showing :—

1. How many members of the House of Commons, or ex-members of the House of Commons, have been appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown since 13th July, 1896 ? (b) What are the names of such members, or ex-members of the House of Commons ? (c) To what offices were they so appointed, and emoluments for same ?

2. How many members of the Senate, or ex-members of the Senate, have been appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown since 13th of July, 1896. (b) What are the names of such members or ex-members of the Senate ? (c) To what offices were they so appointed, and emoluments for same ?

3. How many members, or ex-members of the House of Commons have been appointed to the Senate since 13th of July, 1896 ? (b) What are the names of such members, or ex-members, of the House of Commons ?—Mr. Roche (Marquette.)

Copies of all communications addressed to the government, or to any minister, in relation to the grant of fishing rights in James bay, or Hudson's bay, to Archibald McNee, of Windsor, Ontario. Copies of all answers thereto, and any communication relating to the transfer of said lease.—Mr. Lancaster.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—REPORT OF MR. POTTINGER.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART moved for :

Copy of the report of Mr. Pottinger on the inspection of ties for 1900 and 1901.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Would my hon. friend make the motion read 'any report' instead of 'the report ?'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. All reports.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Any or all.

Motion agreed to.

I.C.R.—PURCHASE OF LAND AT LEVIS.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Monk—moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council, contracts, documents, letters, correspondence, and papers, in connection with the purchase by the government, in or about the year 1900, of a certain lot of land in the town of Lévis, for the purpose of the Intercolonial Railway, or for other purposes ; and also copies of all cheques paid out in relation to the said purchase, vouchers, receipts, &c.—Mr. Casgrain by Mr. Monk.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no objection to this motion at all, but my hon. friend should specify more accurately what he wants. It says 'a certain lot of land in the town of Lévis.' Several have been purchased. Would he indicate what lot in particular he wants ?

Mr. MONK. Perhaps there was only one lot purchased in the year 1900.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think there must have been more.

Mr. MONK. I am not familiar with the matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. Let it go, and when Mr. Casgrain comes, we will see what he wants.

Motion agreed to.

FRUIT MARKS ACT 1901—AMENDMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER. Independent to the wish of my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith), I beg to move that the order with reference to Bill (No. 86) be now called.

Motion agreed to, and House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Mr. Smith (Wentworth) that Bill (No. 86) to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901, be now read a second time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sidney Fisher). Explain.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). This Bill provides for the appointment by the government of inspectors who may be called upon by the shipper or the receiver of closed packages of fruit to inspect it and mark its grade. At the present time we have inspectors, but their powers are limited to examining the fruit and stating whether it is falsely packed or not. That is of no commercial advantage. It is undoubtedly of great advantage in detecting false packing. I may say at the outset that when the Act was first proposed by the fruit growers, they wished inspectors to be appointed for the purpose of branding the apples, but they thought it would not be wise to encumber the Act with that provision at the beginning for fear of endangering its passage. Consequently they omitted to ask for it.

There are a great many advantages in having closed packages of apples or pears marked by a government inspector. It is hardly fair to ask the farmer, the fruit grower, or the packer to put on his goods a mark which may cause him to be fined. There is no other class in the community placed in exactly the same position. The Act, when first brought into this House, did not provide that the packer must put on any particular mark. It provided that he 'may' put on certain marks; it was left optional. When the Act was in that position, there was no hardship. If a person put false marks on his barrels of apples, he knowingly took the responsibility on his own shoulders. But, the Act as amended last year provided that the farmer or packer must put on certain marks. If he thinks his apples are No. 1, and he puts on that mark, and they happen to fall below that standard and come under the notice of the inspector, he is liable to be fined. That is to say, the government compels the packer to put himself in a position where he is liable to be fined, which I think is not the case with any other class in the community.

By the amendment I propose, that onus would be taken off the packer. Under the present Act, the only way in which the packer can escape the onus is by marking his apples No. 2 or No. 3. I think three-fourths or nine-tenths of the apples packed last year were marked No. 2. Almost any kind of apple may be marked No. 2, so long as the apples are the same all through the barrel, as there is no specification of that quality. Many of the apples thus marked were possibly No. 1, but the fact of their being marked No. 2 must to a certain extent have injured them on the market; yet the packer in many cases was afraid to mark his apples No. 1 lest he might subject himself to the penalties of the Act. I would not cancel the provision of the Act which provides for a No. 1 grade. I would rather have another provision defining the No. 2 grade; but I would take the onus off the farmer or packer of being compelled to mark his apples one or other of these grades, and I would provide that a sufficient number of inspectors should be appointed who, on the application of the packer, would take the responsibility of deciding whether his apples were No. 1 or No. 2.

It may be objected that this would cost a good deal. In my amendment I have not provided the method of payment; perhaps I should have done so. I do not for a moment propose that the government should take upon itself the cost of providing inspectors for every one who wants them; but these inspectors would be paid as the inspectors of hides and the inspectors of many other commodities are paid, namely, by fees, made as low as would be consistent with covering the actual cost of the operation. When these fees are placed on the inspection, I am sure that there will not be an overwhelming quantity of apples to be inspected. I presume that nine-tenths of the apples that go forward are sold on consignment, and when they are so sold it is not absolutely necessary for them to be marked with any particular brand, as they are sold on their merits, and it must be a disadvantage to a man selling his apples in that way to feel compelled to brand them as No. 2. But there is a large quantity of apples, perhaps one-tenth or one-fifth of all those sold in this country, which are sold outright, by bargain sale—the way in which I think all fruit should be sold to ensure the seller getting the full value of it. If a government inspector could be called upon to mark these apples, see the position in which a farmer would be placed. A farmer has a quantity of apples to sell, and he grades them, and calls the inspector. The inspector marks them No. 1. The farmer immediately has a merchantable article which he can sell in Winnipeg or in the old country, or anywhere else. His apples have the standard brand of a government inspector, which is something of value to him, enabling him to place them on the market at their full face value, whereas at the present time he does not dare to mark them No. 1, but marks them No. 2, for fear he will overstep the mark and be fined.

The only objection which may be urged against this Bill is the cost of the inspec-

tion. I propose that that shall be paid by the farmer or the packer, so that that objection is removed. It may be said that to carry out the Act will require an army of inspectors. That will not be the case, however, because only a limited quantity of apples will require to be inspected. With proper management and care as many as a thousand barrels can be inspected in one day. I do not by any means, propose that the inspector should inspect every apple barrel, but that he should inspect the apples as they are inspected when sold in the old country—one in ten or one in twenty, as the case may be, of each brand or variety of apples. The apples may be opened up by men in the employ of the shipper, inspected by the inspector, and immediately closed up again by the shippers' employees, so that an inspector might easily in that way inspect a thousand barrels a day. It may be said that the inspection would be no guarantee of the quality of the apples, because the inspector does not inspect every barrel ; but that would be the well-understood condition of the sale—that only a certain percentage of the barrels were inspected. It would be a guarantee between the buyer and seller—whether between the farmer and the packer, or the packer and the merchant —that one barrel in every fifteen or twenty of these apples was inspected. So that I do not think that there is anything in the objection that this will be cumbersome. I cannot see any other valid objection why we should not have an inspection of apples as of other commodities. We have an inspection of cheese and butter. When a man sends a cargo of cheese and butter to Montreal and there is a dispute, the inspector is called in and his verdict is binding. Why not follow the same practice with regard to apples, which certainly require inspection just as much as butter and cheese ? We have hides inspected. A man cannot sell a hide unless it has been inspected by the government inspector. You will find a government inspector in every city and town of the country, whose business it is to see that hides are properly examined and stamped. We have also an inspection of grain, though on somewhat different lines. This inspection of grain, as of many other goods, is paid for by the government, and costs many thousands of dollars annually ; but the inspection of fruit I do not propose to have paid by the government but by the people who ask for it. For my part, I cannot see any valid reason why this amendment should not be accepted. The fruit-growers are in favour of it. I wrote a number of prominent fruit-growers in different parts of the country, and in every case I was told that they fully agreed with me and were in favour of having this amendment put into our statutes. I wrote to Mr. A. H. Pettit, of Grimsby, who has always taken a leading part in all questions of legislation regarding fruit. Here is what he replied :

> Your amendment is all right, but if I read Mr. Henderson's correctly it would annul the Inspection Act entirely. The great importance I attach to the inspection, is that being inspected and branded by the inspector, it settles all questions as to the condition and quality, and we can never expect to make satisfactory contracts with the old country people unless we can give them the guarantee (the inspector's brand). I have spoken to others and they all approve of inspection and brand, with success to your amendment.
>
> P.S.—Since writing the within, this thought strikes me. An Act for the prevention of fraud under which we are now acting is all right, but your amendment covers a more practical point. I want to sell, say 1,000 barrels of apples to an English firm, at a price f.o.b. I cannot ask that firm to accept draft unless I have some surety to offer the firm that I have fulfilled my part of the contract as to quality and condition, the inspector's brand settles that point, the all important point, sale by contract is far preferable than shipping to brokers.

I wrote Mr. McKinnon, who, as the hon. minister knows, is another gentleman of high repute and standing, whose opinion is respected by all who know him. He said :

> Your own Bill I heartily approve, provided the buyer as well as the seller shall have the right to call for inspection and the party calling for it pays expenses.
>
> Mr. Henderson's Bill is simply one to kill the Act in so far as it tends to make a distinct reliable Canadian brand.

I have here a letter from Mr. George Fisher. Mr. Fisher has been for years the inspector for the province of Ontario, and has always given the greatest satisfaction in his work. He is regarded by everybody as a man of good judgment. Here is what he writes :

> Yours of the 6th to hand. Your Bill providing for the official inspection of fruit is part of my contention, but I see no reason, if we pay for this inspection, which is quite right and proper, why inspectors should not be available to inspect any quantity large or small. I certainly think they should be, and this work should be done only at the request of the shipper and to serve his purposes alone, as when he requires a certificate in making a sale.

There are a number of other shippers who approve the principle of this amendment. I trust that the hon. minister will see his way clear to amend the Act on these lines. There are some other changes that may be made, but this strikes me as the most important.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I am very glad to have heard my hon. friend's remarks with regard to this amendment, because I was unfortunately absent when the Bill was first brought up. At that time my hon. friend the Minister of Finance asked that the Bill should stand until my return, and I have arranged with my right hon. leader the Prime Minister that an opportunity shall be given for its discussion. I have been thinking a good deal about this amendment and discussing it with a number of other peo-

ple. There are strong objections to it. The hon. gentleman has, to a certain extent, discussed some of those objections, but I would like to put them a little more forcibly and clearly than he has done. In the first place, while the hon. gentleman read one or two letters asking for an amendment of this character, he did not state that the Fruit-Growers' Association of Ontario had discussed this Bill and appointed a subcommittee to consider amendments to the Act, but that committee had neither passed any resolution nor asked for this or any other amendment to the Act. Various opinions were expressed, and a thorough discussion of all the provisions of the Act was had, yet the Fruit-Growers' Association could not agree on any recommendation regarding any amendment to the Act. In Nova Scotia the Fruit-Growers' Association also held a meeting and discussed the proposed amendment to this Act. They all agreed upon one amendment and one only, which they thought would be in the interests of the province. That amendment was not the present one, but was to the effect that No. 2 fruit should be defined. There is now only No. 1 or xxx defined, and other fruit-growers wanted the Act to go further and define No. 2 or xx as well as No. 1. Thus these two associations practically endorsed the Act as it now stands, and I do not see that because individuals here and there have objections to the Act as it now stands, while the representative bodies of fruit-growers do not believe and cannot agree upon this or any other amendment, with the one exception I have mentioned, we should make any serious change. My hon. friend has stated that the first Act as introduced did not contain this clause.

My hon. friend is mistaken in that. There was a Bill which did not become law, and which was only tentatively introduced in 1900. That, I believe, did not contain this clause C of section 4. But the Act as originally passed did contain the requirement that the grade of fruit shall be marked upon the package, and the amendment which made that stronger still in 1902 was simply an amplification or extension of clause C of section 4. My hon. friend, however, must confess that this Act as it was introduced and adopted by parliament has always contained the requirement that the grade of fruit be marked upon the package. I confess that I consider this one of the essentials of the Act. I hold that if the packer is allowed to send forward a closed package without marking on it what it contains, he will escape to a large extent the wording of this Act, and the effect of the Act—which has been very good indeed upon the fruit trade of the country—will be almost nullified. I appreciate the fact that what the hon. gentleman has said with regard to the particular section does not militate against the argument which he put forward for the adoption of this amendment, but still I want to correct the statement he made with regard to the introduction at first of the Act. Now the hon. gentleman said that he wished to have the packer relieved from the onus of designating the quality of the fruit himself. But it seems to me that this is essential to this Act. Nobody but the packer can really grade the fruit. It is true that, under the hon. gentleman's suggestion, the inspector can go and open 10 per cent of the packages and see what they contain. But this would not inform him as to what the other packages contained. He may easily light upon ten packages in a hundred which will grade No. 1 or x x x; but there might be other packages very inferior, that he would not light upon. Under the hon. gentleman's suggestion, not only will all the fruit in such a case be designated as of first quality, but the government's stamp will be put upon it, and the reputation of the department of the government of Canada will be pledged to the quality of the fruit so stamped. Nobody can grade fruit in a closed package without first opening the package, except the packer himself; and it seems to me that it is proper and right, as well as the only safe way, that the packer should have the onus thrown upon him of packing his fruit honestly and marking it exactly for what he has put into the packages. The whole object of the Act is to protect the buyer from dishonest or negligent packing. Nobody except the packer can tell what is in the closed packages, unless the inspector opens every package. The hon. gentleman himself is well enough versed in the trade to know that it would be impossible to open every package—and that he would be the first,—and all the trade would agree with him—to object to the inspector opening every package, to judge of its contents. This is in addition to the fact that it would be a practical impossibility, to find the army of inspectors necessary to carry out the work as designated by this amendment. The hon. gentleman says that, if a fee were charged, at first at any rate, very few inspectors would be called upon to inspect and grade fruit. I dare say that such would be the case, for one season. But if the buyers judge the fruit by its marks and consider the inspector's mark as a guarantee, you may be sure that they will very soon demand that the government inspector's grade shall be given them and the mark of the government inspector be put upon all closed packages, and so sellers will be obliged whether they like it or not, in the interest of sales, to ask for this inspection. The result must be that it will require for this work an army of inspectors, at a certain time of the year, competent men well versed in the fruit trade and in fruit growing, who at that time of the year are specially difficult to find. Last year, there were nearly 500,000 barrels of apples sent through the port of Montreal for export alone, to say nothing of the great number sold throughout

the country on local markets. This export trade is all rushed into, I suppose, less than three months of the autumn. And, for any number of inspectors to be set to work to inspect and grade half a million of barrels of apples in the course of three months or less, to say nothing of the large number of the internal trade which is certainly as much if not double as much, would be almost a physical impossibility. The hon. gentleman says that, acting under his suggestion of inspecting 10 per cent of the packages, an inspector could inspect about a thousand a day. That is to say, they could inspect and know what was in one hundred packages, and they would mark nine hundred without knowing what was in them. I do not think this is at all desirable. I know it was not what the House or the country expected or wanted when the Act was passed. I must say also that, in the working of the Act no serious hardship, I believe, has arisen to justify this very material and essential change. Now, the hon. gentleman spoke of the onus on the packer, and said it was not right that the packer should have that onus thrown upon him, that, in fact, it was practically impossible for the packer to grade fruit correctly. I know that, during the last season a very large amount of fruit was sent forward as No. 2, because, unfortunately, the season was a bad one, and a very large proportion of the fruit was actually No. 2. But I doubt very much indeed if it could be substantiated that any fruit was sent forward which a packer believed to be No. 1, and yet marked No. 2. It is quite contrary to the spirit of the trade to do so, and it is not at all necessary under the provisions of the Act; for, if the fruit is honestly packed as No. 1, the packer is perfectly safe in marking it No. 1, especially when, under the Act, a certain percentage of apples not quite up to No. 1 is allowed even, when the No. 1 mark is put upon the package. I think the packers can very easily live up to the Act by honestly and correctly packing; and I think the public expect that of them. The purpose of the Act was to bring that about, and it has brought it about to a very large extent. I have had very satisfactory reports from the old country as to the packing of Canadian fruit during last season, and of the condition in which the fruit has reached the market. The people have declared distinctly that this is due largely to the operation of the Act. I cannot say from memory which paper it was in, but I saw the statement that not long ago, one of the associations of boards in England, had gone so far as to recommend to the United States the passing of such an Act as our Canadian Fruit Marks Act, because our Act has helped the fruit trade so much that it would be to the interest of people in the trade for the United States to adopt a similar law.

I venture to think that the amendment which is proposed would to a large extent nullify the operation of the Act, and that there would be a serious danger both to the government and to the trade of the country; because I am satisfied that no government inspection could be as accurate and as careful as that of the packers themselves, and that if the government inspector were to make a mistake and, through neglecting to turn over every package, were to put upon some bad packages his stamp of No. 1 quality, it would affect the trade much more than if a private individual were to make a mistake and were to send forward fruit improperly marked. Of course, you may say that the government inspector must not make such a mistake. But the government inspectors, like other people, are liable to make mistakes, and especially would they be liable when they did not turn over more than a percentage of the fruit, and if they did not know what kind of fruit was in more than a percentage of the number of packages which they were marking. Now the shipper himself, we will say, is making a reputation by the way in which he marks and packs his fruit. If the government steps in and takes that place, then the shipper himself is no longer responsible; if anything is found wrong he can shrug his shoulders and say, it is not my fault. The result is that he loses that great benefit which any person gets who makes a reputation for himself over his own name. I think myself that the shipper's own guarantee is worth more to him—it may not be to the purchaser—but it is worth more to the shipper than any government guarantee could be. A government guarantee would be looked upon as impersonal, while the shipper's own guarantee, which is one of his own creation, is looked upon as personal to that shipper. If a man does his work well and honestly, he will make a reputation for himself and get a better price for his goods and a readier sale. All this will be taken away from him if the government inspector steps in. I do not feel, therefore, that I can accept this amendment.

I would say a word with regard to the difficulty of operation under the amendment. If the hon. gentleman's proposal were carried out, and if every package was to be opened, I do not think the hon. gentleman himself, or those whom he professes to represent, would be satisfied with the result. If it were to be undertaken, it would be practically a physical impossibility to do it. The only way to carry out such an amendment as this, it seems to me, would be for the packer to employ a government inspector to come to his packing house and stay there during the whole time of the packing season. That would mean a great expense to him, and lead to greater evils probably than the present condition of affairs can possibly create. Now the whole intention of the Act from the beginning was, not to have our fruit inspected, but it was clearly defined and stated here in the House

that it was meant to be a deterrent, it was meant to be a sword held over the dishonest or careless packer, to force him, by fear of the penalties attached to this Act, to do what he ought to be willing to do in his own interest, in the interest of the trade and in the interest of the reputation of Canada. The condition of affairs in this trade before this Act was passed, was such as to require some such action, and parliament in its wisdom adopted the Act as it stood, and changed it last session to make it more stringent in this particular section and in this particular respect. I am informed by those who have been watching the operation of the Act, that it was not only good in the first place, but that the increased stringency of section 4 has made it still more beneficial. Under these circumstances, therefore, I cannot believe the amendment to be in the interest of the trade, or in the interest of the country, or even in the interest of the packers at large. There has been no general demand for this amendment from the representatives of the Fruit Growers' Association or from the packers; and even if it were adopted, I cannot see how it could be carried out in such a way as to improve the facilities of the trade, and carry out the intention of the Act itself. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I must ask the House not to pass the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. Before the motion is put, I desire to say a few words. I think the House, on consideration, would be in favour, if not of this amendment of my hon. friend from South Wentworth (Mr. Smith), at least of some amendment drawn on similar lines. I would say to the Minister of Agriculture that some of the fruit growers in the Niagara district find some objection to the present law in that there is no place, no locality where inspection can be expected to take place as a matter of course. My hon. friend from South Wentworth is moving in that direction in trying to get apples, to mention only that class of fruit, inspected where they are packed, or as near to the place where they are grown as possible, or to the place where they are packed and going to be shipped. I would point out to the Minister of Agriculture that there is no specified place where the inspection must take place. The inspectors go where they think the most apples are handled, they go to the large centres like Montreal, or Toronto, or perhaps Windsor.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They go where they find the most fruit.

Mr. LANCASTER. They want to do as much inspecting as possible. It would strike me, and has struck some of the fruit growers in the Niagara district, that if the inspectors went where the fruit is grown, not where it is taken off the cars or boats, but where it can be inspected before it is shipped, they would strike equally large quantities. Supposing, for instance, they inspected at Hamilton, or Grimsby, or St. Catharines, or Winona, they would find as much fruit shipped in a day from these places as they would find in Montreal, that is to say, the inspectors would be exercising just as much economy of time in going to these towns I first mentioned when the apple shipping season is at its height. If they went to Winona, and then five miles further on to Grimsby, then sixteen miles further on to St. Catharines, they would find a very much larger number of barrels of apples or other fruit to inspect than by confining their operations to the larger cities. I think the Act requires some amendment in principle like this, providing some place where the shippers could be expected to have their apples inspected. I think the amendment of my hon. friend is in the right direction. It is much easier for men to look after their fruit at home, and it is reasonable that a fruit grower should expect his apples to be pretty well taken off his hands after they get upon the railroad. After he has shipped a great many barrels of apples, he has a lot of business to attend to, a large number of men under him, and it is natural that he would like to get rid of responsibility for his apples as soon as possible after they are shipped. When they get on the cars for Montreal, if they are going to England, he thinks his responsibility should cease. The minister may say that the fruit can be traced, that the fruit grower has an opportunity of knowing just as much as the railroad how many barrels he ships. For instance, if he ships on a railway, he knows by his bill of lading how many barrels they have in custody, and how many he can hold them responsible for, and I do not think it would be unreasonable that he should be able to know as to the quality. The government provides for an inspection which shall be made somewhere, and I think it is better that it should be made as near as possible to the place where the goods are produced.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The government does not provide that the goods shall be inspected anywhere. There is no provision in the Act that any fruit shall be inspected. It must be shipped under certain conditions and it may be inspected to see if those conditions are complied with, but the government does not assume the responsibility of inspecting fruit.

Mr. LANCASTER. Technically the Act may not provide for its inspection, but practically it is inspected by the government because an inspector is employed and the inspector prosecutes any person whose fruit is represented to be what it is not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are thousands of barrels that are never looked at.

Mr. LANCASTER. The fruit-grower, if this Bill were passed, would be induced to bring about such a state of affairs that there would be a correct, proper and honest packing of fruit. We know that when the reputation of a certain place arises, when some man living at Grimsby, or St. Catharines, or Winona, or Burlington, succeeds in making a reputation for shipping good fruit, somebody else at the same place may get the benefit of that reputation because it is not the man's name that will be remembered so much as the name of the place where the fruit comes from. Where did this fruit come from ? It came from Grimsby, or St. Catharines, or Burlington, or Winona, or Guelph, or some other place, and that fact will probably have more weight with the purchaser than the name of the individual shipper. If the inspectors make an inspection, as we assume they will, being employed for that purpose, in order that the Act shall be properly enforced, I think the Bill of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) is in the right direction, because it would result in the inspectors making their inspection at the place where the goods are first packed. In regard to the number of barrels in each car that would have to be inspected, I do not think that any difficulty would be found in that. I do not know very much about it and I speak subject to correction, but I think that wheat is often inspected by the carload by government inspectors. They, of course, do not examine all the wheat in the car, but they examine samples taken here and there, and they form a pretty good opinion from such an examination. If a man packed a carload of apples and the inspector went through and took out a barrel here and there, I think we would be pretty safe in taking it for granted that he would be able to make a good inspection in that way. I do not think there would be anything unreasonable in making a regulation to that effect, as it would provide for such an inspection as the hon. member for Wentworth wants, and I think it would be a reasonable inspection without examining each barrel. As to the question of packing, of course, it is more or less a matter of opinion. If the inspector is where the apples are grown and he differs from the shipper as to the classification it would be an easy matter to settle such a difference. The inspector says to the shipper : You must not put that fruit in as No. 1. The shipper asks : Why ? The inspector gives the reason. They would talk it over right there and one or other of them would have to give in. If the inspector were firm in his opinion the shipper would know what he must do with the next barrel, or next carload, or next season's crop of apples. It seems to me that it would be much easier to carry out the Act to secure the proper packing of apples if the inspector and shipper were brought in contact where the apples were being shipped. The hon. minister seems to think that a man's reputation would compel him to ship properly. That is all very well so far as it goes. But in many cases a man's reputation does not come quickly enough. The reputation of a fruit-grower, sometimes takes the best part of his business life to make, and it is desirable that he should be able to get the best price for his apples before he has made his reputation. It sometimes takes a man ten or fifteen years to make a reputation, because it sometimes takes him that time to learn how to produce the best fruit, and in another ten or fifteen years he may not have more than five or six good crops. If you wait until he has had enough good crops after he has learned how to grow the fruit properly to make a reputation, I am afraid the man will be ready to depart this life before that result has been achieved. I think he should get the benefit of the price that his apples are worth, if in the first year he is able to grow apples that are A No. 1. There is another matter that is not covered by the Bill which I do not think the hon. minister will object to me mentioning, although I am not prepared at present to move an amendment on that point. The present section 4 of the Act, as amended, provides that the shipper is entitled to mark a package containing fruit of the first quality No. 1, xxx, No. 2, xx, No. 3, x. Several fruit-growers in my part of the country have told me that they are satisfied that a fraud has been perpetrated upon them by some people they have shipped to. Unfortunately, they are not in a position to prove it because it is a fraud which is so easily committed. It is committed in this way : A fruit-grower ships a barrel of fruit marked xx, and the man to whom he ships takes a stencil and puts another x beside the original mark. The first purchaser sells these goods as being of first quality, or xxx. We, in the Niagara district, are satisfied that this has been done more than once. The person who is blamed in the cases in which this fraud has been detected, is the person who ships the fruit and who marked it xx. The shipper says : I only branded the fruit as xx, but the evidence is altogether against him. I think this practice would be made impossible if the shipper were only to mark upon the package the quality in plain figures as No. 1, No. 2, or No. 3, and nothing else. These figures could not be altered, No. 3 could not be changed to No. 2, No. 2 could not be changed to No. 1, and there would be nothing which could be put beside the figure which would change the classification of the fruit. It would then not be so easy for the first purchaser to accomplish this fraud so as to get the benefit of selling fruit of a certain quality at the price of a better quality which he has been able to do without taking any risk himself. If he is caught he simply says : There is the barrel,

there are the marks upon it, go to the man who shipped the fruit. I think this suggestion is worth consideration.

Mr. WADE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me in regard to the last objection, that that might be remedied very easily by changing the kind of stencil that the shipper uses. If he only leaves sufficient space to enable the proper number of X's to be put in, then, another could not be put there. In regard to the Bill before the House, I wish to say a word or two against it, because I do not see how it could be worked out if we were to have government inspectors of all fruit. I do not see how you could, under the present condition of affairs, authorize any one shipper to send word to an inspector that he must come at a certain time and go through a carload or a dozen carloads of fruit. It might occupy the time of one inspector for days or weeks while his services would be required in some other part. If the government is willing to take the responsibility and expense of sending a sufficient number of inspectors to inspect every barrel of fruit which is packed, then and not till then can we consider a provision of this sort. If the government is prepared to go to the expense of doing that, then this provision would be workable, but otherwise it would not, and although I represent a fruit country, I rather hesitate to ask the government to go to that expense, because I think it would be unreasonable. Moreover the present Act is giving fair satisfaction throughout the country, and it has certainly accomplished a large measure of good. I believe that since the passage of the Act the fruit is better packed, and that a better reputation is being secured for our fruit in the foreign market.

Mr. HOLMES. I heartily endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade), because I believe it would be practically impossible to make this Bill workable, unless the government intended to employ a very much greater number of inspectors than they have at present. This amendment to the Act would mean that the inspectors shall be at the call of the shipper whenever there is fruit that they think needs inspection, and that would entail the employment of an army of inspectors. There are other portions of the Dominion besides the counties of Lincoln and Wentworth from which apples are shipped, and it would certainly be very expensive to have inspectors at all these points. There is another feature in connection with it to which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) referred, and I think he was wrong on that point. He said that the reputation of the apple is known by the locality whence it comes, but I am of opinion that the brand of the fruit accounts for the reputation more than the locality. All the shippers have their own brands and they go on their merits in that way. It occurred to me that perhaps in the shipping season it might be advisable if the government could employ a few additional inspectors or sub-inspectors in certain localities, but if we make this Bill law it will be found to be impracticable to work it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture what is the practical operation of the Act at present. Is there an inspection of some portion of all the apples exported or used throughout the country. I suppose it means that only a few barrels, for instance, of a large shipment would be inspected. If some of them are found not up to the mark what is the course pursued ? Do the inspectors in that case inspect every barrel. The Act does not seem to be of very much value unless that course is pursued, and yet if you do pursue that course you would require to do a very large amount of work in order to ensure any value whatever from the marks placed upon the apples by the shipper. If apples are not found to be up to the standard, are proceedings taken by the government against the packer or shipper or the person who is responsible.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I must reiterate what I have often said to the House : that this Act does not contemplate the inspection and grading of fruit by government inspectors.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that perfectly. But it does to some extent propose to ensure that the marks placed upon the fruit by the shipper, are marks which can be relied upon by the consumer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It does that by providing machinery for the working of the law, and penalties for punishment in case the barrels are improperly marked. The government have provided the machinery which any one can put in motion, and they have gone further and appointed certain inspectors so that shippers and packers would understand that in addition to the people to whom they were selling, there were also officials on the watch for infractions of the law. It is believed that the fact of having that machinery and having inspectors who are liable to drop on any shipment at any time, causes the packers to take more care in the packing and as to the marks they put on the fruit. I have figures here which have been submitted to the Committee of Agriculture by the gentleman who has charge of the work, and they show that last season the total number of barrels opened was 78,016 and the total number of boxes opened was 525. These were individual packages of shipments which aggregated 154,000 packages. The practice is that the officer of the department opens, say ten or fifteen packages out of a shipment of 100, and if he finds them good he

goes no further. If he finds them not up to the mark, he either condemns the whole lot as being similar to those he has opened, or, if the shipper wishes or requests it he examines the whole lot and grades those that are good and those that are bad. That is the practice. I may say that we have four inspectors during the autumn in Montreal; two travelling inspectors in Ontario; three inspectors in the maritime provinces; one in British Columbia and one in Manitoba. It is quite understood that these men cannot possibly deal with more than a percentage of the packages and the whole intention of the Act is deterrent; not necessarily to catch them but to induce them to act honestly through the danger of being caught. Generally when a first offence is detected the persons are warned, and if the offence is repeated they are prosecuted, and so far we have not failed in any prosecution we have undertaken. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) referred to a case where the first purchaser changed the mark by adding another x. There was no difficulty in proving that offence, and the first packer was exonerated, and the seller who changed the mark was punished. There is no great difficulty in making proof of that kind, but nevertheless the first packer ought to make such a mark that it cannot be easily changed. If a ring were put around the original two xx the third x could not very well have been added, and the stencil is usually made with a ring around. I am sorry that some packers do not use stencils which are difficult to change, and if they are so careless I am not sure that they ought to be protected from their carelessness. Stencilling is so cheap and easy that I would not care to change the Act so as to protect those who are so indifferent as merely to mark with a blue pencil on the package. However, I may say that we have encouraged the use of the marks Nos. 1, 2 and 3, and I am glad to know that that encouragement is bearing fruit, and that a great many packers throughout the country are using these marks instead of the old ones, and I hope that before long the Canadian fruit trade generally will use a uniform system of marks.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the minister think it necessary to have the x marks as well as those ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was allowed in deference to a section of the country in which the x marks were largely used; but I am glad to say that the Nos. 1, 2 and 3 are being largely used instead of the x marks. With regard to the locality of the fruit and the use of personal marks, I may say that in a great many instances the packer uses his personal mark, though the fruit comes from ten or a dozen different localities. I am sure that my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) buys fruit all over the province of Ontario and puts his name on it. Though the localities from which the fruit comes are not known, Mr. E. D. Smith is known. That is the reputation which I had reference to having been built up by my hon. friend.

Mr. HOLMES. May I be allowed a word more, with the consent of the House, with reference to the matter alluded to by the minister—the case in which the packer had changed the brand ? There was a case of that kind in my own county, in which the fine imposed was merely nominal; and the general opinion of the fruit growers and packers throughout the country was that the fine was entirely inadequate to the offence.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the fine for an offence of that kind ought to be ten times greater than for the other offence.

Mr. GILMOUR. There is one particular in which the Act places the apple dealer at a disadvantage. It is this. There are men who, like the hon. member for Wentworth, buy thousands of barrels of apples on the trees. They then employ men and boys to grade these apples and pack them, and the Act holds the man who buys the apples responsible for these packers. If the apples are not properly packed, he is fined, and his name is sent broadcast through the country as that of a man who has been fined for fraudulently packing apples. If I were a shipper of apples, I would send them out under the second grade, and would work out my own reputation, as suggested by the hon. member for Lincoln. I think the government, in their care to have apples properly packed and sent forward, so as to ensure a good name for this country, should not have gone any further than to require a barrel of apples to be packed uniformly from the top to the bottom, leaving people to put on their own marks. If the apples were found to be not uniformly packed in the barrel from the top to the bottom, then impose as heavy a fine as you please.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I want to ask the hon. minister a question. I stated that the Act at present compels a man to put on the grade mark, whereas the Act as originally introduced into the House in 1900 did not do so. I understood the minister to say that I was mistaken. If so, I would like to have my mistake pointed out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. I said that the Bill as originally introduced in 1900 did not contain that clause, whereas the Bill as introduced in 1901, when it was made law, did contain it, in section c of clause 4. The Bill introduced in 1900 was only a tentative Bill, and was not even discussed.

Motion negatived, on division.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). In the absence of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), I beg leave to move that Bill (No. 130) to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901, be now read the second time. The purport of this Bill is simply to abolish the designations and grades of markings in the Act. The objections urged by the fruit growers to the Act in that respect are so well set forth in a resolution passed by the Fruit Growers' Association at Burlington, that I cannot do better than read it. The purport of it is as follows

Noticing that Bills to amend the Fruit Marks Act are being introduced in the House of Commons, many fruit growers consider it an opportune time to draw the attention of legislators and the public to some grievance which exist under the Act, and possibly to suggest remedies for some of these evils.

No one questions the fact that great improvement in the packing of fruit has resulted from the passing of the Act of 1901. As far as known all fruit growers are in the fullest sympathy with what was ostensibly the purpose of its designers. The purpose of the Act as clearly stated and understood at a conference between the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and representative fruit growers and dealers was—so to frame it as to consider the interests of the growers in preference to those of the dealers when these interests conflicted :—

To prevent fraud in packing by having the contents of all closed packages to correspond fairly with the face or shown surface of such package.

To give the packer's name and address in full as a guarantee of good faith.

And to stipulate that certain marks to be defined were not to be used unless the contents of the package graded up to a certain standard, all other marking to be at the discretion of the shipper.

These provisions would have adequately protected the public from fraud, would not have been onerous on the grower or shipper and would have been entirely acceptable to the great majority of fruit growers and to fair minded dealers.

The beneficial results have been derived principally from section 7 of the Act, which provides that the face of any package shall be a fair representation of the contents, and from clause 'A' of section 4 which provides for the name and address of the packer being placed on all packages. These are the vital points in the Act and constitute within themselves a sufficient safeguard for the public, and with the penalties imposed for infractions a sufficient deterrent to such packers as may be fraudulently inclined. These demands are not too much to expect of the ordinary fruit grower, who can readily understand the difference between honest and fraudulent packing and who cannot but understand the importance of fruit going forward under his name having a uniformity of excellence.

These improvements in the trade and satisfactory conditions, as before stated, have been effected entirely under certain sections of the Act as originally passed in 1901, but in the dying hours of the session of 1902 amendments to the Act were railroaded through the House without explanation or due consideration, and being quite uncalled for either by the public or the fruit grower. The objectionable feature of these amendments are principally embodied in clause 'C' of section 4, which arbitrarily demands that a farmer shall grade to a specified standard which must necessarily vary materially in different sections, and in the ideas of various individuals, and then brand with a fixed mark to designate the grade or quality, which no other class of the community is called upon to do and to which no class but the farmer would submit.

It is therefore widely regarded as an unwarrantable interference with the fruit growing industry and with the rights of a citizen, and the farmers of the Dominion should as one man raise a protest against this injustice being perpetrated on a section of their calling and resent the indignity thus thrust upon them.

Penalties are provided for failing to comply with all the conditions required and heavier penalties for attempting to do so when the judgment of the farmer fails to conform to that of the inspector, although it may be the judgment of an experienced and honest packer against that of an inspector whose efficiency is questionable, and the farmer is at once branded a criminal without the privilege of trial by jury. Thus trade is seriously hampered by terrorizing the grower who, rather than take the risk of marking his packages, and incurring the odium of being fined, is induced to sell his fruit to the speculator much below its value or allow it to remain in the orchard.

This compulsory grading and branding is not only impossible as applied to all packers under varying conditions but it is both absurd and useless. Being the marks of the owner who is an interested party, these marks demanded by the Act would not be considered by any court and would consequently have no commercial value in case of a dispute between buyer and seller.

There should be no compulsory grade marks, and responsibility for grades should not rest on the farmer but on qualified and competent inspectors, who should be available to do inspection work when required, and issue certicates as in other lines of business—these certificates would be final in case of dispute as to quality.

The Act might in the opinion of many shippers define No. 2 or No. 3 fruit, but it should be entirely optional with a shipper whether he has his fruit graded to a government standard or not. Millions of bushels of wheat change hands annually without inspection, and when it is inspected the owner does not indicate the quality, but the inspector makes his examination and issues his certificate. In such cases the person requiring the services of the inspector pays the established fees.

I cannot put the case plainer than it is put in this circular. Under the Act a packer is compelled to put certain marks on his barrels. The hon. minister has told us that in the Act of 1901, there is a similar condition. I cannot see it. Section 6 describes a brand called A No. 1 Canadian brand apples, and section 7 describes No. 1 Canadian brand, and provides and the Act provides that any one who uses these brands must conform to certain specifications. No one, however, is obliged to use these brands. That is what the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) complains of, and his Bill wipes out the grades altogether. I would not go so far. I would like to see these grades in the Act, but only as they were in the Act first introduced. I would like

to have two grades exactly defined, but to have the branding of these grades optional. Let the packer not be obliged to put on these marks and thus avoid subjecting himself to a fine if he makes a mistake. The trouble with the present law is that a packer has to put certain marks on the apples without being in a position to know whether the packing corresponds to these marks or not, and he thus may render himself innocently liable to a fine. The hon. minister's objection that the inspection would cost too much is not reasonable. When a car is examined, every barrel is not inspected, but only some of the barrels. If you take one barrel out of a lot of one variety, packed in the one orchard, it is fair to assume that the remainder of the barrels will be the same. The Act is an excellent one in many respects and has done a great deal of good, but it lacks some things to make it perfect. There are three things wanting. First, grade No. 2 should be defined; second, the marking of these grades should not be compulsory; third, the inspector should be appointed at the instance of any one requiring him. Suppose a car of apples is refused on its arrival. An inspector is called in, and he may go or not as he likes. If he happens to be on hand, and does go and examine a few of the barrels, what may be the consequence? The shipper may be asked to lose fifty cents or a dollar a barrel on the whole cargo when the inspector has only examined five or six barrels. That, according to the hon. minister's contention, is not fair, because five or six barrels would not indicate what the cargo is like, and consequently the shipper has no right to lose. Of course I know that the inspection would not hold as evidence in a court of law, but nevertheless any one can understand that when a shipper goes into court and the evidence of the inspector is taken, the verdict is likely to go against him. I do not know but that the inspection would be absolutely just if it were taken on each of the different brands in the car, but if only taken on five or six barrels which happened to be shoved to the front and were picked out as the worst barrels and then the whole cargo condemned, one can see the injustice. But if the apples had been examined before shipment, and it was then found that they were not up to grade, the shipper could either repack them or sell them as grade No. 2, instead of grade No. 1, for which he would get within twenty-five cents of No. 1. But once the apples are shipped and received by the consignee, and condemned on the examination of a few barrels by the inspector, as not being up to the grade mark, the shipper has to take whatever he can get, because it would not pay him to go to law. Instead of being a benefit as it might be, if made before the apples were shipped, the inspection becomes a detriment. Suppose a shipper sends his apples to Winnipeg or Montreal, and on arrival they are condemned, he is in no position to remedy what he might have done very innocently, because in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the packer gets the best apples he can, but they may not be put up all right. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, as the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) pointed out, the packer gets men to pack the apples. He gets the best men he can, but if they do not put them up right, according to his judgment, still, he is at their mercy to a great extent. The hon. minister knows that very well. When the apples reach Montreal or some distant place, he may be notified that they have not been properly graded and he is then in no position to save himself. If his apples were condemned at home, he could re-pack them and get what they are worth out of them. There are many other things to be said on this subject, and I trust that other members will take up this discussion. I feel that we rest under a grievance as things are at the present time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I understand that we are now discussing the Bill standing in the name of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). It seems to me that the argument of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) was, to a certain extent, mixed up with his argument for his own Bill. While I would not presume to reflect in any way upon the clearness of what he has been saying, I must confess that I have been a little at a loss to know whether he has been speaking in favour of his own Bill or in favour of that of the hon. member for Halton. However, I may follow his example; and I would like to quote against the Bill now before us what the hon. gentleman read in favour of his own Bill. He read two or three letters in which remarks were made about the necessity of having the inspectors go to the orchards and there inspect the fruit. But he read other sentences from these same letters which stated distinctly that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Halton, if passed, would completely destroy the efficacy of the Act. I agree with those statements. I think that if this amendment were passed, the Act would be emasculated to such an extent as to be of very little use. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) referred back to the Bill of 1901. I have not at the moment that Act under my hand. I understood that when the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Smith's) own Bill was being disposed of, and the hon. member for Halton not being present, we would not take up his Bill, so I sent my papers away. Speaking from memory of the Bill of 1901, it did not specify any particular marks, but it did require the designation of the grade contained in the Act of 1901, which are now part of the law, but it did specify in part that the grade of the fruit should be marked upon the pack-

age. That was and is an essential of the Act. If the packer is allowed to pack his fruit and not mark upon the package the quality of fruit, it would be impossible to hold him to any penalty under the Bill. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) bows his head. Is that the object—to prevent the packer being pursued and punished for improper packing and false marking? If it is his object, I take issue with him squarely, and say that the country wants the packer to be pursued and punished for bad packing and false marking, and that that is the very object of the Act. I do not think the hon. gentleman really wants the Act so emasculated that the packer shall escape all responsibility. I do not think the hon. gentleman would take the responsibility before his constituents of saying that he wants to emasculate the Act in that way.

Mr. GILMOUR. How is the hon. minister going to reach the packer, when he is really employed by the buyer of the apples?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gilmour) that the man who actually packs the fruit is responsible, and, under the Act, is liable to a penalty as his employer is.

Mr. GILMOUR. But you cannot find him. How then can you fine him?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Exactly. That is why we want to get at the employer. You cannot find the poor man who has been paid $1 a day to pack the apples—he may be a hundred miles away. But if we found him and punished him, that would not be of any use. We look to the employer, who is a responsible man and responsible for the working of his employees. That is essential to the Act, and I think the House and the country want that to remain a part of the law. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) himself would like to see the employer relieved of the responsibility. If this were done, the Act would not be worth the paper it is printed on. If the hon. member for Wentworth employs men to pack fruit and can throw the responsibility for bad packing on those men, how could he be held responsible or be punished for the bad packing of the fruit?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The hon. minister is quoting me wrongly——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am speaking of the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour).

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). But I am referring to what was said before the hon. member for East Middlesex spoke. I made no reference in what I said to the packer escaping responsibility.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE No; but the hon. member for East Middlesex did. I said that the hon. member for Wentworth would not wish the packer to be allowed to evade responsibility. He knows that the employer ought to be responsible, for he is the only person who can be successfully pursued. The workman who is employed at $1 a day cannot be pursued. It is true that if he does bad packing he is liable to a fine, as his employer is. But if we could pursue him only, the Act would not be of any use. It is the employer who must be looked to and held responsible. The hon. member for Wentworth sells his fruit under his own name. When I buy a barrel of apples marked 'E. D. Smith' I expect to get something good, for the hon. gentleman's reputation, position and standing are back of all he does. But if I turned to John Jones, employed by Mr. E. D. Smith to pack fruit in his orchard and tried to hold him because a barrel of apples I bought was not equal to the markings, I should stand but a poor chance. The hon. gentleman does not wish the buyer to be put in that position, I am sure. He does not want to shirk responsibility, nor does he believe that the employers of labour wish to shirk responsibility. Their reputation is made by being responsible, by giving a guarantee for the fruit they pack and ship under their name. But what I was saying, and what the hon. member (Mr. Smith) misunderstood me about, was in regard to clause C of section 4, which was originally in the Act as passed by this House. In the session of 1902 there was an extension of clause C of section 4, specifying certain markings which had to be put upon the package. That was done to secure uniformity of markings, but the clause is no more stringent in requiring the designation of grade to be put upon the package than was that of 1901.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). If the hon. minister will permit me——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I cannot see how the minister can argue in that way. The original Act did not compel any man to put any particular mark on the package.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman will excuse me. Here is the Bill of 1901, section 4:

> Every person who by himself or through the agency of another person packs fruit in inclosed packages intended for sale, shall cause the package to be marked in a plain and indelible manner before it is taken from the premises where it is packed:
>
> (a) With the initials of the Christian names and the full surname and address of the packer;
>
> (b) Both the name of the variety or varieties; and
>
> (c) With the designation of the grade of the fruit.

That is the Act of 1901. It contains clause c.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). As passed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. That is not the Bill as proposed, it is the law that passed, and in 1902 an addendum was made to that clause which required that in making the designation of the grade of the fruit, certain marks should be used, namely, x, xx and xxx, or No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3. That is an addendum to the clause ; but the essential of the clause, that the grade of the fruit has to be put upon the package, was contained in the original law.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I was referring to the Bill that was introduced at the suggestion of the Fruit Growers' Association.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was introduced in 1900, but after further discussion with the fruit growers, with the dealers, and with the packers, and after full consideration in committee, that Bill was drawn up and introduced in 1901, and the designation of the grade of the fruit was required, and it was passed in that form by this House, after thorough discussion in which the hon. gentleman himself took part.

Mr. WADE. I think this amendment destroys to a large extent the original intention of the Act. As stated by the Minister of Agriculture, in the Act of 1901, clause c, of section 4, merely says that the barrel or package shall be marked with the designation of the grade of the fruit. Then section 6 forbids any person to sell, offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, any fruit improperly marked. This was found not to be definite enough in operation, hence the Act of 1902, which states in subsection c that the packages should be marked :

With a designation of the grade of fruit, which shall include one of the following six marks : for fruit of the first quality, No. 1 or XXX ; for fruit of the second quality, No. 2 or XX ; and for fruit of the third quality, No. 3 or X.

Then it was necessary to amend section 6 in consequence. Now the amendment before the House proposes to sweep away everything that was done in 1902 and leave it to the general expression that there shall be a designation of the grade of the fruit, leading to the same uncertainty that existed before. I think that would be very unwise. In my judgment the only amendment that is needed in this Act is the one that has been asked for by the fruit growers and shippers of the maritime provinces, namely, that not only should there be a specification of the variety of No. 1 or xxx, but there should also be a specification of the varieties Nos. 2 and 3, so that a party should be fined for improper packing of those varieties just the same as in the case of other varieties. I think, therefore, it would be a mistake to do anything which would lead us back to the uncertainty that has existed. No Act of this kind can be framed and put into successful operation from the start. It requires some experience. I think that the amendments passed in 1902 were based entirely upon the experience of those who had been endeavouring to operate the Act. I am sure that so far as the growers and shippers of the lower provinces are concerned, this Act is popular as it stands, and that the only amendment it requires is one with regard to this specification.

Mr. LANCASTER. As I understand the present Act, it only applies to fruit marked No. 1, and not to the other grades.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It provides for them, but it does not describe them. I am in sympathy with the proposal of my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade), and the hon. member for Wentworth himself stated a few minutes ago that he was in favour of having No. 2 grade defined. I think the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) will find that there is a special clause describing what must be put into a package marked No. 1, but there is no clause describing what must be put into a package marked No. 2 or No. 3, and it is that definition which the fruit growers of Nova Scotia and the hon. member for Wentworth have proposed. I am in sympathy with the idea, but I have not yet prepared an amendment to the Act. If I think best, before the end of the session, I may do so.

Motion negatived on division.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question before the Chair is clause 1, of section 3, and the amendment of Mr. Barker to include railways in the operation of the Act.

Amendment (Mr. Barker) negatived.

On section 3, subsection 2 :

Any section of this Act may, by any special Act passed by the parliament of Canada, be excepted from incorporation therewith, or may thereby be extended, limited or qualified. It shall be sufficient, for the purposes of this subsection, to refer to any section of this Act by its number merely.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely we have that power at any time in the future without putting it in this Bill ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose there is no objection to that phraseology. We are following the present Act in putting it in. We have the power, no doubt, but there is no harm in stating that it is intended to be of universal

application except there is something in a special Act which otherwise provides.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I could understand that in a special Act which has already become the law in the Dominion, but it refers to future Acts of parliament that may be passed. It means that a person might make an application for a charter and you reserve the power to the Dominion of Canada to pass an Act which may exempt that special charter from any clause of this Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are providing for application to Acts which are passed. They are covered by this sub-clause and this subclause qualifies the first sub-clause of the section.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am at present of the opinion that this is rather dangerous legislation :

Any section of this Act may, by any special Act passed by the parliament of Canada, be excepted from incorporation therewith——

—that is from incorporation under this Act,

—or may thereby be extended, limited, or qualified. It shall be sufficient for the purposes of this subsection, to refer to any section of this Act by its number merely.

If you are passing this Bill in the sense you are supposed to be passing it, I think if there is one thing above another that we should look after it is the certainty that it shall apply to all railways and that we should not be delegating our powers. I have every confidence in this House as it is at present constituted, but we are doing a very serious thing and we are doing more than at first sight may be supposed. We are saying that notwithstanding the fact that we are creating a commission to dispose of the matters that are said to be creating so much trouble in the country—that a commission is necessary, any railway company may receive a charter by special Act exempting it from the provisions of this Bill, and that if the Railway Committee recommend the granting of such a charter it will be passed because in the House the onus is usually laid upon any person who objects to make a strong case in opposition to the report of the Railway Committee. It is dangerous legislation in connection with a Bill whose application is supposed to be universal. It is true that we have been told it is not the intention of the government that it shall apply to government railways but it is universal except that it does not apply to government railways. If it does not apply to all the railways of the Dominion it is no good. This is legislation to create a Railway Commission to look after those matters which are supposed to be creating so much trouble in the country that a commission is necessary to deal with them, and if it does not apply to all railways there does not seem to me to be of very much use—in passing this law. This subsection is an invitation to this parliament, or to the next parliament, or to any parliament, or to Railway Committee in any year to pass a special Act incorporating the railway and exempting it from the provisions of this Bill That is the effect of it. The hon. minister may say that parliament would not do anything that was not wise. I do not think we should pass legislation that would imply that it might do so I think the Bill would be much better if that subsection were not in. The Bill would still fulfil all its purposes. It would not impair the strength of the Bill itself. This is not in the old Railway Act. I have compared the old Act with this Bill, and there is no such section as this in it. There is a section in the old Act which says :

This Act, subject to any express provisions of the special Act, and to the exception hereinafter mentioned, applies to all persons, companies and railways within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, except government railways.

This subsection does not help to carry out the Bill at all. It cannot strengthen the Bill or make it more easy to work. Unless there is some better reason than that which has been advanced, I think we should strike that subsection out.

Mr. MONK. Does it not seem to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that this subsection is useless ? It simply enunciates a principle that does not require to be stated in the Bill. There is no doubt that the party who drafted the Bill thought it necessary to have this subsection 3 preceded by a recital as in subsection 2, but it seems to me that the subsection is useless and as the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says may encourage parties seeking special charters to have these charters excepted from the operation of some useful section of this Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must confess that I cannot see this matter in the way in which it has presented itself to the minds of my hon. friends opposite. I cannot see there is the slightest fault in the subsection, but I see every advantage in it. This is certainly no more an invitation to parliament to introduce special exceptions into special Acts which may be passed hereafter than is the existing law which says :

This Act, subject to any express provisions of the special Act, and to the exception herinafter mentioned, applies to all persons, companies and railways within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, except government railways.

That is what the old law says, and I cannot see any harm in it. Parliament will exercise its discretion, as it must have the right to exercise its discretion, as to whether in any case it will make any special enactment varying from the general enactment.

Mr. COCHRANE. If this parliament can always do it, what is the use of telling them in this Act that they can do it. It is no argument to say that this clause has always been in the law. Why, that is more Tory than I am. You practically say that because it always has been, it always shall be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should be sorry to assume that everything in the existing Act requires to be amended. It must be remembered that this Act is not an Act simply for the purpose of creating a railway commission.

Mr. BARKER. We are discussing here a public Bill containing a broad general principle that the commission shall have jurisdiction over all railways except two, and yet in the sub-clause we provide that an Act creating a particular company hereafter may contain a clause detracting from the general principle we settle on here. There is a great deal to be said for the argument that the principle of a Bill of this important character should not be subject to be altered by some private Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This Act provides for a great variety of things such as the construction and alterations of lines, railway crossings, protection required on railways, and hundreds of other different things. When parliament created the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to deal with all these matters it deemed it advisable that they should exercise their power under the Railway Act, subject to the provisions of any special Act that might be passed.

Mr. LANCASTER. We should have a little better explanation from the minister. I am trying to help to make reasonable legislation out of this, and although I do not pretend to know as much railroad law as the minister does, yet I think that all he says he wants to do by this clause is done by the constitution without any such clause as this at all. It is safe to say that any particular Act of the parliament of Canada can exempt itself from the operation of this Act without this clause being in at all. As to the argument of the minister, I would say that the more things there are for a special Act to interfere with, the more dangerous it is to invite them to interfere by such a clause as this. Even on the minister's own argument this clause should be struck out. I appeal to the Minister of Justice if I am not right, that without this clause at all any special Act of the parliament of Canada would have the effect which this clause says it shall have. I say it is bad legislation to put in words which are mere surplusage, and which would leave doubt in the minds of the judges who would be construing this clause as to what the intention of the parliament of Canada was in passing such a law. According to the intention of the promoter of the Bill there are five lines here which are absolutely unnecessary, and I say that it is bad draftsmanship and mere confusing surplusage to pass such a law. I wish that some one more eloquent that I am could impress upon the Minister of Railways and Canals the necessity for striking out this sub-clause.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am not a lawyer, but it appears to me that the legislation of this House should be drafted so that a man of common sense can understand it. I cannot help but draw attention to the fact that I have heard in this House from the Minister of Justice and other members of the government the expression: what do you mean by this legislation? Not long since the Minister of Justice put that question in one of the committees. Would it not be better rather than to have such crude legislation passed by the parliament of Canada, that some person should be paid who would be able to bring common sense into the drafting of a Bill so that we would know what the language means? What is the use of passing legislation in this House with reference to which the Minister of Justice, who is supposed to have the brightest intellect in the House has to ask what it means? Should not a Bill be so drafted that the trained intellect of legal gentlemen can tell what it means when we put it on the statute-book? How can we expect the judges of the land to construe such legislation when even the Minister of Justice does not know what it means? It appears to me that it would be better for the Minister of Railways and Canals to bring common sense to bear on this legislation. Can we not have a clause here, founded on common sense so that the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways and Canals will know what it means? I am willing, as the representative of a rural constituency, to pay a man who is skilled in drafting legislation. It may appear to be a frivolous subject to some hon. gentlemen, but I feel serious about it. Perhaps these hon. gentlemen want to make a little money out of the legislation when it comes before the courts; but I want our legislation to be so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein; and I am willing to pay from the exchequer of Canada a gentleman who is skilled in drafting legislation, so that when it is placed on the statute-book we shall know what it means.

Mr. SPROULE. It appears to me that the following words might be left out of this section:

> Any section of this Act may, by any special Act passed by the parliament of Canada, be excepted from incorporation therewith, or may thereby be extended, limited, or qualified.

These words appear to me, as a layman, to be unnecessary, because they give us no power that we do not possess already. Perhaps I am not right in my interpreta-

tion of them, but that is the way they appear to me.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LANCASTER moved that subsection two of section three be struck out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to point out to the committee that the three subsections of section three are all parts of a uniform whole, and are quite in keeping with the general character of our legislation. It is certainly a very proper thing to say in terms that the provisions of any special Act which are in conflict with this, shall not be held to be within the purview of this present Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. We have to look at this Act in the interest of the people, as to how it may be construed. In my humble opinion it is very dangerous legislation to put any language into an Act which is not necessary; because, although we are legislators making the law, the judges in construing it do not go by what we may say here, or by consulting 'Hansard,' but they go by well known legal principles of construction. If a case arose under this Act, and an argument were made by counsel on one side and on the other, the court would be almost constrained to say: We must give a different effect to the Act from what we would if that subsection were not there. If the minister could state any special reason why he is putting this language into the Bill, if he could show that it made the Bill mean something that it would not mean if this language were not there, I could understand it being there; but if it only means what would be the case even if the language were not there—simply that a special Act can, if it is necessary, in the opinion of parliament, at the time it passes that special Act, override this general Act—if that is all that is meant, then I do not see the use of these words being here at all. If we put this in, the courts may feel bound to give special effect to every word, phrase and sentence in the Act, and will conclude that parliament meant something else than would have been the law if this were not in and therefore different to what we intend.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Section 3 provides:

> This Act shall apply to all persons, companies and railways, other than government railways, within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, and shall be incorporated and construed as one Act, with the special Act, subject as herein provided.

It does not say it shall apply absolutely, but it shall apply 'subject as herein provided.' Therefore you cannot leave out subsections two and three, unless you strike out 'subject as herein provided.'

Mr. LANCASTER. Subsection three makes that perfectly clear. You will have a complete section without subsection two being in at all. I am only proposing to strike out subsection two.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he would strike out subsection 2 and make subsection 3 subsection 2?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Subsection 2 refers to Acts that may be passed, but subsection 3 refers to Acts heretofore passed. Under the old law subsection 3 was a section by itself, but it went further than the first subsection of this section 3 does, because it says:

> This Act, subject to any express provisions of the special Act and to the exception hereinafter mentioned, applies to all persons, companies and railways, within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, except government railways.

So, if you strike out subsection 2, you would change the law as it heretofore existed. I am not sure of this point, but I am submitting it for the consideration of the committee. The old law provided, in case there might be any doubt, that the special Act was specially authorized to change the General Railway Act. Now, whether that was necessary or not is a question for us to consider. But, we found it necessary in 1888, when we consolidated the Act, to make special provisions, that the special Act overrode the Railway Act. I do not know whether it is the intention of the minister, but it might affect my judgment to learn, whether it was his intention to divide that section into three subdivisions?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that was my intention; and I may say to the committee that this section as a whole has been very carefully considered, and has been gone over and over and talked about a good deal. It does, in a measure and to the extent which I shall state in a moment, vary the old third clause. Now, let me point out that the main portion of the section, the first subsection, could not very well be left standing alone and declaring on the face of it that this Act shall apply to all the railways within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada. You would have to recognize, as a matter of fair notice to everybody trying to interpret the law, that there might be within the four corners of the special Act exceptions which would override similar or corresponding clauses and sections of this Bill. That is fair drafting, it seems to me, and we cover the point by stating:

> This Act shall apply to all persons, companies and railways (other than government railways)

within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, and shall be incorporated and construed as one Act with the special Act subject as herein provided.

And what is that ?

Any section of this may, by any special Act passed by the parliament of Canada be excepted from incorporation therewith, or may thereby be extended, limited, or qualified.

That is, it is not left merely to implication as I read the clause. Parliament, in a special Act would except from the operation of the general law any one clause or clauses that it chose to so describe and so declare. Well, it is not a complete answer to the propriety of putting it in here to say : Well, parliament has the power to put it in any way. Proper and usual drafting would rather impel one to put in just such a clause as that. Then, we come to the third clause, which deals with the case of special Acts heretofore passed. Now, the old section 3 provides :

This Act, subject to the express provision of the special Act——

That conveys, as my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) has very properly said, the idea that parliament contemplated that special Acts would be passed which would vary the provisions of this Act, and deem it advisable to so enact that one will see at once it speaks in general terms of the special Act. That special Act might be a special Act of the parliament of Canada or it might be a special Act of one of the provincial legislatures. For we are frequently in the habit of declaring some special work constructed under some local incorporation, a work for the general advantage of Canada. That is one of the difficulties we had to face in creating this Act, but we have all sorts of provisions in the local Acts entirely at variance with the General Act, and the question is whether we have by the general nature of these Acts made these special Acts part of the law of Canada and thereby withdrawn the case from the operation of the General Act.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I sympathise with the minister's views to a certain extent, and in criticising the Act, my only desire is to get a better Act if possible. But I do not want to change the old clause, unless the hon. gentleman can point out good reason for it. It is important that we should know, when we grant a charter, just what we are granting. It is important from the practical and financial point of view, for, from any experience I believe that the difficulty is not in getting a railway charter but in getting the money to build railways. In the committee, I am sometimes charged with being too liberal in the granting of charters. But we want railways in this country, and I believe a railway charter is worth nothing unless it contains clearly, and in such a form as to be seen by the capitalists before whom it is put, the rights and privileges it purports to grant. As I say, I am prepared to support any changes in the law that are shown to be necessary. I think it covers everything that he mentions; if it does not, I am quite prepared to have it divided into subsections and change it. The old Act says :

This Act, subject to any expressed provisions of the special Acts and to the exceptions hereinafter mentioned, applies to all persons, companies and railways within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada except government railways.

I am the more mystified and unsettled by the language of this subsection divided into three subsections than I was before, and I am prepared to support the clause of the Minister of Railways and Canals, as he has drawn it if he will show me any necessity for the change. I think it is one of the first rules of legislation to use terse and comprehensive expressions. As the hon. member for Lincoln has said, there is less chance of the court attempting to put some construction on the elaboration than there was in the old system. I want the minister to understand that so far as I am concerned the bulk of this Act meets with my hearty approval. It shows a great deal of care and attention to the important and difficult subject of a railway commission, but it seems to me some of these general sections may have an application that we do not intend. But I have not heard a satisfactory reason why it is necessary to have this elaboration.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had not concluded what I was going to say when my hon. friend rose. I am glad he is giving his attention to the Bill, because I know he will regard it fairly, and that his only object is to make it as perfect as possible. The hon. gentleman does not see why we should have three sections, where one was sufficient before. If he will turn to section 6, he will find that we are putting in a compact form subsection 3 of section 2. Moreover, if the hon. gentleman will look at section 5 of the present law, he will find there that several of its subsections have been dispensed with. Section 5 of the present law says :

The provisions of this Act, from section 32 to section 89 both inclusive, do not apply to every company and railway within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, but apply to——

(a) Every company whose authority to construct or operate any railway is derived from the parliament of Canada, and to every railway constructed or to be constructed under the authority of any Act passed by the parliament of Canada ;

(b) Every company and railway to which such provisions are made applicable as hereinafter provided :

2. Such provisions shall, in so far as they are applicable to the undertaking, and unless they are expressly varied or excepted therefrom by the special Act, be incorporated with the special Act, form part thereof, and be construed therewith as forming one Act ;

3. Any of such provisions may be excepted from incorporation with the special Act by enacting in such special Act that the sections of this Act propose to be accepted, referring to them by the numbers which they bear respectively, shall not be incorporated with such special Act, which shall thereupon be construed accordingly.

It is quite a complicated series of sections and subsections that are practically rendered unnecessary by our including subsection 2 and subsection 3 under section 3.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. As I said the other day, when you change your Act from the ordinary consolidation in the way I speak of, it is more difficult to get at the full meaning of the minister. Now his statement that this section is broader than in the old Act makes it more difficult for me to understand what he is aiming at.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a difficult thing to follow, I confess that.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Do I understand him correctly to say that in making these changes he is only carrying out the substantial provisions of the old Act, with such improvements as he might consider necessary, but putting them in a different order ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I think I have got everything in the new Bill which is in the old one. We have not sought to make any change except in this one particular : Under the old Act, the special Acts referred to there might not comprise local special Acts, and there have been several instances to our knowledge in which serious complications have arisen. It is not proposed, when you enact that a railway whose company has been incorporated by a local legislature, is a railway for the general advantage of Canada and thereby becomes subject to the Railway Act of Canada, that that Railway Act should be cut away in its provisions by all the enactments that may be passed in local legislatures. There must be some authority to make it clear where the final power rests.

Amendment (Mr. Lancaster), negatived, and subsection 2 adopted.

Mr. INGRAM. Not being in the House this afternoon when the question was up in respect to the words 'other than government railways' in the first subsection of section three, I simply rise for the purpose of entering my protest against this exception because I believe government railways should be under the control of the commission.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When this Act gets into operation a very short time would tell whether any complications will arise, and it will be a simple matter for parliament to amend it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In reference to subsection three, has the hon. minister a record of the railways that this clause will apply to ? Has he a schedule or list of those which will be exempted from the present operation of the Act ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

On section 4,

Where any railway, the construction or operation of which is authorized by a special Act passed by the legislature of any province, is declared, by any special Act of the parliament of Canada, to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, this Act shall apply to such railway, and to the company constructing or operating the same, to the exclusion of the whole of any other general railway Act, and of such other of the provisions of the special Act of the provincial legislature as are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. This is entirely new ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Will the hon. minister kindly explain the intention of this section ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We remove the difficulty I pointed out a moment ago; that is when a special Act passed by a local legislature comes into direct conflict with the provisions of the general Railway Act. I think we have safeguarded that point very well so that no special Acts shall have the effect of rendering this Bill practically nugatory.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. In other words, if I understand it aright, because it is very broad, it means that we are assuming that we have the right, and I do not dispute it, to legislate both positively and negatively, that we have the right to include by the mere declaration that it is for the general advantage of Canada the jurisdiction of any provinces that may have chartered a railway. I am not saying but that we have that full power, but if I understand aright that is the intention of the section, is it not ? To prevent any possible question arising we assume that we have that right ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Has the hon. minister satisfied himself that there is no question about our authority to do that ? If we have that right I heartily approve of the section. I think we ought to make that perfectly clear, provided that under the British North America Act we have that jurisdiction. Has the hon. minister the approval of the Department of Justice about that provision or did he think it was so clear that it was not necessary to consult the Department of Justice ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the British North America Act simply gave the power arbitrarily to the general parliament by a declaration to undertake control of all these works. That has been the accepted idea and no question of doubt has been expressed in regard to it. That being the case, if parliament does choose to so declare, then, it is important that we should not be confronted with two conflicting jurisdictions, that we should not have provisions of special Acts conflicting.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that where a railway company receives its corporate powers from the provincial legislature and we assume jurisdiction over it, or declare it to be a work for the general advantage of Canada and take it under our jurisdiction with the corporate powers it received from the provincial legislature, this Bill changes all the corporate powers it received from the provincial legislature and only gives it such powers as we give to any railway under the general Railway Act ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think perhaps the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals did not fully understand the question of the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). It does not change all the corporate powers of a company incorporated under a provincial Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not when they are consistent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Except in so far as they are inconsistent with this Bill. I do not think my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) quite understood that. We may declare that we take it over for the general advantage of Canada under the British North America Act. It is beyond question that this parliament has the right to legislate. This parliament is now legislating in advance by saying that when that is done then the corporate powers shall only continue in so far as they are consistent with the provisions of this Bill. There is one thing I should like to direct the attention of the hon. minister to in regard to the wording of this section. There may be some further discussion in regard to the principle. In the third line from the end you say 'the whole of any other general Railway Act.' I presume the reference is to some provincial Act, is it not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it not be better to so express it, because, otherwise, it would probably in the ordinary course have reference to the Act of this parliament. Is not the word 'other' at the end of the line superfluous ? Does it not interfere with what is intended as the meaning ? Would it not be better to exclude any provincial general Railway Act and such provisions of the special Act of the provincial legislature as are inconsistent with the provisions of the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see what the advantage would be in changing the word 'other,' but I would point out that there could be no other general Railway Act of this parliament and that it must necessarily have reference to this Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course the word 'Act' would in the ordinary course except by express mention or direct implication mean the Act of this parliament.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I differ from the leader of the opposition to some extent. We provide under this Act for the incorporation and organization of that company and under this clause we give it a new incorporation and new powers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have to have some general phraseology in order that the power may be clearly conferred. It becomes perfectly clear that if the provisions of the provincial legislation are not inconsistent with this Act they will be worked under, but if they are inconsistent, the inconsistent part must give way when the provisions of this Bill having reference to the same subject go into effect.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What would be left of the provincial enactment to be inconsistent with the provisions of this Act ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think I could answer that. If the company had already been incorporated under a special Act, then the incorporation would not be destroyed although the company might not have been organized under the provisions of this Act. In so far as the provisions of the special Act are inconsistent with this Act they would cease to be operative from the time the work was declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. It is nothing new. An exact case occurred with regard to the Western Counties Railway in the province of Nova Scotia. I had occasion to investigate the status of this railway and I found that the board of directors had continued to be constituted under the special Act after the railway had been declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, and I had to advise that the constitution of the board of directors under that Act was not valid in so far as it departed from the provisions of the general Railway Act. What is intented by the Minister of Railways and Canals would be worked out just in the same way. From the time the work is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada then you must

work out the corporate powers of your company in accordance with this Act, but it would not destroy anything that had been done before. Everything that had been done up to that time would be exactly as valid as if this Act had come into operation, but from the time this Act comes into operation you must observe the provisions of this Act which in so far as it provides for matters of that kind constitute the charter of the company in place of the provisions of the special Act under which it was originally incorporated.

On section 5,

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. This is a very broad provision and I do not know that it is not well but that we should have such a provision in a Bill of this kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the same as at present, except that the words 'through traffic' are added.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. They are very important words.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is why they were inserted.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I do not question the advisability of that, but has the minister considered whether we have authority to legislate as to highways which are largely under the control of the provinces.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no doubt that parliament must have the right to authorize the crossing of highways by railways, and when you have laid down a railway that is under the control of this parliament you must have some authority to cross the highway by that railway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why did you put in the words 'through-traffic'?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. For greater certainty.

Mr. LANCASTER. There must be some important reason for including the words 'highway crossings' in this section. Under the old Act we always had by virture of other sections such power as was necessary. This section is to take the place of section 4 of the old Act, and it is in effect the same except that in this section you have added the words 'highway crossings and through-traffic.' The prima facie control of highway crossings devolves to the municipalities through the provincial legislatures, and the other sections of this Act sufficiently provide for crossing the highways. I do not say that the section is wrong, but I think we ought to know that it is right because if we pass it without due consideration it might involve some jurisdiction over highway crossings that possibly would be ultra vires of this parliament. I would like to know from the minister whether the words 'highway crossings' are necessary in this section, and if the matter has been carefully considered from that point of view.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The inclusion of these words was very carefully considered by myself and by those who have acted with me in the preparation of the Bill. The fact that we must necessarily, if we are to enact a thorough law, have control of the crossings of railways and the crossing of highways by railways, makes it important that we should leave it absolutely free from any doubt that we have asserted and maintained the right to exercise that power. It is a protection to the public; it is a sort of police power in one sense; and it is as necessary as almost any other power that we could give to the commission, in the interest of public safety. Nobody, I think, would be justified in claiming that this was the assumption of a power which could not be usefully and properly employed in the public interest; and the fact that we have the power to make regulations for the operation of all railways within the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada, and everything pertaining to that, would put it also within our power to confer on the commission the power to regulate the crossings of railways and highways by the one or the other.

Mr. LANCASTER. I may point out to the minister that he is saying, in the last words of the section, that the Act shall apply to highway crossings, whether otherwise within the legislative authority of parliament or not. If they are not within the authority of parliament, this Act cannot bring them in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is in error in that.

Mr. LANCASTER. Suppose they are not otherwise within the legislative authority of parliament, does not that mean that this parliament has no control over them? This parliament cannot give itself control over them by simply saying so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We would not have authority as a parliament to interfere ordinarily with the public highways, but the moment we undertake to say that a railway shall be laid across a highway, then we have the power, incident to the exercise of our authority in regard to the railway; and every local or provincial power which conflicts with our power in that respect must be subordinate to it. For that reason, I think this language is quite proper in that connection.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think there is any doubt whatever that these words should be in the Act. In that respect I do not agree with my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). They are placed here for

a particular purpose. It is well known that the parliament of Canada, in exercising its jurisdiction in respect to railways, undertakes to restrict people in the use of highway crossings. They are not allowed to permit their cattle at large on the highway within a certain distance of a railway. The parliament of Canada has no right to interfere with the people locally in the exercise of their rights over the King's highway except as an incident of railway legislation. Therefore when this provision is inserted in this Bill, it is inserted for the purpose of the railway, and power is given to this parliament for such a purpose whether otherwise parliament would have jurisdiction or not.

Mr. LANCASTER. If my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is right, I understand that this Bill is extending the powers of parliament further than does the old law, which does not contain these words; and if the Bill is meant to give this commission authority over the highways, I am all the more against the section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I might ask the hon. gentleman this question. Suppose parliament has authorized the construction of a railway, through an unsettled section of the country. Population comes in, and the people require roads. Does the hon. gentleman say that the municipal authority should be empowered to declare whether any protection was necessary or not where the roads crossed the railway? Should the municipal authority be allowed to lay down a crossing over the railway without being subject to the restriction of any other power?

Mr. LANCASTER. I think so, if they made it safe.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who is to determine when they have made it safe—the council which does it or the general government through its proper officers, who are responsible for the protection of life and property wherever these railways run? The very moment the hon. gentleman says, if they made it safe, he is weakening his position; because he does not leave the municipal body which puts the crossing over the railway to judge for itself whether it is safe or not. That would never work out in the world.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I think it is clear that there must be one jurisdiction. My hon. friend from Lincoln may be right in saying that we have not that jurisdiction.

Mr. LANCASTER. I say you cannot get it by saying so, if it belongs to the municipalities through the provincial legislature under the British North American Act.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. We may not have it, even though we have power to enact it, and that is the reason I raised the point I did. But it is clear in my mind that only one parliament has it, and in my opinion we have the right in connection with the railways to take it. If we do not take it, it belongs to the local legislature. It would be a sad state of affairs if we had two jurisdictions, because the public would be always in doubt as to who had the right to assert it.

Mr. INGRAM. The word 'highway' is interpreted by the interpretation clauses, but there is no interpretation of highway crossing. Such a crossing might be overhead or underhead or on the level.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A highway crossing would be something crossing the highway, whether overhead or on the level or underneath.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What part of through-traffic is there that is not in the legislative authority of this parliament? Is it traffic that originates in a foreign country? I do not understand why you take it under this clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is merely a general statement.

On section 6,

Subject to the provisions of section seven of this Act every railway, the construction or operation of which is authorized by special Act passed by the legislature of any province, now or hereafter connecting with or crossing a railway which, at the same time of such connection or crossing, is subject to the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, is hereby declared to be the work for the general advantage of Canada.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As I understand it the object of this is to take all the provincial railways affected by this clause within the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada. These are very general terms.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. This is the old law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think the old law was that these railways should come under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada for the purpose of regulating crossings and connections.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is practically the same thing. It is to bring the conditions on which crossings shall take place clearly within the jurisdiction of the railway commission.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is a very far-reaching clause. I think that originally there was some legislation of this kind in regard to the Intercolonial Railway. I did not know that it had ever gone as far as this section contemplates with regard to other railways. The obvious affect of this will be to bring every railway of Canada under the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was the intention before.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That must be the way it works out, because railways must connect with each other. So, no railway will be left within provincial jurisdiction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have the authority, and we must either exercise it or refrain from exercising it. And I think it is clear that we should have power to direct the terms of crossings.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I have said is subject to the doubt as to whether or not that provisions of the British North America Act must be carried out by direct statement, naming the railways to be brought under our jurisdiction. I believe that question has been raised by some very eminent lawyers.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. This has been in force for fifteen years, and I believe no case has ever been carried before the court generally. This is the old clause, is it not ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This goes a good deal further than the old clause. The point referred to was raised in the Manitoba crossing case.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was the point decided in the Manitoba crossing case ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not formally decided. It was argued by Mr. Mowat and Mr. Dalton McCarthy, on one side, and Mr. Blake and Mr. Christopher Robinson, on the other. But the Supreme Court—I was going to say dodged the question. But at any rate, they got around it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They did not find it necessary to decide it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They did not even make allusion to the argument, though the matter was argued very fully. They were content to answer the questions submitted ; but the answers at least implied doubt as to our jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Even if power is given us under the British North America Act surely it ought to be exercised by specific reference to the works we are taking within our jurisdiction, either by naming the road or by stating the points between which we assume jurisdiction over the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see any special difference between the way it is done here, and the way it is done under section 306 of the Act now in force. It proceeds to name every known railway at that time, showing very clearly that parliament did not intend that there should be an exception to the rule, and after naming all the railways it declares these to be works for the general advantage of Canada—

—and each and every branch line or railway now or hereafter connecting with or crossing the said lines of railway or any of them, is a work for the general advantage of Canada.

That does not mean branch lines of these railways alone. So, it seems to be about the same thing as we have here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There might be some very fine question as to the effect of that. For instance, suppose a provincial legislature incorporates a railway, and it is built until within the last ten yards of the last half mile of connecting with the railway which connection would clearly make it a work within the jurisdiction of this parliament. At what time does it come within our jurisdiction ? What is the meaning of the words 'connecting with or crossing ? Does it only become a railway 'connecting with or crossing' when completed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. By the Act of crossing or connecting with one of these other lines, it becomes subject to the jurisdiction of this parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But might it not be argued that it comes within our jurisdiction from the very beginning of the undertaking which would necessarily bring it to the connection that makes it subject to this parliament ? It seems to me that some question might arise as to that, because after all, that which gives a provincial railway the character contemplated by the Railway Act is that to complete it, it must be brought in connection with a railway under the legislative authority of this parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that this parliament does not regard such a work as one for the general advantage of Canada until it connects with or crosses a railway that is of that character. This parliament is seized of the importance of acquiring the control of the railways in respect of crossings or connections so as to prevent crossings or connections which by the absence of proper appliances and regulations might jeopardize life.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The point raised by the leader of the opposition is well worthy of consideration. In the old law there were two sections in place of section 6, sections 306 and 307. Section 306 mentions the Intercolonial and numerous other railways, which, it says,

Are hereby declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada, and each and every branch line of railway now or hereafter connecting with or crossing the said lines of railway, or any of them, is a work for the general advantage of Canada.

That to a certain extent recognizes the principle that the Minister of Railways has evolved in this new section, though he has gone a step further, because he has drawn on the future to the extent of saying that any railway hereafter——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is in the old Act.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE—connecting with any railway constructed under the authority of the parliament of Canada. Technically, I can point out one thing that may happen, and that will be dangerous. Supposing we incorporate a railway that we do not declare to be for the general advantage of Canada, yet under this clause it would be covered.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We cannot do that if we are incorporating it in a province.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. We can incorporate a railway without declaring it to be for the general advantage of Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Within the limits of a province. Can we incorporate a company to construct a railway which should be wholly within the limits of any one province without declaring that work in terms to be for the general advantage of Canada ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. But supposing it is in two provinces ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then it becomes so of necessity.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The point is technical, I agree, but it deserves consideration. If we go further than we ought, it might be held ultra vires. In the old Act we went on to say :

Every such railway and branch line shall hereafter be subject to the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.

But we are leaving that out here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we do not repeal this.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. But it says :

The provisions of any Act of the legislature of any province of Canada——

We are leaving that out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we do not propose to leave out either of these two sections, we propose to except them from the general provisions of the repeal clause, to leave in force these two sections 306 and 307.

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest to the minister that it would be much safer in this clause to adopt the course pursued on a former occasion and name all the provincial railways it is proposed to bring under this section. It is a serious question to these provincial companies to be left in doubt under what jurisdiction they may be. That may cause serious trouble, especially to roads now under construction. It will be very little trouble to name all the railways that will be affected by this clause. If parliament can enact the clause as it is drawn. I see no reason why it may not do away with entirely with the whole provincial jurisdiction. If the minister can do what he proposes to do here, he can deprive the provinces of all power of railway legislation. In order to protect the companies that he is dealing with, it would be far better to name them specifically and thus avoid doubt.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must confess that what the hon. gentleman suggests impresses my mind favourably. It might be desirable to think it over, and I will let the section stand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It can be easily done by adding as subsection 3 something like this : The railways referred to in this Act shall, without restricting the generality of the foregoing provisions, include those set forth in the schedule to this Act.

7. Street railways and tramways, while hereby expressly declared to be subject to such of the provisions of this Act as are referred to in section 5, shall not by reason only of the fact of crossing or connecting with any such railway as mentioned in section 6, be taken or considered to be works for the general advantage of Canada, nor to be subject to any other of the provisions of the Act.

2. This section shall apply to all electric railways (as distinguished from electric street railways) passing through or over the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park, or through or over the property of the province of Ontario lying upon or along the Niagara river and known as the Chain reserve.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This withdraws from the operation of the general clause which we have allowed to stand, all electric railways, so that the mere fact of crossing a railway which is within the legislative jurisdiction of parliament, does not thereby make it subject to such jurisdiction. It is identical with the existing law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Generally you take jurisdiction over the crossings and connections.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, we do that, and we say that the mere fact of crossing does not make it a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. Supposing a tramway is chartered from the province of Quebec to the province of Ontario, how does this Act affect such tramway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see that it would affect it. Any electric railway that parliament has created, of course continues subject to parliament, and therefore would not fall within clause 7, because clause 7 only applies to these electric railways which have been created by a provincial legislature and which, by reason of their crossing a Dominion railway, are not made thereby works for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Do these street railways and tramways include electric railways running out into the country and gathering freight for large railways ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it does not. It is for the committee to consider whether it will be desirable to do that. Subsection 2 of section 7 says :

This section shall apply to all the electric railways (as distinguished from electric street railways) passing through or over the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park, or through or over the property of the province of Ontario lying upon or along the Niagara river, and known as the Chain reserve.

Mr. LANCASTER. That only applies to Niagara Falls.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know. You might put in there, if it is desirable to do so that railways which are carrying freight, so far as their freight business is concerned shall be subject to control of the committee.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I should think it would be most desirable indeed. We have an electric railway in our district that does more business than a great many steam roads in gathering freight and transferring it to other steam roads. This Bill would be of very little use to the people of that section if these electric railways were not included because a large quantity of freight originates with this road. Hundreds and hundreds of cars are collected every season. The road is some twenty-five miles long and runs through the whole fruit district.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does it connect with the Dominion road or is it merely a local railway ?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). It connects with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo and Michigan Central.

Mr. INGRAM. Tramways are only in their infancy, but within the next few years there will be a great many constructed and in order to control freight rates the commission ought to have control of the rates on tramways. Some provision ought to be included in this Bill giving the commission this right.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is incidental to the discussion we had on the express business the other day. I pointed out to the hon. minister an example of goods shipped over the road that the hon. member for Wentworth speaks of in his county, and the hon. minister told us that if these goods were handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway at Hamilton they would be under the control of the commission and therefore it was not necessary to make any further provision in regard to express business. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Smith) desires, and I agree with him, that this commission shall be empowered to deal with the freight business of an electric railway of that kind. This is entirely a provincial railway. That road only runs from Beamsville to Hamilton and I do not know that this commission could be given power over it. I do not say that it cannot, but I think it is right that we should draw the hon. minister's attention to it. The hon. minister will remember that the other day we were discussing the case in the committee of express goods shipped from the county which I represent over this electric road, which is purely a provincial railway, and in no sense within the contemplation of section 3 of this Bill (which is the section that says what this Bill is to apply to) and transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Michigan Central, at Hamilton and then coming down to Ottawa, or Montreal, or going some where else. The hon. minister explained that by virtue of the words 'through-traffic' in section 5 the commission would have jurisdiction over express goods of that kind as being through-traffic, but, now, we are getting just half the case I put. The hon. member for Wentworth desires and I agree with him that freight shipped over that road shall be under the control of this commission. What bothers me is whether this parliament or this commission can control such freight under the wording of section 3 as drawn and as passed by this committee, because that railway is in no sense brought under the jurisdiction of the commission. That is a section regarding the application of this Bill and it was stated the other night, and I think must be admitted by all parties that the Bill does not apply to a provincial railway which does not cross or connect with any other railway which is under the jurisdiction of this parliament. The Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway begins at Beamsville and runs to Hamilton. It is entirely a provincial railway. I quite agree with the hon. member for Wentworth that the fruit growers ship a great deal more fruit over that road than they do over the Grand Trunk Railway which is the only other road they can possibly use. I quite agree with him that this road ought to be under the control of the commission. I think it is a serious question and one which has perhaps not been thought of whether you can exercise control over that road at all by this Bill or by this commission, it being purely a provincial railway.

Mr. INGRAM. There is another point in connection with this and it is the collection of freight on short lines and exchanges by tramways. We know that the tramways in several districts of the country are used for the purpose of changing cars between short lines and trunk lines. They are used as feeders for the trunk lines. They take cars from the trunk lines, the cars are left on the small lines, and when they are loaded they are handed over to the trunk lines again. If the tramways do not come under this Bill great abuses might arise as between the trunk lines and the short lines.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not aware that the carrying of freight on electric railways had developed to any considerable extent in Ontario, or to the extent which hon. gentlemen have stated. They have not established any business of that kind in the maritime provinces or in the city of Montreal so far as I am aware. No doubt the future will find very great development in the construction and operation of this class of railways. They will be found to be inexpensively run and it will be possible to do a great deal of business over them ; so that, the question would require to be considered.

Mr. INGRAM. There are fifty miles under contract now in my district.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Contemplating freight business?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member for West Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has not quite fully stated my view upon the question as I gave it the other day and it would not be a correct statement of my view upon the present point. I admit that as far as my own opinion goes this parliament would not have control over electric railways constituted by the provincial legislatures, even though they were doing a freight business purely and simply, but I am quite clear that while direct control cannot be exercised over them, such as we exercise over other railways, an indirect control is capable of being exercised when the business is done in the ordinary way. If a man who has a carload of merchandise to ship at Beamsville by the electric line and the Canadian Pacific Railway to some point on the Canadian Pacific Railway beyond, consigns those goods in that way, the Canadian Pacific Railway could not name a rate which would not be subject to the control of the railway commission. Therefore, it will be dealt with as through-traffic would be within the jurisdiction of the commission. But, on the other hand, if freight were carried on an electric railway as far as the electric railway would take it, if it were consigned to some one at the end of the railway, and he made a consignment on a further bill of lading in the absence of any freight rate, if there was a special rate simply for carriage on the electric road, and a distinct and separate rate for carriage on a railway, then I have my doubts as to whether the commission would reach that.

Mr. LANCASTER. The case I put to-night is the case of stopping at the terminus of the electric road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know how we could overcome that. I think it will be felt in practice that as a general rule where goods are sent straight through, the railway company would be very much more disposed to give a favourable rate than they would if it were done the other way, and the through route would become the much more advantageous method of sending the goods than would the other, and being advantageous it would be adopted, and being adopted, it would come within this law.

Mr. INGRAM. So far as these sections are concerned, if they are going to exclude tramways from their operation the Bill is not worth the paper it is printed on in reference to sections of the country that rely on tramways to remove their freight. If you gave the commission power to control the rates over those tramways it would be in the public interest.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite of opinion that it would be desirable if possible to include control over tramways which do a freight carrying business. I will think that over and perhaps I may come to a conclusion in the sense suggested. I was not aware that there was any considerable amount of merchandise carried by these tramways.

Mr. INGRAM. People are now very anxious to construct these railways solely with the object of having their freights removed to the trunk lines. If these tramways were to charge high rates there would be no relief to the sections of the country in which they are operated.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will let the first subsection stand, and I will consider it.

Subsection one of clause seven allowed to stand.

On section 8.

The Railway Committee of the Privy Council is hereby abolished and, in lieu thereof, there shall be a commission, to be known as the 'Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada,' consisting of members who shall be appointed by the Governor in Council, at any time after the passing of this Act, and from time to time as vacancies occur. Such commission shall be a court of record, and have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed. Each commissioner shall hold office during good behaviour for a period of ten years from the date of his appointment, but may be removed at any time by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons; and shall cease to hold office upon reaching the age of seventy-five years. Each commissioner on the expiration of his term of office shall be eligible for reappointment. One of such commissioners shall be appointed, by the Governor in Council, chief commissioner of the board, and shall be entitled to hold the office of chief commissioner so long as he continues a member of the board ; and another of the commissioners shall be appointed by the Governor in Council, deputy chief commissioner of the board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS move that section 8 be amended

by striking out after 'governor' in the eleventh line, the words 'General on address of the Senate and House of Commons,' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'In council for cause.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the reason for the change ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The opinion of Council, in going over the Bill, was that it would be desirable to place the members of the commission very much in the same position as lieutenant governors under the British North America Act. It is a very cumbrous proceeding to invite the action of the Senate and House of Commons by an address. Cases might arise in which it would be very important and desirable that prompt action should be taken without waiting for a session of parliament.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the object of extending the term of appointment to ten years ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The period of the tenure of office varies a good deal in various countries. The hope is that by affording a reasonably long tenure of office to the appointees, we shall secure a good class of men. I think it would be practically impossible to expect that any gentleman qualified to fill this position, and being engaged in active business life, would throw that business up to take up a position of this kind for a short term, and be subject to all the loss which would be incident to such a state of affairs. I think any shorter period than ten years would be a mistake.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman provides that each commissioner shall be eligible for reappointment. If his conduct were satisfactory, he would be appointed again. If a man, after his appointment, turned out to be undesirable, then I suppose the government would exercise their power to remove him by action of the Governor in Council. If the term were shorter, he would be put on his good behaviour, because by doing his duty for the shorter term he would secure his reappointment.

Section agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that the blank in the fourth line be filled up by the word 'three.'

Mr. INGRAM. Are we not entitled to know the class of men to be appointed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can only say that the intention of the government is to select the best class of men we can get for the position.

Mr. INGRAM. Railway men, lawyers, or what ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have intimated my own view that it would be desirable to have a lawyer, and a lawyer of some railway experience or knowledge. Then, it would be necessary to have a man of some knowledge and experience in the matter of operating railways, if we could get such a one ; but that is a question which is not yet solved. We have not yet begun to consider the personnel of the commission, but we shall have to give it attention as early as possible. The difficulty of getting men now filling responsible positions in the railway service of the country who would be likely to accept a position of this kind, would be very great ; but we shall do the best we can in that regard. Beyond that I cannot go.

Mr. INGRAM. Has there been any representation made for a prominent farmer to be put on the commission ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have had representations for men in various positions of life, and I do not know that I can say that the farmers have been an exception in that regard. We have not really got so far as to give much thought to the personnel of the commission.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand, from the complaints the farmers are making throughout the country, that they have very serious grievances against the railways in the matter of rates. I presume the hon. gentleman will do his duty by the farmers of this country, and have some important farmer appointed on this commission.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We shall try to see that the interests of the farmers are safeguarded as much as possible.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be well to call this body the railway commission of Canada instead of the board of railway commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is much easier and simpler and more convenient to speak of it as a board. I do not think there is any objection to that word, and it is a very appropriate term.

Mr. SPROULE. It is always referred to by the press as the railway commission and all the petitions ask parliament to establish a railway commission.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The railway board is declared in the interpretation clauses to mean the board of railway commissioners for Canada.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the object of making this board a court of record ? You are providing also that it shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The court seal is evidence of

itself. All the orders and regulations of the board are judicial determinations, and go out as such.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Clause ten virtually provides that the chairman and deputy chairman must be lawyers, because; no matter what may be the opinion of the other commissioners, the decision of the chairman or deputy chairman on the question of law must be accepted by the others.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 10,

Not less than three commissioners shall attend at the hearing of every case, and the chief commissioner (or in his absence the deputy chief commissioner), shall preside, and his opinion upon any question, which in the opinion of the commissioners is a question of law, shall prevail. In any case where there is no opposing party, and no notice to be given to any interested party, any one commissioner may act alone for the board.

Mr. INGRAM. There is too much law in this thing. Three commissioners are to be appointed, two of whom must be lawyers. Where are you going to get the different interests represented? The common sense man is certainly left out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We must treat this section with particular respect, because it happens to be an exact transcript of the English Act. I think, however, we had better let it stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 11,

No commissioner shall be disqualified to act, by reason of interest, or of kindred or affinity to any person interested in any matter before the board; but whenever any commissioner is interested or of kin or affinity to any such person, the Governor in Council may either upon the application of such commissioner or otherwise, appoint some disinterested person to act as commissioner pro hac vice. The Governor in Council may also appoint a commissioner pro hac vice in the case of sickness, absence or inability to act, of any commissioner.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose that we add to this subsection two :—

No commissioner shall hold, purchase, take or have interest for his own behalf in any stock, shares, bonds, debentures or other securities of any railway company subject to this Act, nor shall directly or indirectly have any interest in any device, plans, machine, patented process or article or any part thereof which may be required or used as a part of the equipment of railways, or of any rolling stock to be used thereon, and if any such stocks, shares, bonds, or other security, device, plans, machine, patented process or articles, or any part thereof or any interest therein, shall come to or vest in any such commissioner by will or succession for his own benefit, he shall, within three calendar months after the same was so given to or vested in him, absolutely sell or dispose of the same or his interest therein.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the result of this section. It does not seem to provide any sanction by this qualification by penalty. Perhaps it is provided further on in some subsequent section of the Act, but as it stands there is simply a prohibition.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was not thought desirable to put it in the Bill in a form making it illegal for a commissioner to hold stocks, &c., lest, one of the commissioners might inadvertently invalidate the action of the commission. I think that, having declared that no commissioner shall hold these things, we can rely upon the Governor in Council enforcing it. It seems to me that the control of the government would be more effective than any other.

Mr. BARKER. This clause will only prohibit a commissioner from holding stock for his own use?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Should it not go further? Should it not prohibit him from holding such securities either for his own use or for the use of other persons? Otherwise he might hold them for the use of a member of his family.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think this is the clause in the English Act.

Mr. BARKER. But there is no reason why we should not improve upon that. I think a commissioner should not hold stocks either for himself or for anybody else while he is a commissioner.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see any particular objections in providing that. But it may possibly cause some hardship. A man might have some stocks in a trust capacity and could not well relieve himself of his trusteeship. This seems to be pretty amply covered by providing that he shall not hold stocks on his own behalf. I have no doubt that, in framing the English Act they felt that this would be as far as it would be reasonable to carry it.

Mr. BARKER. The object is to prevent the commissioner having any interest that might make him act in a manner contrary to his duty as commissioner. Holding these securities his judgment might be warped, but in the same way his judgment might be warped if he were holding the securities for his wife.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to accept the suggestion without consideration. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) desires it I will consider the point. Let the section stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 12,

Each commissioner during his term of office reside in Canada in such part thereof which may, from time to time be designated or allowed by the Governor in Council.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to amend that so as to fix the residence of the commissioners at Ottawa. I move to strike out all the words after the words 'reside' and insert the following: 'At Ottawa in Canada.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. 'At or near Ottawa' is a better phrase. That is the judges' rule, and the designation of the Railway Act is within five miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 'At or near' is very indefinite. But there might be cases in which the Governor in Council could extend it to advantage. I will submit a new section, and in the meantime this might stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 13,

It shall be the duty of the board to hold sessions, and to hear any complaint, matter or thing determinable by the board or do any act, consistent with the power vested in the board as provided in this Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that section thirteen be expunged, and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

The commissioners shall devote the whole of their time to the performance of their duties under this Act, and shall not accept or hold any office of emolument inconsistent with this section.

Motion agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 15,

Whenever special circumstances render it expedient to hold sessions without the city of Ottawa, the board may, subject to the approval of the minster, hold the same in any part of Canada.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Will the minister suggest some circumstances under which the board might sit in other places than Ottawa? I know that people generally regard this as a very important feature of the commission, that is, its accessibility; and if the commission cannot be moved from Ottawa except under very important circumstances, it would detract a great deal from the value of the commission.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would suggest that instead of the words 'special circumstances' some words be inserted like the 'public business' or 'convenience of the public.' Let them do like the judge of the exchequer court. He is supposed to sit in Ottawa, but if the convenience of the witnesses require it, he sits in other places, because it is easier for one man to travel about than for a dozen people to travel to him. There might be a large number of fruit growers or farmers from the west who wished to appear before the commission to give evidence, and in such case it would be better for the three commissioners to travel to St. Catharines, or Hamilton, or Toronto, or wherever these people might live, than to bring them all the way to Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The object of this section is to enable the commissioners to do exactly what the hon. gentlemen desire them to do, that is, the court may be a migratory tribunal, and wherever the convenience of the public can be best served, it would certainly be the duty of the commission to move about. They may, for instance, need to go to some locality to view the ground, a variety of circumstances might arise which would render it expedient for the commission to meet in the locality where the controversy has arisen. But I would be willing to strike out the words 'special circumstances' if there is any objection to them.

Mr. LANCASTER. It would be better, because otherwise the commissioners might think it was their prima facie duty to stay in Ottawa, and they were not to move except when there was special reason.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am willing that the word 'special' be struck out.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would also suggest that the words 'subject to the approval of the minister' might as well be struck out too, so that the commissioners might have the right to go whenever and wherever they thought best. I am not saying the minister would improperly withhold his approval, but they might not always be able to reach him conveniently.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At first I was of the opinion that this power of moving about should be subject to some supervision, as of the Governor in Council, because when left to their own discretion any tribunal might travel about the country for the purpose of junketting when they imagined they were on public business. Visits to other towns would always be attended by more or less expense, which has to be paid for out of the public purse. On further consideration, it seemed to be rather a cumbrous thing to leave it to the Governor in Council to deal with requests of that kind, and I thought it would be more expeditious to leave it to the minister or the acting minister to grant the power to hold sessions without the city of Ottawa. It might be desirable that the commissioners should be able to state to the minister when they wished to go on an expedition of this character.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you not say the same of your exchequer court judge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is only one judge to begin with. When there is no business to do he cannot create a business, the business arises in the locality, and it is not a matter of discretion at all. But it is a different thing when there are three men with their clerks.

Mr. LANCASTER. I believe it is contemplated that there shall be an appeal from these commissioners to the Governor in Council. Am I right about that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then, the Minister of Railways and Canals who would start them on their journey to any particular place, would, to a certain extent, be prejudging the matter before they heard it and he would be hearing an appeal from their decision afterwards, because, he is one of the tribunal known as the Governor in Council and probably the most prominent one in a railway matter. I do not think the hon. minister should know anything about it beforehand, or should have anything to say about what the commissioners should do. I think that this commission would have the confidence of the people to a greater extent if we left that approval out.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood that we were to have a railway commission free from any political bias, but I find amendments with a political flavour are inserted too often to bear out that contention. Of course, I do not mean to insinuate that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals would abuse his position for any political advantage, but this course is not in keeping with the promise made in this House and throughout the country that this was to be a non-political commission, and that it would deal with questions independently of political considerations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to see how you could make it any more so.

Mr. INGRAM. I think if this section is to be amended in the direction which the hon. gentleman suggests we might as well not have any railway commission at all. We might as well go back to the old practice of leaving these questions to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The hon. gentleman recommends certain things and as a rule the recommendations of the hon. gentleman would be carried out. If the hon. gentleman felt disposed to use his position for political effect he could easily do so. Farmers are complaining about drainage across lands and other complaints are made in respect to railways and if the commissioners are not to have it in their power to leave Ottawa and go to any particular district to remedy a complaint, I cannot see what use this commission is going to be. They should be perfectly independent in regard to that. The minister must remember that their proceedings are subject to the condemnation of the Governor in Council. If they do not meet with the opproval of the Governor in Council, or if they do anything that cannot be justified before the Governor in Council, he can dismiss them. Therefore, I think it would be unwise to amend this Bill in the direction which the hon. gentleman suggests. It would be better to leave it to the commission and hold the commission strictly responsible for their conduct.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be a little confusing if when an application were made to this commission to redress grievances that existed in a certain locality, and it was necessary that the trial should take place there the commission would be obliged to say : We must first get the consent of the Minister of Railways and Canals ? Would it not raise the question as to whether they would have to apply to the minister to get his consent for the commission to go there and then apply to the commission to take up the case ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not attach very much importance to it. Hon. members seem to think that it might hamper the commission some way. I would yield to their suggestion and strike it out. I move :

That section 15 be amended by striking out the word 'special' in the first line and by striking out the words 'subject to the approval of the minister' in the second and third lines.

I do this the more readily because I quite realize that if it should be found necessary to include any restricting clause it can always be done by parliament.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 16,

The commissioners shall sit at such times and conduct their proceedings in such manner as may seem to them most convenient for the speedy dispatch of business ; they may, subject as in this Act mentioned, sit either together or separately and either in private or in open court, but any complaint made to them shall, on the application of any party to the complaint, be heard and determined in open court. Any members of the board shall constitute a quorum and no vacancy in their body shall impair the right of the remaining commissioners to act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why do you keep in the word 'private ?' This is a court record.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If any party to the complaint wishes to have the matter heard openly it may be so heard. I presume it will be open, but there may be occasions when it might be desirable to sit in private.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In their deliberations they might sit in private, but in hearing cases they ought not to sit in private.

Mr. INGRAM. For instance railway companies and their employees have difficulties

and it may be very important that there should be private or secret conferences in the matter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The commissioners have nothing to do with that.

Mr. INGRAM. The commissioners have to do with matters of rates or grievances.

Mr. SPROULE. They would have nothing to do with any grievances with reference to labour troubles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a court of record and as such it should not sit in private.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is not familiar with the proceedings of courts of record.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It should not hear cases in private.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The board of railway commissioners in England sits in private, although it is a court of record and it is especially authorized by law to do it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, I know. This is a copy of the English Railway Act, but I do not see any reason why a court of record, unless it is making up its judgment, should sit in private.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose it was dealing with the matter of rates ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then the public have a right to know all about it.

Mr. INGRAM. It might be necessary to exclude a certain party from the court in reference to a matter of that kind.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The objection is now that some case might come within the rule, but this section gives power to the commissioners to hear all cases in private.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not if any of the parties complaining desire that the court shall be open.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the parties agree in not desiring a public hearing why should they not be allowed to have a private hearing ? I beg to move :

That the word 'two' be inserted in the 25th line and that after the word 'quorum' the remaining words be changed so as to read : No vacancy in their body shall impair the right of the remaining commissioners to act.

Motion agreed to,

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will be taken to-morrow.

Mr. INGRAM.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will go on with this Railway Bill as the first government Order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And go right along with it to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes ; in the evening possibly there may be Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to give notice that when the House is next moved into Committee of Supply, I will move an amendment substantially as follows :

This House is of opinion that the tariff of customs duties should give such protection to iron and steel industries as will not only secure to our own producers and manufacturers the Canadian market in articles now produced or manufactured in this country, but will also develop and sustain the manufacture in Canada of other iron and steel products which at present are imported in large quantities from other countries.

And that the present tariff of customs duties should be now readjusted on this principle.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have delayed for a few days on account of the absence of the Minister of Finance, as I thought it would be desirable that he should be present when the motion is made. If the House is to be moved into Committee of Supply to-morrow, I will move this resolution ; not with the idea that it shall necessarily be regarded as a motion of want of confidence, but with the hope that the government may, notwithstanding the declaration of the Minister of Finance in his budget speech, be inclined to give consideration to the ideas expressed in the resolution and to act in accordance therewith.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 2, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 189) to incorporate the Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company.—Mr. Birkett—by Mr. Taylor.

Bill (No. 190) respecting the Queen's College of Kingston.—Mr. Harty—by Mr. Logan.

THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to call the attention of the House to a matter that is both serious and of a pressing nature. The rumour has circulated from time to time —in fact it was announced to the House— that a commission would be appointed to

investigate the granting of concessions in the Yukon Territory, and, amongst others, the Treadgold concession. Since then the rumour has been consistent that Mr. Justice Britton, of the High Court of Justice of Ontario, has been appointed a commissioner to make inquiry into these matters. It is also stated that a gentleman who is a civil engineer will be associated with Mr. Justice Britton to conduct the inquiry, and that Mr. Lacombe, a member of the legislature of Quebec, will be, or has been, appointed secretary of the commission in question. I shall put myself in order by moving at the end of my remarks that the House do now adjourn. This morning the papers announced that Mr. Justice Britton has actually left Kingston on his way to Dawson. Now, it seems to me that this is a most extraordinary way for the government to treat the House. Here we are in session; this matter was discussed in the House the other day; the announcement was made, as I said a moment ago, that a commission would be appointed to investigate; and now, all at once, we learn, not from the ministry, but through the public press, that the appointment has actually been made and that Mr. Justice Britton, with another gentleman, will carry on the investigation. It seems to me that it was the duty of the government, first of all, to inform this House of the appointment of the commission, of the names of the gentlemen who would be charged with this difficult and important investigation, and also to submit to the House—as I think was almost promised some time ago—the terms of the commission under which Mr. Justice Britton and the other gentlemen would act. This matter is of a grave nature, and I take it that the members of this House have a right to know what were the instructions to be given to Mr. Justice Britton. These instructions should have been submitted to us, so that we could have seen whether or not in our judgment they were sufficient and covered sufficient ground.

Now, this matter is of more importance than the ordinary mortal would believe at first sight. Not wishing at all to refer to a debate which has already taken place in this House, let me simply call attention to the fact that the principal denunciation of what took place in the Yukon in regard to these hydraulic concessions was brought to the notice of the government by the government's own friends. When the member for the Yukon went before the electors the very first questions which were put to him were whether he would have the Treadgold concessions cancelled, and whether he would have the other, or the hydraulic, concessions cancelled also. Let me read to the House—because they will bear repetition—some of the questions which were put to him at the time when he went before the people as the government candidate in the Yukon. One of the questions was this:

Will you agree to advocate for and insist upon the cancellation of the Treadgold concessions?

Will you pledge yourself to advocate and insist upon the punishment and exposure of officials both in Dawson and Ottawa by whose fraud or culpable negligence or inefficiency those concessions were granted in the first instance, or are now continued in force after the same by their terms should be cancelled?

. . . .

Will you support the appointment of a commission of five persons of whom two shall be nominated by the premier, two by the leader of the opposition and one by yourself to inquire into the administration of the Yukon country, both local and federal in all departments and report?

I believe the member for the Yukon was not present at the time in Dawson city, or near Dawson city, and he could not answer these questions; but a gentleman well known to this House, a high official of the government, the Gold Commissioner for the Yukon, Mr. Congdon, wrote in answer to the questions as follows:

Dawson, November 4, 1902.

Sir,—I beg to say that your questions were received and forwarded to Mr. Ross at too late a date for it to be possible for him to have answered them by this time. I know the views of Mr. Ross as well as any one can and have no doubt he will advocate the course of action you suggest in your questions.

Now let me call the attention of the House further to the fact that it is requested in these questions that there should be punishment and exposure of the officials, both in Dawson and Ottawa by whose fraud or culpable negligence and inefficiency these concessions were granted; and to this the member for the Yukon, by his agent, by his friend, by his right hand man in that territory, answered that he would see to it that this commission was appointed, not a commission of one man or of two men, but an absolutely impartial and independent commission, the members of which were to be appointed by the premier, by the leader of the opposition and by the member for the Yukon himself. Now, Sir, that is not all. When the member for the Yukon was nominated by the Liberal convention, here are the resolutions which were put to him:

Resolved that the government be requested immediately to make careful examination and obtain reports upon the subject with a view of cancelling forthwith the Treadgold concession, and undertaking such supply as a national enterprise.

Resolved, that in the opinion of this convention many of the concessions now held were obtained by fraud and imposition; that it is in the interest of this territory that such concessions should be annulled, and to that end that inquiry should be set on foot to ascertain the circumstances of such fraud and imposition, and action taken by the Attorney General of Canada in the premises.

And the member for the Yukon, in a letter in answer to the resolutions which

were passed at that convention nominating him, wrote as follows :

With this in view I shall advocate the reduction of fees, &c. . . . the thorough investigation of the charges of fraud made in respect to the manner in which certain concessions are alleged to have been obtained, and if such fraud is established the immediate commencement of such proceedings as may be required to vacate the grants, and the enforcement of strict compliance with the conditions embodied in all crown grants in the Yukon.

And furthermore, at a meeting of the Liberal club, held at Dawson, this resolution was passed :

That an inquiry may be set on foot to ascertain the circumstances under which the leading hydraulic concessions were obtained, in order that action may be taken by the Attorney General of Canada in the premises.

Now, Sir, it will be seen that, not members of the opposition, not gentlemen in any way connected with the party which we represent in this House, but the very friends of the government allege that the Treadgold concessions and the other concessions were obtained by fraud, by false representations, and that the government was, as it were, imposed upon by certain parties, and they asked that a thorough investigation be made of this fraud, not, as I said before, by any body who would be open to the least bit of suspicion, but by an independent and impartial tribunal. Sir, I do not wish to say anything in disparagement of the character of Mr. Justice Britton. We knew him here in the House, he was a very estimable member of the House, until some time after the last general election, when he was appointed to the bench, either in 1900 or 1901. Now it seems to me that Mr. Justice Britton was not a fit and proper person under the circumstances to be charged with this most important inquiry. He comes, as it were, from the very hotbed of politics, he is fresh from the political arena ; and although he may be upright and honest, he is like every one of us, a man, and he must have his political leanings. Now I ask, is it fair to Mr. Justice Britton himself, is it fair to those who have brought these accusations of fraud and misrepresentation against the government, against officials of the government, and against ministers themselves, is it fair that an inquiry of this nature should be put into the hands of Mr. Justice Britton, and that Mr. Justice Britton should be put into this position, that he is between the fulfilment of his duty which he will swear to accomplish, and his political leanings ? Because, Sir, although, as I said before, he may be perfectly honest, he may be perfectly upright, he cannot fail, like every one of us, to have his political leanings ; and having been associated so long with hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, having been a devoted supporter and partisan of theirs, having been appointed only lately to the bench, is it possible they can have in him that confidence they would have in such an independent and impartial tribunal as was suggested to the member for the Yukon by the Liberal convention. Why, Sir, it is well known—and this is not in disparagement of the character of Mr. Justice Britton, I take it—it is well known that when he was a member of this House during the last parliament and a part of the present parliament, the government had no more ardent and no more active supporter than the judge himself. When an investigation was asked for and a committee appointed to investigate matters pertaining to the administration of the affairs of the country by the government, for instance, into that question of military rations for South Africa, and I believe also in the question of the West Huron and Brockville elections, Mr. Justice Britton was appointed by the government as the best man they could probably get to defend the government in those two matters.

That is not all. If we look at the 'Hansard' what do we find ? We find that upon these very questions of the administration of the Yukon, Mr. Justice Britton expressed his opinion on several occasions. We all know that when a judge has expressed his opinion upon a matter that afterwards comes before him, or upon a matter similar to one which afterwards comes before him to be adjudicated upon in his official capacity, the judge recuses himself by his own motion, or if he does not, he is recused by the parties interested. On the 13th of April, 1899, my hon. friend for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) moved an amendment to the Address to His Excellency with regard to the maladministration of the Yukon. Mr. Bertram, who then sat in this House, moved an amendment to the amendment expressing satisfaction at the prompt action taken by the government with respect to this maladministration. Mr. Justice Britton, then a member of this House, voted in favour of the amendment of Mr. Bertram. Again on the 28th of June, 1899, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, the senior member for Pictou, moved a resolution with respect to the maladministration of the Yukon. A vote was taken on the 29th of June. It is true that Mr. Justice Britton did not vote on that occasion, but he was paired for the government with a member on this side of the House. On the 31st of May, 1900, the senior member for Pictou moved another resolution respecting the maladministration in the Yukon, and Mr. Justice Britton spoke upon the motion in opposition to the arguments which had been given to the House by the senior member for Pictou. At this time also he did not vote, but he was paired again for the government. On the 28th of June, 1900, the junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) moved a resolution upon the same question, and again Mr. Justice Britton spoke in defence of the government upon this resolution, and voted with the government against the resolution.

Now, Sir, it seems to me that under the circumstances the choice of Mr. Justice Britton as a commissioner to investigate these serious frauds which are charged by supporters of the government is an unfortunate choice, unfortunate for this House, unfortunate for the country and unfortunate for Mr. Justice Britton himself. I would like to know what the terms of the commission are under which Mr. Justice Britton is acting. Have counsel been appointed to conduct the investigation, because we all know it is a complicated matter, it is a matter which requires a good deal of study and preparation, and such an involved case as this, without saying anything against gentlemen who do not belong to the legal profession, is a matter that should be placed in the hands of counsel so that a prepared brief could be made up and an effort made to get at the bottom of facts as to the manner in which these concessions were granted. Where is this commission going to sit ? We have seen it in the papers that Mr. Justice Britton is leaving Kingston for Dawson and that he expects to get there in twelve days. I remember that some time ago a challenge was thrown down to us here by the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) to go before this commission, make our accusations and try and support those accusations with evidence. Are we to leave our duties here while this House is in session and go to the Yukon at our own expense ? Are we to lose our time and not to perform the duties which are imposed upon us as members of this House and go to the Yukon to conduct this investigation or to lay our charges before the commission ? What opportunity is given us of conducting an investigation into these very serious matters ? It seems to me, that, parliament being in session, that this House being now met for the discussion of the affairs of the country, the proper course to have taken would have been to appoint a parliamentary commission to investigate these matters. If a parliamentary commission had been appointed during this session we could certainly have brought witnesses down from the Yukon territory at less expense than it would have cost us to go up there and conduct the investigation. And besides, as I mentioned when I read the questions put to the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross), this alleged fraud was committed not only in Dawson but also here in Ottawa. Then, it becomes, of course, the duty of Mr. Justice Britton and of this commission to sit also in Ottawa, but if this commission is to sit in Dawson and Ottawa also, certainly, that is another argument in favour of the appointment of a parliamentary commission which could go fully into this matter and report to the House, so that the House during this session would see whether or not any charges which have been brought against the government and the ministers are well founded and whether or not any of the hydraulic concessions were, as the resolution of the Liberal Club said, obtained by fraud and misrepresentation. Let me tell the House that there are ugly rumours afloat about the granting of this concession. I am not repeating anything that is not said on the street every day. I am not repeating anything that is not said in the corridors of this House, and it is constantly repeated that large sums of money have passed between the grantees of this concession and certain gentlemen in authority. These are questions which should, in the interests of this government be investigated also. If these rumours are not true, if these rumours are ill-founded, then, so much the better for the credit of the government and the credit of the country. I stand here as a member of this House wishing that the government for the credit of the country shall wash its hands completely of these accusations which have been brought constantly and persistently against the members of the administration. I beg, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) were not so credulous as he has shown himself to be, and if he had exercised a little of the judgment with which Providence has endowed him, he would not have made the statements which he now makes. My hon. friend has been caught by a rumour and he has risen simply because he has read in the newspapers that Mr. Justice Britton has left for Dawson City. All I have to say is that if he has read this rumour he should have taken the trouble to verify it before saying what he has said, because I can inform him that there has been no communication with Mr. Justice Britton except to ascertain whether or not he is agreeable to serve upon the commission. Nothing has been done with Mr. Justice Britton up to the present time except simply to ask him whether or not he is willing to serve as a commissioner to go to the Yukon to inquire into the matters which have been referred to the commission. My hon. friend says now that there are rumours now going on the streets that large sums of money have been paid to high officials of this country, and he expresses the hope that the government will wash its hands of these accusations. The government will not appoint a commission simply to investigate rumours. If the hon. gentleman will take the responsibility of these rumours by making a statement upon the floor of the House and asking the judgment of the House upon it, the government would be prepared to appoint a commission to investigate his accusations. But the hon. gentleman is not serious, surely, when he tells us that we should appoint a commission simply to investigate wild rumours. I am about the corridors of this House as much as the hon. gentleman is, I am about the corridors every day in the week. I have not heard of these rumours. Perhaps they have been heard by those par-

ties only who are interested in hearing them. So far as I am concerned, I have not heard these rumours. If any member of the House of Commons will take it upon himself, according to parliamentary usage, to give voice to such rumours, then he shall have all the investigation that he wants. In regard to the charges made by the hon. gentleman against Mr. Justice Britton, I think he must himself admit that they are equally uncalled for. One of the best members of the Ontario bench at the present time, I think is Mr. Justice Britton. Mr. Justice Britton is human, as my hon. friend has said. He may have had his political leanings and he had in the past, but is my hon. friend prepared to say that because a man has had political leanings he will not be an upright judge ? That would be a severe indictment against the bench of Canada, because men on this side or on the other side who have been appointed to the bench have had their political leanings, but still, I do not think that the bench of Ontario has ever been charged with political partisanship. I know that men have been appointed to the bench from the Liberal side and from the Conservative side who have in their day had strong political leanings, but I have never known of a judge who ascended the bench against whom the charge of partisanship has been laid. Though Mr. Justice Britton, when he was here, may have had political leanings, still, I am not prepared to say that Mr. Justice Britton would not be a most admirable man to perform the duties which he has to perform. Mr. Justice Britton has had large experience in the province of Ontario as a drainage commissioner ; he understands, therefore, something of hydraulics, he understands something of the questions which are to be investigated in the Yukon, and that is one of the reasons why we selected him to perform the duties which he is to perform. It is true that while Mr. Britton was here he voted on a motion which was made charging maladministration in the Yukon. When Mr. Britton gave that vote at that time, I do not know that he did not give the very vote which he should have given as events have developed. We have heard a good deal about maladministration in the Yukon, but these charges are now proved to be futile and worthless, to have nothing in them, and if anybody has to recant or apologize for the vote which he gave on that occasion, it is not those who voted as Mr. Britton did, but rather those who voted in favour of the motion against which he voted. I have nothing further to say in defence of the character of Mr. Justice Britton. I do not believe that there is a single man who ever appeared before Mr. Justice Britton since he has been on the bench, who will be ready to countenance the charges made against him by my hon. friend. As I understand, everybody in the province of Ontario is satisfied with his judicial spirit, with his impartiality, with his efficiency, and I have reason to believe that he will perform the duties of this commission as ably as he has performed his judicial duties. It is quite proper that before Mr. Justice Britton proceeds upon his mission, the terms of the commission should be laid upon the Table of the House. The commission shall be laid before parliament before Mr. Justice Britton proceeds to Dawson, and before he takes charge of the matter. We shall not avail of the invitation to invite the advice of parliament as to what should be the character and terms of that commission. We shall proceed according to parliamentary rules and usages. We are responsible to parliament for whatever we do. We exercise our duties to the best of our judgment, and when we have put them in concrete form we submit them to parliament and it is for parliament to pass upon them. If, when we bring down to parliament the instructions given to Mr. Justice Britton, they are not satisfactory to my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) it will be for him, if he chooses, to move that other instructions be given, but we are not prepared in advance to say that we should consult parliament as to what instructions should be given in this investigation. For these we are responsible. Unfortunately they cannot be brought down for a day or two, and the reason why they are not brought down to-day is that the gentleman we wanted to associate with Mr. Justice Britton has given us notification that it would not be convenient for him to serve upon that commission. I do not know that I have to say more than this at the present moment. The commission will be brought down in proper time, and if it is not satisfactory to my hon. friend it is open to him to move any kind of motion he wishes in connection with it. Just now I have only to protest against the assumption of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) that a man whose record has been most honourable up to the present time, is not fit to discharge the duties with which he has been intrusted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The House might be very much impressed with the earnestness of the right hon. Prime Minister, if we had not had some illustrations of the same earnestness on some somewhat similar occasions heretofore. Nothing could have been more delightfully earnest than the right hon. gentleman when he got up to tell the House some years ago how desirous he was that there should be a thorough and sweeping investigation into the West Huron and Brockville elections ; and when he assented at once to sending these matters to the committee, the right hon. gentleman was eloquent on the subject—the purity of parliament must be preserved; no stream could be pure that was polluted at the source and elegant phrases of that kind. And the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was not far behind him. And then, when we went to that

committee, this gentleman against whom no charge had been made by my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) but in reference to whom only certain facts have been stated—this gentleman was one of the men put forward on that committee to fight the battle of the government and to protect the men who were being charged as being criminals. He is one of the men who voted in that committee that my witnesses, whom I brought there, should not be heard until the criminals themselves had first been put upon the witness stand. I have nothing to say against Mr. Justice Britton, except that he was a very intense partisan on all occasions in this House; a very intense partisan indeed; a man whose character led him to be such; a man of very intense opinions. I do not know that I am saying anything to his discredit in that, because there are a great many intense partisans on both sides of the House here to-day; but I do say that it is a remarkable thing that Mr. Justice Britton who has just only left the arena of politics, should have been selected, and that the government should have seen fit to appoint him, before every other judge in Canada, for this particular purpose, especially when as pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) he had been present during four debates on the maladministration of the Yukon; he had spoken in two of those debates, and he had voted or had been paired on every occasion when a resolution was proposed to the House, and on every such occasion he had voted against any such investigation as was demanded from this side of the House.

Now, these are not charges against Mr. Justice Britton; they are simply facts that no gentlemen in this House can controvert. Under the circumstances, I join with my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) in regretting that the government saw fit—having so wide a choice among the judiciary of Canada—to select Mr. Justice Britton for this particular occasion.

This matter has been brought up, and it has been discussed in parliament, and my right hon. friend says that the government would be prepared to grant any investigation that is demanded from this side of the House when charges are laid. Did we not lay charges from this side of the House once before, and did not my right hon. friend call upon his followers to vote them down, and were not they voted down, and was not the investigation that was proposed refused, although the hon. gentleman on this side who made the charges stated from his seat in parliament, that he would consider it his duty to retire from public life, and would consider himself incapable of holding any office in the gift of the Crown. unless he made good the charges he read before the Speaker of the House. And yet my right hon. friend stands up and says that if any hon. gentleman will make charges, that is all that is necessary, and an investigation will be granted at once.

The right hon. gentleman promised most definitely to bring this commission down not later than to-day. He said it would be brought down yesterday, but not later than to-day, and he tells us now that it has not been brought down because one of the commissioners has not consented to act. Is there any particular reason why we should not see the terms of the commission. Cannot the commission be brought down in blank, so that we can read the terms of it and understand whether there is any proper provision made for safeguarding the rights of the public. My right hon. friend must remember that very serious things have been said against this condition of affairs in the Yukon. I do not desire him to take the statements in the independent press; I do not desire him to take statements from people who are interested in any way as political partisans on the Conservative side; but I ask him to take the statements made by his own friends in the Yukon; by Liberal conventions; and I ask him to realize then, if he can, that this is somewhat a serious situation so far as the standard of public life in this country is concerned. For example, we have a convention of the Liberals of the Yukon in which the statement is made :

> That the commissioner should be requested to represent to the government that in the opinion of this meeting the insertion of such features in the Order in Council can only have been procured by gross misrepresentation and fraudulent concealment.

Further on

> Resolved, that in the opinion of this convention many of the concessions now held were obtained by fraud and imposition. That it is in the interest of this territory that such concessions should be annulled and to that end that an inquiry should be set on foot to ascertain the circumstances of any such fraud and imposition and action taken by the Attorney General of Canada in the premises.

It is the political supporters of my right hon. friend who are voicing the sentiments of the Yukon in this way. It is not any independent opinion; it is the opinion of those who are supporting this government; business men in the Yukon who sent the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) to represent them in this House. And the hon. gentleman from the Yukon (Mr. Ross) in adopting this platform used this language :

> I have received a copy of the platform adopted by the convention which honoured me by its nomination as a candidate for the House of Commons. I freely subscribe to every measure suggested therein.

And further, the question was put to him :

> Will you pledge yourself to advocate for and insist upon the punishment and exposure of officials both in Dawson and at Ottawa by whose

fraud or culpable negligence or inefficiency those concessions were granted in the first instance or are now continued in force after the same by their terms should be cancelled.

And the answer given by the gentleman (Mr. Congdon) who is now the commissioner in the Yukon was, that Mr. Ross freely subscribed to everything stated in that platform. Under these circumstances, especially as a strong voice from the Yukon demanded that there should be an independent commission appointed, a commission in which the government, the opposition, the people of this country independent of the government or opposition should be represented, it might well have become the government and my right hon. friend to submit to the House in the first place, as he did in the case of the judicial investigation into the electoral frauds, the terms of the commission, in order that they might be discussed in the House, and that such steps might be taken as would insure a prompt and thorough investigation into these alleged frauds which have been referred to by the right hon. gentleman's friends in the Yukon. There is a precedent for that course in the proposal for the judicial investigation into the electoral frauds. In that case my right hon. friend brought down the commission before it was issued, in order that it might be discussed in this House. It was discussed in this House; suggestions were made, in some of which the late Minister of Justice, the late Hon. David Mills, acquiesced, and the commission was amended in accordance with those suggestions. In view of the gravity of the charges made on all sides in this matter, some of which have not been mentioned in the House, though I have no doubt they have come to the right hon. gentleman's own ears—at all events, they have appeared in the public prints in the Yukon—I say it might well have become the government to bring down the terms of the commission and have them discussed, as was done in the case to which I have referred. However, the right hon. gentleman has seen fit to adopt another course; he has seen fit to appoint a commission of his own choosing. What precautions are to be taken in the terms of that commission for safeguarding the public interest I do not know; because, although the commission was promised us to-day, we have not yet had an opportunity of perusing it. But, in view of the facts already brought to the attention of the House, the rumours, the more than rumours—the statements made in the public press of this country in regard to this matter—I think the right hon. gentleman has not taken the wise course in neglecting to take the House and the country into his confidence in regard to the terms of this commission, before he settled them and before he appointed commissioners for the purpose of making the investigation. Therefore, I think that my hon. friend from Montmorency was perfectly justified in bringing this matter to the attention of the House to-day, and that it would have been far better if the government had pursued in this case the same course which they pursued in the case to which I have referred.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I rise merely for the purpose of saying that I entirely concur in what has fallen from the lips of the hon. leader of the opposition, and particularly in the suggestions made by my hon. friend from Montmorency. The right hon. leader of the government is, I think, mistaken in saying that my hon. friend from Montmorency made a charge against Mr. Justice Britton. He made no charge of any kind at all; but what he desired was that the ordinary rules of administrative decency should be followed in this case as in every other. There is no question that in litigation, at all events in our province, Mr. Justice Britton would be debarred from sitting in this case, having on many occasions previously expressed an opinion, not exactly, perhaps, on the particular question involved, but on questions akin to it, and that he would have excused himself for that reason from sitting on the case. Under these circumstances, it seems only right and proper that my hon. friend from Montmorency should have conveyed to the government his sense, which is the sense of many other members of this House, of what is decent and proper in connection with this investigation. The right hon. leader of the government treats lightly the accusations which my hon. friend from Montmorency brought to the notice of this House. It may be that my right hon. friend is not aware of all the rumours, as he contemptuously calls them, which were circulated in respect to this affair; but I am perfectly convinced that if the right hon. gentleman were more in touch with what has been stated for weeks in regard to this matter in all the cities of the Dominion he would see that it is far too important a matter to be investigated by a man who has so recently occupied the position in politics which Mr. Justice Britton occupied. I am very pleased to hear from the right hon. gentleman that there has been as yet no acceptance by Mr. Justice Britton of this important mission; and I feel convinced, from my knowledge of that hon. judge, that taking all the circumstances into consideration, he will refuse to act on this commission, as I think it is his duty to do. There is another point which I think deserves to be brought to the attention of this House, and that is that Mr. Justice Britton, or whoever is going to investigate this matter, is to begin his investigation in the Yukon. Now, the Yukon is the country which has been aggrieved by this nefarious transaction, and it may be proper that that transaction should be investigated on the spot; but unless that investigation is made primarily here, and unless we have the opportunity of hearing, before those charged with the investigation, the people

concerned in the transaction, most of whom are to-day in England, the real facts of the case will not be brought out. Because it must be not unknown to the hon. gentleman sitting on the treasury benches that serious charges have been made before the public—that it has been stated time and again by responsible men—and there is not a member of this House, I am sure, who will not corroborate what I say—that these concessions were only obtained by the payment of sums of money, as the hon. gentleman from Montmorency has said, to persons occupying high and controlling positions. The sum has been mentioned. It has been stated that a document was signed in connection with that transaction, and that that document is to-day in the city of London. Everybody knows that, and I demur to the proposition of my right hon. friend that a man is obliged, when he hears these rumours current in the public, when time and place and circumstances are stated—when it is stated, for instance, that my right hon. friend himself, when he was in England, was made aware of certain circumstances connected with this matter——

The PRIME MINISTER. I deny that absolutely.

Mr. MONK. So much the better, Mr. Speaker; but I say that has been stated, and I demur to the proposition that we are here for the purpose of bringing accusations.

The PRIME MINISTER. Do it, then. Do it, then.

Mr. MONK. We are here for the purpose of conveying to the House the sentiments of the public and what is stated by the public. I deny that my function is to go around finding accusations against ministers or against my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House. But when we hear these things stated constantly and continually, I say it is our duty, as representatives of the people, sitting here in the interests of the people, to bring these statements to the notice of the House and government; and it is then for the government to have the facts fully investigated. That is my interpretation of the duties devolving upon us, and I demur entirely to the proposition that when we make the House acquainted with matters charged not only by the Liberal Association of the Yukon, but in the public press, it is our duty to make an accusation when we have no personal knowledge of the facts; but it is the duty of the government in the presence of the public to have a full and complete investigation. That is my proposition. I venture to say that unless we have just such an investigation by men entirely disconnected with politics—and when I say that, I am casting no reflection on Mr. Justice Britton, for there is not a man whom I held in higher esteem when he sat in this House, but he has been too recently in the political arena for his judgment to give satisfaction to the public in a matter of this kind—I say that unless we have such an investigation, public opinion will not be satisfied. That is the ground I take. Unless we have the statements under oath of the men who engineered this concession, unless we have the explanation given by these men of this transaction, the public will not be satisfied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I only wish to make one reference to what the hon. gentleman has just said. The proposition advanced by the hon. gentleman is an amazing one to come from one who has had so much parliamentary experience. He says that if rumours are abroad reflecting on the integrity of any member of the government, and a member of parliament informs the House that rumours of this character are in circulation, the duty devolves on the government of appointing a commission for the purpose of having the matters investigated concerning which these rumours are circulated. Let me ask my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier and the hon. gentleman beside him if, in all their experience in public life, they have ever known of any such principle having been laid down before, or, if laid down, having been acted upon. Is it conceivable that the duty of gentlemen in opposition is to gather up all the garbage they can find and then constitute themselves into channels for spewing that out into parliament? And when they do undertake such a task, are we to be told that it is the duty of the government to appoint a solemn tribunal in order to find if there is any warrant for these slanders? Why, the government which would adopt any such course, would simply make itself contemptible in the eyes of the whole people. It would not only make itself contemptible but ridiculous, and would take up all the time it should devote to the discharge of the public duties in pursuing investigations of this character. One hon. gentleman after another gets up and says that there are rumours in London and in every city in Canada, that this or that minister has been conducting himself in a discreditable manner. They do not pretend to go into particulars, they simply state that they have been informed that certain discreditable things have occurred. They do not even say that they believe their information but that there are people who do believe it. If that principle were to hold, what would this parliament be doing? Why, every member of the House who approved of that sort of proceeding, who revelled in scandal, who wanted something to do, would take up some yarn and seriously retail it to parliament and then ask parliament to appoint a commission.

Mr. MONK. Why did you appoint a commission?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall tell my hon. friend in a moment. But I want to know whether a

more absurd and more startling proposition ever emanated from any responsible member of parliament? I for one do not think that any member of this House, outside of my hon. friend, would seriously desire to commit himself to any such a declaration. Now, I shall tell the hon. gentleman why a commission was appointed. No commission was appointed or intended to be appointed for the purpose of holding any investigation into rumours which hon. gentlemen have brought here and which they say are in general circulation. No such commission is contemplated, but simply a commission for the purpose of deciding whether or not the method which the government has adopted for solving the problem of mining in the district is the best method that could be adopted. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to do any nosing around to see if they can get hold of something or other on which they can hang some reflection, they are at liberty to do so, but if they want any importance to be attached to their statements, they will have to take the responsibility of saying that they believe, at all events, that somebody has done wrong before they can ask, with any confidence or any reasonable degree of justice, for the appointment of a commission of investigation. Therefore I say that there is no good sense in the hon. gentleman's proposition.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). I listened with delight to the remarks just made by the hon. Minister of Railways, as I always do to all his statements. His speech was both eloquent and forcible, but it reminded me of the words of the old song: Like the flowers that bloom in the spring, it had nothing to do with the case. It was all very well for the hon. gentleman to call upon members of this side to make charges and assume full responsibility for matters of which they have no personal knowledge, but we were told that the government have appointed a commission. It was not we who asked the government to appoint a commission, but the government who announced that they had appointed one. From the lips of the right hon. the Prime Minister, we had that information, and accepting it as true, it cannot be out of place for hon. gentlemen on this side to endeavour, to the best of their humble ability, to assist the government in making that commission as efficient as possible. There are two possible objects of a commission. One is to disclose the truth and the other is to suppress it. Surely we are not to suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite have gone through the farce of appointing a commission in order to deceive themselves and the country and suppress the truth? Surely they cannot complain if we charitably assume that, in appointing a commission, they honestly desired to ascertain the truth? If that be the case, they cannot object if we make a few suggestions regarding certain features of this commission. I would be sorry to say a word against the hon. Mr. Justice Britton. No member of the bar of Ontario would support me if I were to say a word against his ability or integrity, but when we remember that Mr. Justice Britton who committed himself with regard to these charges when he accepted a seat in this House, we may assume, without any disparagement of his ability or integrity, that should his decision not be in conformity with the preconceived ideas formed by the general public, they will conclude that justice has not been done. And, Sir, we all know that it is almost as bad to have the public, or a large section of the public, believe that injustice has been done by the bench as it is actually to have such injustice done. Now, in the province of Ontario we have had a little experience of commissions. We have had commissions and commissions. We had a commission in the western part of the province appointed as this apparently is, a commission of judges, to investigate certain election matters. No provision was made for a prosecutor, no provision was made for the purpose of arranging to bring the charges home to the parties accused, no provision was made to have witnesses brought—simply one counsel appointed for the commission. From one end of the province to the other, Conservatives and Reformers all know that the only result was to bring not only commissions but the bench itself into discredit, because of the failure, in fact, the complete travesty of justice that was exhibited. We have had a second commission, a most important one in Toronto, the sittings of which have just been closed. Perhaps it would not be out of place, as the report of this commission is not yet down, to say that everybody thinks that that commission, composed of two of our most eminent judges, endeavoured to the best of their ability to elicit the truth no matter who might be hurt. In that case, we had those who were prosecuting and those who were defending, both appointed by the government, as though it were felt by them that the public, after all, were the people most interested, and that if counsel was appointed to assist one side, counsel should be appointed to assist the other side; if witnesses were wanted, it should not be left to the parties who might be making the charges to go to the expense of bringing those witnesses to prove a thing which, after all, was in the public interest. So, I venture to think that the right hon. premier would make similar provision to that of our recent Ontario commission and have counsel for the prosecution as well as counsel for the government, and give counsel for the prosecution power to bring witnesses and pay them and do whatever might be required to be done. I venture to say that when the commission made its report the public would have confidence in that report. I have here the remarks made by the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) as to the scope of the com-

mission in this case now under discussion. In giving his views as to the scope of that commission, the hon. gentleman said :

I would also say to my hon. friend who tells us that he is so desirous of investigation that I am sure he must well know that it has been long the fixed intention of the government to hold such an investigation. The hon. gentleman must remember that, when the election was held, promises were given to the people of the Yukon that there would be a commission to inquire into the whole administration of that territory. There has been no opportunity since that date until the present to send in commissioners. I doubt if navigation is more than open, even if it is yet open. When the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) returns to Ottawa—he is at present in British Columbia, I understand—and we can have the benefit of his advice, it is our intention to fully carry out the representations made to the citizens of the Yukon to have a full investigation into all charges or suspicions that hon. gentlemen may be good enough to mention or entertain in regard to any matters connected with the Yukon administration. I give that public notice to my hon. friend, so that, in addition to the advantage he has had of ventilating his views on the floor of this House, he will have an opportunity to make good, if he can, any of his charges or suspicions before a tribunal where newspaper extracts and letters will not be the only evidence, but where gentlemen will have the privilege of pledging their oaths to the truth of all they say.

It will be a matter of interest to this House, when the commission has actually been laid on the Table—and I presume some day it will be—if any of us live to that interesting day—to compare the utterance and the promises of the hon. Postmaster General with the statements just made by the hon. Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair). I am afraid that it will puzzle the ingenuity of even the right hon. the premier to reconcile the promise on the one hand and the statement on the other. I have no desire to go into the merits of the case, but surely it would not be out of place to remind hon. gentlemen opposite, when they so glibly call upon gentlemen on this side to make charges assuring us that there will be an investigation, of the tone and feeling on the other side of the water. It is but a short time since a British minister of the Crown, a gentleman against whom nothing was charged, but who simply happened to be a director in a company whose transactions had not been altogether creditable—though nobody, not even his enemies suggested that he had any knowledge or connection with these matters—yet, even of the company in which he was found it was deemed necessary, because of the pressure of public opinion, for him to resign his seat, which he promptly did. If that spirit were to be shown here, if hon. gentlemen read the newspapers in the Yukon, read the resolutions of the Board of Trade of Dawson, read even the utterance of their own political friends assembled in convention, I am sadly afraid there would be at least one vacancy behind my right hon. friend the premier before the present session is much older. We trust to that, hon. gentlemen opposite, in bringing down the commission which we looked forward to with hope and expectation, will help to realize the good opinion which we wished to have of them by allowing us to assist them in making this as perfect an investigation as can be made. For, surely, laying aside partisanship and viewing this simply as a Canadian, in view of the charges made in the British newspapers, in the newspapers of Dawson, by the Board of Trade of Dawson, by the vote lately taken by the elected members of the Yukon council, and by the statements made in this House this afternoon, there is no man who has pride in his birthright as a Canadian, who does not feel that, in the interests of our country, and as a defence of its fair fame and honour, these charges should be either proved or disproved at the earliest possible day.

Motion (Mr. Casgrain) to adjourn negatived.

ATLANTIC FAST LINE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) whether or not he has anything to communicate to the House with regard to the tenders for the Fast Atlantic Service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I expect to be in a position to do so within a day or two.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). There were three or four sections that were held in reserve until they might be considered and sections drafted. The first of these is clause (e) of section 2. It may be remembered that an hon. gentleman from Manitoba suggested that there were in his province political divisions which were not called counties, and that it might be desirable to add some words to meet such cases. I propose to insert, after the word 'division' in the seventeenth line, the words 'to that,' so that it will read 'or like division to that of a county.'

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. If there is any division except that of a county in any province, would it not be better to use the name given to that division in the province itself?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are divisions like counties, but they are not called counties, they are called municipalities.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Then why not use the same technical name that is used in the province to designate the division ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This amendment I propose will sufficiently meet the case.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Now, in the same section, in clause (k), I propose to strike out the word 'passage' in the thirty-third line and insert the word 'public.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think clause (m) also stood over. The minister was going to consider what I said about giving that jurisdiction to county judges, because it would be a great saving of expense.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have considered that, and I think there would be no objection to it.

Mr. SPROULE. In clause (k), which reads :

The expression 'highway' includes any public road, street, lane or other public or communication other than a farm crossing.

It seems to me there might arise cases where it would be desirable to give the commission further power. For instance, a farmer might wish to subdivide his property and sell 50 acres of it. Now, the party who buys that 50 acres would also require a crossing over the railway, and the company are not always willing to give it, in fact sometimes they have refused to give it. It seems to me this commission ought to have authority to look into such cases and adjust them. There may be other cases where a portion of a lot is surveyed out for villa purposes, and another crossing is necessary over the railway. Also the railway has refused to allow travel over its road except by the farmer who owns the farm, and only for the purpose of doing work on that farm. This was done at West Toronto junction. Such cases are likely to arise, and we should provide that this commission shall have power to adjust such difficulties.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the law already sufficiently provides for what the hon. gentleman mentions. If he will turn to section 196 of this Bill, he will find that every railway company is required to make crossings for persons across whose lands the railway is carried. If the company refuses, it can be compelled to do so by the commission.

Mr. SPROULE. The company claim that they are compelled to make only one crossing for a farm. If a farmer sells 50 acres off his farm, the company may refuse, and has refused, to make another crossing for the convenience of the new owner. Now, this clause (k) in the interpretation section, only provides for a public road or communication other than a farm crossing. I think the commission should have power to consider the right of a farmer to have more crossings than one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have no provision in the Bill, except section 196, to deal with such cases, and that section makes it incumbent upon the railway companies to give the farmers a crossing. I do not know that we should require that the company should be compelled to give every person a crossing who wants it.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me state an instance that came under my own notice. The front portion of the farm was sold as far back as the railway, but the farmer reserved along one side of the line sufficient width for a road to the rear of 50 acres of his farm. It is doubtful whether the railway will consent to give him another crossing, because it is claimed that they gave him one crossing at the centre of the farm. He has reserved the right of way alongside the line fence of the farm, but part of the farm, because the balance of his farm is on the other side of the railway. I think he should be entitled to get a crossing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The right of way is reserved ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you mean that the person who owns the land behind owns the right of way ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That on one side he only owns enough land to give him the right of way, and that on the other side is a large portion of his farm ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The object would be to make connection between the two ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am inclined to doubt whether this section will cover that point, but I will consider it. I do not think we could alter the case by amending clause (k) of section 2.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Section 196——

Mr. SPROULE. Section 196 does not meet the case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I admit it does not meet the case, but that is a proper clause to amend when we come to it, and before we get there we can think it over. I realize that what the hon. gentleman complains of is entitled to consideration. I beg to move :

That subsection (m) of section two be amended by inserting after the word 'superior' the words 'or county.'

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 4,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that section 4 be amended by striking out the last three lines of the section and substituting the following:

Such of the provisions of the special Act of the provincial legislature as are inconsistent with this Act and in lieu of any general railway Act of the province.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before passing from that section, I would like to call attention to these words in the third line: 'by any special Act of the parliament of Canada.' Does that refer only to Canada since the British North America Act was passed, in 1867?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but we have another clause that provides for railways incorporated prior to that time.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How do you apply this Bill to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which received its incorporation before 1867?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Section 306, which is not repealed, declares the Grand Trunk Railway to be a railway for the general advantage of Canada, and, therefore, it is subject to this Bill.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The difficulty that the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) points out is this: In the old Act we named every road. The danger is that by cutting all that out and by attempting to cover the ground by a general clause we are rendering it open to question whether a railway such as the Grand Trunk Railway, which got its incorporation from the old province of Canada before Canada was confederated comes under the operation of this Bill. It is just one of those things that we have to watch very carefully. The old way may seem longer and more cumbersome, of naming the roads, but if we do not get our general language right, we may not cover the ground that is intended to be covered by these words.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is the hon. minister perfectly clear that the words 'by any special Act of the parliament of Canada' apply to legislation passed by the two old provinces?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think they do apply.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am sure of it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 6 is adopted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to strike out the citations of the Acts as we go along.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do you think it wise to take them out?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We always do.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is a very great advantage when you consolidate an Act to have the references at the end of a section to show where it came from. That subject was pretty carefully considered at the last revision in our own province and the references were put in. Where a statute was taken from the statutes of Great Britain, or of Ontario, or of our own province, the reference was put in. It frequently facilitates the work of any one who undertakes the construction of an Act, because he is able to know whether or not it is taken from any other enactment upon which there has been a judicial decision. I think that unless there is some objection you should leave the citations in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We might consider that point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) know what course is being pursued in respect to the present consolidation of the statutes?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We are indicating the source. It is very convenient.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is very convenient.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We have revised several of the most important statutes and we have followed that course. It is of very great convenience to the profession to be able to go back and find the origin of a statute.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has the Minister of Justice in his mind that they should be struck out as we go along.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They should be continued. Where you proceed as in the case of the state of New York and in Quebec by numbering the sections consecutively, they omit the reference, but for convenience it would be better to follow the old system and give the reference.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In one of the western states, opposite the section they give every judicial decision upon it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That has been suggested but that is going too far.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is absurd.

On section 7,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The suggestion was made yesterday by the hon. member (Mr. Ingram) that where electric railways were doing 'a freight business and charging tolls for the carriage of freight they ought to be included in the Bill. On consideration I have decided to propose an amendment to be inserted at the end of subsection one of section seven, which will bring such railways within the scope of the Act. This section provides that they shall be exempted, and I propose to add the words :

Unless such railways or tramways carry freight traffic and charge tolls therefor.

Mr. BARKER. If they carry freight will they be considered as works for the general advantage of Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I think so. If there is any doubt in the hon. gentleman's mind I will add some words to make it clear.

Mr. BARKER. I simply wish to know whether if they carry freight they shall be considered works for the general advantage of Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, in crossing or connecting.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 10,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to strike out the words in brackets

Or in his absence the deputy chief commissioner.

and to substitute

And the chief commissioner when present shall preside.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 12,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose that this section shall read

Each commissioner shall during the term of his office reside in Ottawa in Canada or within five miles or within such distance thereof as the Governor in Council may at any time determine.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 21—staff of board,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose that the following be inserted as the first subsection :

The Governor in Council may, from time to time or as the occasion may require, appoint one or more experts or persons having technical or special knowledge of the matters in question, to assist in an advisory capacity in respect of any matter before the board.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not intended to give them any voice in the proceedings beyond advising ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are not to be members of the board, but simply advisers, like assessors in the courts.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 24,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to have the words 'orders and' inserted after the word 'make.' The clause would then read :

The board may make orders and regulations—

—with regard to the matters covered by these various subsections.

Mr. BARKER. Are the words of this section broad enough to cover electric railways, just one car through the streets of a city or its suburbs ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

On section 24, subsection (a),

Limiting the rate of speed at which railways, trains and locomotives may be run in any city, town or village, or in any class of cities, towns or villages described in any regulation ; and if the board thinks fit the rate of speed within certain described portions of any city, town or village, and allowing another rate of speed for another portion thereof, which rate of speed shall not in any case exceed six miles an hour unless the track is properly protected.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to strike out all the words after 'thereof' in the thirty-third line. This would leave it to the discretion of the board what the rates should be. I do not think it right for us to limit their discretion too much.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think we ought to go quite so far as that. These commissioners are given very wide powers under the Act; but this is a matter which involves such dangers to the travelling public in different localities that, I think, it would mean that the commissioners would be assumed to do what it would be almost impossible for any commissioners to do satisfactorily. It has been the law for a good many years under the present Railway Act that there must be some general limitation to speed in cities, towns and incorporated villages. The section of the present law which this is to replace says :

—which rate of speed shall not in any case exceed six miles an hour, unless the track is properly fenced.

Now, there have been a great many decisions in our courts under that section. Not to take up unduly the time of the committee, I would say generally to the minister, that these decisions have not been at all such as the railways can complain of. They have been against the protection of the public more than some of us representing the people here, and more than most of the people, think they ought to have been. We

shall go still further if you take all limitation away and allow these commissioners to say what shall be the rate of speed at every crossing throughout the whole Dominion of Canada. With no limitation whatever they might have as many rates of speed as there are crossings. The minister will probably say: We must expect them to be reasonable and be governed by some regular rule. But it seems to me it would be better to carry out something like the old clause. If the minister thinks, for instance, that the limit of speed must be raised, that, living faster than we used to do, we should travel faster and be allowed to cross streets at a higher rate of speed in cities, towns and villages, I would be ready to consider whether it would be well to make the figure eight or ten miles an hour instead of six. But to say that this commission shall have no guiding rate at all, no standard that it shall be allowed to make any rate it sees fit at any crossing, that it is not bound to make them alike or consistent with one another, would be very much against the interest of the travelling public. Of course, there is no question about railways being liable to damages if they do not use ordinary caution. But damages do not pay for lives. There have been a good many accidents at these crossings at the older points in Ontario. At Grimsby, not very long ago, three young people from eighteen to twenty years of age were cut off in an instant while crossing Depot Street. They were returning from church and went behind a freight train which had just passed when an express train going the other way at a very high speed sent them into eternity in an instant. It is true that their people are entitled to recover damages for the loss of their lives; but that is not the point—the point is to avoid killing people. The Act is not provided as a means of enabling people to get money for the loss of life, only because the railways are responsible, and as the way to make them careful is to make their carelessness cost them money.

But that is no real quid pro quo, that is no real compensation to anybody for the loss of those that are dear to them. The travelling public who cross a railroad must be made safe as well as those who travel on the railroad at a high rate of speed. We have heard a good deal lately in regard to the safety of the travelling public on trains. But there is another class of the travelling public that has to use the highway when trains happen to be passing, and they have just as much right to be protected, and the commission for that purpose ought to be restrained in some way. If the ministers were to make a change of that rate from six to eight or ten miles an hour, I would not have so much to say about it; but I protest against striking out the last words of this section and permitting the commission to allow a railroad train to run at any rate of speed the commission may see fit. I do not think this commission will go to every village, town and city in the country to look at the different crossings, and unless they do, they cannot be certain as to what is the proper rate of speed for the train to make in such town or city. All railroad crossings are not equally dangerous, they are dangerous according to the lay of the land, and to other local circumstances. Sometimes a train comes into view all at once, at other times a train can be seen coming for half a mile. Therefore the danger is not at all the same at all the crossings. I submit there is no way of deciding as to what rate of speed is safe at any crossing unless you see that crossing itself, and see the geography, the hills, the hollows, the levels, the buildings, the trees and the state of the land. Therefore it would be a mistake to allow the commission to give the companies power to run at any speed they see fit unless they do so under certain restrictions. To give the commission power to let them run at any rate they like, without any guide or restraint, is asking the commission to do what is practically impossible; they could not do it unless the trains were limited to a comparative low rate of speed of six or eight miles an hour. Unless the minister thinks that trains should be allowed to run much faster than that, he ought to make this Bill read so that the commission should be guided as they are under the old Act.

While on this section I would like to point out that the words in the first line 'limiting the rate of speed at which railway trains and locomotives may be run in any city, town or village,' those words 'railway trains and locomotives' are rather inapt in view of the language of the Act. He has amended the first line by making it read that the board may order and make regulations limiting the rate of speed at which railway trains and locomotives may be run. I want to point out that the word 'trains' in his interpretation clause has a much wider signification than the words 'railway trains and locomotives.' I suggest that he use the word 'trains' instead of 'railway trains and locomotives,' because the word 'trains' in the clause (cc) of the interpretation section includes any engine, locomotive or other rolling stock. Now any rolling stock, whether it be railway trains or locomotives as described in this section 24, ought to be governed by the section, and the word 'trains' would make it cover all other rolling stock such as electric railway trains or single cars. The words 'railway trains and locomotives' have no extended meaning in this Act, they are not described in any interpretation clause. Therefore, in reading section 24 we really seem to be given to railway trains and locomotives their ordinary meaning, whereas if we use the word 'trains' it will include engines, locomotives and other rolling stock, the word 'trains' would cover everything that passes over the road. I would also point out that in the

present Railway Act, where the words 'railway trains and locomotives' are used, they have not the same meaning in the existing law as in the Bill before us. Therefore, to make this section effect what it is designed to effect, that is to protect people at crossings by giving the commission power to regulate the speed, it must mean anything that crosses in the shape of an engine or anything that is used upon a railway. We should either say 'railway trains, locomotives or any rolling stock,' as suggested by the hon. member for East Elgin, or else give the word 'trains' the meaning it has in the interpretation clause.

Mr. INGRAM. This is a very important part of the Bill, because the railways throughout the country are doing their utmost to increase their rate of speed in order to compete with each other. The public generally want to travel at a very high rate of speed. I want to point out that if we frame a law confining railways to a speed of six miles an hour in villages, towns and cities, then the railways cannot run at the speed they are scheduled to run at the present time. There are no railway rules and regulations made in this country that can be carried out to the letter. Every railway in this country is violating from day to day the regulations that we have laid down for them. No railway in this country can be run by the regulations that are in existence to-day. I want to point out that if the public want railway trains to run at a high rate of speed, then it must be proper to increase the rate at which they should pass through cities, towns and villages. There is no use in framing regulations that will be a farce, because they will be a farce if they are violated. In the next place I want to say that if we are going to restrict railways to a speed of six miles an hour, when an employee is put on an engine for the purpose of taking a train through to its destination within a time which will require a rate of speed far exceeding the rate which we lay down, then if an accident occurs in the city, town or village, it is not the poor employee who should suffer but the railway company itself, because it is the railway company that gets the benefit of the increased rate of speed. At present, whenever a railway accident occurs in a city, town or village, the employee is brought forward at the coroner's inquest, the rules and regulations are produced by the company, and if it can be shown that the employee has exceeded the rate of speed laid down in the rules and regulations he is made to suffer for the accident. That is unfair to the employee, because unless he has made the rate of speed required by the company, they say to him: We don't want your services any longer, and we will get somebody else. For my part I am opposed to putting this imposition upon the railway employees. If a company and the traveling public get the benefit of increased speed I see no reason why the employee should be made to suffer. I think if this rate of speed is entirely too low in view of the clamour in this country from the public for an increased rate of speed on railways, I feel more like increasing the rate to twelve miles an hour than making it six miles an hour. We have a large number of railway crossings that are not properly protected. It will properly be a subject for parliament to consider whether railway crossings in thickly settled districts, or in towns and villages, are properly protected in order that this increased rate of speed may be brought about. These are things that parliament may deal with, and I do not want to shoulder the blame on the innocent party.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has not quite understood my contention. I am not objecting to the railways running a mile a minute if they want to, if they properly protect their crossings by watchmen and gates. The hon. Minister of Railways has struck out the rate of speed mentioned in this subsection: 'which rate of speed shall not in any case exceed six miles an hour, unless the track is properly protected.' I am perfectly willing that the rate shall be as fast as they want it if the track is properly protected, but they must protect their crossings with watchmen and gates so that people going along will be warned that the train is coming and be compelled to stand still until the train has passed, just as is now done in the most thickly populated parts of large cities. I want to put myself right and to point out to my hon. friend that he is wrong in his understanding of my contention upon this matter. I am not undertaking to say that he is wrong in what he was saying, but he is wrong in his statement of what I am contending for. I am not objecting to railways running as fast as they choose as long as they are protecting their crossings. This Bill says that the rate of speed shall not exceed six miles an hour unless the track is properly protected. The words in the old Act are 'properly fenced,' but I think the words 'properly protected' are better, because a judge will decide the question with reference to whether they have watchmen and gates to protect these crossings when the train is going along. It matters not at what rate of speed they run as long as nobody can get hurt. I am quite willing, if the speed of trains is required to be increased in the interests of the country, that it shall be increased, but if the railways are going to get permission to increase the speed they should be willing to go to the necessary expense to employ a few more men, a few carpenters to make gates and a few more watchmen, costing a few dollars extra, to properly protect their tracks. There may be some tracks which are properly protected almost by nature.

There will be some tracks in regard to which the railways will not have to go to so much expense in protecting as others. But if they are to be allowed to run at any rate of speed they choose all we ask is that the tracks shall be properly protected. The hon. minister strikes out the words 'which rate of speed shall not in any case exceed six miles an hour unless the track is properly protected.' Then the door is to be wide open for the commissioners, entirely unrestrained, to allow the railways to run at any rate of speed, and they are given to understand by virtue of this change in the law that they are not required to place any protection at these crossings. One of the commissioners is to be a lawyer, and we must assume that the commission will be composed of intelligent men. They will probably know what the old Act was and it will be drawn to their attention that the old law required the rate of speed to be not more than six miles an hour unless the tracks were properly protected. When they know that this has been expunged, when they know that parliament has seen fit to strike this out, if the crossings were not properly protected, they would be apt to say : We are not supposed to bother our heads about the question whether there is protection or not. I think it would be quite right that they should say that, because parliament has not required that the railways should protect their crossings. If the minister were to make the rate of speed eight or ten miles an hour, I would not quarrel with it so much. Perhaps eight or ten miles an hour is not an unreasonable speed, because there is a case pending in the Supreme Court now against the Grand Trunk Railway where the rate of speed was twenty miles an hour. The jury thought it was an unreasonable rate of speed at which to go through the village of Forest, and the question is now before the Supreme Court on the appeal from the Court of Appeal of Ontario, which decided in favour of the relatives of the people killed. It is not quite free from doubt what would be held to be a reasonable or an unreasonable rate of speed, but if the minister were to change it to eight or ten miles an hour, I would not have so much objection as to striking out the limitation altogether, and thereby to say that the commissioners need not bother themselves about whether the crossing is protected or not. If you leave it as the Bill was drawn you will require protection to be provided at crossings where they exceed six miles an hour. ' I think that would be right. If they do not have their crossings protected they must not go faster than six miles an hour, but if they want to run faster than six miles an hour, thirty-five, or forty, or fifty, or sixty miles an hour, they must have watchmen and proper protection at each crossing so that people will know that the train is coming. I think the section as drawn is better and more in the interests of the people than if the amendment prevails.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member, I think, perhaps, has not fairly grasped the whole scope of the Bill. This present section with which we are dealing is very similar to the clause in the present Act and is professing to deal with the rates of speed when trains are running ' in any city, town or village, or in any class of cities, towns or villages, prescribed in any regulation.' It is not dealing with the general rate of speed. It does not touch the speed at highway crossings or is not intended to. That is dealt with elsewhere. The question in my mind is whether or not it will be desirable to limit the number of miles or the rate of speed in this section. When you are declaring the jurisdiction of the railway commission, it is a question whether it would not be a proper thing to enact that practically this should be left in their discretion to a degree. The discretion which the board would be enabled to exercise in such cases would be, not the discretion to allow the trains to be run at any rate of speed which the railways might wish, not even to exercise a discretion to allow trains to run at what would be an abnormal rate of speed going through any district, but the rate of speed limited in the Act. If you turn to section 227 you will find that it is provided that :

> No trains shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than——

In the present Bill it is six miles an hour. On further consideration, I would say that six miles an hour is too slow a rate.

Mr. INGRAM. I can walk as fast as that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it should be higher. My own idea would be that is should be ten miles. Perhaps it should be twelve. It is a matter that I have no very strong view about either way. We have enacted that the rate of speed shall not exceed that in these particular classes of districts. The discretion of the commissioners comes in here. They may say that circumstances are so exceptional and of such a character that trains should not run up to the rate of speed laid down by the Act, because the Act says that they shall not go at a greater rate of speed than that. A discretion should be exercised, and I think it should properly be left to the commission to say whether the rate of speed might not be reduced.

On subsection (e) of section 24,

Mr. INGRAM. Would that mean that if they provide proper screens in the opinion of the commissioners, they will be removed from any liability under the law.

Mr. BARKER. That must be the effect of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A great many fires have occurred because the best class of nettings are not used.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I doubt if the language would necessarily take away the liability.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to amend subclause (f) by adding the words

Requiring the company to use or exempt the company from using upon the railway or any portion of it within such time or during such period as the board may deem expedient.

Mr. INGRAM. What becomes of the Bill of the member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) which the minister said in the committee he would consider. The minister does not specify that the latest equipment shall be applied to these cars.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When we come to the proper stage in this Bill I propose to insert, if not all, many of the clauses in the Bill of Mr. Smith of Wentworth, just exactly as he has proposed them.

Mr. MONET. 'Do I understand from the Minister of Railways and Canals that if the commission does not think fit to order the railway company not to use the most modern invention, then if the company causes damage to any private property it would not be held responsible. Why should we not take charge ourselves of that part of the law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what I propose. I propose that the board shall have power under subsection (e) to require the use of the most modern appliances.

Mr. MONET. Suppose the railway commissioners would not think well to give such instructions to railway companies. In case of Roy, the Privy Council held that the plaintiff suffered damages, but as the railway company had fulfilled the obligations of the Railway Act they were not responsible. I suppose the company could not now say under this Bill, that a government commission was given power to tell them what to do, and if the commission did not order them to do something they would not be responsible.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that would follow.

Mr. MONET. In the case of Roy, the Privy Council held that as the company had fulfilled all the obligations of the Railway Act they could not be held responsible for damages. I presume that if the company was not ordered by the railway commission to do certain things for the protection of private property, then they would contend that they were not liable to damages, because they did not do what they were not ordered to do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We propose to do that in this Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to direct the attention of the minister to the language of this amendment. As it reads, it seems to be a rather remarkable provision. I suppose the idea is to provide that within a certain period the railway shall use these appliances; but the language used does not seem to convey that meaning.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The idea is that the board shall have the power, at certain places and within certain periods, to require the appliances proper and necessary to use, and that in certain other circumstances the railways shall be exempt from using them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will you not cover the case by simply requiring the company within a certain time to use these appliances?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so. I would like to go over the clause again.

Section allowed to stand.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the minister has perhaps forgotten the other argument which I made besides the one he overruled, in regard to subsection a; where the words 'railway trains and locomotives' are used instead of the word 'train' which, in the interpretation clause, includes any engine, locomotive or other rolling stock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the word 'train' would cover everything. I presume that if we were drafting the section anew, that word would be used; but we have just copied the old clause as it was.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In passing over the Act, the minister forgot the promise he made yesterday in reference to section 6, referring to the question of scheduling the railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have that still in mind.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that the hon. minister is not going to take up this Bill 'after eight o'clock, but that we are going into supply. It is within a few minutes of six and too late to take up another clause, and I want to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to what he said on Friday night:

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not been quite clear this afternoon during the discussion, as to whether my estimates were under consideration or whether the Railway Bill was being dealt with. The debate has passed from one theme to the

other, so that it was almost impossible to discriminate as to what was in the minds of the gentlemen who are addressing the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. You did the most of that yourself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the committee hear my hon. friend deliberately and coolly state that I occupied the most of the time of the House.

I went over 'Hansard,' and I find that the hon. Minister of Railways occupied 458 lines, the hon. leader of the opposition 313 lines, the hon. member for Lincoln 270 lines, the hon. member for Kent 212 lines, the hon. member for Guysborough 220 lines, the hon. member for Cape Breton 90 lines, and the hon. member for South Lanark, the hon. member for Hamilton and one or two others less than this. But 50 per cent more of the space of 'Hansard' was occupied by the hon. Minister of Railways himself than by any other person. So I was quite justified in making the remark I did, that he had occupied most of the time himself. He has done much better this afternoon.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend certainly does excel as a statistician.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the various provinces and in the North-west Territories, $1,059,865.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the hon. gentleman the information he promised about the port of Gananoque ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson). The port of Gananoque is doing very well. In 1894-5 the revenue was $17,202.20 and the expenditure was $1,811.77. In 1901-2 the revenue was $20,591.61 and the expenditure $1,795.15. So that the revenues increased between those periods $3,000 and the expenditure is a little less. The hon. gentleman has a port which is very well and economically worked. The expenditure is about 8 per cent of the revenue.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion of this $80,000 increased expenditure over last year will go in the province of British Columbia for salaries, &c.?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. About $6,000.

Mr. BLAIN. How do the revenues of the two years compare ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Last year the revenue was $2,354,404, and the year before it was $2,358,842, or about $4,000 less last year as compared with the previous year.

Mr. BLAIN. How is it that the expenditure is increasing in British Columbia when the revenue is growing smaller ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We felt that our officers were not paid sufficiently, and we advanced their pay. The cost of living there is very high. There was also an increase of business at Vancouver and Victoria, and we had to get some extra help. There must have been a decrease somewhere else to bring down the total.

Mr. BLAIN. How is it that the revenue decreased in British Columbia and increased in every other province ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know that I would have any means of ascertaining that more than the hon. gentleman himself. Perhaps trade in British Columbia has not been quite as brisk as in other places. Of course, many duties are collected in one province on goods which may be consumed in another. For instance, duties are collected on goods at the port of Montreal which go into all the provinces. Still the returns would seem to indicate that the province of British Columbia has not been quite so prosperous as some of the others.

Mr. SPROULE. The other night we inquired of the hon. Minister of Militia if the government were prepared to lay on the Table the report of the commission on the Martineau matter, and he replied that when the hon. the Finance Minister returned that report would be submitted. Is my hon. friend the Minister of Finance prepared to lay it on the Table now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will take steps to have the report printed and submitted to the House immediately.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Some time ago I brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs a petition for the establishment of a port of entry at Dauphin. As the hon. gentleman is aware, the town of Portage la Prairie, which is the nearest port of entry, is some 115 or 120 miles from the town of Dauphin, and the merchants of the latter are seriously handicapped by having the port of entry so far removed from their district. The town is a very important one, having 1,200 of a population and growing very fast.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My impression is that I have a report on this matter, but I have it not under my hand. I shall inquire about it and bring it down tomorrow. There are many places claiming to be made ports of entry, and we are doing all we can, year by year, to meet all these demands. I may say that since I have had charge of the department, I have establish-

ed in the North-west Territories ports of entry at Edmonton, Moose Jaw, Medicine Hat, Strathcona, Banff, Stand-off, Wapella, Whitewood, Qu'Appelle, Wolseley, Moosomin, Indian Head, Broadview, Grenfell, Qu'Appelle Station, Battleford, Olds, Canmore and South Qu'Appelle. In Manitoba we have opened offices at Melita, Morden, Rapid City, Neepawa, Selkirk, Manitou, Sprague, Mowbray, Stonewall, Gladstone, Minnedosa, Birtle and Yorkton. So that the hon. gentleman will see that we are endeavouring to give facilities as fast as we can.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have before me the estimates for 1895-6 and 1896-7, and I see that in those times it was the rule to divide the customs estimates according to provinces. For instance, in 1895-6 Nova Scotia required $108,000; New Brunswick, $88,000; Prince Edward Island, $16,000; Quebec, $201,000; Ontario, $286,000; North-west Territories, $3,000; British Columbia, $60,000. Of course, I give only the round figures. The columns in the estimates show the increase or decrease for each province. Now, the hon. gentleman bulks the whole Dominion in one sum. In the estimates for 1896-7 there is a record giving the total estimates for the outside service for each port, with a comparison of the estimate for the previous year. But now the hon. gentleman comes down this year and asks for an increase of $80,000, without any details given, and he has been increasing for the last five or six years, until now the total increase is about $500,000 a year. We ought to have the details as in the old estimates. He asks a bulk sum this year of $1,059,865, being an increase of $80,000 over last year, with no details given. Why has the wholesome rule of former years been departed from under the direction of the minister?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is not a new departure.

Mr. TAYLOR. It began with the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) himself.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, I fancy I am responsible for it. But the change was made several years ago, and has been sanctioned by the committee. It is very difficult to estimate exactly what you need for each province. If, under the old system, we had a surplus of $8,000 in British Columbia, and were short estimated by that amount in the province of Quebec the Auditor General would not allow us to use that $8,000, but we had to have a vote with the sanction of the House. When the amount is voted in a lump sum, we are able to avail ourselves of the vote for any of the provinces. With reference to the ports, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) will find the receipts by ports in the Auditor General's Report, and I think they are also in the Trade and Navigation returns.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is quite true of the receipts, but, in the year 1895-6 and 1896-7, we have the cost for each port. Take Halifax for instance. The vote there was $44,000 for permanent salaries, $2,000 for extra services and $2,000 for office rent and contingencies—total $48,000. But the hon. gentleman has changed it so that he can run the whole amount through, leaving the committee in the dark as to the details. There should be a detailed statement by provinces and ports. As it is now arranged, we could spend the whole amount in one province and none in the other, and the Auditor General could find no fault. The House is left in the dark until they see the details in the Auditor General's Report a year or two hence—because we only get the facts up to the 30th of June of the year before, when the expenditure is an old story. But if we had the details down in black and white when we are voting the estimates, we could see in what provinces and in what ports the increases were taking place. Now, with a great flourish of trumpet the hon. gentleman speaks of the larger amount he is collecting as reason for the increased expenditure. But when I ask him to bring down the facts for one specific port, he shows, on the one side an increased revenue, but, on the other side an actual decrease in expenditure. If that is the case in one port, why not in others, and why should there be an increase of half a million dollars as compared with the expenditures of 1895-6? Under the present system we cannot tell whether the money is required or not. My own opinion is that the hon. minister is extravagant in asking us to vote such a large sum as compared with that of a few years ago.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I am not extravagant.

Mr. TAYLOR. The vote looks like it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No. The money has to be spent. The men render the service, and you have to pay them. There are quite a number of new ports such as those I have mentioned in the North-west Territories, and we have new ports in all the provinces. With regard to Gananoque, the port to which the hon. gentleman has referred, that port is not singular in the showing that is made. No matter how small the business is you must pay the officer a salary. In some of the maritime provinces ports the amount is as low as $400. The officer is not fully occupied, but he cannot take up any other occupation. In such a port there might easily be an increase of several thousand dollars without any necessity for increasing the expenditure. In the port of Montreal there has been an increase of about $6,000,000 collected in 1895 to about $10,000,000 in 1902—an increase of about $4,000,000. Yet, the cost of collection there is increased by only about $20,000. But it is plain that there must be

an increase of expense there. The same is true of Vancouver, Winnipeg and all our larger ports. It is in these that the increase of expenditure takes place, and if hon. gentlemen will consider how many large ports there are they will see that the increase I have asked for is not so large as to be justly called extravagant.

Mr. TAYLOR. It seems to me quite unfair for the hon. gentleman to say that because he has collected so much more money and has increased the expenditure by only a certain percentage, therefore he is not extravagant. Yet the hon. gentleman dwells on that. And, in the case of Gananoque, and, no doubt many other ports, there is the increase in receipts without any increase of expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is regrettable that the hon. Minister of Customs has changed the old system of keeping the accounts. If his reason for the change is held to be good, we might as well apply it to the Public Works Department and vote a lump sum to the Public Works regardless to where it is to be spent, leaving the minister to apply it to any works he may see fit. But it did away with the possibility of ascertaining whether the money is spent economically. If we had the reports we could compare them with previous years and ascertain what work was done at these ports, the number of hands employed, and the amount of collections. We could tell pretty well whether the business was extravagantly conducted or otherwise, now we cannot do it. It may be it would be a little inconvenient to satisfy the Auditor General, but even that is not a sufficient reason for changing the accounts, because it leaves us in the dark in the endeavour to ascertain whether there is extravagance in any particular port.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to explain some of the changes which have taken place in Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know that I could give the hon. gentleman all the changes that have taken place in Montreal. It is a large port. I think no important changes have been made. There have been one or two superannuations, and some vacancies by death have been filled, and some extra men have been put on as the business has increased. I could give a list of the new officers that have gone on during the year.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think the hon. gentleman might give us the names of those who have been superannuated. But if he cannot do that I will not insist, but I may ask him later on.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister surely does not expect to get this item through without giving us explanations of the increases that have been asked for ? I want to get a whole lot of information about the port of Toronto, about the appointments, about the number of superannuations, the names of those who have been appointed, whether they have passed the civil service examination, and a whole lot of information like that. I think the minister should allow this item to stand until he brings all that information down. We are going it blind if we do not get it. Now in 1896-97 the expenditures in Toronto were $67,687. What are they to be next year ? What is the cause of the increase ? How many additional officers have been appointed ? Who have received an increase of salary, and how long have they been in the service ? How many are in the service, and for how long a time, who have not received an increase, and why have they been overlooked ? These are certainly very reasonable requests.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. With reference to superannuations in Montreal, there has been only one, Mr. Lavoie, replaced by Mr. Menier.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Could the hon. gentleman give me the names of the new men he has employed this year ? If he has not got them under his hand, I will ask him later on. I am in no hurry.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. These are the names of the new men that have gone on in Montreal : William Mayberry, E. Redmond, A. Demers, L. A. Beaulac, H. Lajoie, A. Boyd, S. H. Carpenter, A. Fichaud and John Hamilton. Those are put on for the season of navigation.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. These are extra hands?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes. Very few changes are taking place. Now about Toronto. In a port where there are two or three hundred employees, I have not myself been put through a course of questioning with reference to each one of these employees before. It is rather new to me, and it would be more convenient if the hon. gentleman would mention any particular cases where he thinks that an injustice has been done, and I will try to give him the information. But it would take a long time to give all the information in detail that he has asked for. He will find much of it in the civil service list, so far as the permanent employees are concerned, he will see the number of years they have been employed and the salaries they are getting. What we call temporary clerks of course he will not find on the list. But I will be glad to give the hon. gentleman the information with reference to any particular case. I can give him the names of the new men that have been appointed. All the permanent appointments must have passed the civil service examination. But they are generally appointed as temporary at first, and after they have passed the qualification they are

placed on the permanent list by Order in Council.

Mr. CLARKE. It would be interesting to get the number of those who have not yet passed the civil service examination. I would like also to know the ages of the new appointments.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are 108 at the port of Toronto, ninety-two are permanent and sixteen what we term temporary.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Why was Mr. Lavoie pensioned ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He had reached a great age, and had been more than thirty-five years in the service.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How old was he when he was superannuated ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I may say to my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Mary's that he was 69 when he was superannuated. At the port of Toronto there are Thos. Armstrong, who is acting as a landing waiter, appointed on April 15, 1880 ; James Brooks, packer, salary $500, appointed in 1901 ; E. L. X. Jarvis, messenger, appointed 1897.

Mr. KEMP. Has the hon. minister the ages of these gentlemen ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) will make the calculation himself, he will find the ages. Armstrong was appointed in 1880 and he is acting yet. He only gets $320. Then, James Brooks, who is receiving a salary of $500, was born on March 14, 1840, and he was appointed 9th April, 1901. E. L. Darby gets $450, he was born September 20, 1879, and he was appointed July 27, 1897. Geo. A. Cresman gets $600, born November 29, 1874, appointed July 10, 1901. W. J. McCleary gets $600, was born in 1868 and appointed in 1899. Geo. Forrest gets $600, was born in 1836 and appointed in 1900, Geo. M. Biggs gets $300, was born in 1859 and appointed in 1900. John V. Horn gets $500, was born in 1866 and appointed in 1901. A. B. Stanbury, appointed 1901, gets $600 and A. R. Cochrane, appointed 1902, gets $300. And then it follows on.

Mr. CLARKE. How many of these gentlemen have not passed the civil service examinations ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. None of them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Some of them are 67 years of age when they were appointed.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If they pass the civil service examination, and they are known to be good officers, we put them on the permanent list.

Mr. SPROULE. How can you do that when the Civil Service Act says that they cannot be appointed if they are over 35 years of age.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That only refers to the inside service. It does not apply to the outside service. I think hon. members are pretty well satisfied because this was debated the other night, and, Mr. Chairman, you might as well declare the item carried and we will proceed with the next item.

Mr. BLAIN. This is an item in regard to which we can get some information upon another important point. The item is a very large one and there is a very general complaint that there is a large number of officers appointed in the hon. minister's department who have not passed the civil service examination. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would give us a general statement of how many officers are in his employ, how many have passed the civil service examination, and how many have been appointed in the last five or six years who have not passed the civil service examination.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Of course, we are dealing with what we call the outside service. The civil government estimate was passed some time ago when I gave the hon. gentleman the information he asks now in regard to the inside service. There are 445 temporary employees throughout the Dominion and 1,172 on the permanent list. There is a total of 1,617 officers in the outside service altogether.

Mr. BLAIN. How many out of that number have not passed the civil service examination ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The collectors and subcollectors do not have to pass. None of them have passed. The inspectors do not have to pass.

Mr. CLARKE. Are they included in the list of 400 odd ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The collectors are not. The temporary officers, I think as a rule, you will see, have not passed the examination.

Mr. BLAIN. How many are there ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Four hundred and odd.

Mr. CLARKE. More than 25 per cent of the service have not passed the civil service examination.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. As I said the other night, it would please me if these officers could pass the civil service examination and go on the permanent list. Temporary officers are at this disadvantage that if they are sick they do not get paid while they are absent as they do if they are on the permanent list, and they are not entitled to the three weeks holidays that the others get. Some of these officers are

just as good officers as those on the permanent list. There are men who were appointed away back in 1880 and 1882 and from that time down. They have been in the service for from ten to fifteen years, and they are just as good officers and do the actual work of the department as well as if they had pased the civil service examination. They could have passed this examination when they came from school, but now they will not try it. I would like, speaking for myself, if parliament would pass a law that would somehow enable me to put all these men on the permanent list.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to express my disapproval of that kind of procedure. If we are to have a civil service examination and the employees of the different departments are called upon to pass this examination, I think it is unfair to those who go up for examination and pass that other men who are not called upon to pass the examination are put into positions, and especially when we have a large number of men who hold the proper qualification, having passed the examination, out of employment at the present time. I think the government should either abolish the civil service examination or see to it that the men who are appointed to the different offices in the departments should have the proper qualification under the examination I have referred to.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The trouble is that a great many of these men have been employed for years. In Montreal alone there are twenty-one of these temporary employees and they were there when I came into office. They are not all new appointments. We continue them and we have to continue them as temporary except they pass the examination. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is desirable that they should pass if they can.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the future ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are trying to do as well as we can. We are not perfect in the direction the hon. gentleman speaks of.

Mr. CLARKE. Are there any of these gentlemen who have been appointed since 1897 on the temporary list who have passed the preliminary examination ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not think so. We appoint them as temporary and then they pass. If a man wants to be a tide waiter or a packer he would have to pass the preliminary examination.

Mr. CLARKE. The only qualification the government requires now from these officials is the influence of political friends to get them in. They do not have to pass an examination now and the minister appears to be ignoring the Civil Service Act altogether. It is a dead letter in some places.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. CLARKE. It is so far as the port of Toronto is concerned. A number of men appointed there have not passed the preliminary or qualifying examinations. It is not unreasonable that this item should stand until we know the qualification of these men and their ages and all about them. What part of the $80,000 is to be spent in increasing the salaries of officers, and what officers are to have their salaries increased ? I am told that some of the men now acting as assistants and subordinates are getting as much if not more salary than the gentlemen whom they are assisting. The minister has the information at his finger ends in the department, and we should have it before we can intelligently discuss this very large item of over $1,000,000. The item had better stand until we get the information. If I had nothing else to do I could go to the Civil Service list and pick out those who are in the service of the government, but even that would not give me the temporary clerks because their names do not appear there, and there is a large percentage of them at the port of Toronto. I appeal to the Minister of Customs and to the Minister of Finance if it is not a reasonable request that this item should stand until we get this information, and get it not only with regard to Toronto but with regard to all these large ports : Montreal, Vancouver, Halifax and St. John ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The document I was reading before gave their ages, the date of their birth and so on. I will give the hon. gentleman the officers employed in Toronto. Thomas Armstrong, acting landing waiter, $1 per week day ; A. Calder, acting messenger, $500 a year ; E. L. Darby, acting mesenger at $400 per year ; W. J. McCleary, acting preventive officer, $600 a year ; George Evans, acting landing waiter, at $600 per year ; George Forest, acting packer, at $1.50 per working day ; J. B. Brooks, acting packer at $500 per year; D. Fraser, acting landing waiter, $600 a year ; J. V. Horne, acting messenger, $500 per year ; J. M. Biggs, acting landing waiter season of navigation at $50 per month ; A. B. Stanbury, acting preventive officer, $600 a year ; E. H. Ross, at $20 per month.

Mr. CLARKE. What does he do.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He discharges whatever duties the collector assigns him. I cannot be expected to say what they are.

Mr. CLARKE. It seems peculiar to have a civil servant at $20 a month.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I presume he is a boy. There is George H. Cressman, acting preventive officer at $600 a year; A. R. Cochrane, acting preventive officer. I think that is all. I think I have given all the information that I can, and I may say that in 20 years of parliamentary life I have never heard of such explicit information being asked for or given.

Mr. INGRAM. Who are the temporary officers at Windsor ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. J. W. Yearsley, J. Watson, and P. E. McEwen and the new collector, John Acheson Smith.

Mr. INGRAM. There are a large number of temporary officers who cannot qualify under the Civil Service Act, but who have certainly proved themselves efficient officers not only at Windsor but elsewhere. I am sure my hon. friend from North Essex who is interested in the officers around Windsor will bear me out when I say that the officers there are good officers. A great many of these officers are temporary, and it is a great injustice to them that they should be kept on the temporary list for years. It makes them subject to the influence of both political parties and places them in an embarrassing position. The government should take some means to amend the Act so as to enable these old, tried and efficient servants to be put on the permanent list, so that they cannot be interfered with no matter what party is in power so long as they do their duty. Would the minister state what part of the $100,000 which he says he will ask for, is for the purpose of meeting the fees now paid by the transportation companies.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. About $78,000 I think. That $100,000 is not in this vote, but it will, come in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. INGRAM. How does the minister arrive at that amount ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The transportation companies do not pay the men direct, but the payment passes through the department, and the accountant has knowledge of it.

Mr. INGRAM. As I understand it, that increase is for the officers whose special duty is to accommodate the transportation companies, and it is not for the officers who are stationed along the border line.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is for the same officers who work over hours, and that is to pay for their extra time, which we will pay in future instead of the transportation companies.

Mr. INGRAM. If you have officers doing day duty and night duty you need not pay them for extra time.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The men do their day duty and they earn their salary and then they are on night duty as well.

Mr. INGRAM. Why ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If we had a day staff and a night staff we would have to employ extra officers, and one reason why that has not been done is that the salaries of these officers are small and they are very anxious themselves to get some over time and extra pay for it. I agree with the hon. gentleman that when a man has put in 10 hours of faithful work in the day time, that ought to be enough, but they are very anxious to put in three or four extra hours to get extra pay for it and to supplement their salaries.

Mr. INGRAM. That was not the point I was making. At Fort Erie and Niagara we will say you have to have day and night officers. Having day and night officers now, how can you get in the extra time unless one officer lies off, either day or night ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We do not have day and night men at these ports.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, that is where the department should make the change. All the trains do not come over the line in the day time. Many come at night and it is as important to have night officers as day officers. For instance, at the city of Detroit, you should have both day officers and night officers. If the hon. minister has no night officers, and if this duty is to be performed by the day officers putting in extra time, for which I presume they get a higher rate of pay than they do for day work, then the department is paying more for the service than it would pay if it had both day and night officers, and I think the department should be reorganized for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is what we would like to; but that item is not under discussion now; it will come in the supplementary estimates. To have day and night men would probably be all round the best plan; but it would necessitate a larger expenditure. Suppose you have an officer to whom you are paying $600 a year, and who, for the extra time, which he is anxious to put in, makes from $150 to $200 extra. In that way he gets $750 or $800, while his salary is $600. If we were putting on a night man to do the service for which the day man is paid extra, he would expect $600 at least, the same salary as the day man. Then the day man would immediately press us and say, I was getting $800, and you are cutting me down to $600, and I cannot live on that. We would find him pressing for as much pay for his day work alone as he had been getting for both day work and the extra work. That system would entail an extra expense upon us, though I have no doubt it would otherwise be very satisfactory, and we may adopt it in some cases.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is referring to points where there would be only two or three hours of extra service. I am referring to points like Detroit, where it would be necessary to have men on duty all day and all night. In such cases it would cost a great deal more to pay day men extra for night services than it would to have day men and night men working the same number of hours.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). As I live at the city of Windsor, I can explain perhaps how this matter has been conducted in the past at that point. In connection with the ferry company, which runs its boats up to twelve o'clock at night the customs officials get twenty-five cents an hour after six o'clock, and they are glad to get it for the extra service. The extra pay in connection with the railways amounts to $40 or $45 a month. In these ways the officers' salaries have been considerably supplemented, and they have been quite willing to meet the trains and boats at night for this extra pay. On their behalf I can say that they are opposed to this change by which the government will pay them instead of the railways. However, there has been a request for this change made by the business interests of that and other localities. While speaking on this subject, I might refer to these officials who have been in the service for many years, and yet have not been put upon the permanent list. I found in 1900, when I came in, that there were four or five men in that position. I felt that if these men, whether Conservatives or Liberals, were good officials, they should be put on the permanent list, for this reason. It appeared that when they fell ill or took their holidays, they lost their pay for the time they were absent, by not being on the permanent list. I thought that a hardship, and therefore I recommended to the hon. Minister of Customs that they should be put on the permanent list, and I think they were—two Conservatives, appointed prior to 1896, and two Liberals, appointed subsequent to that date.

Mr. CLANCY. How did the hon. gentleman get these officers placed on the permanent list, in view of the statement of the Minister of Customs that he regretted that he was unable to do that ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). I do not see why the civil service examination should apply so strictly to these officials as it does to other officials of the government. I thought it was nothing but right that they should be put on the permanent list, in order that they might be rescued from the disabilities I have mentioned.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not the question I asked. I quite concur in what the hon. gentleman says, that the evil he refers to ought to be remedied ; but I am now going to ask the Minister of Customs how the hon. member for Essex succeeded in doing what the hon. minister expressed himself as unable to do generally for officers similarly situated throughout the province. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can explain how that took place ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, yes, with pleasure ; and it is very simple when you know how it is done. Collectors do not have to pass the civil service examination, nor preventive officers, nor landing waiters. Appraisers have to pass special examinations. As I have explained before, I recognize the spirit of the Act to be that we should endeavour to get as many as we can to pass the qualifying examination, but in certain cases we take advantage of the clause allowing us to appoint clerks to the position of preventive officer without their undergoing examination. Where there are employees who have been years in the service and who are faithful and competent officers, but who do not feel competent to pass the qualifying examinations, we put them on as preventive officers. It would be very difficult for men who have been on the staff for years to pass this literary examination—I doubt whether I could pass it myself —and it would not be fair to compel them to do so.

Mr. CLANCY. I can quite understand that the rule which the hon. gentleman lays down is a good one, and that officers who have been years in the service and given satisfaction should be put on the permanent staff as preventive officers. But the hon. gentleman is constantly bringing in new men and putting them over the heads of those temporary clerks who have done efficient service for years. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but will he say that there are no cases of new men being put over the heads of these men who have served for years as temporary clerks ? The hon. gentleman will have the support of both sides if he will bring down a Bill to cure the evils of the past and prevent them from multiplying in the future. It is no excuse for him to say that the same state of things existed in the past. If he is a progressive minister, he will put an end to it. A temporary clerk who is employed throughout the year, and who is paid practically the same as a permanent officer, should no longer be left in that position, and then no new man should be appointed to any position in the service until he has passed the qualifying examination. I should like to have an expression of opinion from the hon. gentleman on this point. We ought to know whether he is prepared to take hold of this matter courageously and deal fairly with that class of men and put an end to a condition of things which is not consistent with good service or healthy administration.

Mr. CLARKE. This item comprises practically the whole vote, and we cannot let it pass without more information.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The last time we had this item under discussion, some hon. gentlemen opposite said I spoke too much, and I thought that I would let them do the talking to-night. If there are to be amendments to the Act, I shall have to submit my views to my colleagues. It is only just to those older servants, who do their work well and may not be able to pass this literary examination, that they should not be compelled to pass it. As regards

future appointments, we are trying to do the best we can, but when deaths or other sudden changes occur we have to put a man on at once, and the way we have been doing is to appoint a man and have him pass the civil service examination later, or in some cases, where he is a valuable officer and does not feel competent to pass his examination, we put him on as a preventive officer. I think that the previous government, either by Order in Council or in some other way, put any one who had been in the service prior to 1882 and down to 1896 on the permanent list, and at that time those on the permanent list came under the Superannuation Act. But, of course, the question of superannuation does not come up to-day.

Mr. KEMP. Will the hon. minister have a statement prepared giving a list of the officials and the whole staff employed in the port of Toronto and the outports connected with it, showing salary received, the dates of appointment, and the total annual expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have the information all here. But it would take a good while to read over this whole list of about a hundred employees.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the hon. minister send it over to us for a few minutes ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is in a book containing particulars of all the other ports as well.

Mr. CLARKE. Would not the minister have some clerk copy it ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And bring it down on concurrence ?

Mr. CLARKE. Not on concurrence.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) does not want to hold the item until these particulars are furnished. The hon. gentleman wants this memorandum laid on the Table at any time.

Mr. KEMP. Yes—within a day or two.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the hon. minister dispensed with the services of Mr. A. S. Gerald, of Prescott, and for what cause ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He was superannuated, I think last year.

Mr. BENNETT. What rule does the department follow with regard to salaries paid ? Has the amount of customs receipts anything to do with it ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, yes. It is not invariable. But when increases are asked the officers usually point to the increase of revenue, and, where we are able to grant increases, we like to see increased revenue if we can. That would be more particularly the case with the collector. But the payments are not uniform. In some ports the collectors are paid as much as those of other ports of twice the revenue.

Mr. BENNETT. I believe the collector at the town of Midland is paid only $800. I would call the minister's attention to the fact that a landing waiter was appointed, and, though the collector has been there for many years and is kept at $800, the landing waiter began with $600.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was under the impression that we had given the collector there an increase. However, I believe we eased the work by appointing an assistant. But the port is going ahead and the revenue is $26,500. While I do not bind myself, I think the collector would be entitled to a little more, comparing this port with others. In fact I think I have his name with others before me for consideration. I do not speak of this as making an absolute promise. This brings me to what the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said with regard to the estimates for the several ports. We dropped that purposely. The estimates had to be made for a long distance ahead—usually a good deal over a year—It might then be found impossible to give an officer the amount that had been asked for from parliament, and the officer would say not unnaturally : Parliament voted that money to me. Therefore, we asked the committee to leave the matter in our hands. But I would ask hon. members of the committee if they think that injustice is done to any officer or merit is not recognized. I would take it kindly if they will mention the matter so that we may give it consideration. Of course, the committee would not wish me to go through the list of the 1,600 employees we have and give the names and salaries. But each member of the committee knows the officers in his own locality, and I shall be glad to give any information with regard to any officer asked for.

Mr. BENNETT. While the receipts at Midland are much larger than in many other places where the officials are paid higher salaries, this of itself does not measure the work done by the collector. For a large quantity of grain passes through that port—last year the quantity was about 15,000,000 bushels. No duty is collected on this, as it goes through in bond. I hope the minister will at least advance the collector's salary by $200. It then would only be on a par with that of many other officers who have far less to do. May I ask the minister what rent is paid for the office occupied by the collector at Midland ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The rent is $180.

Mr. BENNETT. If the collector was paid at the same rate as the office is paid for, he would have $2,000 or $3,000 a year. I see that the rent was formerly only $60 a year.

But the leverage exerted by a warm camp follower has resulted in giving $180 for premises that would be dear at $90.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The accountant informs me that when the change of office was made we had a report from the inspector or the collector in favour of it. His recollection is, and, so far as mine extends, it is the same that the collector advised us favourably.

Mr. BENNETT. I think that perhaps the collector would have been afraid to report against it. There was formerly one large room, now there are two small ones. However, as a camp follower, the landlord is entitled to something, and he is satisfied with small things.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know about the camp follower, but my recollection is borne out by the recollection of the accountant—and his memory of these things is pretty accurate—that when the change was made it was because of the increase of the business of the port and it may have been said that there was a vault in the new premises or something like that. At any rate our record is that the collector recommended it.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the collector will be treated as liberally as the landlord.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, he will not be charged with being a camp follower.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the salary of the collector at Campbellford ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Five hundred dollars.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does he attend to the duties of the office himself ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, they would be attended to by himself.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are you sure of that ? My information is that he was an official of the Grand Trunk Railway, and some deputy was attending to the business.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Still we should hold him responsible, and more than that, he should discharge the duties himself, and for anything I know he does.

Mr. COCHRANE. How much does the collector at Brighton get ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Six hundred dollars.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is not there a much larger revenue collected at Campbellford than there is at Brighton ? I venture the assertion that there is double.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then how do you reconcile the two facts ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is difficult to reconcile them.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is absurd to say that an officer at one port should get $500 for collecting double the revenue that an officer collects at another port who gets $600 for it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am afraid I am following in too large a measure what was done by my predecessors in these two places. I must do better.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have heard that answer so often that I am sick and tired of listening to it, especially when I hear it from the Minister of Customs, whose stentorian voice I used to hear so often on this side of the House condemning the party I supported years ago. And still to-day we hear that flimsy pretext that he is following the government that he condemned. Does a business government do business in that kind of a way ? It is so absurd to my mind that I hope no intelligent minister will give that answer any more, but take the responsibility of his own acts and not say, oh, you did it. The hon. gentleman used to denounce everything the Conservative party did, and now he has—I will not say what I was going to say, but I will say that he has the impudence and the hardihood to get up and say that he is following in the steps of his predecessors that he condemned. Is it not the height of hypocrisy for a minister to follow in the footsteps of a party that he condemned ? Get out. Make footsteps of your own, and be responsible for your own footsteps, and don't lay the responsibility on a party that has long since resigned the responsibility of office, and I think very largely to the detriment of the country.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well I have a dim recollection that I used to find some fault with the previous government. Since I have been in office I have concluded that perhaps if I knew as much then as I do now, I would not have made all the criticisms I made then. I dare say my hon. friend, if he gets my position or one like it, will come to the same conclusion. But that is no reason for continuing a bad policy. If years ago a certain salary was attached to a certain office it is a difficult thing to reduce that salary.

Mr. COCHRANE. But he has changed the official. That argument would be good if the old official remained, but the old official at Brighton resigned, and he has appointed a new man and given him a salary very nearly as much as the old official had, while the official at Campbellford was appointed long previous, and collected an amount nearly double that was collected at Brighton. If it was the old official, there might be some argument in it, but there is no argument in it when you appoint a new man with a salary a great deal larger than

the salary of the man who is collecting a much larger revenue.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is true, but after all you must remember that when a certain salary has been paid at a certain port, a salary which is not excessive, if you cut that salary down it is considered as degrading to the port, people look at it as lowering the standing of the town, as putting the town down.

Mr. COCHRANE. It would not be anything derogatory to the town of Campbellford if you increased the salary of that official to somewhere near where it ought to be, relatively to the other man.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman, I understand, has given a pledge to my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) that he will bring down a detailed statement of the staff of the Toronto customs house, giving the names, ages, dates of appointment and salaries received.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, I will do that.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like also if the hon. gentleman would bring down a statement as to what part of this $80,000 he is asking for in this year's estimates will be distributed among the officials at the port of Toronto. Of course, the hon. gentleman knows what he is going to do, and whose salaries he is going to increase. Then I would like to know what plan he has adopted with reference to paying the assistant appraisers at the port of Toronto, I see some of them are getting $1,000, and some $1,600, while some of them are getting $800, some $750, some $1,200, and so on. I see the name of one very old friend of mine, Mr. McCaw, who has been there for twenty-five years, and he is getting the munificent salary of $800. Others who have not been there half as long are getting half as much more. What plan does the hon. gentleman pursue ? Does he follow the example of his predecessors in this respect, or is this a plan of his own ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The assistant appraisers, generally speaking, are under the Civil Service Act and get from $600 to $1,500. The appraisers run from $800 to $2,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What cast iron rule does the hon. gentleman lay down in fixing the salaries ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is no cast iron rule, we try to be guided by the rules of equity and justice so far as we can. When I speak of equity and justice, it is with reference to the duties they perform. A man might be an appraiser for many years, and another man who has not been so long in the service might be getting more because he is more capable.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope the minister will apply the rule of equity and justice, and not merely cold justice, which I think has been the rule applied to many of these officials up to the present time. Some of these assistant appraisers are most competent men who have served many years, and their salaries remain stationary ; while others who have since come in and who are no doubt competent men, are getting half as much more, though they have not had the experience in the Customs Department, they have not had the training. Surely if equity and justice are to be the guide of the minister in apportioning the salaries to these gentlemen, there ought to be a reorganization of that department in reference to salaries, and those who have been standing stationary at a minimum salary of $750, should receive consideration. If we had the information tabulated such as my hon. friend from East Toronto asked for, we might be able to understand the position better. The gentleman I mentioned is one of the most efficient officers in the service, and his salary is $800 ; others who have come in since are getting double.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, he was appointed in 1877.

Mr. CLARKE. A very worthy man, too.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He was seventeen or eighteen years there under my hon. friend's government, and my hon. friend must not be too hard on me for not having been able to accomplish in something over six years what the late government was not able to accomplish in eighteen years. If he was appointed at $800 he remained at that.

Mr. CLARKE. What accentuates this case is the fact that assistants have been brought in since then who are getting double the salary he is getting. That was not the case with the late administration. The assistants did not come in then at $1,200 or $1,800, but they came in under lower salaries. There are men who have been in the service for years getting $750 who are thoroughly competent. Surely, if the hon. minister is going to apply any rule of equity and justice, he will not allow them to stand at $750 or $800 or $900, and bring in strangers who have not had the training or experience that these officers have had and put them at salaries at 60 or 75 per cent more than the old hands are receiving. I am sure, that, the hon. minister's attention having been drawn to these cases now, he will see that they at least get cold justice. They do not seem to have been able to get either cold or hot justice in the past.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Except there is some reason, it looks as if this officer were entitled to something more than he is getting.

Mr. CLARKE. There are lots of cases, and I think the hon. minister should allow this item to stand.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Why should it stand ?

Mr. CLARKE. So that we could consult with him and show him that it is all wrong.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are asking for this extra money. We note down as far as we can before we make the estimates the officers whose salaries we think we will be able to increase. But we do not commit ourselves to it. New ports will have to come in. We have over 1,600 officers, and if I gave them $50 each of an increase the whole of this $80,000 would be gone. I cannot do that. We have to open new ports. A case such as the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has called attention to is a case that should receive consideration. I put it that way that it should receive consideration in case that it may not be said that I have violated my word, but I am going to look into that case. There is no use of our delaying the item, because the hon. gentleman will get the information that he desires.

Mr. CLARKE. It will be too late to do anything.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have to bring down supplementaries, and there is concurrence.

Mr. CLARKE. We know all about concurrence; we have been there before.

Mr. CLARE. The hon. minister states that the amount of revenue collected has something to do with the amount of salary paid. I would like to call his attention to the amount of revenue received in a few of the different customs houses and the salaries paid. At Bowmanville the revenue was $10,545 last year, and the salaries $1,500; Cobourg, revenue, $19,763, salaries over $3,000; Collingwood, $28,000 revenue, salaries, $1,635 ; Galt, revenue over $66,000, salaries, $1,850. This certainly seems very unfair. I have been asking the hon. minister for two years for an increase of salary for one of the officers at Galt. The amount collected is very much larger in proportion to the expenditure on salaries than at some other places.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The representations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clare) have not been forgotten. They have been noted. I do not know if I shall be able to accomplish it, but there has been a note made of the request and it will be fully considered. Of course, Galt is an inland town. At Cobourg there is trains-shipping and there are outports under the collector.

Mr. CLARE. There are outports of Galt, too.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I suppose there are.

Mr. CLARE. When you take into consideration how much more is collected at Galt than at the towns I have cited, it is hard to understand why there should not be some increase if there is any fair division of salaries.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman turn to page F—11 of the Auditor General's Report and explain what he means by 'acting collector D. Ferguson' and 'acting landing waiter T. Morse' ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. At St. Thomas ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It means that these officers are not appointed by Order in Council at once. When they are not appointed by Order in Council at once they are referred to as acting collectors or landing waiters. When they are put on the permanent list by Order in Council they will appear as 'collector' or 'landing waiter.' The term 'acting collector' just shows that when he was first appointed he was not appointed by Order in Council.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the Order in Council been passed making Mr. Ferguson the permanent collector ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, he was appointed permanently on May 20 last.

Mr. INGRAM. What about Mr. Morse ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Morse was appointed permanently on April 1 last.

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Chairman, before leaving this item, I desire to remind the hon. minister of the promise he made last year in regard to the superannuation of James Curry, the late collector of customs at Charlottetown. Mr. Curry was superannuated at the age of sixty-seven years, an active and vigorous man. I desired to obtain information last year as to what officer had reported on Mr. Curry's case and what data was before the treasury board when ordering Mr. Curry's superannuation. The hon. minister promised to give me that information last year, but I have not seen it yet. I ask him now if he is prepared to give it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, Mr. Curry was superannuated. I have forgotten the exact circumstances now. What was it I was to give the hon. gentleman last year ?

Mr. HACKETT. I have here 'Hansard' of last year :

Mr. HACKETT. Would the hon. minister state upon whose recommendation he was retired ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not expect to be asked for the details and have not got the information here, but I will bring it to the hon. gentleman.

The information I desire to obtain is this : Who was the inspector that reported that

Mr. Curry was unfit for duty, was Mr. Curry retired under the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and what information had the treasury board before it when retiring Mr. Curry ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will try to have that information for the hon. gentlemen when I bring down my supplementary estimates.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the hon. minister the salary that is paid to the custom-house officer at Napanee and the salary of the landing waiter there ? I think the customs officer there is also the inspector of excise.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He receives $800.

Mr. WILSON. Is that all ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Eight hundred dollars is all he gets from the Customs Department.

Mr. WILSON. Well, he is the inland revenue collector, too ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I could not tell the hon. gentleman about that.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to have that information.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Would the hon. gentleman make that request when the inland revenue items are under consideration ?

Mr. WILSON. There ought to be enough members of the government present to give such information when it is asked for. There is no reason why there should only be two or three members of the government in the House. I do not see why they should not sit here as well as the rest of us.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Of course, the miniser whose estimates are under consideration has to assume the responsibility of explaining them, and some of the other ministers can be spared to attend to other pressing duties. This gentleman is also an officer of the Inland Revenue, and when the Minister of Inland Revenue is asking for his vote he will explain about him.

Mr. WILSON. What is his salary as landing waiter ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. $500.

Mr. WILSON : And you do not know what he is getting as an inland revenue officer ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not.

Mr. WILSON. I will try and be here when the inland revenue estimates are up.

Mr. BLAIN. What number of officers were appointed in the Customs Department last year who did not pass the civil service examination, and what number were appointed in that department altogether ?

Mr. HACKETT.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot give that information to-night, as I did not know it would be asked for, but I shall get it.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the minister also give us a list of the appointees this year who have passed the examination ? And now that the attention of the minister has been called to the anomaly of some assistant appraisers receiving $750 a year and some $1,600, I think he should give some explanation.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A note has been made of that, and it will be considered.

Mr. CLARKE. The preventive officers are paid all the way from $40 a month to $70 a month, and some of those recently appointed are getting a great deal more than the old-timers. What is the explanation of that?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is no specified salary applicable to that class of officers ; you can give them as high as you like and as low as you like. You cannot assume that because they are all called preventive officers they discharge the same duties, because some of them are in the long room receiving entries, which is the most particular work, while others of them may be merely out on the wharf.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish the minister also to bring down the number of officers he has superannuated last year at the different ports, and the reasons for their superannuation. Was Mr. Gerald superannuated because he was unfit for service, or why was it that he was superannuated ? Did he apply for superannuation ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would have to refresh my memory from the list which has been placed upon the Table of the House, which gives the names of those superannuated and the reasons for their superannuation.

Mr. TAYLOR. In this $80,000 increase is there anything for increasing the salary of the customs officer at Gananoque, who collected last year $20,591, and the expense of the office was only $1,193 ? That is for Gananoque proper, and including the two outports the cost was only $1,700. The officer at Gananoque is entitled to an increase. At Bowmanville, where only $10,000 was collected, the officer and his assistant gets $1,643, as compared with $1,100 at Gananoque, where twice as much is collected.

Mr. BENNETT. His brother is a member.

Mr. TAYLOR. His name is Beith, and I presume he is a brother to the hon. member of that name. The minister should see that justice is done to the collector at Gananoque. There are more steamboat arrivals and departures there than there are at most other ports on the St. Lawrence, and notwithstanding that the customs officer has

to do duty day and night he only gets a small pittance for salary.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is no doubt that the port of Gananoque shows up very well.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister show his appreciation of this good service ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It would not be wise to make a definite promise, but a note has been made and I will consider the case. You cannot go solely by the revenue, because the officer at Galt collects $45,000 and gets $800.

Mr. TAYLOR. Guelph collects $113,000 and gets $3,550. In Toronto it costs $87,000 to collect $6,000,000, and in Montreal it costs $155,000 to collect $10,000,000. There is no comparison there.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, they vary very much.

Mr. KEMP. I wish to ask the Minister of Customs if it is the intention to adopt any more stringent rules or regulations to prevent the customs revenue from being defrauded by continental goods being admitted as British goods, and getting the benefit of the British preferential tariff ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We want to do all we can in that way. I do not know that we can devise anything better than we have at present. If there is any practicable way in which they can be strengthened, we would be glad to be informed of it. I think we have done about all we can do by means of rules and regulations. As to carrying them out, we are insisting on our officers being as vigilant as possible.

Mr. KEMP. But there is no barrier against certain classes of goods which are made on the continent coming here from Great Britain as if they were British manufactures. The certificate which the government requires to be on the invoice, and which is signed by the shipper or the clerk of the shipper, is no barrier. That is all that the government does in reference to this matter. When the preferential tariff was first adopted, a declaration was suggested, and a form was given to the collectors of customs which made it compulsory for shippers to go before a notary public, a commissioner, a municipal officer of a city or town, a British consul, or a secretary or a president of a chamber of commerce, and take an oath. That was in 1897 ; but in 1898 the government saw fit to put into effect a different sort of obligation—an ordinary certificate. That certificate can be made by a senior or junior clerk in the employ of the exporting firm, and it is merely the ordinary form of declaration. The hon. Minister of Customs knows, from his experience as a business man, of what little importance these certificates are in the eyes of exporters or shippers. We all know what little importance some shippers place upon an affidavit, and they place far less importance upon the mere signing of an invoice. This form in use at the present time, I know from personal experience, is often signed by a clerk employed by a firm which has probably a hundred invoices a day going out. The form going to Canada may be different from that going to India or Australia ; and that is the only barrier that the Customs Department has provided against continental goods coming into Canada and obtaining the preference as British goods. I believe it has been the intention of the government not to allow that to go on. In 1901, I remember the hon. Minister of Finance stating in the House that that was not the intention of the government, and he said practically what the hon. Minister of Customs says now, that if any other device could be suggested, he would be pleased to hear it. I am informed by one of our leading wholesale dry goods merchants of Toronto, a man who has had great experience in importing, that he could not say of certain classes of goods whether they were of German or Belgian or English manufacture. This gentleman stated this case to me : 'Some years ago I bought from a firm of very high standing in Bradford, before the preferential tariff came into effect, a certain class of dress goods as being of British manufacture, and they were placed in my warehouse in Toronto. My son was at the time living and undergoing an apprenticeship in a town in France. A short time afterwards he came to Toronto on a visit, and saw these goods in my warehouse, and asked where I had got them. I said from Priestley, of Bradford. My son said that they had been made in the factory in France where he was employed.' This same gentleman told me that he would not be prepared to swear in what country the following goods were manufactured : dress goods, certain classes of laces, silks, ribbons, velvets, velveteens, hosiery, underwear, gloves, buttons, linens, printed goods, and flannels. These different classes of goods, I believe, are coming into this country all the time as being of British manufacture, and I believe that a very large proportion of them are largely German goods. A short time ago there appeared in the Toronto 'News' an article headed 'How some German firms avoid paying full duty. Many manufacturers send goods to Canada via England. They thus save ten per cent. Germany to Canada, thirty-five per cent ; England to Canada, twenty-five per cent ; Germany to England, free.' The article, of which I will just read a small portion goes on to say :

The Canadian tariff on manufactured woollen goods imported from Germany is 35 per cent compared with 25 per cent imposed on British manufactures of the same class entering Canada. As these German goods are admitted free into England, the German manufacturer at once sees that by sending his goods to Canada via

England, he saves 10 per cent in duties. Walter Muhlinghaus, Toronto, who represents the Hermann Muhlinghaus Company, Lennep, Germany, states that this unfair and round-about method of getting into the Canadian market is resorted to by several firms. With this end in view they established agencies in London and sold their goods through that medium. Mr. Muhlinghaus states, however, that his father's firm, to which he is attached, sends their manufactures direct from Germany to Canada.

Frequently this German agency was placed with a British manufacturer, who availed himself of what was known as the 'business secret,' that is he sold these German goods as the 'made in England' article, and in most cases the Canadian purchaser was none the wiser. The classes of goods in question were underwear and similar clothing.

Owing to the comparative cheapness of production in Germany, the British manufacturer found that he could buy certain lines of German goods and sell them in Canada at greater profit than by manufacturing the goods in England. Mr. Muhlinghaus stating that the cost of production was at least 30 per cent cheaper in Germany than in England.

I have satisfied myself that what I am stating is correct, and I believe the officers of the Customs Department know that this kind of thing is going on, and I have no doubt the hon. Minister of Customs knows it. It is a difficulty which should be overcome in some way or other. The British preference was not given for the purpose of letting in continental goods under it and thus swindling the government. There is another point I would submit. Under that German surtax, I believe there is a new regulation, but it does not amount to anything more than the old one. The temptation to get in German goods from Great Britain will be greater than it was heretofore. There is absolutely nothing in the way except a mere certificate of the exporter or his clerk on the bottom of the invoice, which means nothing. The buyer on this side does not consider that it is his duty to investigate. He sees his neighbour doing the same thing and it will not do for him to suggest to the Customs Department that the goods may be German, Belgian, Austrian or French. He says to himself: 'My neighbour will not do that, why should I? If I do it, it will result in raising the duty on myself.' That sort of injustice is being perpetrated and these foreign goods are coming in as British. Under this German surtax the temptation will be greater, the swindle will be greater, and the government should devise some better method of dealing with the case.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). How is it that the customs officers will not give receipts for customs duties paid at the various ports of entry—a straight receipt to the importer or his broker?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It has not been considered necessary. The importer pays his duty and gets his goods.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). When an importer sends money to his broker, the broker pays the duty at the port of entry and the importer has no check on his broker.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the merchant gives the broker his check, it comes back to him through the bank. If he remitted the cash, he would have to trust his broker.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). But he wants to know the items for which this money was spent. I do not see any valid reason why the officer should not give a receipt. This is done on the other side, right across the river, and it would be a great convenience to importers. The custom is to receipt a third copy of the entry, but that is a cumbersome way and it takes just as long as it would to give a straight receipt.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. When persons are on the cars with small parcels, the officer gives them a receipt, but it is not usual in ordinary transactions, and this is the first time I have heard any complaint on that score. As a rule the brokers are responsible men and the merchant knows with whom he is dealing.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). It is not a matter of very great importance, but I know that a great many complaints have been made. I know of cases where the parties absolutely refused to pay the duty unless they got a receipt, and I can not see any reason why one should not be given. A proper form might be made out and submitted to the customs officers for approval.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to have an explanation with regard to the matter I brought up.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I really cannot give any more information than I have already given. As the hon. gentleman has rightly stated, the department do not intend to let goods in, under the preference, that are not entitled to it. A certificate is required from the exporter, signed by himself or signed by one of his clerks, who must declare that he has personal knowledge of what he certifies to. But whether signed by the clerk or the merchant, the house is held just as firmly. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that when the preference was first introduced we required an affidavit accompanying the invoice. But we found that a source of great annoyance to our importers. Houses in the old country complained very much. They complained that they had to pay a fee of fifteen cents for each certificate, and in some cases they had to get their certificates from the Chamber of Commerce, and there was a good deal of trouble and annoyance especially in the cases of small parcels. The department concluded that if a house would deliberately sign a declaration on the invoice in the name of the firm, which was not true, they would also make a false affidavit. As far as the penalties

are concerned, these penalties would follow just as surely a false declaration as a false affidavit. We thought that it would ease the trade in the old country and please the importers here and be just as safe to the revenue to have a declaration instead of an affidavit. You may say that a man might sign a declaration who would hesitate to make an affidavit, but I do not think there would be many cases of that kind. If a man would be careless in signing a declaration, he would be equally careless in the matter of an affidavit. We may probably be able to do a little better in the future in the way of supervision in the old country, because my hon. colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, is appointing commercial agents in some of the cities in the old country. One has been lately appointed in Birmingham, and if we have any doubts about imports of hardware from there, we can avail ourselves of the services of that commercial agent. We are giving the matter every attention and care, and I will hail with pleasure any suggestion that would be workable and supplement the present regulations.

Mr. KEMP. I did not know that there was a fee charged by the secretary or president of the Chamber of Commerce, but if there was, it could have been but a very small fee. I happened to be in London about the time this order was changed, and Mr. Murray, the secretary of the London Chamber of Commerce drew my attention to it and prophesied that the result would be very unsatisfactory. His reason was that in London particularly, there are all kinds of merchants, and because a firm in this country imports from a certain firm in London, it does not necessarily follow that the firm in London is composed of British subjects of the high character of British merchants, whom we were glad always to think of as men of great integrity. These men are foreigners, to a very large extent. They reside in England sometimes only for a short time ; they are people of all nationalities, and if the precaution were taken by the government of insisting on their going before a notary or a secretary or a president of a chamber of commerce, and making an affidavit, that would be a greater safety for the government and for the revenue than the mere declaration now required. I think the government will do well to reconsider the step it took in 1898 in framing the new regulations, especially in view of the German surtax. The temptation will be greater under that even than it was before. I repeat that I do not think that the certificate at the bottom of the invoice amounts to anything in at least three-quarters of the cases. In the other 25 per cent it might be of some value. But, on the whole, it is no effective guard against bringing in continental goods and passing them through as British goods.

Mr. CLARKE. In fact it is not worth a continental.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot agree that it is no guard. With regard to Mr. Murray himself, I imagine that the fee on account of these affidavits was a personal perquisite. I take it that these fees would not go into the coffers of that chamber of commerce but would be one of the perquisites of his office.

Mr. KEMP. I do not know what the charge was.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If what I suppose is true, he would naturally favour having that continued. But there is this value to the declaration made by the firm that if there is a flaw, we seize the goods, and the importer, as an innocent party would have this recourse against the exporter, that, under our customs law, the perpetrator of the fraud could not collect for the goods sent to this country. They run the risk of having their goods forfeited and not being able to collect them. While some houses might be lacking in principle, the fear of the power of the law is there to help to keep them straight.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the minister what steps he takes or can take, if there is a fraud in the matter ? How, in the name of conscience, will he or his officers find out that there has been a fraud ? Will he enlighten us on that point ? We have drawn the attention of the minister to this question in years past, but he has never enlightened us on the subject. Will he do so now ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The party who signs that declaration knows whether it is a fraud or not.

Mr. CLARKE. Yes, but how can the minister's officers find out if it is a fraud or not ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. By their expert knowledge, they might be able in a case of a certain article to know whether it is an article of German manufacture or not. In the case of a textile, I judge, that would be a difficult matter. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) would be able to tell us about that.

Mr. CLARKE. But the difficulty is made greater by the fact that raw material from which the goods are made may be German. They may be manufactured in Germany and yet come in under the so-called British preference. How can there be the slightest safeguard, under the present system, against goods brought in under affidavit, that they are British goods, and yet, without a farthing of British labour put up on them ? The handicraft is the same. How, then, can the hon. minister's officers detect any difference ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We have to rely very largely upon the affidavit. But if we are going to have a preference that difficulty occurs and you cannot help it. Has there been any deficiency on our part—that is the practical thing.

Mr. CLARKE. The whole preference is deficient.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman's argument is against the preference as a whole; but we have it, and we have to deal with it. The question is now, are we lacking in anything that would enable us to exercise greater circumspection ?

Mr. CLARKE. But the hon. minister is making the whole thing impracticable. The regulation cannot be practicably carried out. He says this is a British preference and we contend that it is a German preference. The government should change the name of it and call it a continental preference, not a British preference. The hon. gentleman cannot tell us any way by which he can find out where the goods are produced, unless he watches their manufacture from the time they are begun until the time they are exported to Canada. That has always been our contention, and now the hon. gentleman admits that it is right. Well, what does he intend to do under the circumstances ? Does he intend to allow these goods to come in as British goods under the preference when he admits that he cannot know, without watching the goods in the course of manufacture, whether the affidavit on the invoice is right or not ? Is he not going to advise his colleagues that this whole thing is a fraud on the face of it ? It is surely wrong to call this a British preference when he himself admits that foreign goods are coming in here and getting the advantage of the preference. The German manufacturer and the middleman in England and in New York are the only persons who are profiting by the preference—not the British artisan or manufacturer.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is mistaken. Of course he is leading the discussion away from what is really my point, the point that I seek to defend. He is opening up the question of the policy of the government.

Mr. CLARKE. For the reason that the hon. gentleman admits that there is practically no safeguard.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I do not admit that. I think we have a great safeguard in the declaration, and another in the expert knowledge of our officers. I hope we shall have an additional safeguard in our commercial agents. The hon. gentleman's argument is against the whole preference. The goods, to come in, must be declared to have been finished in Great Britain. We require the finishing process there. There must be at least twenty-five per cent of the value of the goods of British production, and this twenty-five per cent must include the last stage of manufacture. They could not send out British goods which would make twenty-five per cent of the completed product and have them manufactured in Germany and sent here. The last process must be in Great Britain. The hon. gentleman asks what further we can do ? Well, for instance, our attention was called to linseed oil which was coming in under the preference. We were informed that it was made largely from Argentine seed. This raised a very nice question. If the material was pressed from Argentine seed it could not come in under the preference. But if the seed came from India or some other British possession entitled to the preference, the value of the seed would be counted in towards the twenty-five per cent. We wrote to the High Commissioner and he investigated at the headquarters of the manufacturer, what proportion of Argentine seed went into the production of the oil. We take all the steps we can to guard the revenue. As to saying that you can absolutely determine all these points, I am free to admit that that cannot be done. But do not blame the customs department for that. We have to carry out the law. The hon. gentlemen about me, forming the parliament of Canada, have said : We want this preference. Parliament having declared that these goods shall come in under the preference we cannot exclude them. We let them come in under what seem to us the best regulations. But, if there has been a fraud, we seize the goods and the man who has made the false declaration cannot collect for them.

Mr. CLARKE. How many seizures have been made, because of false declaration, of goods brought in under the British preference ? Has there been one ? Surely that is an easy question for the minister and not an unreasonable one. The preference has been in force since August, 1891, I believe I hope it will not tax the memory of the minister too much to tell us, how many seizures have been made because of false declarations since that time.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. I do not think there have been many.

Mr. CLARKE. Was there one ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I should think so.

Mr. CLARKE. More than one ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think so. We had a good many seizures.

Mr. CLARKE. I am asking about the seizures because of false declarations under the British preference. If there was only one, the hon. gentleman could give us some particulars, because it would be im-

pressed upon his memory. Where was that seizure made ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is not impressed upon my memory particularly.

Mr. CLARKE. If the minister will bring down the information——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I could not tell offhand.

Mr. CLARKE. Bring us down the memorandum when we next discuss the hon. gentleman's estimates, showing how many of these seizures there have been, where, and the amounts involved.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The department does not give the names.

Mr. CLARKE. Only the place, and the amounts involved.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You are asking me to bring down so many things I am afraid I shall forget some.

Mr. CLARKE. I am very sorry to burden the minister. But how can he know, except from the declarations, whether 25 per cent of British labour has been added to the value of these goods ? I need not remind the hon. gentleman that the circular issued by his department to the collectors in 1897 permitted the goods to come in as having had 25 per cent of value added to them, if the person who bought them in Germany, or Belgium, or France or Switzerland, sold them for export to Canada at 25 per cent more than he paid for them in the foreign country. That 25 per cent was to be accounted, according to the instructions issued by the hon. gentleman's own officials, as British labour, as an increased value given to the goods by British labour. In interpreting exactly what the hon. gentlman meant, how can he state that these goods have been enhanced by British labour to the value of 25 per cent ? Our contention has been that it is not necessary to add even one per cent to the value of these goods by British labour, foreign goods can and do come in under the preference. That is the reason why we protest against the so-called British preference, because we claimed it was a continental preference. Will the minister explain how his departmental officers could tell that 25 per cent had been added by British labour ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We cannot tell exactly. The hon. gentleman has a copy of the declaration. If the goods have been enhanced in value 25 per cent, he sees that it is an addition of 33⅓ per cent. 25 per cent off leaves 33⅓ per cent on.

Mr. KEMP. But that is 25 per cent on.

Mr. CLARKE. If the merchant in England or the middleman in England purchased $800 worth of goods made in Germany and sold them to the Canadian importer at $1,000, thus adding 25 per cent, the difference between what he paid for them and what he sold them for was to be counted, under the instructions issued by the hon. gentleman, as British labour. That is the point.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They have to be enhanced in value 25 per cent, enhancing in value 25 per cent means that 33⅓ per cent has been added, because 25 per cent off is equal to 33⅓ per cent on. Now there is no profit at 33⅓ per cent on a wholesale transaction.

Mr. CLARKE. 25 per cent includes the difference, the addition, made to the goods purchased on the continent, when they land in England and are sold in Canada, and may embrace insurances, freight, boxes, &c.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Here is $1 worth of goods, if they come in there must be additional value given to them as British labour. Take that 25 per cent off and that leaves 75 cents, 25 on 75 is 33⅓ advance. Now there is no 33⅓ profit made by the wholesale merchants, or anything of that kind. I think in textiles the cost of the labour averages about 33⅓ per cent. So while 25 per cent of the finished value of the goods is required to be put on, it is about 33⅓ advance.

Mr. CLARKE. I say that if the British merchant or the middleman brings in $800 worth of goods from the continent and sells them for $1,000 to a Canadian merchant, he has added 25 per cent to their value according to the instructions issued by the hon. gentleman, and he gets the advantage of the preference, although British labour has not added one cent to their value.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That would be a simple and direct fraud.

Mr. KEMP. That is what we claim.

Mr. CLARKE. And we claim that this fraud is permitted by the department because of the circular of instructions issued in 1897.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Can the hon. gentleman point out any other way by which a fraud like that can be avoided ?

Mr. CLARKE. We are asking the hon. gentleman to do that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But hon. gentlemen are finding fault, and I think it is not unreasonable to say, after we tell how we are doing it, that they should suggest any better way if they are able. One suggestion he has given that there should be an affidavit instead of a declaration. We tried that, and we abandoned it. But what other plan can he suggest ? The argument of the hon. gentleman is against the preference altogether. That does not concern our duty. The duty of the department is to administer the law as parliament, including hon. gentlemen opposite, have enacted. Parliament said, we want a British preference, we want the goods to come into this country

that are made in Britain at a lower rate than those that are made in other countries. That being the law, we have to administer it, and in doing that we try to keep foreign nations from taking advantage of that preference illegally. I furnished the hon. gentleman with all the declarations, rules and regulations, and I think we have done all we can without unduly hampering the trade. But I shall be obliged to hon. gentlemen if they will tell us of any other step we can take that we have not taken.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister has at last taken our advice very kindly, and he has put on the surtax. They were slow to take advice offered from this side of the House, but at length they did it. But let me read for the hon. gentleman's information one paragraph contained in the circular issued by his department in 1897, which will sustain our contention :

In estimating the labour of the United Kingdom entering into the production of articles manufactured therein partly from imported material, the extent of such labour may be reckoned by the value of the manufactured article ready for shipment at the place of production after deducting therefrom the value on entering within the limits of the United Kingdom, represented by the component parts of such articles which are the produce of countries not entitled to the benefits of the preferential tariff.

Surely that can only have one meaning, that if the goods are sold for export to Canada for 25 per cent over and above what they cost when imported into England from the continent, the difference between what they cost and what they are sold for is to be acounted as British labour, although there has not been necessarily one per cent of British labour or any other kind of labour added to them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman has the latest circular that we issued, I gave it to him the other day. There is one-quarter to be added to the value of the goods.

Mr. CLARKE. No ; the hon. gentleman must not persist in maintaining that after this circular has been read.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What part are you referring to ?

Mr. CLARKE. I am dealing with what was in operation in 1897.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Deal with what is in operation now. I have the form of circular prescribed :

Form of certificate prescribed to be written, printed or stamped on invoices of all articles except raw and refined sugars, for entry under the British preferential tariff of Canada, when made and signed by a person other than an individual exporter.

1, (I).....hereby certify that I am (2).....of (3).....the exporter (s) of the articles included in this invoice, and that I am duly authorized to make and sign this certificate on behalf of the said exporter (s).....

I have the means of knowing and I do hereby certify that this invoice from the said (4)..... .....to (5).....amounting to (6).....is true and correct ; that all the articles included in the said invoices are bona fide the produce or manufacture of one or more of the following countries, viz.:.....(7).....and that a substantial portion of the labour of one or more of such countries has entered into the production of every manufactured article included in the said invoice to the extent in each article of not less than one-fourth of the value of every such article in its present condition ready for export to Canada.

(Sgd.) .....

Dated at.....this.....189 .

There is the declaration that they have to make. It enters into not less than one-quarter of the value of the article. If the article is of German origin, there must be 25 per cent of it that is the result of British labour. Take that off and the valuation is 75 cents. Twenty-five per cent on 75 per cent will not make up a dollar, but 33⅓ per cent will, and therefore there is an enhancement in value of literally 33⅓ per cent. Twenty-five per cent off is equal to 33⅓ per cent on.

Mr. CLARKE. I have not that circular.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is no difference between that circular and the one which my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) has read. If an exporter in England purchases goods in Germany and makes 25 per cent profit on the transaction, he can take that declaration, because that 25 per cent is put on by his labour in purchasing and selling again. It comes down to the bald fact that 25 per cent of the value of the article so exported has not been added by goods of British origin going into it or British labour being employed in its manufacture. But it may be increased 25 per cent in value by the party who has purchased it in Germany, imported it and sold it again. He can take that declaration, and it is being done every day. The country is being flooded with German goods and they have the benefit of this preference, although they have not been enhanced in value by material or labour in England, except the value that is represented by wrapping and stamping.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister has given us the form of declaration that exporters have to subscribe to, and he accompanies that with an explanation as to how they estimate the increased value. That circular provides that if the value is enhanced by 25 per cent over what the article cost the exporter in a foreign country that fact will be sufficient to justify him in making that declaration.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. minister has a very ingenious argument in regard to 25 per cent off being equal to 33⅓ per cent on, but I guarantee that not one exporter in a thou-

sand understands the matter in that way. He understands it in the way that the hon. member for West Toronto understood it when he said that if $800 was the value of goods purchased in Germany and they were sold for $1,000 in this country, the $200 difference would be considered the 25 per cent. At any rate, if the goods were worth $800, the exporter in Great Britain might calculate his profit to be a certain amount, the carriage of these goods to be a certain amount, the packing to be a certain amount, and it might result in there not being 1 per cent of British labour put upon them under the regulations which are in effect in the Customs Department of this country. I think the argument of the hon. minister shows that he admits that fraud is perpetrated. I do not think he is prepared to deny that fraud is being perpetrated, that the regulations do not cover the situation and do not prevent continental goods coming in here and getting the benefit of the preference. The quantity that comes in, it is impossible to state. It is an indefinite quantity. The hon. minister says to us, having admitted that fraud does exist, and having admitted the correctness of our argument: What would you do? I ask the hon. minister if it is the duty of this side of the House to prescribe what should be done? Whose invention is this Is it not the invention of the government, and should it not be their duty to invent some means to overcome the difficulty to which we have referred?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Quite so, but I know if the hon. gentleman knew anything more that could be done to prevent possible fraud—mind, I only admit possible fraud; I do not say that fraud is committed, as I do not think there are many frauds committed—but I believe that if the hon. gentleman knew of any step that could be taken that would tend to greater security, his sense of patriotism, his desire to see the law enforced, would impel him voluntarily to give me his suggestion. These hon. gentlemen have not suggested anything. Although we are doing the best we can, they believe the best we can do is ineffectual. I grant that possibly it may be, but I do not know of any better system. When I was in England last year accompanied by my secretary, when we got through our work, we met a great many merchants. We were waited upon by a large commercial body in the hotel one day for the purpose of discussing an insolvency law. The delegation was composed of large shippers. I availed myself of the opportunity of finding out if they thought there were any large frauds perpetrated in reference to the preferential tariff. These were shippers of high standing and men whose word you would not doubt at all. Their interest would be, if any fraud was being perpetrated by any other house, to reveal it to me, because if any other house was perpetrating a fraud of this kind it would beat them out in the Canadian trade. Notwithstanding that their interest was to reveal any fraud if it existed, their reply was that they were not aware of a fraud of that kind being committed, and they did not think it was being committed to any extent. We had other opportunities of procuring information in regard to the subject, and my secretary, who is fairly up in the department, visited the establishments of some of the houses interested in the Canadian trade, and he was unable to discover that fraud existed to any extent.

Mr. CLARKE. These great shippers and leading merchants were supplied with the circular that provided that the profit of the middleman was to be counted as British labour. There was no fraud as far as they were concerned in interpreting the circular which the hon. gentleman had issued.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is no such profit as 33⅓ per cent on the whole transaction. There is nothing of that kind.

Mr. CLARKE. If our contention is right these gentlemen with whom the minister and his secretary came in contact could not say that a fraud was committed, except it be a huge fraud on the Canadian public in calling the preference a British preference, when as a matter of fact goods that had not one dollar of British labour in them were classed as British.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Their testimony was in a general way that they did not believe that fraud was perpetrated under this preference tariff. We made personal inquiries and in some cases we availed of the services of the officers of the High Commissioner. I hope I may be permitted to say that this is outside of my estimates, which is a vote to pay the officers who must be paid, and I think you might now conclude to give me the money provided I spend it in a proper manner, which I will try to do.

Mr. CLARKE. It is pertinent to the estimate that we should ask for the number of seizures because of fraud. I understand the minister will bring that down?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I might not be able to trace that for a number of years.

Mr. CLARKE. For the last two or three years.

Mr. BLAIN. The linseed oil manufacturers of Canada sent a deputation to wait on the minister to complain that foreign oil was being imported under the name of the British preference. Has the Minister decided to remedy that wrong perpetrated on the linseed oil manufacturers of Canada and which is a very serious grievance?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My recollection is that we took steps to get the facts from the people who manufacture this oil, and the information we got from them

did not agree with the information given us by our friends here. It was very clear to me that the labour in pressing the oil itself did not amount to 25 per cent, but if a certain quantity of seed coming from a country entitled to the preference entered into that oil, that together with the cost of production would entitle it to enter. My recollection is that while they claim that they use some of the Argentine flax, that there was enough of the other kind to bring it under the preference, while our manufacturers here claim that while they ran the Argentine seed they ran it pure, and they do not accept the statement that it is mixed. These manufacturers told us that to mix the two would lessen the value and that it was against their interest to do so. We were not able to determine whether it was right or wrong, and I have not heard very much since from my linseed oil friends or whether they feel that they are not getting fair play. It is one of the most difficult questions we had to tackle.

Mr. McGOWAN. I would like to know from the minister if there is any way of ascertaining whether there is any other seed than this Argentine seed in this linseed oil? I suppose the minister admits that there is not 25 per cent of British labour in the manufacture of this oil?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. McGOWAN. They got over that by saying that there was some British seed in it, and the minister let it go at that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We had inquiries instituted, and my recollection is—I speak subject to correction—that they claimed there was enough of Indian seed going into the oil so that with the cost of production it brought it within the preference.

Mr. McGOWAN. Could you tell from the oil itself whether there was Calcutta seed in it or not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot, and I do not know whether our experts could. Can my hon. friend (Mr. McGowan) tell?

Mr. McGOWAN. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, if you cannot tell I do not suppose that our experts can. It is a difficult matter, but we took all the steps we could.

Mr. McGOWAN. I do not know anything about these other things which my hon. friend from Toronto speaks of, but I am perfectly satisfied that in the matter of linseed oil the revenue of the country is being defrauded in connection with this preference. The minister says that there is not 25 per cent of British labour in the manufacture of this oil and that there must be enough British-grown seed to make up for the deficiency of the labour. I can tell the minister that this is not so. There is not 25 per cent British labour, and every one knows that there is no Calcutta seed going into it. I think the department should take the trouble to ascertain whether they are being defrauded or not in this matter.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The British colonies are entitled to the preference and British seed grown in India gets the benefit of it.

Mr. McGOWAN. How do you know that there is Calcutta seed in it?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If there is not it is not entitled to the preference.

Mr. McGOWAN. It comes in all the same.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The labour expended in producing this seed is as much entitled to count in the preference as the labour of crushing it in England. The contention is that the cost of producing the seed together with the labour of crushing it in England entitles it to the preference.

Mr. McGOWAN. Did they furnish any information as to the portion of Calcutta seed in that oil?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think so.

Mr. McGOWAN. Then I would like to have that evidence brought down.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman would not consider it too much trouble to come to my office, I will be glad to show him the efforts we made in order to arrive at a decision in this matter. I know that the views of the men here who understand the business do not agree with the views we received from the English producers.

Mr. BLAIN. We are to understand that the information furnished by the linseed oil manufacturers of Canada was found to be incorrect.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, it would be better to say that the department has not come to a decision yet.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister has been asking for suggestions to overcome this difficulty, and I wish to remind him that the linseed oil manufacturers of Canada gave him some very valuable suggestions on that score. I will just read one clause:

> Mr. Paterson then asked us what we could propose. We suggested that all persons making such a declaration should make a detailed statement of where the materials were obtained from which the goods were produced.

That is to say, you would alter your declaration so that the party who made the linseed oil would be compelled to make a declaration stating where the seed came from out of which the oil was made in England before it came to this country. May I ask the minister if he proposes to take action

and adopt the suggestion of the linseed oil manufacturers, which I am satisfied would keep out of this country the foreign article ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is worth considering.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister would have to go further. If a portion came from a British colony which was entitled to the preference, he would want the declaration to state the proportion coming from the colony and the proportion coming from a foreign country.

Mr. BELL. It would appear, from the discussion that has taken place to-night, that the charges or statements made on a great many occasions with reference to the importation of goods from Germany, France and other foreign countries into this country, under the British preference were true. The Minister of Customs practically admits that they are true.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I say there might be some come in.

Mr. BELL. That being the case, what steps have the government of Canada taken to protect the revenue ? So far as I know, they rely on the certificate, which has not the force of a declaration, and that in the face of the fact that the department knows from past experience that certain foreign houses in Great Britain have been in the habit of defrauding the revenue continuously. Not many years ago, under the present Minister of Customs, a foreign house in Montreal was detected in a very extensive undervaluation of invoices, carried on for a number of years, in which it was perfectly clear that any statement or declaration made by a house of that character would be perfectly worthless ; and yet, from the statement made to-night by the hon. Minister of Customs, he has relied entirely on evidence in the form of declarations or statements of people of that character of those with whom he had that experience in the past. Virtually the understanding at which the House must arrive, after hearing the minister's statement, is that in this matter the country and the revenue of the country are absolutely unprotected. There are a great many articles of foreign manufacture, which it has been asserted from time to time have been getting the benefit of the British preference, including some goods to which it was scarcely conceivable that any value could be added after their production ; for instance, cutlery, crockery, certain classes of textile fabrics, silks, neckwear, hats and caps, and many other classes of goods. These are apparently coming into Canada continuously as British goods, when the minister has practically confessed to-night that the department over which he presides is not at all satisfied that they are British goods.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not say that. I admit that it is possible that there may be some come in. I admit the possibility, but I do not go further than that.

Mr. BELL. When the minister admits the possibility, and is unable to discriminate or differentiate between a case in which the proper entry is made, and another in which it is not made, or in which an improper entry is made, he leaves the House and the country to come to the conclusion that as far as he is concerned the whole body of entries might be fraudulent, of course I do not say that they are ; that would be an extreme statement ; but apparently the minister is not in a position, with the resources he has in his department, to specify even what percentage of fraud is committed under this preference ; and, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Toronto, the inducement to commit this fraud is now doubled, because, instead of German goods entered as British goods receiving a preference of 33⅓ per cent, they now receive a preference of 66⅔ per cent, which is the difference between the surtax on German goods and the preference on British goods. So that there is danger that this fraud will be perpetrated much more extensively now than it has been in the past. In dealing with these irregular merchants, the minister would not think of accepting a declaration made by a smuggler, much less a mere statement made by a man who is defrauding the revenue of the country. In the case of a smuggler, he does not rely on the goodwill or the good intentions of a man who is under suspicion as a criminal. But he equips an efficient branch of his department as a detective branch, and by that means he has, I believe, to a great extent abolished smuggling on our coasts. In the face of all the statements made in years past, by members of parliament, importers, merchants and others, that German and French manufacturers were taking advantage of the British preference, is it possible that the hon. Minister of Customs has to admit that he has to rely on a simple form of statement, which is added to the invoice in the simplest manner in the world, in many cases by means of a rubber stamp, at the foot of which is put the initials of some clerk or employee of the shipper ? It seems incredible that the minister has not organized some system by which he would secure information in the English markets, such as Sheffield, Birmingham, Liverpool, or London, from which he has the greatest reason to suspect that these irregularities arise. Has not the Minister of Customs employed a detective to catch some of the culprits in this wrong-doing, and, by imposing heavy penalties, made it so serious a matter to evade the law in this respect, that it may be put a stop to ? As far as I can understand from the minister—and I would like to hear further from him in that respect—he has not taken any precaution whatever to secure the conviction of any

person engaged in these fraudulent transactions. Nothing whatever would appear to have been done to secure detection or conviction. If I did not misunderstand the hon. minister to-night, he has practically admitted that he knows that a certain proportion of customs entries are fraudulent. I understood that the hon. minister is in the habit of sending agents to the United States and elsewhere to watch for cases of undervaluation. I understood that a portion of the machinery of his department was the employment of men thoroughly versed in the manufacture of the several branches in which undervaluation is practiced, and I am surprised to find that while the hon. minister was apparently compelled to admit that all the statements made with reference to the evasion of the preferential clause are correct, and so far he has taken no means to secure the detection of the guilty parties and prevent the continuance of those frauds. The country would sustain him in any reasonable expenditure in order to protect our manufacturers and the honest merchants by seeing that the preference we have given so generously to the mother country should not be taken advantage of by foreigners. If the hon. gentleman would apply the same energy to the prevention of frauds on the revenue by this abuse of the preferential clause which he does to putting down the operation of smugglers throughout our seacoast, he would find that this House would cordially second his efforts. There can be nothing more unsatisfactory than to find that the preference which Canada has given the mother country is not being enjoyed by the merchants of the mother country at all, but by foreigners, to whom certainly we would not be willing to extend any favour whatever, particularly at the expense of the manufacturers and the workingmen of Canada. It is quite possible that the hon. minister may not care to take the House into his confidence. He may possibly have taken some steps in this direction and not care to disclose them, in case that might prevent there being successful. Well, if he is in a position to say that he is prevented by the fear of publicity from fully taking the House into his confidence, I would not be disposed to press him unduly, but the impression I gathered from the whole discussion leads me to the belief that the minister was of the opinion that we were being cheated, but could look upon it with a good natured smile as one of those things no fellow could understand. It was a sort of fourteen-fifteen puzzle, which he was inclined to pass over to this side of the House in order that we might see what we could do with it. That certainly is the impression which the hon. gentleman left on my mind. This energetic minister of an energetic government practically confessed that he was beaten and threw up the sponge. He practically admitted that if these foreign houses in Britain choose to continue to send us goods of those different classes under the preferential clause, he did not see what he could do and was disposed to ask what we thought should be done. Does the hon. gentleman wish us to understand that there are insuperable difficulties in connection with this preference, that he has exhausted his ingenuity, that the cleverest minds in his department are powerless to devise a remedy, and that he is absolutely at loss to know what to do ? Is that the position the hon. gentleman takes ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. BELL. I am very glad to hear him say so, but might I ask him to take us to some extent into his confidence and tell us what he proposes to do. It is not at all satisfactory for the people of Canada to feel that they are being defrauded by foreigners, who are ingenious enough to get the advantage of the preferential clause, which it was never intended should apply to them. The people of Canada will not long tolerate a minister at the head of the Department of Customs who admits that he cannot remedy this condition of affairs, and it seems to me that it ought not to be very difficult to devise some means of assuring the conviction of those who thus evade our customs laws. There are only a very few business centres from which these suspicious invoices may come, and but a small number of houses which do this kind of business; is there any insuperable difficulty in watching the operations of those houses ? Can the government not secure evidence, if necessary, by acquiring information from the employees of these houses ? Convictions could thus be secured and the minister could make up a black list of exporters of the mother country, houses dealing in the class of goods under suspicion no statement from which would be accepted in any custom house under the control of the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) is mistaken when he says that the hon. Minister of Customs has admitted that all the statements made with regard to fraudulent invoices under which German or other continental goods obtain the benefit of the British preference are correct. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bell) whole speech was based upon the assumption that the hon. Minister of Customs had admitted these statements. But the hon. minister has not admitted anything of the sort. What he said was—the hon. gentleman will no doubt reccollect it when I remind him of it—that it was possible that fraudulent invoices had been sent and goods fraudulently entered. Wherever you have a system of taxation somebody will manage to evade some portion of his just due. The difficulty is all the greater and the temptation is greater if you have two rates of duty on articles precisely the same or of a similar character. But I wish to say that I think

it is a mistake to have the discussion proceed upon the assumption that there is widespread fraud in this matter. I have not the same information on this subject as my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. But to the extent of my information I agree with him in saying that I do not believe that such frauds exist to any considerable extent. And I will tell why. The Minister of Customs has said that he appealed to reputable business houses in Great Britain on the subject—and they would have an interest in seeing to it that fraudulent dealers were not permitted to carry on their business in this way—and the best information he could obtain was that this fraud was not likely to be perpetrated to any great extent. Among the numerous gentlemen who have waited on me with regard to tariff matters were many who believed that German goods were being fraudulently brought in as British. But I think I do not go too far when I say that in most cases when they were asked to look into the matter carefully and see if they could fortify their impression—because it was only an impression—by reference to particular cases, they failed to do so. We did not ask them to give public information whereby they would have been brought into trouble. We said: Give us a clue; give us your impressions, we will take your information confidentially—some things we could not take confidentially but that we could—we will be glad to follow up your clues and ascertain the facts if possible. And I think I shall not be doing wrong if I say that in most cases the gentlemen who thought that there was this widespread fraud are now inclined to believe that they were mistaken. Of course, some thought the restrictions should be greater—I do not say they upheld the whole preferential arrangement;—but I think that business men are under the impression, not that there are numerous frauds but that the law is being enforced. It may be that there is fraud—there is temptation. But I know on the other hand, that the hon. Minister of Customs has endeavoured to follow up any information he has gained from the merchants. Wherever he has had a clue he has followed it up to ascertain the truth of the case. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) is right in saying that in matters of undervaluation it is the habit of the customs to send agents abroad, if there is reason to believe that any fraud goes on even to a limited extent. It is the duty of the Minister of Customs in such a case, to send out his officers and to see to it that the revenue is protected. While I say with the Minister of Customs that it is possible and even probable that the revenue laws are sometimes evaded, still, my impression is that there is no such general evasion of the British preferential tariff as has been mentioned, and I think that most business men in Canada who have looked into the matter will confirm that impression. If in any case any gentleman in Canada, or any outside of it, will give information that will enable us to follow up the case, no expense shall be allowed to stand in the way of a full investigation. We have all the same object in view. We all want a British preference, that the article which is the product of British labour shall have the benefit of the British preference. That is why the hon. minister is acting fairly in saying that he would be glad to receive suggestions. When merchants have told me that they believed these evasions were taking place, I have asked them to give us the information and to look into the matter, and they have been compelled to say that they could not give the information and would drop the case. If any merchant in this House or out of it would give us information on which we could proceed, then I believe with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), we should follow the matter up and do everything that may be necessary to make the British preference a British preference in reality.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the mistake the hon. Minister of Finance makes is in talking about this as a fraud. If any exporter has this blank declaration before him what will he do. There are instructions accompanying it to the customs collector or inspector. And they tell him that in valuing the goods if they are twenty-five per cent in value over the value for which they were sold in the country from which the goods come, then they are to be entered under the preference. If the exporter makes out that declaration and the goods pass, he does not regard it as a fraud. He is complying with the regulations of the law, according to instructions given him from the Customs Department here. So he does not regard it as a fraud and in reality it is not a fraud to him. But it seems to me that the government have arrived at this stage—they admit that the law giving a preference cannot be worked out, that they cannot find ways and means of so working it out as to secure this preference for British goods, yet they will not repeal or amend it, but will allow it to remain as it is and allow this imposition upon the British public and the Canadian public to continue. Because, say they, we do not know how to devise ways and means to carry it out and the opposition will not tell us how to do it. That is about the situation. The hon. Minister of Finance says that they spoke to reputable business houses. Who were they? I assume that they are people who buy and import and export this very class of goods and who are interested in carrying on the business exactly upon that line.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will permit me, what I said was that of the manufacturers who came with a view to obtaining higher duties, if they might, and who suggested their impression that German goods were being brought in under the British prefer-

ence, I have not found one who, when pressed to bring information, could show a single case in which this has taken place.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman spoke of reputable houses that were consulted in London, England, and the Minister of Customs did the same. If he qualified it by saying manufacturers——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The manufacturers I refer to were in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Have we not shown the minister over and over again how it can be done. Has not the Minister of Customs himself admitted that it could be done in that way? Yet, with that knowledge before him, he does not propose to amend the law or repeal it, but will allow it to go on.

Mr. MONK. The Minister of Customs must admit that it is not very easy to allow such a large item as this to pass until he can give a categorical explanation as to what is being done to prevent these frauds. No doubt frauds have been committed—I have myself heard in Montreal time and again cases where the goods were introduced into this country coming from Germany, and without the observation of the clause in the tariff with which the minister is familiar. So I think we have a right to obtain a clear and categorical statement from the minister, in that voice that can be heard afar, as to what he intends doing to protect the manufacturers of linseed oil, and also what means he intends to adopt to prevent these frauds in the future. The minister must take the House into his confidence. If he is adopting means which he deems it in the public interest not to make public, he is bound to tell us what proportion of this large increase of $80,000 is going to be employed to prevent these frauds. Under these circumstances, I would suggest that this item stand until we have that categorical statement from the minister, to which I think the public are entitled. I move that the committee rise.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman, not yet. Not only do I want to get these items through to-night, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is waiting to get his estimates through. Of course the hon. gentleman is not serious in moving that the committee rise. Perhaps he was not in the House when I was giving categorical answers, as I have been doing all the evening, I have been doing nothing else. He will find my answers in 'Hansard,' and I am sure he will be satisfied with them. But there is not much fraud under the preferential tariff when you compare it with what takes place under the general tariff. I have admitted there may be fraud, but I go further and I say that under the general tariff I know there are frauds, lots of them. We know it, because we seize the goods, and we have to adjudicate upon these frauds. We have special officers in the United States who travel about ascertaining the values. Every little while cases are coming before me of frauds which have been going on for three years, where there has been systematic undervaluation during all these years; and in dealing with them we not only make the offenders pay duties for the three years, but we impose penalties for the three years. There are scores of such cases under the general tariff.

Mr. MONK. Of fraud?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, under the general tariff. You must have them, you cannot help it.

Mr. MONK. Have there been any seizures in regard to infractions under the British preference?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, I believe so; but there has been nothing like the number that there is under the general tariff on goods coming from the neighbouring states, where we get all the information we can. There are scores and scores of seizures, always have been and always will be.

Mr. KEMP. The minister says he has officers throughout the United States investigating. How many officers have the government at the present time, or have they had at any time in the past, in the United States, or in England, in Germany, or France? How many officers have you employed to investigate matters under the British preference?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We have not had one, nor do I propose going to the expense of sending one until I am more convinced than I am yet that frauds are being perpetrated. I do not believe there is an evasion of the preferential tariff to that extent that would warrant me in having special officers in England to look into the matter.

Mr. KEMP. Are the Americans more dishonest than the Europeans?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are doing a large trade with the states, and we have our officers over there. As I say, there have been scores and scores of cases in the department, always have been, of undervaluation and cases of fraud that we have to adjudicate. There is the general tariff, you take what precautions you can. What precautions do you take? Prima facie, the invoice, then there is the new declaration which I have introduced. The old declaration was 'certified correct.' That was all there was on the invoice. The merchant goes over to the other side and buys goods at 30 per cent discount. The invoice comes in certified correct. It was a perfectly true and honest invoice as between the seller and the purchaser, but it was not correct for the Customs Department, because customs duties are to be levied on the value of the goods when they are sold in that coun-

try. Our merchants were going on and making declarations of the price at which they bought the goods in the country of production. You pointed out to them that the goods were undervalued, and they said they didn't know. Well, we said, there is some one that does know, and that is the man who sells these goods, and we will make him certify to the price, and we got a declaration from him. Now when a case of seizure comes up, we come upon the importer and he says he had no idea the goods were undervalued. But our recourse is not on the foreign merchant, he is not within our reach, but these goods are within our reach, and we put a seizure upon them. It is idle to talk about there being no infringement of the preferential tariff, there may be, but there is nothing approaching the frauds that take place under the general tariff. When I say it is possible that some goods come in illegally, I could not say anything else. But if you want my honest opinion of the preferential tariff, I believe there is very little fraud indeed in comparison with the general tariff. Perhaps I have spoken longer than I should. We want to get on a little faster. We need this money, it is to pay your officers. You believe that your officers ought to be paid a little more, some of them at least; and we are asking for more money to pay them and to open new ports in order to keep up with the increasing business.

Mr. BLAIN. When the minister was in the old country last year he made, as he told us, an effort to find out whether frauds were being committed under this preferential tariff. During the debate a year ago this matter was brought to his attention and a quotation from a British newspaper was read to the House. I propose to read it and find out whether the Minister, when he was in the old country, endeavoured to find out from the publisher of this journal whether this statement was correct.

How Foreigners Rob Canada.

Since Canada granted a preference tariff to Britain, tons upon tons of German and other foreign textiles have been brought over to England and reshipped to Canada, after a so-called process of 'finishing,' in order that they may be classed as goods partly of British manufacture. In some cases this 'finishing' in England consists simply in taking off the German, French or Austrian labels, doing the goods up again, and then giving them a British name or label. There is no branch of trade in which this style of smuggling is carried on to the extent that it is in the textile trade.—(Belfast 'News,' January 23, 1902.

That was read when this question was up for discussion in the House on a former occasion. When the hon. minister was in the old country surely he would have thought it worth his while to go and see the publisher of this large and important journal to find out whether he was publishing articles without a tittle of truth in them as the hon. minister has said. Surely he would have thought it worth his while for the protection of the manufacturers of this country and in view of the complaints that were being made in this House and in the newspapers throughout the country to go to this leading publisher and find out whether this article was correct or not. This article says that tons upon tons of goods are being brought over from Germany to England undergoing slight alteration as to labels, &c., and then being sent to Canada under this preference. Surely the hon. minister would have thought it worth his while to put some special officer at work in this country and the old country to find out whether this condition of things could not be stopped in the interests of the people of Canada.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not see that article.

Mr. BLAIN. It was read in the House last year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not pay any attention to that article. It is like the criticisms that are rather too strong and which lose their force for that reason. Talk about tons and tons and tons! Such statements as those lose their force, just as my statements would if I were indulging in criticism and making statements which were altogether too strong. Perhaps there is a possibility that we may be defrauded in some cases under the preferential tariff just as we are under the general tariff, but there could be no better precautions taken than those we have taken that I am aware of, except to employ an army of men over there watching initial processes and then we could not cover every point.

Mr. SPROULE. We do not employ any at all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, we had better get on, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MONK. We have only touched the fringe of this question and we think a great deal more might be said upon it, particularly since the hon. minister has admitted that he does not employ any special men in Montreal or on the other side to prevent these alleged frauds.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not admit that.

Mr. MONK. This is another of the consequences of this unfortunate preference which has done no good to the British people and certainly has done no good to us. I would be prepared for my part to allow the item to pass but the hon. gentleman must understand we cannot go any further this evening.

Mr. BROCK. I must acknowledge that I have been quite moved by the appeal of the hon. Minister of Customs, not so much in his own behalf as on behalf of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr.

Préfontaine), whom we are keeping out of bed to such an unusual hour and who is so unaccustomed to it, but notwithstanding that, now that the hon. Minister of Finance has taken a hand in the debate, I would just like to draw his attention to something that probably might not have struck him before. I refer to the disastrous results of the budget that he brought down this year wherein he stated that he was not going to make any tariff changes. The disastrous results of that budget are beginning to show themselves. We put on duties first of all to collect a revenue, I have no doubt, to pay the expenses, but we also put on duties incidentally, I have no doubt, to protect the manufacturers of this country. The extent to which the manufacturers have been protected may be judged somewhat by the state of the industrial classes at the present time. Are we not aware of what is going on in Toronto at the present moment, and of the value that has been put upon cotton stocks, woollen stocks, steel stocks and other stocks that are affected by the tariff that the hon. Minister of Finance has placed upon the statute-book of this country ? How does he like to talk of millions and millions that are being lost in Canada to-day as the result of the disastrous tariff that the hon. Minister of Finance has imposed upon this country, and as the result of the want of proper protection to the industries of this country ? If we had had proper protection we would not have probably kept the committee so late and we would have been in a better spirit and temper to discuss the matter that is now before this committee. We, on this side of the House, do not object that the officers should be well paid. We think that a great many of them are underpaid. At any rate, the point I wish to make is that the state of affairs in Montreal, in Toronto, and in the large cities of this country is such as should startle the hon. Minister of Finance and make him feel that this country is suffering severely as the result of the want of adequate protection to its industries. The hon. minister says that he is assisting these industries by the small amount of duty that he is placing upon important goods. I contend that we would not have the present disastrous condition of affairs in this country that we regret to see by the Ottawa evening papers to-night had the hon. Minister of Finance taken the proper course at the beginning of this session. If, up to the present time, such serious consequences have resulted from the want of adequate protection to Canadian industries, are we not likely to suffer greater disasters if a change is not brought about ? But, we do hope to have a change. We do not hope to have that change with the present hon. gentlemen in power, but we hope that next year a change will be brought about by the people of this country.

An hon. MEMBER. Not much.

Mr. BROCK. I think some hon. gentlemen who say ' not much ' might speak with better knowledge. They know what is going on at the present time in Ontario and in Quebec, and they know how the people are suffering down by the sea. From one end of this country to the other the manufacturers are suffering and suffering definitely and positively in consequence of the manner in which the hon. Minister of Finance has managed the finances and the financial statement of this country. One of the reasons he gave for refusing to make any changes in the tariff this year was that the manufacturers came to him and he refused to accept statements from them which he said they wished to be kept confidential. There was a very good reason for wishing to keep these statements confidential, not from the people of Canada but in the interests of the people of Canada. I think that the hon. Minister of Finance owes the country an apology and the very best reparation he can make after having caused such an enormous loss, and it is no laughing matter—I can assure you it is a very serious matter——

Mr. DAVIS. That is blue ruin.

Mr. BROCK. To those gentlemen who are handling industrial stocks. The great cry of our hon. friends from the west is wheat. They are all right, but the people who are engaged in industrial pursuits, who have invested millions and millions, are losing their money entirely in consequence of the want of proper sympathy and support from the government of this country.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Before that item is passed I would like to get an assurance from the hon. minister in regard to the matter I brought to his attention a little while ago. He is asking for large increases in the salaries of his officers. Surely it would not be too much to ask them to give a receipt when they take money from importers. It is a small matter, but I can assure the hon. minister it is a matter that is felt by those who place their money in the hands of agents at the ports of entry. It is important that they should have a proper means provided of getting a reckoning from these agents. Collusion might take place between the agent and some of the customs officers and a portion of the money in the hands of the broker might be retained. Between the two of them it should be accounted for.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to send me the letter I will correspond with the collector in reference to the matter. It would be inconvenient to make a law like that if there is no general demand for it, and in many of the large ports it would be impossible to do it.

Salaries and contingent expenses of inspectors of ports, and travelling expenses of other offi-

cers on inspection and preventive service; Board of Customs—expenditure in connection therewith; Customs laboratory—to meet expenditure in connection with the testing of sugar, molasses, &c., including pay of officers appointed or employed for that purpose; Salaries of officers appointed or employed for compiling statistical returns of imports and exports, $129,200.

Mr. TAYLOR. This item used to be given in detail, under the late government and in the first year of this government, and now we have a lot of these items grouped together and the minister is asking $129,000 for a service that a few years ago used to cost only $40,000. We must have detailed explanation about this.

Mr. MONK. We really have done a considerable amount of work. We have voted a million dollars now, and we spent the afternoon on the Railway Bill to suit the convenience of the Minister of Railways.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, carried.

Mr. MONK. These hon. gentlemen need not say 'carried' because we can stay as long as we see fit to do so. We require an explanation as to why these estimates should be grouped together. I think we have done enough work to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We have done nothing.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Of course, there is no intention to force the committee at all, but I am an old enough parliamentarian to know how part of this discussion has gone on to-night. I know that it is not because of a lack of confidence in the Customs Department or in the officers, but gentlemen opposite are in the mood of enjoying themselves a little. I have been long enough in opposition to understand that. However, there will be an opportunity for that when some of my colleagues bring up their estimates, but mine is a business department. I was asked how long my estimates would take and I said they would go through like a shot because I knew that everything was right. Hon. gentlemen opposite have got up one after another on questions that are not very foreign to the subject although a discussion on the tariff was hardly germane to the estimate. We have got over the troublesome item now, and this is a very easy one. The increase is $8,500, but in the supplementary estimates this year I will have to ask for $6,000, because we were short. Here are the particulars: Twelve inspectors, salaries $24,750, expenses $8,500; board of customs, 27 officers, salaries $23,500, expenses $7,000; statistics, 51 officers, salaries $42,000, expenses $400; preventive service, 12 officers, salaries $8,350, expenses $1,300; laboratory, 3 officers, salaries $2,900, expenses $2,500—we have to pay express charges on sugar and other articles that are sent to be tested. Of the increase, $6,000 is to meet additions to the staff and increases. Taking out the 12 inspectors and the chief of the preventive service there are 92 officers and an increase of $50 to each of these would mean an increase of $4,600, I am not promising to give the increase, but I am saying what it would be if we did give it, and perhaps the hon. gentleman would not object to that.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman intend to give it?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think we will in some cases; yes.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister must have made up his mind to it or he would not ask for more money than he needs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are taking a vote for that, and if the hon. gentleman would please let us have it I think we will use it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why should not these votes be kept distinct and separate as they were in 1897, so that we would know what each costs? What is the object of mixing them all up together to confuse them? Omitting this statistical branch which the minister has created, for what purpose we do not know, and which costs $42,000, the minister is now asking $129,200 for services which in 1897 cost us only $42,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This has been done for years, and has been sanctioned by the committee, and for the purpose of comparison is all right. The hon. gentleman is mistaken about the expenditure. There is $42,300 for statistics and $8,350 for preventive service which did not exist in 1897. We established it, and, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) gave us credit to-night, I believe we have stopped smuggling altogether, and that was a tremendous evil in the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am speaking more particularly of the illicit importations of liquors from St. Pierre and Miquelon, which found their way into those provinces. That is not because the people of those provinces were more addicted to the use of liquor. We have, I believe, wholly stopped that smuggling, and the Minister of Inland Revenue, through that stoppage, finds his receipts greatly increased. The expenditure is against me, but the credit goes to the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. MONK. What amount?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That I cannot state. Unless the drinking habit is cured, the liquor which was formerly smuggled is now got from the home manufacturer, and the country gets the revenue from it. Then we have increased the inspectors

since 1897. That was necessary to provide for the inspection of ports which had not been inspected for years. With regard to the statistics, the department have been congratulated by the manufacturers of the country for getting them out. We can send to the members and others at their residences, full returns for the previous month, as full as those that appear in the Trade and Navigation returns.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is under the Department of Trade and Commerce.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, by the Customs Department. We publish these returns by the authority of the House. We are taking the vote just as we did before, but we are asking $8,500 to meet the additions to the staff, and leave us a little margin to give an increase of salary to those who deserve it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman takes credit for establishing the detective service. Surely he cannot take credit for that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is the preventive service.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. McMichael was at the head of that service, with a staff of officers under him, and they were paid out of the vote in 1897. And yet the hon. gentleman claims that he established the preventive service. Nothing of the kind; he simply continued the service which he found when he came in, and I do not know that he has added anything to it. The other items were voted separately, whereas my hon. friend grouped them together for his own convenience a year or two ago. It may be that they passed the House unnoticed; but it is not right to vote $129,000 for half a dozen different services. The items should be voted separately so that we shall know what each service costs. My hon. friend claims credit for giving statistical information. We have a double service of that kind both by the Customs Department and the Department of Trade and Commerce. Why should there be this double expenditure unless it is to provide places for friends of my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This preventive service is different from the preventive service to which the hon. gentleman refers. The preventive service we took up, to deal with the great evil of smuggling from St. Pierre and Miquelon.

Mr. TAYLOR. We had that before.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No. Mr. Fred Jones was put at the head of that branch, and he and the officers under him have done great work, and the service has paid for itself many times over.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Jones was not employed, but Mr. McMichael was, and he was at the head of that service.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. McMichael was and is yet at the head of the service. He has inspectors going around to the different ports, but they do not deal with the smuggling. That service is virtually new. The statistics are also new. They are not published by the Department of Trade and Commerce. Every month we send out as fully detailed statistics with reference to the imports and exports of this country as you get in the Trade and Navigation returns, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that they are valued by the business men of Canada, especially by the manufacturers, who have passed resolutions commending me for that course; because it was at their instance largely that these statistics were published.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they not published by both the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Customs Department?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The report of the Department of Trade and Commerce is not in the same shape. They do not give all the details, as we do. What they give they get from the Department of Customs. We gather the information, and they compile it in their own way, in a condensed form.

Mr. MONK. I would like to get some satisfactory explanation from the hon. minister as to why he has abandoned the former system of giving us these expenses in detail. My hon. friend took nearly ten minutes to explain to us the details of this item of $129,000, which would have been perfectly unnecessary if the estimates had been made as they used to be. I have often observed that the report of the Auditor General in England is far less voluminous than ours, which gives us too much detail. But I maintain that a great deal of our time might be shortened if we had more detail given to us in the estimates submitted by the government. How is it that in former estimates we had all the details that we have been obliged to-night to ask from the minister?

We had then in former years the amount in each province, the increase in each province, and other details which saved a great deal of discussion. Under the present system the hon. minister may divert one expenditure to another, so that we do not know exactly what we are voting. The hon. minister should also explain the distinction between the statistics prepared in the new branch he has organized and those we find in the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce. I fail to see the difference, and this new department imposes on the country an additional expenditure of $42,000. Why has the hon. minister such an enormous staff in that department? The country got on very well before without these fifty-one employees, and the hon. minister tells us that he intends increasing the salaries of

these men, who are doing just the same work as is done by the Department of Trade and Commerce. We have also a right to know from the hon. minister the names of those whose salaries he intends increasing.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If I gave the names my hon. friend would not be any the wiser, because he does not know the men. The expenditure this year shows an increase of $8,500 over the last. The expenditure last year was $120,700, and the House voted that amount. We need not therefore go behind that. We have that as a basis to start from, because the House sanctioned that last year, but hon. gentlemen have a right to ask for the details of this additional expenditure of $8,500.

Mr. LANCASTER. The conditions may be changed from last year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The only change is that we are asking a little more salary for some of the men employed in this work. I think it is a fair rule of criticism that you should start with that amount voted last year as a basis, and ask for details of the additional sum required.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman need not tell us what policy we should follow in criticising his estimates.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was simply pointing out what I judged to be legitimate criticism.

Mr. LANCASTER. We are the best judges of that.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister says that the opposition admitted that the vote of $120,000 last year was right. But he will find that the opposition objected as strongly to that vote then as they do now. But because we do not give an individual or separate vote on each item and because an item is forced through by the majority behind him, the hon. minister taunts us with having admitted that the $120,000 voted last year was necessary. We did not admit it then nor do we admit it now, and I would move to have the item reduced by this $8,500.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If you move to reduce this, you are going to place it out of my power to give any additional sum to men I consider underpaid.

Mr. MONK. Not at all, because under the system adopted by the hon. gentleman he can take the money from another part and increase the salaries. He is not bound by this item. The hon. gentleman has not answered any of my questions. I asked why he has abandoned the system of giving the various items composing this vote. We then could tell for what specific purpose we were voting the money. But to-day, instead of giving us the vote under a number of different heads, he groups it in one single item of $120,000, which will enable him to distribute the whole sum of money over the different heads as he chooses. We are asked to vote $120,000 for seven or eight different objects without knowing what amount will be devoted to each one. There may be reason for that. Surely the hon. minister is able to give us the reason. Otherwise, we shall pursue that course and, in future years we shall be voting still larger sums en bloc without knowing what amount is to be devoted to each separate item. That is contrary to the principle of voting money that we have usually followed and are still following in other matters. As representatives of the people we ought to vote the money for each separate item and limit the sum to that item. This is a wise rule that we have followed, and it is the rule followed in England, and, so far as I know, in the United States, and in the large budget that is voted in France. There may be a reason why we should not follow that rule, but, if so, why does the minister not state it? Another question which I asked, which the minister did not attempt to answer. I merely wanted to draw attention to the difference, if any, between the expensive statistical branch he has established and the one in the department of Trade and Commerce, which formerly gave us the same information. There has been no answer. Was the hon. gentleman himself when in opposition, satisfied with those on the treasury benches when they did not answer his questions? I have never had the pleasure of seeing the hon. gentleman perform the duties of a member of the opposition, but I am sure that he insisted upon answers to his reasonable questions. Then the hon. minister will observe that he has not given us the names of those whose salaries are to be increased, for which purpose he asked a considerable amount. Why not give these names? I think we have a right to answers to these questions, and I would like the hon. minister to give me that satisfaction before we pass this item.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I said to the hon. gentleman that for years the estimates have been prepared in this way.

Mr. MONK. Not in 1896.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It has been so for some years. It is more convenient. If the items were specified, you would not be able to do with the officers of the department what you can now. The services are of like nature—as, for instance, the inspector of the preventive service, the statistical branch and the laboratory. You cannot estimate exactly what you are going to want for each service. But, in this way of voting the money, you can interchange the officers as you could not do otherwise and pass the Auditor General if the money were otherwise voted. You might want to take an officer of the statistical branch and assign him to the board of customs or one in the office of the board of customs and put him in the preventive service or the labor-

atory or make one of them assistant inspector. As changes become necessary during the year you can make them. It will be more than a year before this vote is expended, and it is impossible to say what changes may be necessary in that time.

Mr. CLANCY. Why should the hon. minister make any such changes? The hon minister will pardon me for saying that it is incredible that he sould need to distribute his officers in this way. Does he say that he has a staff of officers compiling statistics for whom he has not employment during the year? If so he had better dismiss them. And so with the other branches. It is unreasonable that the hon. gentleman should bulk five or six distinct services and ask the House to vote the whole sum. The country will expect him to tell how much he needs for travelling expenses of inspectors, how much for travelling expenses for other officers, how much for the board of customs, how much for the laboratory, and so on. Each of these is a distinct service. The hon. gentleman will concede that there is nothing unfair in that. I hope his answer will not be that the item slipped through in other years and that therefore it should be passed now. The fact that it slipped through without question before does not do away with the right of the committee to ask for the facts now. Will he give his estimate of how much is required for each service? If he cannot, he has bungled his department and its expenditure in such an extraordinary manner that the country cannot learn anything about it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I gave that detail, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) did not hear it.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the hon. gentleman give it for each service?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, and I have no objection to repeating the figures for the information of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy).

Mr. CLANCY. I understood the hon. gentleman to give the estimate for last year. But, of course, that is only half the question. Will he give the expenditure?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is the actual expenditure for 1901-2.

Mr. MONK. I think that, so far as getting any information from the hon. gentleman in regard to the difference between his statistical branch and the similar branch in the Department of Trade and Commerce, I must give it up.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No. I must beg the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Monk's) pardon, I was going on to speak of that, when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) interrupted me. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier can bring that up when the Minister of Trade and Commerce is putting his estimates through, the Minister of Trade and Commerce will then give his reasons for the publication that comes from his department. I have given the justification for the issue so far as the Customs Department is concerned. I believe every member of the House values this publication. By bringing the statistical department here we are able to do what we could not do before. We used to have great delay in obtaining the Trade and Navigation returns. Sometimes, even in the month of March, we could not get the returns of the imports and exports of Canada for the month of June previously. Members were forced to ask for special returns, whereas under this system, in the month of July, you can get the whole transactions, imports and exports, for the month of June.

Mr. MONK. I do not quite see that the statements which we get should necessitate so large a staff of employees. Here are fifty of them at an expenditure of over $40,000 a year. I can understand that possibly a larger number of employees might get out the information more rapidly than we got it before.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman will be pleased to know that our statistical department is doing its work very rapidly. There is not a country on the face of the globe that gets out as prompt returns and with as much information as we get. I believe Canada stands ahead of every nation in this respect.

Mr. MONK. I do not at all agree with the hon. gentleman. It is like our Year-book that we get a year after the proper time. If you go to New Zealand, to Australia, or to all the other British dependencies, you will find that their Year-book is out a long time before ours. If you go to the United States, you will find that their statistical abstracts of trade are more complete, sooner brought out, better printed, in fact better than ours in every respect. But the hon. gentleman, I think, has laid down a very erroneous principle when he claimed that because we had passed an item in a previous year we must necessarily pass it every year, unless there is an increase. I do not think the hon. gentleman adhered to that principle when he was in opposition. Parliament is called expressly for the purpose of criticising every year every item of expenditure; that is our duty, and we are endeavouring to fulfil it. Now when my hon. friend to my right made a motion to reduce this item by $8,500, he gave us an example of the kind of arbitrary power we are conferring upon the minister. What did the minister say? He said that in that case all the poor employees of his department would be deprived of their increase of salary for this year. What enabled the hon. gentleman to say that? Just the very rule which he has infringed for two or three years past, and which my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) pointed out. He gave

us several services voted en bloc; and then he says that he can increase or diminish the number of members of the board of customs and their travelling expenses. He is absolute master of that sum of $129,000. My hon. friend knows what difficulties this government had with the Auditor General, most of which were based upon the failure to observe the good old rule that we should vote specific amounts for specific purposes. Now I venture to say that most of the correspondence that we find in the Auditor General's Report since this wise rule has been infringed, has been caused precisely by a failure to observe that rule. Under this particular vote let me point out that we can diminish the salary of all the employees of the board of customs out of the $24,000 that he says is required for that special service for this year. Out of that $24,000 he can divert any sum he likes, to provide for the expenses of a preventive service, for instance. Does he not see that voting money in that way deprives the House of Commons of its valuable privilege of controlling these expenses? We say to the minister: Here is a sum of $129,000, of which you can spend just as much as you like, provided you confine it to six or seven specific objects. If I am in order, Mr. Chairman, I move that this item 228, of $129,200, be divided so as to show the sum of money to be appropriated to each service. I think that would be bringing us back to a very wise rule, and save the government a good deal of trouble with the Auditor General.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the only safe rule parliament can follow in voting money. The object of separating it up into as many parts as possible is that the House may understand what the money is needed for, and afterwards that there may be control over its expenditure.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I trust hon. gentlemen do not think it necessary to do that. Where is the danger? If there be no danger, it is a convenience in the department. If I had to estimate for these different votes I should then have to estimate for a larger amount than I am asking here. I would have to ask for more money under different heads. Things will occur. There are fourteen months ahead before some of this money will be expended, and it is impossible to estimate the whole thing. As it is, this is in the hands of the minister, and it will be in the hands of the minister then. The minister has no more opportunity of doing what is unjust if the vote were divided than he has now. When you want to make an expenditure of a certain amount for a public work, you want to know how much money you are going to expend and what it is for. This is an absolutely different thing, because we are now dealing with the question of salaries and expenses attendant upon the duties of these men.

Mr. SPROULE. Under the old system, when it was broken up and specifically given, was it the custom of the government to ask for more? They asked for less.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will give the hon. gentleman an illustration of that myself. Formerly the vote was made by provinces. This was changed, because you could not estimate fourteen months ahead, and you would have to make an outside estimate for each province. If you ran short $2,000 in one province and you had $8,000 which you did not need in another province, you could not, under the old system, use the unexpended money in the province where your estimate had fallen short, and the officers in the province in which you were short would have to wait for their pay until the new estimates were passed.

Mr. BLAIN. If the House votes money for, say the board of customs, the hon. minister asks the privilege of being allowed to expend that on salaries. Would he not regard that as dangerous legislation?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The board of customs means salaries.

Mr. BLAIN. Or for travelling expenses. The hon. minister has a general vote here, and he can take that money and apply it to any purpose he wishes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Within the vote.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that not a rather dangerous kind of legislation? I think it is, and it is not permitted in any other department of government.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, yes; that has always been permitted in the estimates of the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. BLAIN. Not in the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is a very different thing.

Mr. BLAIN. It is a question whether this House has a right to pass legislation in that way. It seems to me that the minister having charge of that department in the House ought to be able to say nearly how much money he requires for the next twelve or fourteen months for the payment of salaries.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is what I am doing.

Mr. BLAIN. And that he should be able to say what he requires for travelling expenses.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is what I have done.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, if the hon. minister comes forward and says that he wants $20,000 for travelling expenses, what objection can he have to saying that it will be expended for that purpose alone?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You cannot tell exactly. Suppose a case of fraud arises and a special officer has to go to Kansas City, or New York, or Philadelphia, or Boston, you must have a little something to play on. If I had to separate this, I would have to ask for a larger amount than I have, because there would be a danger that in some way we might be short, and the expenses could not be paid. The mission would have to be foregone or the officer could not get his pay. I have given the actual expenses under the different heads last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much did they amount to ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. $121,000. There is nothing to be gained by dividing the vote, and you will only make it more difficult for the department to work. You will just increase the book-keeping.

Mr. TAYLOR. How would it increase the book-keeping ?

Mr. SPROULE. Let us take the hon. minister's reasoning, and we could very much reduce the work of this House. Take, for instance, the Militia Department. There is money to be voted for cartridges, for travelling expenses, pay and drill. We have been dividing these items up and asking for a specific amount for each of them. We could reduce the work very materially by saying we want $2,500,000 for militia purposes. We might go through every department of government and do the same thing. But we do not do it, because parliament, in its wisdom, has devised a better way, and one that is calculated more to protect the public treasury.

Mr. CLANCY. How is the minister able to say what each service costs if there is that promiscuous sort of a thing, of one clerk going from one service to the other. How often has that happened during the past year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am told by the accountant that we have done it two or three times during the last two or three months.

Mr. CLANCY. The very rarity of its occurrence shows that there is no necessity for it. The minister was an able critic when in opposition and he did his country good service, but he knows that such a latitude amounts to license and that it is an extremely bad precedent. I am prepared to acquit the hon. gentleman of anything like stealing or misappropriating any money or anything of that kind, because I believe that if a greater sum were voted to him than is necessary he would only spend so much as would be in the interest of the country, but the principle is wrong.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is no parallel between this case and the case of the Department of Public Works as has been cited. It would not be right to take a vote of $2,000,000 for buildings in Ontario without specifying where these buildings were, but here is a vote to pay salaries earned by our officers and what does it matter so long as the salary is paid whether it is paid under the head of statistics or under the head of Board of Customs. It is a convenience to the department and I hope hon. gentlemen will let it pass, as it is now nearly one o'clock.

Mr. MONK. I move to amend the second item of resolution on 228 so as to show the the sum of money to be appropriated to each service. I am quite prepared to admit that I believe the minister will make a judicious use of this money and that he will not divert it unnecessarily from one service to the other, but in order to defend this system he should not fall back upon his own honesty in which we have the most implicit trust. There is no such vote as this taken in committee of the British parliament.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My impression is that the whole army vote and navy vote is passed in a bulk sum.

Mr. MONK. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am inclined to think so, but I am very certain there is no such detail in the British estimates as there is in our estimates.

Mr. MONK. I am perfectly sure that the hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says that the whole army vote or the whole navy vote in England is passed in a bulk sum. We never find in the British estimates a number of items accumulated together as these are. In voting this sum of $139,000, we are confiding the disposal of it to the hon. gentleman's own discretion. That is what we have no right to do. My hon. friend says he would probably not make any undue use of the money, even in the exercise of that discretion. But in all previous years up to 1896, we voted the amount for the service under separate items. In 1896 it amounted to $819,000, whereas here it amounts to $1,000,000, all the items being grouped together.

Amendment negatived : Yeas, 7 ; nays, 28.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the hon. minister if he proposes to establish a custom-house in Bracebridge ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Bracebridge is one of fifteen or twenty points with reference to which applications have been made. It is an important point, and the application is under consideration. We have not yet finally determined. We ascertain in all cases what business is done. I had a deputation to see me about Bracebridge.

Mr. CLANCY. I might ask about Dresden ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is under consideration, too.

Mr. CLANCY. May I ask the hon. gentleman if there is any comfort to be drawn from the fact that it is under consideration ? Does that brighten the present prospect any ? He took Dresden under consideration last year, when he asked for $10,000 for matters of this kind, including, I believe, some service in British Columbia. This year he is asking for a larger sum. The country has a fair claim on the large revenue the hon. gentleman is collecting from the people, and I think he ought to congratulate himself that there are not more than twenty places asking for additional advantages. I quite understand that the hon. gentleman is subject to constant pressure, in some cases not entirely warranted. I also recognize that it is difficult to make a distinction between different places; but there are always business interests, as in the town of Dresden, which should decide the matter, and the people there put to inconvenience in not having that point made an outport. The hon. gentleman has a preventive officer at Walpole Island, and I would suggest that he might transfer that officer to Dresden and do away with the service at Walpole Island. I know the locality very well. It is said that smuggling has gone on there to a large extent; but a very small sum is collected by the officer there, indicating that the smuggling is very small. I hope the hon. gentleman will consider the desirability of making this change.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It was represented that there was a large Indian settlement at Walpole Island, and that there was not only smuggling, but that the Indians were getting liquor, and that it was desirable to have an officer there. Dresden is becoming an important point. Bracebridge is also. As the hon. gentleman knows, Dresden is near Wallaceburg.

Mr. CLANCY. Twelve miles distant.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That would weigh against it as compared with Bracebridge, whose nearest point is Orillia, thirty-five miles away. I am not putting one place against the other. I am merely stating the points that we have to consider.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to know where the hon. gentleman gets the representation that the Indians are bringing in liquor to such an extent as to require him to keep an officer there. It is not liquor to resell. If it is a little bottle in an Indian's pocket, the officer would have as much difficulty as anybody else in protecting it. I would like to know where the representation comes from.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know whether it was an inspector or not who reported it, but it was reported that it was necessary.

Mr. MONK. I would like to call attention to the reports I have heard of frauds in Montreal in connection with importations from Germany. The hon. minister might employ somebody to find out whether those reports, which have reached me from reputable people, are well founded.

Miscellaneous—Day books, ledgers, bookbinding, printing and stationery, subscriptions to commercial papers, flags, dating stamps, locks, instruments, &c., for various ports of entry, legal expenses and uniforms for customs officers, $37,500.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is an increase of $2,500 here, which is required to meet the cost of printing a book now in course of preparation by the assistant commissioner, containing instructions to the customs officers on their respective duties. We have 1,617 officers, and I suppose each one should have a copy.

Mr. TAYLOR. How does the hon. minister account for requiring $37,500 now when in 1896-7 only $15,000 were required.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. $3,000 are accounted for by the expenditure on uniforms.

Mr. TAYLOR. I find by the Auditor General's Report that last year the department purchased from W. E. Charleson, goods to the amount of $784.94. Were those purchased by tender ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, they were just small items.

Mr. TAYLOR. They were small items bought at retail prices. There is no merchant in Canada who figures so often in the Auditor General's Report as W. G. Charleson. In this account, F—36 of the Auditor General's Report, there are sixteen coal screens at $7.75; enamelled measures, two sets $9.50; ever-ready flash lights, two, $7.50; hammers and hatchets, twenty-four at fifty cents, three at sixty cents; nail pullers, one at $1.25, fourteen at $1.50. In any hardware store you can purchase the best at one dollar. We want samples of these goods brought here. Paper clips, 101, $75.75; padlocks, two gross at $125. We would like to see a sample of the padlocks. You can buy them at ninety cents a piece.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We want good padlocks.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, and I know what customs padlocks are. Why not go to a wholesale hardware man and pay cash prices instead of paying Charleson retail prices for two gross of padlocks, $250. Scales, union, three at $7; four at $7.50; special, seventeen at $6, one at $7; stamping scales, $7.65; small items, $38.40. These goods are charged from twenty-five to fifty per cent advance on the wholesale price. Why should the hon. minister throw away the people's

money in this manner? I think this is enough to warrant the committee to be careful in voting money to the minister—in whose own honesty every person has confidence, but whose department we find buying articles from Mr. Charleson at such prices as I have quoted.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is something I do not know about. To tell the truth I did not know that Mr. Charleson's name was there. But I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has mentioned the matter. I do not know that we can buy these small articles by tender, but we have a right to be saved from over-charge. I will take this matter up with the clerk of supplies and shall question him as to whether we get proper value. So far as I am concerned, I want no extra prices paid for goods, I will look into the matter.

Mr. BLAIN. I see that legal expenses are included in this item. How much was spent for legal expenses last year?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There were only two small items, one for legal advice given to the collector at Montreal, $12 odd, and the other was over some trouble about a lease in Richibucto.

Mr. MONK. This is another case of grouping. And, to show that in England these items are voted according to the principles we have been defending, let me point out the difference. This item includes: day-books, ledgers, book-binding, printing and stationery, subscriptions to commercial papers, flags, dating stamps, locks, &c., for various ports of entry, legal expenses and uniforms for customs officers. In England they separate printing, paper, parchments, binding, small stores, printing for stationery, office publications. There is far more detail in England and each item is treated separately.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is not the army estimate put through in one vote?

Mr. MONK. I have not the army vote here, but the hon. gentleman may be quite sure that in England money is not voted in this way. Now, with regard to the point raised by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), why does not the department adopt the principle which is observed in England and which I have often advocated here? In England they send out a circular with respect to stationery and other articles which the department may require. A list of the articles is given, and the circular is sent to responsible persons, who are asked to report the lowest price at which they will furnish these articles. But the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) purchases these articles without tender, and without information as to prices from friends of the department. We lose more money in that way than it would take to put the port of Montreal in perfect condition in five years. Is the hon. gentleman willing to try the experiment of following the English fashion in this matter?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Day books, ledgers, stationery and such articles are furnished to all the departments from the Printing Bureau.

Mr. MONK. Why is not the principle adopted for all the departments? The hon. gentleman knows that at present when hardware is required, it is Mr. Charleson who sells it to the government at prices that are always or almost always excessive. We have gone into these details in the Public Accounts Committee, and in every case there was proof that a great deal more was charged than the regular price.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that is a mistake.

Mr. MONK. No, I think the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) will recollect seeing in his own newspaper organs, statements that we were paying attention to trifles. They were trifles taken separately, but the aggregate of all these trifles was a very large sum. But, not only is it a loss of money, but the system is unjust to the people in the trade. Under the method pursued in England every man has an equal chance to sell his goods to the government.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that this new arrangement is an ingenious device to get around the Auditor General who has been a very troublesome official to the government——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not to our department.

Mr. SPROULE. Reading the correspondence in the Auditor General's Report, I think we are justified in coming to that conclusion. He has objected to expenditure in many cases because it was not, in his judgment, in acordance with the purpose for which the money was voted. Now, this new arangement is the only way—except by overruling by the Treasury Board—by which the government can get over the Auditor General. This is admirably calculated to answer the purpose and leave the government free to spend money in any one of half a dozen lines without any check whatever. We have just voted a sum of no less than $129,200 which may be spent on travelling expenses, board of customs laboratory, or statistical branch. No matter how the government arranges the expenditure within these broad limits, the Auditor General can make no complaint. If this system is to be continued, you might as well do away with the Auditor General, for his supervision of expenditure is reduced practically to nothing. I do not believe the country will endorse this or like it. The Auditor General is a most useful and important officer, and his power of imposing a check upon the government expenditure should not be curtailed. The sooner we drop this system and revert to that which we

formerly had, the better. We asked the minister several times why he grouped the expenditures in this way, and he gave us several frivolous reasons—did not appeal to us as being legitimate or proper reasons at all. I think I can see through it plainly now, that is the reason for which it has been adopted. I think we will find many evils creeping in under this system, and the sooner we abandon it the better.

Mr. MONK. A moment ago I was pointing out how these items are voted in England. Here is a sum of £536,000 passed in estimates in England, and passed probably in a shorter time than it has taken to discuss this item. But every detail is given: Allowances to servants, allowances to one surveyor, allowance to assistants in laboratory, pay of each clerk, pay of boy clerk, increase in salary of boy clerk. Every single item of that large sum is given.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But they do not discuss individual items as the hon. gentleman is doing.

Mr. MONK. If we take a longer time to vote the estimates, it is because we do not have the information.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The item under consideration is word for word as it was in 1895-96.

Mr. MONK. That does not make it right.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman will certainly allow this item to stand until he brings down the information.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then we can stay here as long as the hon. gentleman can. My hon. friend said he did not know that Mr. Charleson spent $780 of this money last year buying goods. He says the storekeeper no doubt did it. But storekeepers only buy at such places as the government directs. I presume the minister tells his storekeeper where he shall buy his supplies.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I do not, the commissioner may.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman allow this item to stand until he brings down the information, telling us where the storekeeper purchased these goods and at what prices? And let him give us some illustration of the values that we get for the money we expend.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He purchased them because he wanted them, and he certifies to all of them as being reasonable.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let us have a sample of the goods. We have men in this House who know the value of goods as well as Mr. Charleson. The hon. gentleman does not know anything about the value of these goods.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He certifies that the prices are fair and just. I told the hon. gentleman that I would look into it myself, if that is what he means.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then bring down the information before the item is passed.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. On concurrence. I cannot get it to-night. I am anxious to get this passed, so that we may pay these men.

Mr. TAYLOR. We can stay till six o'clock, and we are prepared to do it. The hon. gentleman is undertaking to bluff us to-night. He wants to pass all his estimates before he quits. He is not going to make any progress by adopting this course. Though we are few in numbers, we have just as strong powers of endurance as the hon. gentleman and his friends. We want some more information. Will the hon. gentleman bring down a sample of these goods and submit them to members of this House who are acquainted with the prices? He will find that the prices are outrageous.

Mr. McCREARY. Can you not criticise these items in the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. TAYLOR. But the minister is asking for these votes for next year, and probably a slice of them will go to Mr. Charleson again.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The accountant tells me that he cannot get a nail puller, that they have not got any.

Mr. TAYLOR. Your accountant will not tell you that he cannot get a duplicate of them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I know what an opposition can do if they want to. But when the hon. gentleman says he will talk till daylight, I do not think his friends will support him. The hon. gentleman says he thinks that we paid excessive prices for certain supplies. Well, I will take care to examine into that, I will do so to-morrow the first thing. I will have the clerk of supplies up, and find out what he has done. Now the accountant tells me that he gets a statement that the goods have been received and that the prices charged are fair and just. This person was not appointed by me. He is one of the higher salaried officers and a cousin of Sir Charles Tupper, I think, but a gentleman we have confidence in, and when the hon. gentleman says that they will talk all night unless I consent to let this go, I do not think he is reasonable. This item we are considering now has been the same year after year, with the exception that the customs officer's uniform has been added.

Mr. MONK. I do not think there is anything unreasonable in this demand. Here is an item of $37,000 which is not as it has been in previous years. It is more than

doubled, and we find that Mr. Charleson has sold to the government an item of $708 worth of goods. I am not an expert in the value of hardware. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is, and perhaps the hon. minister is, and perhaps he will be struck with the prices that are charged in that account. They appear to be very abnormal and very extravagant and this is not the first time Mr. Charleson's name has come under the observation of this committee, and the Committee on Public Accounts in connection with excessive charges.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A customs lock would necessarily be a good lock.

Mr. MONK. Is there anything unreasonable in asking that we should see samples of this extravagant bill of sale?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. These goods are scattered all over the country.

Mr. MONK. There are no samples ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No samples, so the accountant tells me.

Mr. MONK. As my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) says they could be got at any time, and one of these locks would be worth keeping as a curiosity.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This clerk can go before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. MONK. When we have voted the money and find that these remarkable charges have been made, our duty is to recriminate.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Would the hon. gentleman know the value of a padlock if he were to see it ?

Mr. MONK. I would. But there are other articles mentioned that I do not know very much about, and I would certainly like to see these samples. I do not think this is a very unreasonable demand. I venture once more to make an appeal to the hon. leader of the House. It is going on to two o'clock and I do not think it is fair to ask us to sit here any longer. I am ready to remain all night if it is necessary.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I had hoped at an earlier stage of the evening that we might have had an opportunity of directing our attention to the estimates of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine), but it is rather too late now for that. I think, however, that having devoted so much time to the estimates of the hon. Minister of Customs, it is only reasonable that we should finish this branch of the estimates and then adjourn. In regard to the late hours, my own opinion is that if the session is to close any time this side of October we will have to sit later than we have been doing in the past. I hope to have the co-operation of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is all very well to adjourn at eleven o'clock if business is going on smoothly, but if the work is to be disposed of it will be necessary that we should sit later than we have been doing in the past.

Mr. MONK. I agree with the hon. Minister of Finance as to the desirability of finishing the session, but it seems to me that we are called upon too early in the session to vote large sums of money when important measures are left in abeyance until it is too late to do them justice. Now, as to the proposition of my hon. friend may I suggest to him that we finish these estimates of the Department of Customs with the exception of one item, the amount required to meet the expenditure in the Yukon. I make this request as there are really so few of us here to-night, and I think it would be well to leave one item open.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are supplementary estimates for the current year and the coming year to come down, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that they will afford ample opportunity for discussing customs matters, and that if they pass this item they will not in any way deny themselves the opportunity of discussing any customs questions at a later stage if in their judgment such is necessary.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have to bring down supplementary estimates for the Yukon for this year, and hon. gentlemen will then have an opportunity of discussing the question because there will be an expenditure made.

Mr. MONK. I suppose if we have an opportunity in the Public Accounts Committee to look into this account of Mr. Charleson we can bring it up in the supplementary estimates ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not the slightest objection to you doing it?

Amount required to meet expenditure in the Yukon Territory, $40,000.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister ought to give us some explanation as to the increase because there has been a falling off in the revenue.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not this year.

Mr. CLANCY. As compared with two years ago.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We ask $40,000 for 1903-4. For the current year we asked $31,000, and I will have to bring down a supplementary estimate for $5,000 extra for this year so that the actual increase will be $4,000 over the expenditure of the current year.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the cause of the increase ? As the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) knows there has been a very great shrinkage in the revenue.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will have to ask for a supplementary estimate

this year for $5,000 more, so that really when this is voted by the House the increase will be $4,000, as between 1902-3 and 1903-4. The increase is made up by an increase in living expenses of two officers at Dawson, Messrs. Harold Rolph and A. Forest, of from $1,200 to $1,800 per year each, increased living allowance to the appraiser, Mr. Wm. Marchant, from $1,200 to $1,800. That is for six months. He comes out from the Yukon to Victoria during the winter, and he is not allowed his living expenses then, but for the six months he is in the Yukon he is allowed $1,800. Then, we have a new officer, Mr. A. D. Ross, who has no living allowance, but who has a salary of $1,800, and there are two new officers who are employed seven months in the year at a salary of $150 a month each. They are T. W. Alcock and T. R. Moulton. These officers were employed on the recommendation of Chief Officer McMichael. He went up there during the summer clothed with plenary power to put the office in perfect shape and he made these arrangements.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—HIDES INSPECTION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I beg to call the attention of the government to the following telegram which I have received :

Some men interested in cattle trade called on me to-night and asked me to put in protest against government's Bill insisting on the stamping of hides. They say there should be no government interference in the matter, for instance, if their hides are stamped number three by the government inspector and they cannot get their price here and have to sell in the states the stamp will hurt them very much. Look into the matter and if you can say something in above line try and do so as I hear also it is the tanners who are at the bottom of it and against the cattle men and farmers.

This telegram is from Mr. W. F. Maclean. I understand the Bill is before the sub-committee and not finally considered, and I wish to call the attention of the government to it, so that they may know. Might I ask what business will be taken up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Railways desires to resume the consideration of the Railway Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Will that be all for to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we get through that we will be very glad ; the Bill is quite a long one.

Mr. SPROULE. If you get through will you go into supply ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not anticipate that we would get through with it, but if we should be so fortunate as to dispose of it——

Mr. SPROULE. If you dispose of that, will you go into supply ? It is of some importance that we should know.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is possible we might take up other Bills, but if all other business is disposed of, we would have to go on with supply, and in that case the estimates of the Minister of Marine will be under consideration.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.50 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 3, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 191) to incorporate the Home Bank of Canada.—Mr. Russell.

Bill (No. 192) to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboia river water power.—Mr. Puttee.

PUBLIC WORKS ACT—AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 193) to amend the Public Works Act. He said : Under the Public Works Act it is provided that the department shall invite tenders for all work to be done. But for the last twenty years, under an Order in Council and on the discretion of the minister, the department could do work up to the amount of $5,000 without inviting tenders. That Order in Council, I understand, has been declared ultra vires by an opinion of the Department of Justice. It is my intention to ask that the Act be amended so as to provide that the department can expend sums up to the amount of $5,000 without inviting tenders ; in other words, making legal by legislation what has been the custom for a great many years in the department.

Mr. MONK. Is there any provision for the transfer of a part of the attributions of the Public Works Department to the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not in this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. WILSON—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. On what part or parts of the bonuses or subsidies, voted in 1896 and up to 1st of May, 1903, was interest payable ? How much of each

of the said bonuses or subsidies, on which interest is payable, has been paid ; and what are the details with reference to each railway ?

2. What is the amount of interest paid in each of these years by each of the said railways on the bonuses or subsidies they have received ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The answer to both questions is that no interest has been paid on these accounts.

PROSECUTIONS UNDER ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. How many writs, or prosecutions, for violation of the Alien Labour Act have been instituted since the coming into force of that Act ?

2. What was the date of the first, and what was the date of the last, of such writs or prosecutions ?

3. How many of such writs, or prosecutions, have resulted in recovery of penalty, or conviction ?

4. How many persons have been deported from Canada for violating the Alien Labour Act ?

5. How many applications have been made to the government for the institutions of writs, or prosecutions, under the Alien Labour Act, which have not been complied with by the Government ?

6. What amount has been expended by the government for the enforcement of the Alien Labour Act, in each year since this Act came in force ?

7. How much has been paid to informers on account of penalties recovered under the Alien Labour Act, in each year since the coming into force of the said Act ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). As to the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th and 7th questions, the government has no power to institute actions for violations of the Act, the law vesting such power in private citizens. The government has no information as to how many of such actions may have been instituted or what penalties may have been recovered. If any such penalties have been recovered, no portion thereof has been paid over to the Crown. Under an apparent misunderstanding as to the provisions of the law, eight applications have been made to the government for the institution of actions for the violation of the Act, but which the government has no legal authority to comply with.

4. Fifty-two persons were deported as the result of official investigations and nineteen left the country during the course of investigations, making a total of seventy-one deportations carried out at the instance of the Department of Labour.

6. The following sums have been expended by the government for the enforcement of the Alien Labour Act :—

1900-1..	277 65
1901-2..	277 65

Since the latter date there has been no separate account of the cost of enforcing this Act.

Mr. WILSON.

CONTRACT FOR NEW PIER AT QUEBEC.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. When was the contract for the construction of a new wharf, or pier, in the harbour of Quebec, granted to Messrs. Dussault & Lemieux ?

2. What is the contract price for the building of the said wharf, or pier ?

3. How many tenders were received for the said wharf ?

4. What are the names of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender ?

5. After the contract had been awarded to Messrs. Dussault & Lemieux, were any changes made in the specifications and plans of the said wharf ? If so, what changes ?

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

1. May 8th, 1903.

2. $198,700.

3. Seven tenders were received.

4. Dussault & Lemieux, $198,700 ; The W. J. Poupore Company (Limited), $199,999.99 ; Lyons & White, $219,900 ; M. P. Davis, $249,000 ; M. Connolly, $273,000 ; Larkin, Sangster & Macdonald, $300,000 ; informal—cheque not accepted—Corry & Laverdure, $184,000.

5. No.

ILLUSTRATIONS IN REPORT OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Have any complaints been made to or by the Department of Public Printing and Stationery regarding the unsatisfactory character of the half-tone illustrations which appear in the annual report of the Department of the Interior ?

2. Were the half-tone cuts for these illustrations made in the Government Printing Bureau? If not, in what office were they made, and what was paid for them ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. The Department of the Interior complained of eight illustrations at the end of part 6. The two least satisfactory were cancelled and done over again. The King's Printer pointed out at the time that the original photographs, which were supplied by the Department of the Interior, were done by an unsuitable process, and better results could not be expected from them.

2. No, the half tone plates were not made at the Government Printing Bureau.

Of the illustrations which appeared, six were done in the Federal Press office, Ottawa, and the two others were done by the Grip Company, of Toronto. For the six $8.50 each, and for the two $12.50 each was paid.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has an investigation been made in regard to the accumulation of postal matter in the Montreal post office ?

2. By whom was said investigation made ?
3. What is the result of said investigation ?
4. Did the person charged with said investigation hear any of the employees upon whom devolves the duty of handling said mail matter?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). If it is intended by this question to suggest that there has been any accumulation of general postal matter in the Montreal post office, such a suggestion is without foundation. The history of the post office shows that at leading city post offices, on exceptional occasions, large quantities of printed, circular and other advertising matter, at times amounting to tons in weight, are at the same moment delivered at the post office for distribution, but such matter is not allowed to interfere with the regular despatch of ordinary regular mail matter. One such instance occurred at Montreal a few weeks ago, owing to the unexpected arrival at that point of a considerable quantity of American circulars, advertisements and sample newspapers, and was in due course disposed of without any interruption whatever to the despatch of the regular business of the office.

No formal investigation was called for or held. It happened that a certain newspaper in Montreal charged the department with delay in the transmission of mail matter, and the Chief Post Office Superintendent, being in Montreal at the time, looked into the matter and informed himself by inquiry of the proper officers as to what foundation there was for the charge, and he found the facts to be as above stated.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Is the government aware that bags of newspapers, circulars and catalogues have remained for weeks, and even months, in the Montreal post office, owing to the insufficient number of employees in said office ?
2. Have Montreal post office employees been obliged frequently to work overtime, in order to dispose of such accumulated mail matter ?
3. Have said employees been paid for such extra work ?
4. Has the Minister of Labour any knowledge of the above facts ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. No.
2. No, only occasionally to meet emergencies.
3. No.
4. The Minister of Labour is not aware that any employee at Montreal is either overworked or underpaid.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Is it the case that employees in the Montreal post office have been subjected to fines, and even suspended, for weeks at a time, for trifling and involuntary mistakes, in the discharge of their duties ?
2. What becomes of the fines thus imposed upon the employees ?
3. Have letter carriers been dismissed for delaying during one day the delivery of certain newspapers, while whole bags of newspapers, and even letters, remained unsorted and undelivered at the Montreal post office, contrary to the public interest ?
4. Is the Minister of Labour aware of the foregoing state of affairs ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. No.
2. The amount of the fine levied upon any employee, if deducted from his salary, would remain in the treasury.
3. No.
4. The state of affairs above suggested appears to be entirely imaginary.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in Committee on Bill (No.21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 26,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that in the latter part of the section there is some confusion of language. You say that :

> Every document purporting to be signed by the chief commissioner and secretary, or by either of them, shall be prima facie evidence in all courts.

I think that is all right.

It would be better phraseology to say 'any document certified by the commissioner or secretary, or either, to be a copy shall have the same force and effect as the original.' However, if the minister is satisfied with it I have no objection.

On section 29,

> The company shall, as soon as possible after the receipt by it, or service upon it, of any regulation, order, direction, decision, notice, report or other document of the board, or the minister, or the inspecting engineer, give cognizance thereof to each of its officers and servants performing duties which are or may be affected thereby, by delivering a copy to him or by posting up a copy thereof in some place where his work or his duties, or some of them, are to be performed. 51 V., c. 29, s. 25, Am.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would suggest to the hon. minister that the words in the section, after the word 'thereby' be struck out, and some words like these inserted : 'And shall see that such regulation, order, &c., is properly carried out.' You are limiting the company to a certain way of delivering the document, and I think it would be more practicable to leave it to the company themselves to decide the best way of reaching their servants or employees, so long as they carried it out. I submit that for the consideration of the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were a number of suggestions made by some Ontario organizations, —boards of trade or town councils—and this may be one of them. Some of these sug-

gestions, it was not thought well, on consideration, to adopt, because they were framed without a knowledge of the scheme of the Bill as a whole. On a superficial glance, they might seem to be all right, while if adopted they would dislocate some parts of the Bill. We have ample provisions in the Bill that the company shall do their duty, and defining what their duty is, so that it is not necessary to say in this clause that they shall perform their duty.

On section 35,

Any decision or order made by the board under this Act may be made an order of the Exchequer Court, or a rule, order or decree of any Superior Court of any province of Canada, and shall be enforced in like maner as any rule, order or decree or order of such court.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You make this new board of commissioners a board of record ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What, then, is the necessity of making any decision or order of the board an order of the Exchequer or Superior Court ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One very cogent reason is that it might be necessary to enforce it by some executive officer or some machinery of the court.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would this have the effect of giving the court jurisdiction over the matter or a right to hear an appeal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

On section 35, subsection 2,

Where an order or decision of the board has been made a rule, order or decree of any court, any order or decision of the board rescinding or changing the same shall be deemed to cancel the rule, order or decree of such court, and may in like manner, be made a rule, order or decree of court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to amend this subsection so as to make it apply to orders of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council as well as to orders of the board. Therefore I move that after the word 'board' these words be added : 'under this Act or of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council under the Railway Act.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see that provision is made for an appeal from this board to the Governor General in Council. In case of such an appeal and of a change of the order by the Governor General in Council, what means would you have of enforcing that decision ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Exactly the same. The appeal would be from the order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council—under the law as at present. The Governor General in Council, if they saw fit, would rescind or vary the order in any way. When so adjudged it would be sent back to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and they would make their order in the terms of the order of the Governor General in Council. They would be obliged to do that. Then, that order, so amended, would be made a rule of court.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there any section that provides for that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is inherent in the necessity of the case.

Motion agreed to, and subsection amended.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 39,

When any work, act, matter or thing is, by any regulation, order or decision of the board, required to be done, performed or completed within a specified time, the board may, if the circumstances of the case seem to so require, upon notice and hearing, or in its discretion, upon ex-parte application, extend the time so specified.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that not a little dangerous to suggest that they may in their discretion, extend that time without hearing the other party ? They might be interfering with the other party's rights. There is no objection to their having the power to extend the time, but there is a danger that they might interfere with the rights of the other party if they are allowed to extend the time in their discretion on an ex parte application.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A sudden emergency might arise where it might be necessary to extend the time without giving notice, and where it would be undesirable to hamper them in the exercise of their discretion. It is well to make the Act as elastic as possible. We do not want to see the commission brought up standing against some legislative obstacle, as they might be if they are not given discretion. Circumstances may occur which would make it in the highest degree necessary to all parties that a moderate extension of time should be allowed. We could not afford to legislate in any such iron-clad manner.

Section agreed to.

On section 41,

No order of the board need show upon its face that any proceeding or notice was had or given, or any circumstance existed, necessary to give it jurisdiction to make such order.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Should not an ex parte application or order say that it is an ex parte one ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it is necessary to

require that that should be done in order to give the commission jurisdiction. This is a class of legislation which is very much adopted in order to avoid the possibility of acts of the tribunal being set aside.

Mr. LANCASTER. It may not be necessary to make the order show all the circumstances that are required to exist to give jurisdiction, but it would be right to have the order say whether it was given on notice or ex parte. I think my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is right. The order should state whether it is made ex parte or on notice.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think where it would be ex parte we may be safe in assuming that there will be no likelihood of omitting the statement, but I would not like to put it in the statute. There are a large number of cases in which it is provided that ex parte orders may be made temporarily, made only to enable time to elapse so that notice to the other side may be given. It is hardly well to encumber the Bill too much or to assume that any reasonable statement of the reason for making the order would not be there.

Mr. LANCASTER. My point is this; I am not saying that the statute should say that notice must be given or that the order must say that it is ex parte or not. If the section read in this way it would be better :

No order of the board need show upon its face that any circumstance existed, necessary to give it jurisdiction to make such order.

It need not say whether notice was or was not given, but if you leave in the words 'any proceeding or notice' you are almost enacting that the board shall not say that the order was made on notice. You are rather indicating to them that it would be better not to do so. You are legislating on a matter that is all right from the hon. minister's contention, if these words are left out. By leaving these words in, we give notice to the commission that they should not say in their order whether it has been issued on notice or ex parte. I think they should be free to do so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman is wrong in saying that any inference of that kind will be drawn by persons administering this Act. There will be no purpose served by setting forth in the order whether it was made ex parte or not, because the people who are interested and who claim that they ought to have had notice before any order was made would know whether it had been or not. They need not be acquainted with what is already within their own knowledge. It is not necessary to assert that the order was issued with or without notice in order to give jurisdiction. The fact of the notice is not necessarily an element in jurisdiction, because the Bill provides that temporarily and in emergencies interim orders may be made ex parte and this is regarded as likely to be necessary in many cases. You cannot reach people to give them notice. Some emergency may arise and the board ought to have power to act without notice.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is a different question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it is not a different thing. Therefore, notice to the party would not be necessarily an element in jurisdiction in many cases. We are only dealing with the question of jurisdiction. We are only providing that the jurisdiction shall not be questioned because of the omission to allege or set forth any circumstances which existed.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would not that be sufficient without expressly saying 'any proceeding or notice was had or given ?'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It refers to the circumstances existing in the case relating to the merits. It is not the circumstance as to who made the application or who was present at the time the order was made. If the presence or absence of notice is necessary to constitute jurisdiction, then, it would be necessary to allege it in every case. It could not be alleged truthfully in every case, and it would not be necessary in every case.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not mean that it should be necessary to allege that there was notice given, and that if the parties got notice that is all there would be about it. The party who got the notice or did not might want to prove that he had the notice or he had not as the case might be. A party might want to be able to prove that it was an ex parte order, and I think he should be allowed to. The order would prove in the hands of anybody whether it was an ex parte order or an order on notice, and I think it would be well that it should do so.

On section 45,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved :

That section 45 be expunged.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You cut out section 45 altogether, and you do not give them power to award damages.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. The more I thought of that the less favourably I was impressed with it. I do not think we should usurp the usual functions of the courts of this country.

On section 50, subsection 2,

No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, papers, tariffs, contracts, agreements and documents before the board, or in obedience to the subpœna or order of the board, or of any person

authorized to hold any investigation or inquiry under this Act, or in any cause or proceeding based upon or growing out of any alleged violation of this Act, on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him, may tend to criminate or subject him to a penalty under this Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think there ought to be here a provision like that in the Criminal Code with regard to protecting a man if he gives the evidence. Under this section, you might make a man criminate himself. But, in such a case sufficient public benefit is gained by his evidence and you should give him the protection afforded by the Criminal Code. The exact words of the criminal law on this point I have not at hand at the moment. But they have been found to work out very well. They provide that a man is bound to attend and give evidence, but, if he gives the evidence, he is absolved from criminal prosecution except prosecution for perjury in relation to the evidence he gives. I do not think it would be well, as a matter of public policy, to leave the section as it is here. Under this section a man might be compelled virtually to put a halter around his own neck and lock himself up. In that case he is apt not to tell the truth. But, if he is freed from a criminal prosecution, you can probably get from him, all the facts, and that is what is needed in the public interest. I should suggest that the hon. gentleman insert here the words of the Criminal Code with regard to a similar state of affairs.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I intended to propose an amendment which may be in line with what the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) suggests. I move to strike out the words 'a penalty under this Act' at the end of the clause, and to put in their place the following: 'any proceeding or penalty, but no evidence so given or any document so produced shall be used or received against such person in any criminal proceeding thereafter instituted against him, other than prosecution for perjury in giving such evidence.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose that this point has been very carefully considered. It is covered in the Canada Evidence Act, I think, and I suppose, in the code also. Are we following the same language?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The same as the Canada Evidence Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Subsection, as amended, agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose the following as a third subsection to section 50:—

In any proceedings before the board and in any action or proceeding under this Act every written or printed document purporting to have been issued by the company, or authorized by the company or any officer, agent or employee of the company, or any other person or company for or on its behalf, shall, as against the company, be received as prima facie evidence of the issue of such document by the company and of the contents thereof without any further proof than the mere production of such document.

Motion agreed to.

On section 60,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This does not seem to make any provision to meet the case where no date for the annual meeting is fixed in the special Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would be an oversight if it were not named in the special Act. It is always named.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In a great many cases that have come under my personal observation the day is not fixed in the Act and the directors are authorized to fix the day. In the province of Nova Scotia it is the usual practice not to fix the day but to allow the directors to do it by by-law. You might have a little difficulty with regard to the words 'on the day mentioned in the special Act.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you suggest that we name a special day?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You might say 'on the day mentioned in the special Act, or provided for by the special Act.' That would cover it perhaps.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do you not fix, somewhere in the Bill the day of the annual meeting?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is alluding to.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought it was fixed in the Bill for the purpose of making up the report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not recall any case in which it has not been fixed, but there may be cases in Acts passed previous to recent years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In view of what has been said by my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) do you desire that there shall be a uniform day for the annual meeting?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is important that it shall be held anterior to a certain day so that we get the reports in time for our annual report. That is all we are concerned about. They generally hold these meetings on the 5th of September, or about that day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it is of any importance this would be a very good place in the Bill to provide for fixing the day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We might say the first Wednes-

day or the first Tuesday of a certain month in cases where provision is not made in the special Act.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 61,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved:

That section 61 be amended by striking out the words at the end of the section 'evidence of the sufficiency of such notice' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sufficient evidence of such notice having been given.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 66,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Under this you will still have to prove that the person signing is the secretary. It is a question as to whether or not we should not provide for that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would go very far to facilitate simplicity in these matters, because after all they are purely formal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Some time ago I had to get a document certified so that it would be used in the courts of Massachusetts, and I had to get it certified by the Chief Justice, by the Lieutenant Governor, by the Secretary of State and by the Governor General, if I remember aright, and it took us about a month to get the document so prepared. In matters of this kind that are purely formal, and where there is no probability of fraud, it is desirable that they should be made simple. Perhaps the minister would consider the wording of this clause.

On section 73,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In a case which recently arose, the number of surviving directors did not constitute a quorum and they could not fill the vacant seat. Of course, that is unusual, but I propose to provide for it by inserting:

And in case such surviving directors do not constitute a quorum, then by the shareholders at a special meeting to be called for that purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister uses the words 'surviving directors' here, and the words 'remaining directors' in another part of the clause. Would it not be better to continue the words 'remaining directors,' and then you will deal with those who have resigned as well as those who are dead.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would be better.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ERIE ONTARIO POWER COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 134) to incorporate the Erie Ontario Power Company.—Mr. German.

On section 11,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Bill stood over that I might have an opportunity to look at the eleventh clause. I have considered the matter and have concluded that I would suggest to the committee the advisability of leaving out this section entirely and amending the corresponding clause in the General Act so as to cover the point which I think was intended to be covered. My amendment would be to strike out this clause, and renumber the clauses from ten down. There is no reason why this should be incorporated in all bills.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time, and passed.

CANADIAN NORTH-WEST IRRIGATION COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 143) respecting the Canadian North-west Irrigation Company.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 5,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member who is in charge of this Bill will be able to explain.

Mr. McCREARY. I have been asked to take charge of the Bill by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). I have no instructions except that the hon. gentleman told me that the Bill had passed the committee except for the eleventh section, which, it was agreed, was to be struck out as, I understand the provisions will be incorporated in the General Irrigation Act. So far as I know the balance of the Bill is satisfactory. If there are any objections, I shall have to ask that the Bill be allowed to stand over, as I do not know the merits of the Bill personally.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As I understand, the object of the Bill is to have this irrigation company take over some lands belonging to a railway company, and form a separate corporation for the purpose of irrigating the land. I think the Bill was allowed to stand over in order that the Department of the Interior might investigate. I believe that has been done and that the report upon the Bill is favourable.

Mr. McCREARY. Yes. There is a letter from the Deputy Minister of the Interior

that the Bill, with section eleven struck out, is satisfactory. The company, under the original Act of 1893, have power to hold a very large quantity of land. The quantity they are allowed to hold under section five is much less than that allowed under the original Bill. The Deputy Minister of the Interior wrote the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) that he was satisfied with the measure.

On section 11,

Mr. McCREARY. That is to be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Shall clause eleven be struck out ? Carried.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time, and passed.

UNITED EMPIRE LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 163) respecting the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Thompson (Haldimand and Monck).

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Finance Minister intended to look into this Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I have made some inquiries. The hon. member who has charge of the Bill will be able to explain the points involved.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). The purpose of this Bill was merely to extend the time of this particular insurance company. But the Department of Finance requested the promoters of the Bill to make some changes by which the powers of the company were limited instead of extended. These changes were agreed to, and the Bill was passed by the committee about a week ago. One or two other clauses were added also, one to enable the company to change its name, because the present name is very like the name of another company in existence. The Bill passed through the committee without any opposition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). One of the questions raised was in reference to whether or not the somewhat elaborate sections introduced by way of amendments were covered by the notice given of the Bill in the 'Canada Gazette' and the local press. That is a matter which perhaps would not come to the attention of the committee to which the Bill is referred and, of course, the Committee on Standing Orders would only have regard to the provisions of the Bill as originally introduced. Is there anything in the amendments which would fairly require further notice ?

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). I do not know how that would be technically, but I think there is no need of anything of that kind. As I say, the amendments proposed in the committee deprived the company of some powers which they held under the old charter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where a Bill is introduced in conformity with the notice, the House claims the right to change it if necessary. I do not think there is anything in the rule which would prevent our considering it. Of course, if the changes were very material, it would be a fair argument that notice should be given so that the parties concerned should be protected. I was not present at the consideration of this Bill, but I am informed that officers of my department were present and were satisfied with it, and no doubt, taking that statement, it was well considered. Personally, I was not present, nor did I hear the discussion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think we would have to take these suggestions with a little caution, because otherwise a very important measure might go through the House with very little notice. A single section of a Bill might be introduced in the first instance, and the necessary notice given, and then very elaborate provisions attached to it by way of amendments in committee. I should be inclined to think a Bill limiting the powers of a company would require notice under the rules of the House just as much as a Bill extending the powers. However, as the Department of Finance seems to have been satisfied with regard to the matter, and as I cannot see that any one is likely to be very much affected by allowing this Bill to pass, I am not disposed to raise any further question.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 180) to incorporate the Prince Edward Island Ferry Company.—Mr. McKinnon.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 91,

At the annual meeting of the shareholders of the company, a dividend may be declared out of the net profits of the undertaking.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). It appears to me that technically speaking this is hardly in the form it ought to be. No dividend should be declared until after a full statement has been submitted by the directors to the company and approved of by them, which statement should show just what the transactions of the company have been for the year. This course is one which has been pursued by the principal companies. In the

course of my communications with the companies they have not made any objection to the Bill being amended so as to provide that such a course should be taken.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is an important change in the Bill. Would the minister have any objections to leaving this clause so that we can see the amendments after they are prepared ?

Mr. BARKER. The practice with nearly all companies is that the directors at the end of the year decide what the dividend shall be, and as a rule it is paid out. But at the annual meeting which generally follows a month or six weeks afterwards, a formal resolution is taken confirming that divided, and it is thus really a dividend authorized by the shareholders. I think the committee ought carefully to consider any change, and I suggest that the hon gentleman have his amendment printed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am anxious to have the views of the committee on the subject. It is manifest from what the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has stated, that the course pursued is not one which is sanctioned by law as the law stands to-day, because it is the company at its annual meeting which declares the dividend according to the existing law. Seeing that the law is not in conformity with the existing practice, I think it is necessary that something should be done and that some change should be introduced into this Bill. I will pursue the course the hon. member has suggested, and before we come to deal with this again, the members will have an opportunity of seeing the proposed amendment.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 93,

No dividend shall be declared whereby the capital of the company is in any degree reduced or impaired, or be paid out of such capital, shall any dividend be paid, in respect of any share after a day appointed for payment of any call for money in respect thereof, until such call has been paid ; but the directors may, in their discretion, until the railway is completed and opened to the public, pay interest at any rate not exceeding five per centum per annum, on all sums called up in respect of the shares, from the respective days on which the same have been paid ; and such interest shall accrue and be paid at such times and places as the directors appoint for that purpose. 51 Vic., c. 29, s. 71, Am.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that amended in any way ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only change is from 6 to 5 per cent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This seems to be a rather singular provision. Does it mean that you can pay 5 per cent interest out of capital ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that is what it means.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It has been on the statute-book for some years past, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does not the hon. minister think this is rather dangerous legislation even though it is sanctioned by the fact that it has been on the statute-book for so long a time ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why should the company pay back to a shareholder who has put his money into the concern, part of that money pending the completion of the railway ? I have no doubt there must be some plausible reason for it which was urged when it was originally passed, but I am rather at a loss to conceive what that reason could have been ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only reason that occurs to my mind is that in the initial stages of these undertakings and organizations it is very important to offer considerable inducements to people to subscribe and pay up their stock. I presume it has grown to be a practice, and having become a practice has been consecrated by legislative enactment, and the law has been passed to allow people who have put their money into an undertaking of that kind which cannot possibly be a paying one at the outset, to receive interest upon the money which they have advanced, and from the date at which they have advanced it. I do know, from personal knowledge, having had some little acquaintance with the manner in which companies are financed and organized, that this is not an uncommon thing for other companies to do.

Mr. BARKER. I think the hon. gentleman's explanation is just what has taken place in these companies. If the money could not be obtained upon shares during construction, the company would probably have to borrow from banks and pay interest, and they therefore induce shareholders to pay up as early as possible under the promise of getting interest. While it appears an extraordinary thing to pay dividends not earned, yet if the shareholders did not pay up early, and during construction, when the company could not possibly earn any dividends, the company would have to borrow from bondholders or bankers and others and pay interest. I do not know that it wolud make any appreciable difference to the company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They could make calls payable as the directors might see fit.

Mr. BARKER. Subject to the approval of the shareholders.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the shareholders, by postponing calls and working the

matter out under this section, would really get back part of the money they put into the company as capital. If you had a railway which occupied a long time to complete, you might have 25 or 30 per cent of the capital paid back to the shareholders by way of interest under this section. I do not regard the principle of the legislation as good, and as far as other companies are concerned, I do not know how any other company could do that legally except by virtue of some such statute as this. Apply it to the case of an ordinary commercial company and see how badly it will work out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is done all the same.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it is done the directors are subjecting themselves probably to a criminal prosecution. They are putting themselves exactly in the same position as they would place themselves if they paid dividends out of capital.

Mr. BARKER. This is only during construction.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is only during construction, but a railway takes a very long time to construct and it is different in that respect from the working of any other undertaking. In the latter case the operation begins almost at once. The operation of a railway may be postponed for a long time, and during that time the shareholders cannot get any dividends out of profits, because no profits can be earned. It seems to me that the better way is to leave this out. Any man who goes into the business of a railway knows when he has put in his money that he cannot get a return for four or five years. He is in no worse position than the man who puts his money into a life assurance company, and who knows that he cannot get dividends for five or six years. I cannot see very much distinction between allowing a life assurance company to pay dividends out of capital and allowing railway companies to pay dividends out of capital. However this may be sanctioned by practice and the fact that it is already on the statute-book, I am bound to say that I cannot approve of the principle of it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Here is the principle of it: Where a subsidy of so much per mile is given upon the completion of a road, the company hypothecate government securities and sometimes make an arrangement with the government by which the government become the trustees of the fund and one of the conditions of the trust is that pending the completion of the road dividends shall be paid out to the shareholders on the moneys they paid in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not think of introducing a clause into the Bill embodying that principle if it were not there, and yet I feel reluctant to suggest that it should be dropped out. There are many reasons against it, it is true.

Mr. CLARKE. Would there be any hardship in dropping it out?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think there could be anything that could be strictly described as a hardship. It may be less easy to finance an undertaking of this sort when it was dependent upon the stock subscribed.

Mr. BARKER. The chief objection to the clause arises out of the change that was made in another clause of the Railway Act. Originally no one could take stock in a railway company without the obligation to pay for the stock in cash, but as times went on and methods were found for floating companies, provisions were put into the Railway Act under which directors might give persons promoting a railway, either as directors or otherwise, stock as paid up stock. These people never pay a cent in cash upon their stock, and the objection I see to this clause is that shareholders who never paid a dollar might be able to draw dividends during construction. I would not see any practical objection to it if no one drew a dividend on the stock during construction except the man who actually paid his hard cash into the enterprise. The minister will see that where a contractor or promoter gets a considerable block of stock without paying anything on it, it may be a nice thing for him to draw a dividend during construction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When the Erie and Niagara Power Company's Bill was up the other night I asked that it might stand over until I gave some attention to a similar clause, and I hope to be able to suggest an improvement in that clause.

Mr. BARKER. Why not let this stand until the question is considered.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very well, the section stands.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 103.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What do you mean by rateable shares. Do you mean by this clause any person who refuses to pay a call made upon him in respect to any shares?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is my interpretation of it.

Mr. BARKER. The call itself is rateable and the nonpayment should not forfeit the shares but should subject them to forfeiture.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And the shares are not forfeitable to the company. Suppose all the calls were paid but the last one, it is

pretty hard that they should be forfeited to the company.

Mr. BARKER. It should be done by a resolution of the board.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Even then, when a forfeiture occurs, that is done by resolution of the board, not by Act of parliament, which makes the shares forfeitable by the company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, the word 'forfeited' is very often interpreted as equivalent to liable to forfeiture. That seems to be the effect of this section, because the forfeiture does not actually take place until there is a declaration thereof at a general meeting of the company. Is this the statute as it is now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is, and it is very curious that no question has arisen under it, so far as we know. However, we will let the three sections, 102, 103, and 104, stand for consideration.

On section 105,

The directors may sell, either by public auction or private sale, and in such manner and on such terms as to them seem meet, any shares so declared to be forfeited, or any unissued shares, or he may pledge such shares for the payment of loans or advances made or to be made thereon, or for the payment of any sums of money borrowed by or advanced to the company : provided that authority for such purpose and for the issue of the stock be first given at a special general meeting of the shareholders for the purpose. 51 V., c. 29, s. 83.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any provision in the Act giving the company power to dispose of its shares below par ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is not in the Railway Act a similar provision to that which I think can be found in the General Companies Act, authorizing the board of directors to declare a rate of discount. I think it is in the English Companies Act, and I know it is in the New Brunswick Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I read this section, it would give the directors unlimited power in that respect. The directors may sell either by public auction or private sale. Suppose we leave out the words that are immaterial, the section would read thus : 'The directors may sell, by private sale, on such terms as to them may seem meet, any unissued shares.' That is to say, the directors, having taken a few shares, enough to qualify themselves as directors, could sell the other shares by private sale at ten cents on the dollar. In that way the Act does give the directors power to issue the shares at a merely nominal figure. Is that the clause in the old statute ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the minister considered that as a matter of policy ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, the duty would devolve on the directors to dispose of the shares to the best advantage.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the statute give power to the company to increase its common stock ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. A special Act sometimes does. But then there are conditions attached.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not assuming a case in which the directors are acting otherwise than bona fide. I know power is sometimes given in special Acts, respecting industrial enterprises, to dispose of the stock on such terms as the directors may seem fit ; but there are always exceptional reasons which induce a legislature to grant a power of that kind, and the courts have been very strict in regard to such powers. Of course, I do not minimize the fact that this provision has been in the statute for a long time; but as a general principle I am opposed to giving any company power to dispose of its shares below par, and it seems to me that that is particularly applicable to a railway company. If you have a railway company which requires to raise $1,000,000, and you give it power to capitalize itself for $10,000,000, and under a section like this to issue that stock at ten cents on the dollar, you will have a difficulty about dividends and everything of that kind when you attempt afterwards to interfere with or control the rates of the company. It seems to me that a provision of this kind might merit from the hon. minister the attention which perhaps, in a very voluminous statute such as this, he has not been able to give to it up to the present.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With regard to these clauses concerning the issue of stock, no complaint of any sort having arisen, I did not scrutinize them closely with the view of seeing whether they contained any objectionable matter. I had my mind particularly directed to the other practical cases which had come under my own attention. I think that there is very much to be said in favour of a somewhat exhaustive examination and improvement of these clauses, but I would not like to undertake to cover the ground now.

Mr. BARKER. I do not see any objection whatever to allowing the directors to sell forfeited shares. They fall into the hands of the company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not raising any question as to that.

Mr. BARKER. But as to the other part of the clause, enabling directors to sell unissued shares at any price, I think that that

is extremely dangerous. The fact that it has not given rise to any question so far is not quite material, because hitherto there has been no real value in railway shares, but there may be a great deal of stock held to-day, which in a few years may become valuable. It may be that shareholders, who perhaps had subscribed 20 per cent of the whole capital, would authorize the directors to sell 80 per cent to the existing shareholders at the rate of 10 cents or 5 cents on the dollar. In that way there would be watered capital from the very beginning of the enterprise. If there is one thing more than another, which the public objects to it is being made to pay dividends on watered capital. It does not at all follow that, because such a clause has been in former Railway Acts, that it was ever considered with any care. A good many clauses were inserted in Railway Acts because somebody had suggested them, and they were often put in for a private rather than a general purpose. It would be well to allow this clause to stand and let the minister appoint a committee or take it upon himself to consider the whole scope of these sections.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would involve a good deal of change to re-cast them all. We could deal very summarily with this by striking out the words 'or any unissued shares.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. My opinion is that the directors, with the consent of the shareholders at a special meeting, should have the absolute disposal of forfeited shares or the unissued stock of the company. That has always been the case. Perhaps in the case of forfeited shares, you might provide that the original owner should have some equitable interest in them.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a strong feeling against the shares of a railway company being sold at a very low figure, and then traffic rates being levied to pay a dividend on the par value of the stock, and some means should be devised for putting a stop to that practice. With regard to forfeited shares, even though you strike out the words 'unissued shares,' you might by collusion allow the shares of a railway to be forfeited—certain parties might allow them to be forfeited with the understanding that they would be sold by the directors to the shareholders.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I agree with what the hon. member has just said. There does not seem to be any reason why the directors should have the right to place a mere nominal value on a large body of unissued shares, distribute this stock among themselves practically for nothing, and after the lapse of a few years dispose of them in the market as securities upon which dividends are expected to be paid. I am quite of the opinion that we should put an embargo on that sort of thing. At one time it was the law of the land that every one who subscribed for a share was bound to pay the par value in cash, or if the company got into difficulties, he could be compelled to pay the creditors the difference between what his share cost him and its par value. That is no longer the law, and it is now the custom for companies seeking incorporation to issue their stock without a farthing being paid into the treasury of the company. I think perhaps we had better let clause 105 stand, and see if it is not possible to do something in the line indicated.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 106.

A certificate of the treasurer of the company that the forfeiture of the shares was declared, shall be sufficient evidence of the fact, and of their purchase by the purchaser; and such certificate, with the receipt of the treasurer for the price of such shares, shall constitute a good title to the shares; and the certificate shall be, by the said treasurer, registered in the name and with the place of abode and occupation of the purchaser, and shall be entered in the books to be kept by the company; and such purchaser shall thereupon be deemed the holder of such shares, and shall not be bound to see the application of the purchase money—and his title to such shares shall not be affected by any irregularity in the proceedings in reference to such sale; and any shareholder may purchase any share so sold.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is one thing that occurs to my mind at this moment in connection with this section. We know that the cases in which shares are forfeited are very few and that might be a reason why we should have a special clause with regard to that. But it occurs to me that as soon as we take away from the company the power to dispose of the unissued shares, the ingenuity or others in control of the undertaking will be directed in the other way, and they will have shares subscribed by parties who do not pay or intend to pay. These will forfeit the stock, and so by a roundabout way they will accomplish the same purpose as if the shares were alloted to them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That can be prevented by cancelling the shares when forfeited.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it will be better to let that clause stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 108,

Every shareholder shall be individually liable to the creditors of the company for the debts and liabilities of the company to an amount equal to the amount unpaid on the stock held by him, and until the whole amount of his stock has been paid up, but no such shareholder shall be liable to an action in respect to his said liability until an execution at the suit of the creditor against the company has been returned unsatisfied in whole or in part.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That would render the shareholder liable if his shares were forfeited.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He would be liable for the balance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is another clause by which it is provided that the forfeiture shall exempt him from liability for all actions for suits,—actions or prosecutions whatever.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is as between shareholder and shareholder. But he is not relieved of the balance due on his shares.

On section 110,

A true and perfect account of the names and places of abode of the several shareholders shall be entered in a book, which shall be kept for that purpose, and which shall be open to the inspection of the shareholders.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there any provision under the Act that a majority of the directors shall be British subjects ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that is in the Railway Act. It is sometimes put in special Acts.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is so in some of the special Acts. But, as I understand it, they may come under the provisions of this Act by abandoning their special Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that where the special Act requires that the directors or a portion of them be British subjects, that would govern no matter what we might put in here. I do not think it would be well to put in a general clause that the directors or any particular number of them shall be British subjects.

On section 111—issue of bonds ; disposal of bonds ; extended borrowing power.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The reference to section 70 in the 37th line is an error,—it should be section 61, and I move that it be so amended.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to insert after the words 'issue bonds, debentures' the words 'debenture stock.'

Mr. BARKER. Would the minister use there the words in addition 'perpetual debenture stock' ? That is a well-known species of stock in England, and I think there is something like it now being issued by the Mackenzie & Mann Company. They are called perpetual debenture stocks because they are not redeemable.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will make that addition also.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any limitation in this Act as to the amount per mile for which bonds or debenture stock may be issued ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The special Act determines that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may be that the limitation is fixed in every special Act which is passed by this legislature, it may be that that has been the practice. But may you not be confronted with this situation, that you have a special Act by a legislature, or a special Act passed by this parliament, which makes no mention whatever of any bonding powers ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In that case there would be a limit to the extent that it would not enable them to issue any bonds at all, because they have got to have a special Act to define the quantity.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there some provision to that effect ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not say there is in explicit terms. But I have not contemplated the probability of any special Act being passed which did not deal with a bond issue.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not considered this as much as the minister, and whatever I say is in deference to his better-considered opinion. But the scheme of this Act is that its provisions are to be treated with the special Act as one statute.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then you have a special Act which contains no provision whatever about bonding, but you have incorporated with that the express enactment in this section and subsequent sections which give power to bond under such terms as should be fixed at a meeting of the company. It would seem to me that the result of that is to give to the company power to bond for any amount that may be fixed at the annual meeting.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Act everywhere speaks of the two being combined together, the special Act and this Act as containing the limit.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not observe those words before making my remarks. I suppose they will probably cover it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think by implication they would. I can see, however, that to make it clearer a word or two might be inserted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think what I said before might not perhaps be very pertinent except that in a special Act passed by a provincial legislature powers might be granted which this parliament would not

consider justifiable. Therefore, it might be wise to put some limitation in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that if we say that the amount of the bonds, debentures, or other securities shall be fixed in the special Act and shall not be exceeded, we will make it clear beyond all doubt. They have to get in a special Act the necessary authority to issue bonds and the limit will be specified. In the general statute you could not name the quantity because every case must rest upon its own circumstances.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Suppose excessive powers are given by a provincial legislature, of borrowing that we would not think of giving here ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, the special Act passed Dominionizing, as it were, the railway would contain a limitation as to the power to issue bonds.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a railway went into an amalgamation ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do I make myself clear ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not to me. Suppose, under a special Act of a provincial legislature, a company is given what we think excessive bonding powers, the amendment of the hon. minister would hardly seem to meet the case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It seems to me that you would require a special Act of this parliament to create the undertaking a Dominion work. That would be a special Act and in one of the clauses of that Act you would declare the amount of bonds that might be issued, provided no bonds had previously been issued. If they had already been issued, then, of course, it would be past and gone and there would be no remedy, but if they had not been issued you could do it in this way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought the scheme of the hon. gentleman's Bill was that the mere connection of any proposed railway with a railway already under the legislative authority of this parliament would make it a work for the general advantage of Canada, and therefore they would require no Act of this parliament at all. For that reason it seems to me that the hon. minister does not quite meet the difficulty raised by my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I see it now. We might leave that section and consider it later on.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 116,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This section is very inartistically worded. It is a transcript of the existing law and it starts out by the use of language which does not seem to contemplate the idea of a company making a note for borrowing on its credit, but rather suggests that it may simply have power to transfer the note it may receive. There are two things which I propose to do here. I propose to strike out the $100 and not place any such limitation as that upon the company. I propose to recognize in this clause the right of the company to borrow money as occasion may arise without limitation, not as they would on bonds with respect to which they would probably issue a mortgage, but to go into the bank if they wish for their temporary purpose ; suppose the company find it necessary to make a loan, for instance, to do some emergency work which they would expect to repay out of the earnings in the ensuing few months. A large company may want to borrow half a million or a million dollars and when its credit is good they should be allowed to go to a bank and give a note for it. Practically it is done every day, and it would be as well that it should be recognized. It is done but it is not done under as favourable conditions as if the practice were recognized by law. My proposal is to insert after the word 'may' in the first line :

May for the purposes of the company borrow money by either draft, promissory note, warehouse receipt, bill of exchange or otherwise upon the credit of the company.

I would strike out also the words 'less than $100.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I cannot imagine a railway company wanting to give a note for less than $100.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is absurd.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is unlimited for any purposes of the company, and it is unrestricted as to the time of repayment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and as to the amount.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They might in this case effect a twenty year loan.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do you think the bank would look after that ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In England they have sometimes provisions of this character. They have borrowing powers not exceeding a certain limit, and these are usually secured by debentures or debenture stock, or what are called there floating securities. Besides that, the company has power, for its ordinary, every-day, temporary purposes, to effect loans of a different character, which are not taken into consideration upon an inquiry as to whether or not it has exceeded its borrowing powers. It is not considered to be an exercise of the borrowing powers to which I have referred. It seems to me

that this clause, taken in connection with the bonding clause, might lead to a somewhat curious result. I do not know that I can point out at this moment any special evil that may be anticipated from it, but I have a feeling that we do not exactly know what we are doing in giving these special powers. I do not know whether the minister has thought the matter out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have given the matter a good deal of consideration, and it did seem to me that a railway company which was not in a pretty strong financial position would not be able to borrow much, while a company which was, and could borrow on advantageous terms, would not be likely to do so unless it were necessary. Why should not the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk, for instance, be free to borrow any amount they really needed? They would not want to borrow more.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the minister is satisfied, I do not take any objection.

Section agreed to.

On section 117,

If the construction of the railway is not commenced and fifteen per cent on the amount of the capital stock is not expended thereon within two years after the passing of the Act authorizing the construction of the railway, or if the railway is not finished and put in operation within five years from the passing of such Act, then the powers granted by such Act or by this Act shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the railway as then remains uncompleted. 51 V., c. 29, s. 89 Am.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is a pretty stringent clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have reduced the time for completion from seven years to five years. We are now putting five years in all our special Acts. After this Act comes into operation, that will not be necessary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any provision in the Bill with respect to a railway company which ceases to operate its railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman mean that without any question of insolvency it ceases running?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For example, I have in my mind two railways which were mentioned in the House during the present session—the United Counties Railway and another, which ceased to operate their respective roads for a considerable period of time; and when some question was asked in the House with regard to them, I think the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals stated that nothing could be done under the law as it then existed; and it occurred to me, in view of this section, that possibly some provision could be inserted to meet such a case; and my inquiry was intended to elicit whether any provision of that kind has been proposed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is nothing in the present Bill that will cover the subject which the hon. gentleman alludes to. We deal with the case of a railway which ceases operation because of insolvency, and only that. The difficulty which I felt regarding the whole question was this. A company ceases to operate its line or part of its line, because it does not find it to its advantage to operate it: it is not profitable to do so. It might possibly be a solvent company. If it is, and if it has received any aid from the government, it would be liable, under its contract, to proceedings to compel it to operate the road and pay a pecuniary penalty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman mean that there is a provision in the subsidy contract that the company shall operate the road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but how to provide anything like an adequate remedy in such a case is to me at present an insuperable difficulty. The government might take possession of the road, but that is a thing we could not seriously consider. There are many roads which are just managing to survive, because everybody in the district through which it passes is interested in helping it along, but if there was the slightest possibility of the government taking possession, in case the road should stop running, it would stop very soon. If anybody has any idea of some really workable plan, I shall be glad to know it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This clause supersedes any powers given for the construction of the road and any limitation of time provided in any special Act?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the special Act governs.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would that be perfectly clear if the special Act had been passed before the enactment of the general Act?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Section 3 provides for the case of any special Act passed previous to this Act as follows:—

If in any special Act heretofore passed by the parliament of Canada it is enacted that any provision of the general Railway Act in force at the time of the passing of such special Act, is expected from incorporation therewith, or if the application of any such provision is, by such special Act, extended, limited or qualified, the corresponding provision of this Act shall be taken to be excepted, extended, limited or qualified in like manner.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You still have the old nightmare of the special Act subse-

quently passed by a provincial legislature. Suppose you have an Act passed next year giving a railway company in the province of Nova Scotia seven years to complete its road. The road connects, let us say, with the Intercolonial Railway, and is connected at once, and then construction is started towards the Strait of Canso, as might be the case with the road proposed to be constructed through the county of Halifax. What would be the effect of this section upon it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that in that case, we could apply section 4.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This Act would then apply to such a railway to the exclusion of inconsistent provincial legislation. Therefore, you will not by section 117 reduce the time from seven years to five.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We may have amended it so as to destroy the application, but otherwise it would.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In any event I suppose it is a very unlikely case.

Section agreed to.

On section 118, subsection (g) :

Erect and maintain all necessary and convenient buildings, stations, depots, wharfs, and fixtures, and construct, purchase and acquire stationary or locomotive engines, rolling stock and other apparatus necessary for the accommodation and use of the passengers, freight and business of the railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to amend this section, in the first place, by placing the word 'construct' at the beginning of the section.

Amendment agreed to.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see that the words in the existing law, 'carriages, wagons, boats and other machinery,' are struck out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. I propose also to insert in the first line of the subsection, after the word 'convenient,' the word 'roads,' and, after the word 'wharfs,' in the second line of the subsection, the words 'docks, elevators,' and to strike out the word 'fixtures' and insert the words 'other structures.'

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. BARKER. Why not, instead of 'passengers, freight and business,' use the words 'traffic and business,' for 'traffic' is defined in the interpretation clauses as covering passengers and freight ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very well. I move to strike out the words 'passengers, freight' and insert the word 'traffic.'

Mr. BARKER. There is no objection to the word 'business,' except that it seems to be covered by the other expression.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Better leave it there.

Amendment agreed to.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why does not the hon. minister give the railway company power to buy carriages, wagons and boats for their business, to carry freight to and fro between the town and the station ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think there is any doubt about their power to do that.

Mr. BARKER. The expression 'other apparatus' would cover that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A good many of the railways do their own freighting in the cities.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think they do it through independent organizations.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Some do it through subsidiary companies, but others do it direct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is covered by 'other apparatus.'

On section 118, subsection (i) :

Take, transport, carry and convey persons and goods on the railway, regulate the time and manner in which the same shall be transported, and the tolls to be charged therefor.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This will not give them compensation for carrying to and from the station. This is in line with leaving out the words 'carriages, wagons and boats for their business,' as given in the old Act. They are limited simply to tolls.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think these two clauses were intended to be broad enough to cover the case I was mentioning, where a railway acts as its own freighter in a city it could buy carriages and wagons and could charge something more than a toll as compensation for the freightage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The subject was discussed very fully, and it was thought that the word 'tolls' would be sufficient to cover it.

On section 118, subsection (j) :

Fell or remove any trees which stand within one hundred feet from the centre line of the railway, or which are liable to fall across any railway track.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to ask the committee to strike out the words 'the centre line' and insert the words 'either side of the right of way.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You give them power to cut trees within one hundred feet

from the side of the line of the road. Suppose the right of way is sixty-six feet wide, that would give them 133 feet instead of 100.

Mr. LANCASTER. By the use of these words 'or which' you may be going further than 100 feet from the right of way. Should we not describe some limit as to how far you will go?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Go just as far as the tree may be high. If the tree is more than 100 feet high, they would have a right to cut it down.

Mr. LANCASTER. Look at the effect on the land owner. He would not know where the railway had a right to go, and he might get into complications in trying to prevent them from what he thought would be a trespass. It would be better to fix this a little clearer than to have the railway employees go into a man's field and take one isolated tree without being bound by any certain distance from the line of railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This has been the law for twenty years, and there have been no difficulties so far as we know.

Mr. LANCASTER. There have been troubles to my certain knowledge, and that is why I mention it. It would be better to say 150 feet if necessary.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to restore a clause in the existing law and to make it subsection 2 of section 118 as follows:

Any company which has obtained from the Crown by way of subsidy or otherwise, in respect of the construction or operation of its railway, a right to any land or to an interest in land, has, and from the time of obtaining such rights has had, as incident to the exercise of its corporate powers, authority to acquire, sell or otherwise dispose of the same or any part or parts thereof; and such company may convey the same, or any part or parts thereof, to any other company which has entered into any undertaking for the construction or operation, in whole or in part, of the railway in respect of which such land or interest in land was given; and thereafter such other company shall have, in respect of such land or interest in land, the same authority as that of the company which has so conveyed it; and as to any lands given to the company by any corporation or other party as aid towards, or as consideration in whole or in part for, the construction or operation of the company's railway, either generally or with respect to the adoption of any particular route, or on any other account, the authority of the company and of any other company to which it may convey its right in any of the said lands shall be the same as if such lands had been obtained by the company from the Crown as aforesaid.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If I understand the hon. minister rightly, this gives the company power to convey land to another company to be used for a similar purpose to that for which it was required by the company conveying it. It does not interfere with the purpose for which the land has been expropriated. According to some opinions when land is not used for the purpose for which it is expropriated it reverts to the original owners.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Some opinions hold that it does revert altogether.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This gives the company which has expropriated land for railway purposes power to convey it to another railway company which has to use it for the particular purpose that the company which expropriated it intended to use it for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It enables a company to dispose of its lands as freely as a private individual may. It cannot acquire, sell or dispose of lands that it has obtained for the purposes of the company except in a very limited way and under special conditions, but if it has received by way of bonus or grant an area of land from any source, it can deal with these lands the same as a private individual can, and if there are any conditions attached to it, such as that a railway shall be constructed, the company may transfer these lands to another railway company and the other railway company is bound by the conditions and shall be entitled to exercise all the rights and powers the same as the original grantee.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then it goes farther than I stated. Where a railway company receives a grant of land for the purpose of erecting a station in a particular part of the town it may, upon the non-user of the station, abandon the property, dispose of it absolutely to another person just the same as the original grantor could to the railway company or any other person.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it does not mean that. It is not applicable to any such case at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The trouble is that we cannot tell from looking at the amendment because we would have to look at the particular section which it amends and we have not that before us.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will pass it and if the hon. gentleman sees anything about it that he would like to have altered he can call attention to it.

Mr. BARKER. I think it would be desirable to let us see the original section and bring it up again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no objection to that.

Section allowed to stand.

Progress reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will be taken up to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We shall take some of the Bills which are on the Order Paper, and when we dispose of as many as are ready, we will proceed in Supply on the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the Railway Bill come up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. The Minister of Railways and Canals has other engagements to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, June 4, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 194) respecting infectious or contagious diseases affecting animals.—Hon. Mr. Fisher.

QUESTIONS.

SETTLEMENT OF LABOUR DISPUTES.

Mr. BELL asked :

1. Of the twenty-four instances in which conciliators have been appointed for the settlement of labour disputes, under 'The Conciliation Act, 1900,' in how many cases has a settlement of the dispute been arrived at as the result of the appointment of such conciliators ?

2. In the case of such settlement, if any, in how many instances has the settlement sustained the claims of the employees ? (b) In how many instances has the settlement sustained the claims of the employers ?

3. Of such twenty-four conciliators, how many have been officials of the Labour Department ?

4. In the event of any settlements of disputes having resulted from the appointment of conciliators, why has not a memorandum of the terms of each settlement been filed with the Minister of Labour, as subsection three of section four of the Conciliation Act requires ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. There have been fifteen instances of the settlement of labour disputes by a conciliator, under the provisions of the Conciliation Act, 1900. Two of these were cases of strikes averted as the result of the appointment of a conciliator under the Act. There was in addition, one case in which, the intervention of the department having been requested by one of the parties to a threatened strike, negotiations were subsequently suspended at the request of the same party, and the matter in dispute left for final adjustment to the parties immediately interested.

2. In the case of the fifteen settlements referred to, three have been in favour of the employers, five in favour of the employees, and seven the result of compromises and mutual concessions. Two of the strikes in question arose purely out of misunderstandings and were settled by explanations of the real situation.

3. With the exception of the cases in which the Minister of Labour acted as conciliator, the conciliator appointed under the Act has invariably been an officer of the Labour Department.

4. The cases of conciliation effected under the Conciliation Act have not been effected through the medium of boards of conciliation, or of representatives of the different parties, as contemplated in subsection 3, of section 4, but have been effected through the instrumentality of officers of the department, and in each case the settlement has been announced in the next issue of the 'Labour Gazette.'

CENSUS—RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION OF PEOPLE OF CARLETON AND VICTORIA, N.B.

Mr. HALE asked :

1. Has the attention of the census commissioner been called to alleged errors in the religious classification of the people of the counties of Carleton and Victoria, N.B., especially of the free Baptists ?

2. Has the commissioner asked the enumerators, or any of them, in the counties of Carleton and Victoria, N.B., to revise their returns, with the view of the correction of errors in the religious classification ?

3. Was such revision made, and what report did the enumerators of the counties of Carleton and Victoria make to the commissioner ?

4. Has the commissioner corrected his compilation of the religions of the people of the counties of Carleton and Victoria, according to the corrections made by the enumerators ? If so, what changes have been made in the totals of the several denominations in these counties ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. The attention of the census commissioner has been called to alleged errors in the religious classification of the people of New Brunswick, with especial reference to Free Baptists, but not in particular to the counties of Carleton and Victoria.

2. The enumerators of Carleton county have been asked to revise their returns.

3. The enumerators of Carleton county have reported that the religions of the people were entered on the schedule, exactly according to the information given to them by the people at the time of census taking ; but that when the revision was made during the present year, they were informed of cases in which persons entered on the schedules as belonging to one particular sect of Baptists, or as Baptists simply, belonged or were attached to some other sect of the same denomination. The compilation was made according to the entries in the schedules, the correctness of which has been attested by the oaths of the enumerators.

4. The tables were published before the revision in Carleton county was begun, and no changes have been made in the totals of the several denominations.

CENSUS—RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION OF PEOPLE OF SUNBURY AND QUEEN'S, N.B.

Mr. WILMOT—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the attention of the Census Department been called to alleged errors in the religious classification of the people of the counties of Sunbury and Queen's, N.B., especially of the Free Baptist denomination ?

2. Has the commissioner directed the enumerators, or any of them, in the foregoing counties, to revise their returns, with a view to the correction of errors in the religious classification, if any ?

3. If so, what report did the above enumerators make to the commissioner ; and will that officer be directed to correct the classification of the religions of the people in the above counties ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. No, except generally for the whole province.

2. Yes, concerning persons who were recorded as 'C. Baptists,' whose identical sect was in doubt.

3. The revision showed that some persons so described were Calvinistic Baptists, and that others were Christian Baptists, and the corrections were made for the first volume of the Census Report, the Christian Baptists being counted as Free Baptists, and the Calvinistic Baptists as Baptists.

STENOGRAPHERS IN YUKON TERRITORIES.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Has Mr. J. A. Valiquette been appointed stenographer for the Territorial Court of the Yukon ?

2. Has he also been appointed private secretary to Judge Dugas ?

3. If so, is the government paying him the same salary as the other official stenographer ?

4. Is it the intention of the government to provide each of the three Yukon judges with a private secretary ?

5. Has the government received any intimation that the time of the court stenographers is not fully required in their official duty?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.)

1. Yes, in place of Mr. Shepard, transferred to Gold Commissioners' office.

2. No.

3. Yes.

4. No.

5. No.

POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES—HOLIDAYS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. How many letter carriers and post office employees, in Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and Quebec, have been deprived of their holidays in the years 1896, 1901 and 1902.

2. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to grant the usual holiday to all men employed in the post offices of the above cities this year ?

3. Can such a holiday be given to the Montreal post office employees in the present condition of that office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock.)

1. None so far as the Post Office Department knows.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

MONTREAL LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE—PAYMENT OF MILITIA.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Is the government aware that the city council of Montreal has unanimously adopted the following resolution :

'Whereas the harbour of Montreal is recognized as the national port of Canada. Whereas the recent longshoremen's strike affected the trade and commerce of the Dominion of Canada. Whereas the Militia Act stipulates, in connection with such an emergency, that the pay of the force requisitioned may be advanced out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada : Be it resolved, that the Dominion government be humbly requested to pay the militia employed on the property of the harbour of Montreal during the said longshoremen's strike.'

This was carried unanimously.

2. Is it the intention of the government to relieve the ratepayers of the city of Montreal from the payment of the cost of calling out the militia at the time of said strike ?

3. What is the total amount of said cost ?

4. Will the government treat the ratepayers of Montreal as well as it has treated the ratepayers of the town of Valleyfield ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden).

1. The government is aware that the city council of the city of Montreal has adopted the resolution set out in the question, but it is not aware whether it was adopted unanimously or not.

2. Under the provisions of the Militia Act the government has no power to do so.

3. $18,850.42.

4. The government has no power to discriminate as between ratepayers of the different communities.

NORTH-WEST LANDS—SCHOOL TAXATION.

Mr. OLIVER—by Mr. McCreary—asked :

Are Canadian Pacific Railway lands in the North-west now subject to school taxation, as a result of the recent legal decision by the Manitoba courts ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The government is so advised.

P.E.I.—WINTER COMMUNICATION.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is the government aware that the winter steamship 'Stanley' is in such a condition as

to render her unfit to perform the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ?

2. Has it been reported to the government that the hull of the ship has been weakened and plates bent and indented by contact with the ice, greatly impairing her usefulness as an ice steamer ?

3. Is it the intention to send SS. 'Stanley' to a first class shipyard in Great Britain during the present summer for repairs ? If not, Why not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Mr. Prefontaine).

1. The government is not aware that the steamship 'Stanley' is in such a condition as to render her unfit to perform the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the Mainland.

2. It has not been officially reported to the department that the hull of the ship has been weakened. There are some indentations in the plates, which must result from a service of that nature, but they are not sufficient to impair the usefulness of the ship. These indentations will be removed where possible and new plates placed where necessary.

3. No, as work can be done here.

FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask whether the Minister of Trade and Commerce is prepared to make an announcement with regard to the Fast Atlantic Service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I hope, to-morrow.

ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier) moved second reading of Bill (No. 187) to amend the Electric Light Inspection Act. He said : This amendment is simply to provide for the recovery of penalties from corporations when corporations are owners of electric plants.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, read the third time, and passed.

INLAND REVENUE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 186) to amend the Inland Revenue Act, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The change is in making the duties payable on the first instead of the sixth of the month. All articles produced by manufacture are required to be either warehoused or entered for duty at the close of each month. Any article produced during the month, if not placed in warehouse, was allowed to be held by the manufacturer until the sixth of the following month before the duty was collectable. At the present time very little goods are so held over, and in order that the accounts of the different divisions might be closed at an earlier date, the payment of duty is fixed the first day following the close of each month.

On section 3,

Mr. MONK. Why is there a proviso that this subsection shall apply to all transactions subsequent to the 1st of July, 1902? Are there any questions in abeyance in connection with that ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The change is owing to the fact that it has been determined that the quantity of fusel oil or other refuse removed from spirits produced from molasses is greater than that found in spirits produced from grain. Grain spirit is left at 3 per cent, and molasses spirit fixed at 4 per cent. The provision is made retroactive so as to cover the operations of the current fiscal year, and thus enable the manufacturers to take advantage of this law.

On section 4,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The only change is providing for the payment of the duty on the first instead of the sixth of the month, and is rendered necessary by the change in section 1.

On section 5,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The only change is to make it clear that packages of cut tobacco weighing one pound do not require to have the gross, tare and net weight marked thereon, and to permit the removal of cut tobacco from one manufactory to another as raw material for the purpose of blending or further treatment before being packed and placed on the market. In fact, the only change is with regard to cut tobacco.

I wish to move the following as an additional clause :

That subsection three of section 241 of this Act as enacted by section 11 of 52 Vic., chapter 15, be repealed and the following substituted in lieu thereof :—

3. When it is ascertained by the quarterly stock-taking that the standard of production established by or under this Act has not been reached by any bonded manufacturer, the duty on the quantity of spirits equivalent to the deficiency so determined shall become due and payable within one day of the close of each quarter, except that in cases where a deficiency has been found, and where the Minister of Inland Revenue, after a proper inquiry, is satisfied that such failure to reach the established standard was not due to any fraudulent dealings by the manufacturer, the quarter in which the deficiency arose and the one immediately following may, for the purpose of computing the standard of production, be merged and dealt with as one period. The provisions of this section shall apply to all transactions subsequent to the first day of July, 1902.

The reasons for this addition are the following: In many bonded vinegar manufactories, the standard of production (100 proof gallons of vinegar from each twenty-five proof gallons of spirits used) is not reached owing to the generators becoming defective and incapable of properly converting the alcohol into vinegar. In consequence manufacturers, at times when it was impossible for them to produce the required standard of production, have been compelled to pay an assessment to bring the production up to the standard fixed by the department. It is felt that, in cases where the cause for such deficiency in production is found to be beyond the control of the manufacturer, and not due to any fraudulent practices, the privilege should be granted of merging two quarterly periods into one. In the past the department merged one quarter with another, extending over three or four quarters: but a year ago we were advised that we had no authority to do this, though it had been the practice for many years, perhaps twenty years or over, and this provision is to limit the time to six months.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

Bill (No. 188) to amend the Weights and Measures Act, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). This section is new and exempts postal scales of a limited capacity from the provisions of the Act respecting inspection. Those small scales are used only to determine approximately the amount of postage payable upon letters or other articles sent through the mail. The true amount of postage is determined by the post office authorities. These scales are in many cases exceedingly small and of frail construction, and their inspection, which is now required by law, is not essential in the public interest, as the legal determination of the weight upon which postage has to be based is ascertained by the officials of the Post Office Department.

Mr. McCREARY. I would ask the hon. minister to defer action until some members from the west are present who are aware of the particulars. I think that the hon. members for Marquette and Macdonald wish to make a few remarks and have some suggestions to offer. I am not thoroughly acquainted with the practical working of the Bill myself. I notice that the hon. member for Lisgar is absent as well. I think it would be well to allow this Bill to stand over until another day. I move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

CUSTOMS ACT—SURTAX.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 174) to amend the Customs Act.—The Minister of Customs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson). This is a Bill to define what is meant by the surtax, which is a new expression. It is not a Bill imposing the surtax, but a definition of what the surtax means.

On section 3, subsections 1 and 2,

The subsection added to section 4 of the Customs Act by section 2 of chapter 22 of the statutes of 1895, is repealed and the following are substituted therefor:—

There shall be a Board of Customs, which shall consist of the commissioner of customs, or any officer for the time being acting as such, who shall be the chairman of the board, and such duly qualified officers of customs as the Governor in Council from time to time appoints; and the said board shall have such powers and perform such duties as are assigned to it by any Act of the parliament of Canada or by the Governor in Council; and three members of the board shall form a quorum and be competent to transact the business of the board at any meeting thereof, whether regular or special, called by the chairman, of which quorum one member shall be either the commissioner of customs or the officer for the time being acting as commissioner of customs.

Mr. MONK. Would the minister please explain the additional expense that this organization will throw upon the country?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. So far as the alteration of the Board of Customs is concerned, it will entail no extra expense—perhaps lessen it. At present the Board of Customs is composed of an officer in Victoria, an officer in Halifax and officers in other outlying ports. The repeal of the existing section and the provision that there shall be a board, the members of which shall be nominated by the Governor in Council, the number of whom can be added to if the necessity arises, will enable us to summon meetings of the board more rapidly and at less expense. With reference to the subsection as to the assistant commissioner, that will add $2,800 to the expense.

On section 3, subsection 3,

There shall be an assistant commissioner of customs, appointed by the Governor in Council, who shall hold office during pleasure, and shall have such powers and perform such duties as are assigned to him by the Governor in Council, or by the Minister of Customs.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. minister selected the assistant commissioner?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, Mr. John Bain.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did the hon. minister give the reasons for the appointment of an additional member of the staff

at the time when the resolutions were passed in committee ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) may recollect that the subject was debated when the vote for the salary of the assistant commissioner came up as one of the items in the estimates for my department. After discussion, the committee passed the vote. The appointment is made necessary by the growing work of the department. For many years there was an assistant commissioner, but, when Mr. Watters left the service, no successor to him in the office was appointed.

Mr. TAYLOR. When did Mr. Bain come into the service ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In 1896.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is he a first class clerk ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. He is secretary to the minister, is he not ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. This will necessitate the appointment of a private secretary to take Mr. Bain's place ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not, so far as I remember, taking a vote for any additional help.

Mr. INGRAM. Will Mr. Bain fill both positions of deputy commissioner and private secretary ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He may not be able to give the time to the duties of private secretary, as he will be under the direction of the commissioner, and will be pretty fully occupied with his duties as assistant commissioner. Much of the business for which I have to avail myself of a private secretary is of a public nature. So, I think, there will be no difficulty in getting on without increasing the staff.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it likely that Mr. Bain, considering the time that he has been in the service, will be as efficient an officer for this position as some member of the staff who has been longer engaged in the work ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Bain has been a very efficient officer. I have no doubt that he will worthily discharge the duties of assistant commissioner.

Mr. SPROULE. He has only been in the office a few years, and I presume he came in a new man. Then, again, does this not involve an injustice to others who have been in the department for a longer time and who, from length of faithful service, are entitled to promotion, as well as likely to be more efficient than Mr. Bain could have become in the time he has been in the office ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think there is no difficulty of that kind. There is no one in the department who has any feeling about that—none that I am aware of.

On section 4,

The Customs Act is amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 4:—

The Minister of Customs may, from time to time, authorize the employment of such temporary or acting officers of customs in the second or outside division of the Customs Department as are required to carry on the work of the department ; but no such officer so employed shall receive a higher salary than he would be allowed if appointed permanently to the same rank or class ; nor shall any such salary be paid until voted by parliament.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not think that section really necessary. It has been the practice of the department since before I came into it to employ men in this way—the department could not be worked otherwise. An officer dies suddenly and his place must be filled. A temporary appointment like this is made. But, when Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice was looking over the Act, he thought that possibly it would be well to provide definitely in this way so that there could be no possibility of doubt.

Mr. CLANCY. What is meant by saying that 'no such officer so employed shall receive a higher salary than he would be allowed if appointed permanently to the same rank and class ; nor shall any such salary be paid until voted by parliament ?' As I understand it, there are no classes in the outside service. This, then, compares the position of a temporary appointee with a position that does not exist ? Perhaps the hon. minister will explain.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are ranks in the outside service—appraisers, chief clerks, clerks, landing waiters, tide waiters, &c.

Mr. CLANCY. How would their positions compare with the classes in the inside service ? For instance, does a chief clerk outside rank the same as a chief clerk in the inside service ? Surely not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. CLANCY. How does the hon. minister reconcile that ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It does not need reconciling. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will look at the Civil Service Act he will find the ranks or grades of the outside service of the Customs enumerated and a minimum and maximum salary fixed. The exact salary is not fixed, nor do these officers come within the class of those for whom the $50 annual advance is given—the inside service. So, if we appointed a landing waiter temporarily, he could not be paid a higher salary than if he were appointed landing waiter by Order in Council.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the minister already power under the law to make these appointments ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We think so, it has been done for years.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, what is the meaning of the clause in the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I explained that. There is a revision of the statutes taking place at the present time, and, in looking through the Customs Act the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe, thought it would be as well that we should have the power stated here expressly. It is absolutely necessary for the working of the department.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose this will be the finishing touch to the Civil Service Act ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. CLARKE. This will give it the coup de grace ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, it will not affect it.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister, under this, can appoint temporary officers and keep them there as temporary officers at his own pleasure, without it being necessary for them to pass any examination. Will that be the effect of this clause ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, what will become of the Civil Service Act ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes ; but they are appointed temporarily. We impress upon them the necessity of qualifying so as to be placed on the permanent staff. They are anxious to get on the permanent staff as soon as they can. For instance, where a collector dies it may be necessary to fill the vacancy at once at that port by some one who has not passed the civil service examination. We have to appoint a collector immediately, and there may be no meeting of the treasury board perhaps for weeks. In these cases we appoint them acting collectors, and as soon as we can we get their medical certificates, and at the first meeting of the treasury board they are made permanent.

Mr. CLARKE. Then these people need not pass the civil service examination, they may be appointed under the provision of this law ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. And they can remain in the service at the pleasure of the minister without passing the civil service examination ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If their services are required.

Mr. CLARKE. Then practically the Act is done away with.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No more than in the past.

Mr. MONK. Would it not be better to leave the custom that has prevailed heretofore ? Because if we pass this clause we will admit the principle that temporary officers may be employed contrary to the present law.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I would not say that.

Mr. MONK. Does not the minister interpret that clause as meaning that he may employ temporarily parties who have not submitted to the test of the civil service examination ? I know that has been done, it is being done now; but it would be a mistake to give it the sanction of the law. The minister himself said it was scarcely necessary to pass this law. But if he does pass it, he sanctions a complete departure from the existing law.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I would not say that. The Deputy Minister of Justice thinks it would be as well to have the practice put in this express language. It has been the practice of the department from the beginning, and it has been absolutely necessary to follow this practice to carry on the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Customs said there were a number of so-called temporary officers in the service, some of whom might have been employed as long as twenty years continuously, and the reason they were not put upon the permanent staff of the department is that the time had passed by when they could very well take the civil service examination. There may be some force in his observations with regard to that, but does not this Act put that custom on a permanent basis ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will it not have that effect ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me it will. Let us assume that we must continue these men who have been for a long time in the service, and who are not on the temporary staff, although to all intents and purposes they are permanent officers. Now, if the minister, in this clause, simply proposes to take power to appoint temporary officers of the department whose employment as such shall continue only for a limited period, it would be a different proposition. from that which is before us. But this provision is wide enough in effect to repeal the whole Civil Service Act so far as the hon. gentleman's department is concerned; because all he has to do is to appoint a man as a temporary officer, and he remains in the department receiving the salary, it may be up to the limit, as if he were a permanent officer. It puts upon a permanent basis that which is now only a custom, and is continued for

the reasons of expediency and necessity which the hon. gentleman mentions. If the provision were limited to the appointment for six months, or for such a period as would be reasonable, I could understand it; but I cannot understand the necessity of a provision having so wide a scope as that which is presented to the House now.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are cases where we have to appoint them temporarily for the summer, when there may be a press of work. But there will not be the same danger that the hon. gentleman apprehends. Under the present law we can appoint any one in the place of a preventive officer and make him permanent at once; and the minimum and maximum figures that are fixed for the salaries would allow a very wide range. So there is no more danger than before, the department is getting at once more power than it has already, because we could appoint them permanently at once as preventive officers. But we do not wish to do that. We have to appoint them temporary at first, and then we urge upon them to pass the examination. But as I said, there is no more danger of wiping out the Civil Service Act in doing this than under the present law, because all we would have to do would be to appoint them under that clause regarding the appointment of preventive officers and assign them to any duties we liked.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). After over fourteen years' experience as collector of customs in the port of Halifax, I may say that I do not know of a single instance where an officer in the outside service was required to pass the civil service examination. The outside service generally consists of landing waiters, tide waiters, lockers, &c., and they are appointed just because they are smart, active people. I do not think the service will be improved by compelling these people to pass the civil service examination. I know that all the time I was in the custom house the outside service were not required to pass the examination. There was no such a thing as a chief clerk, or a clerk at all, wanted for the outside service duties, because they brought their returns into the custom house, and records were kept in the custom house by the officers who were required to keep those records themselves. I think you will find that this is the practice in all the large ports.

Mr. INGRAM. The other evening we brought this same question before the hon. gentleman. I am rather surprised that he does not propose in this Bill to make the temporary officers permanent, clean up the sheet entirely, and see if this grievance cannot be remedied once for all. I mentioned the city of Windsor the other evening, where I find there have been ten preventive officers appointed since the hon. gentleman took hold of the department. There had been men appointed there as preventive officers years before that, and they are still on the temporary list, and I suppose all the new appointments are made permanent. That is what we complain of on this side of the House, that political influence is brought to bear, and men are put on the permanent list who are not entitled to be put on over men who have already been long in the service. If the hon. gentleman put these men on irrespective of their party politics, then perhaps there would not be so much cause for complaint.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I shall be glad to have them all pass the examination, and in some cases they have passed, while in others they have not. But the hon. gentleman must not think that I am guided by political influence in making these appointments. There have been at least as many Conservatives put on the permanent list of preventive officers as there were under the old government. There were as many Conservatives put on the permanent list as there were others, or at least, as many as had been appointed by the old government.

Mr. INGRAM. There are some Conservatives left.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. So that it would not be right to make recriminations in that way.

Mr. INGRAM. I know of cases of men there who are not on the permanent list and they are as good officers as ever were stationed at Windsor. There are no complaints against them. This is growing to be a very serious complaint, and it will take up the time of the House session after session unless the grievance is remedied. I could see no injustice if there was something in the shape of an Act giving the hon. Minister of Customs power to put these men on the permanent list. Here is an opportunity now, and we could insert an amendment providing for that in the Bill now before the committee.

Mr. BENNETT. May I suggest to the hon. minister that if it is the intention of the minister, in making these temporary appointments, simply to place these persons in a training school to prepare them for making an attempt to pass the civil service examination, he might do this by saying that such appointments made after this date shall only hold good for a limited length of time, say six months, and if they are not then able to pass the civil service examination their services will be dispensed with.

Mr. MONK. I think that is a very wise suggestion of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). There is no doubt that under this clause the hon. minister can employ an officer who is not qualified and keep him employed. That is the intention. It is bad enough that the custom has prevailed in the past. I do not think we should give the sanction of law to it, and the way to

guard against that is to carry out the suggestion that has been made and which I have incorporated in the amendment which I am now about to read: 'Provided such temporary employment be not continued for a period of more than six months.' This would permit employees to qualify under the Civil Service Act, and would prevent such abuses as those which we know are occurring. I move to add to the section the provision that temporary employment should only last for six months.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The objection to that amendment would be that if you employed a person temporarily during the busy season of the year and you required to do the same perhaps next year, the person who had had so many months' training would be the very person the collector would want to put his hand on to continue the service for another year.

Mr. MONK. Could he not qualify in the meantime?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). My experience has been that in the outside service the qualification required in the inside service is not necessary, and it has not been the practice to ask for the examination of a man in the outside service. These men are in a good many ways more like labouring men with a good education than clerks who would suit in the inside service.

Mr. MONK. In that case I think it would be better to amend the Civil Service Act directly, and not do it in this way.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes. I think that would be a better way than by pressing this amendment if it is considered desirable. In regard to what the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) says, I do not think we could make such an amendment to this Bill. The proposed amendment is one that could be introduced any year, but there would have to be a consultation, and the government would have to be agreed upon it. It is a subject that is on my mind, but I cannot deal with it this year. The suggestion as to six months employment, of course, will not work, because there is only a qualifying examination once a year. There might be an officer appointed very shortly after the examination that takes place this fall, and it would be a year before the board met again, so that six months would not do. If any time at all were fixed, it would have to be a year.

Mr. MONK. Make it a year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Would it be fair to make a provision of that kind now? I think there would be something like a moral obligation to put all officers on the same plane, and we would have to put away all the temporary officers we now have who have been employed for fifteen or twenty years, and who know their business just as well as any officers in the inside service. It would not accomplish anything if there was any fear that the department would be worked in an improper or unfair way. If there was any danger that political influence might be brought to bear on the minister and he might not hold the scales evenly, you do not obviate it by that, because, as long as there is that provision, I could appoint a temporary clerk and if he could not pass the examination at the end of six months, if I wanted to retain him, I could simply appoint him permanently as a preventive officer.

Mr. CLARKE. The department has power to do wrong, any way.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It has the power. I do not think the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) will find that there has been any consistent course pursued of ignoring men because of the difference in their position, and I am sure there has not been in the cases he has mentioned. I could give scores of cases where men appointed long before I came into office have been put upon the permanent list.

Mr. INGRAM. I think I can fairly complain in these cases I have quoted, because I know some of these men very well, passing up and down there very frequently, as I do. Of course, this side may change to the other, as I am confident it is going to soon, and the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite would be in the same position then as our friends are now. It is hard to explain why men who have been in the service ten or twelve years at least are overlooked, while those who have only been in a few years are made permanent.

Mr. MONK. I think there is no doubt that the hon. minister is right when he says that he could evade the law, any way; but I do not think that is an argument for us to change the law, because that is what we are doing in this section. In the amendment which I presented I intended to provide for the future only. I have no objection to stating that any amendment with that new disposition will apply to the future, but I think it does that without any such expression. I am quite willing to change the period of six months to a period of one year, but I think it is very desirable that we should not by this subsection change the general trend of the law in regard to qualification for the civil service. What the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross), said may be quite true also. It may be true that in the outside service examination and qualification are not necessary, but it is in the law, and I think we should leave it there.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I think if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) would inquire at the port of Montreal, or Toronto, or St. John, or Halifax, he would not find a single instance where a preventive officer has passed the examination, or was requir-

ed to do so. The education of these men might be more practical perhaps than that of a good many whose education is designed to enable them to pass the civil service examination. The men in the outside service are more like workingmen. A locker receives casks into his warehouse, and he sees they are properly placed and delivered on warrant from the custom-house. These men do not require to pass an examination, and the chances are they would not be as good as they are if they did.

Mr. CLARKE. I believe the hon. gentleman is quite right in a good deal of what he says, but is it not the proper course to amend the Civil Service Act so that these gentlemen might be properly appointed.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). That is just what I want. I want to get them the increase of salary and promotion they would be entitled to if they did pass the examination.

Mr. CLARKE. This amendment does not accomplish that, and under it the minister can appoint any number of temporary clerks to remain there during his pleasure.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the position of surveyor of customs should become vacant, under this Act the minister could appoint an acting surveyor who had not passed the examination, and he could draw his salary and fill the position during the pleasure of the minister. Would not that make him virtually a permanent employee ? Suppose in the town of Prescott the position of chief clerk were to be vacant, and no doubt there would be a great number of applicants for it, perhaps the government might wish to appoint some one who did not pass the examination and they would appoint him as acting chief clerk. If he filled that position for a number of years he would virtually hold it permanently, although he was not appointed by Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Until an officer has been appointed on the recommendation of the treasury board and sanctioned by the Governor in Council he does not become a permanent employee. He might be acting landing waiter and be paid, but he could not be appointed permanently to that rank until he had passed his examination, and he would lose his time if he were ill and would not be entitled to holidays and so on.

Mr. REID (Grenville). We have a vacancy in the town of Prescott in the Inland Revenue Department which has existed for some time, and if the Minister of Inland Revenue were to introduce such a Bill as this he could appoint a person who had not passed the civil service examination, and the Minister of Inland Revenue knows that there is pressure brought upon him to do that now. Suppose he should appoint a man as acting inland revenue collector and he remained in office for some years, he would be recognized by the public at least as a permanent officer, and in the case of a change of government or a change of minister even, it would be unfair to dismiss an officer of that kind. I think myself that a person should be appointed to such a position only until such time as he would have an opportunity of passing the civil service examination, and if he failed at first he might be credited with his percentage or something of that kind, but at all events there should be some limit. The public now believe that it is impossible for a minister to appoint a person to a vacancy until he has passed the examination and for that reason the minister is saved a great deal of trouble. If you pass such legislation as this there is no doubt that your staff will deteriorate in time.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In reply to the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr Monk) I wish to say that this is no evasion of the law at all. The law at present provides that inspectors, collectors and preventive officers in the Customs Department may be appointed without examination and without reference to the rules for promotion prescribed. All that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) would accomplish by his motion would be that if a person were appointed, and at the end of the year he would not be able to pass the civil service examination, he would be dismissed. The civil service examination is largely clerical and I venture to say it would trouble the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) and myself to pass it now. I dare say we could pass it when we left school, and although I do not want to say anything against laws that are in vogue, yet when you come to a practical department like customs, the qualifying examination, in my judgment, is of very little avail. You want general knowledge, you want good judgment and in some cases you want a knowledge of the methods of trade. If a man proves himself to be a good officer, but could not pass the examination, we could then appoint him a preventive officer under the law. But wherever we can get them to pass the examination instead of appointing them preventive officers and saying : You discharge the duties of landing waiter, if he does pass the examination his title would be landing waiter or tide waiter or clerk or whatever he is. This makes the practice a little more regular, but there is no change.

Mr. CLARKE. Is not that exemption in the civil service law wide enough now ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This does not make it any wider, but this permits the appointment of an officer temporarily. In some cases these appointments must be done in an emergency and sometimes you cannot summon a meeting of the Treasury Board and get His Excellency's assent in a day or two. There are times when, after a long session of parliament perhaps, some ministers are taking a well-deserved rest for a day or two, and you

might not be able to get a meeting of the Treasury Board or of Council ; or His Excellency might be away ; and a month might elapse without anything being done. You must have persons to attend to these duties, and so you appoint them temporarily. The object of the Bill is not to discharge men from the service or get more men into the service without reference to the Civil Service Act. It is simply the result of a suggestion from the Department of Justice that it would be better to have this additional provision that when a person is temporarily appointed to a certain office he shall not receive a larger salary than is paid to a permanent officer of the same rank or class.

Mr. CLARKE. Has that been the practice ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No. In the case of preventive officers there is no limit at all.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister knows that it is not customary to appoint a temporary officer to one of the high positions in the service, such as surveyor of customs ; and he would not appoint a man as a preventive officer, and then assign to him the duties of a surveyor. If he has done so, I think he has not rightly understood the law. Under the proposed provision, the minister could appoint any person to the position of acting surveyor, and virtually make him permanent. I understand the minister to take the position that he could appoint any person as a preventive officer, and then allow him to fill the position of chief clerk or surveyor of customs in the city of Toronto.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, he could, but the appointee could not be styled chief clerk ; he would be acting clerk. A great many men who have been appointed preventive officers are taking entries, and are as efficient officers as we have. I think that I have shown that this is a proper provision, and it would be better for the hon. gentleman to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MONK. I do not understand how the hon. minister can say that this Bill which he asks us to pass makes no change. He stated, when we first took up this section, that it was almost unnecessary to pass it ; and yet the fact is, if I am not mistaken, that the question having been referred to the Department of Justice, Mr. Newcombe, of that department, stated that the system at present was irregular, that the law was not being observed, and that it would be necessary to pass this amendment in order to regularize the position of these employees. I do not think there is any doubt that under this provision, if we pass it, the Minister of Customs may name a temporary officer, and employ him from year to year temporarily, without subjecting him to what the law requires—the qualifying test of a civil service examination. We had under discussion a day or two ago the estimates of the hon. Minister of Customs, which we now pass en bloc. The evening before last we voted $129,000 for five or six branches of the Customs Department, and having had the money voted in that general way, the minister can keep a temporary employee continuously in his service without our knowing anything about it. We shall not even go through the form of voting his salary every year notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. I do not say that the deputy minister of Justice was not right in making that suggestion to regularize the position of those employees ; but the object we ought to have in view is to improve our civil service, not to spoil it, as we have been doing for many years past by this custom. The hon. gentleman knows how in 1896 a very large number of civil servants were dismissed without any opportunity of being heard. I will not go back upon that ; it was fully ventilated at the time ; but in my own county the number of civil servants who were dismissed without notice and without any opportunity of defending themselves was very great, and much hardship was incurred. Here we are at present still further mutilating our civil service organization. We are doing the exact opposite of what they have been doing in years past in the United States, where they had a deplorable civil service. Under the Cleveland administration a set of men undertook to improve conditions, and at the present moment for over five thousand employees of the government of the United States, there is no more trouble with the spoils system, and they cannot be dismissed. The United States are improving their civil service. England has a much better system of patronage and civil service than we have in Canada, and here we are opening the door to abuse. It has been said on this side of the House, and I think it is worthy of the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite, that they are preparing trouble for themselves. We know how members belonging to the ministerial party are bothered with demands for employment. Under this section, if we pass it, there would be far greater demands, and members will not have the defence of saying that those who solicit employment will have to pass an examination, because under this proposed section they may be employed temporarily, so to speak, for ever. Under these circumstances, I think we ought not to give the sanction of the law to the unfortunate custom which has prevailed in all the departments in the past, and I think the amendment that has been suggested would be a protection not only to the public, but for hon. gentlemen opposite themselves, and particularly for those in charge of the government departments. We might modify it in the direction suggested by the hon. member for Grenville, so as to provide that

temporary employment will not last beyond the period fixed for the next civil service examination, and that this section will not apply except in the future, if that is necessary. I think all our efforts ought to tend to the improvement of our civil service, and not to its deterioration, and I think the hon. minister, on reflection, will himself acknowledge that we are readily helping him by this suggested amendment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think the suggested amendment in any way adds to the appeal of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I think, on the contrary, that the amendment has for its object to cause some of the abuses that have existed for the last twenty years to disappear. My hon. friend is aware that under the Civil Service Act, provision is made for the appointment of officials to the civil service, first, after examination, and, second, on a special report of the deputy head of the department to the effect that the person has special qualifications. In addition to these two modes of appointment, we have, in subsection 2 of section 37, a provision that Customs inspectors, collectors and preventive officers may be appointed without examination and without any reference to the rules of promotion That is to say, you can appoint preventive officers without any reference whatever either to examination or to promotion. But there is no provision in the law defining the duties of a preventive officer, and the practice has grown up in the last twenty years of assigning preventive officers to the performance of special duties. The authority to do this is to be found in section 5 of the Act, which provides that the Customs Department shall have the control and management of the collection of customs duties and matters incident thereto. The result has been that preventive officers have been assigned to the discharge of duties, such as those mentioned in schedule B, for which the regularly appointed officials are paid a different salary. Take, for instance, the case of a clerk. Under the Act he would be only entitled to receive $400 per year, but the duties of clerk may be assigned to a preventive officer who will receive a much larger salary. This anomaly has suggested the amendment which authorizes the appointment of a temporary or acting clerk to perform the duties of a regular clerk, which are now assigned to a preventive officer. We wish to do away with the anomaly that exists at present, and if a temporary clerk is appointed, under this amendment he will not receive any larger salary than the regular official would who is appointed under section 56 of the Civil Service Act. It is for the House to say whether or not it is wise to amend the law which has been in existence all these years, giving authority to the Customs Department to appoint these officials without examination. If the law should be amended, if all these appointments made in the past should be declared irregular, what will become of the service ? The proper thing is to get the sanction of this parliament to do what has been done in the past.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any provision now in the Civil Service Act obliging these men who are appointed temporarily, to pass an examination in a certain period ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not preventive officers unless they want to come into the permanent service.

Mr. CLARKE. They would remain on permanently although only temporarily appointed ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Then is not the suggestion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier right that the trend of this legislation is to deteriorate the public service ? The hon. gentleman admits that one-quarter of the outside employees have never passed the examination.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The principle of the clauses is this. Inspectors and collectors were not required to pass a qualifying examination, just the same as post office inspectors and postmasters, and for this reason, in order to be able to give such appointments to parties whose long political service was entitled to some recognition. Any person may be appointed to a department with special qualifications. Suppose the head of the department wants a chemist for analytical purposes, it would be absurd to require such a man to pass the civil service examination. Take a landing waiter, there is no necessity for his passing the civil service examination. But the Act never contemplated that such an officer could be transferred to the position of a clerk without passing the examination. It may be said that that has been done, but it has been done with the understanding that these parties would pass the civil service examination within the year or go back to their old positions. This amendment will justify these appointments in voidance of the Civil Service Act. There is no necessity at all for it. There are thousands of young men in the country, with all the qualifications necessary for any of these appointments, and who have passed the qualifying examinations, but because a person happens to be appointed a landing waiter, he is open, under this clause, to receive any appointment at all in the service.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understand the hon. Minister of Justice, he can, under the law, appoint anybody as preventive officer and then promote him to any other position without his passing the examination.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Under the Civil Service Act a man may be appointed without examination, a preventive officer. The law makes no provision for

the duties to be performed by a preventive officer, so that the Minister of Customs can assign that preventive officer to any duties he thinks proper, and the practice has been in the past to assign them to certain duties.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What are they?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Some clerks, some lockers and all manner of duties. A great number of them are in the department, and this is to prevent that practice in the future, by providing that if a preventive officer is assigned to perform the duties of clerk he shall not receive a larger salary than would be paid a clerk regularly appointed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). My point is this: According to law, a person to be appointed a surveyor of customs must have a certain qualification. If you are going to appoint him permanently he must have passed the civil service examination. According to the law, section ten of the Civil Service Act:—

All appointments to the Civil Service shall be during pleasure, and no officer shall be appointed or promoted to any place below that of deputy head unless he has passed the requisite examination and served the probationary term heretofore mentioned.

If you have a preventive officer appointed temporarily you cannot legally transfer him to perform the duties of a surveyor until he has passed the examination. If the law will not allow you to put on an acting surveyor because he has not qualifications, how will it justify you in putting in another officer who has not the qualifications?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is possible that the law may have been violated ever since 1886. But, if it has, we desire to remedy that and prevent it occurring in the future.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) was not in the House the night before last, when I submitted a question to the Minister of Customs which affects one of the constituents of the hon. member for Grenville. Perhaps the hon. minister would explain more fully now. We have at Prescott a preventive officer, an able and efficient man. Now, one of the pledges the hon. minister made was that the superannuation law should be abolished. This preventive officer, Mr. Gerald, was placed on the superannuation list, as the hon. minister informed me, at $300 a year. I am satisfied Mr. Gerald is as competent to perform the duties of the office as is the gentleman who was appointed as his successor, perhaps at the same salary as Mr. Gerald received. I asked the reason for the superannuation but did not get the information. My hon. friend from Grenville is more conversant with the facts than I am. I know that Mr. Gerald is superannuated at $300, which is an abuse of the law, carried out simply to find a place for a gentleman whom the minister thought was entitled to some patronage, and whom they appointed as preventive officer as they could not appoint him to the service because he has not passed the civil service examination.

Mr. REID (Grenville). With reference to the case mentioned by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) I may say that Mr. Gerald was superannuated and another gentleman appointed in his place who had not passed the examination. He was appointed a preventive officer. He had to take that minor position. The Minister of Customs knows that the gentleman appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the superannuation of Mr. Gerald had been looking for a much higher position for several years, but not having passed the examination, could not be appointed. According to this law, he could have been appointed to one of the higher positions, say as acting surveyor. Now, suppose that were done. If a change of government should take place, I do not hesitate to say I would do all I could to have all appointees under this administration retain their positions, if they had been appointed honourably—that is that they had not been appointed through the unfair dismissal of a supporter of the Conservative party, which, I must say, has not been done so far, and I am not finding fault in that way. If this gentleman were appointed chief clerk or acting surveyor, I would feel in duty bound to recognize the appointment as a permanent appointment. So, what I feel is that the minister is only going to give more trouble to himself and also make a great deal of feeling should a change of government take place.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The surveyor ranks next to the collector in authority in every customs house, because he has control of the outside service, though he is not regarded as a deputy according to the Civil Service Act, I think you will not find a case in any port of Canada where the surveyor has been compelled to pass the civil service examination.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. To whom does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) allude when he speaks of the surveyor?

Mr. REID (Grenville). There always has been a surveyor until a short time ago. When the position of surveyor became vacant, the hon. gentleman established a chief clerkship instead. The hon. minister knows the gentleman who got the position is qualified. But there may be others who have not the necessary qualifications and could not receive the appointment, but who are recommended by the Liberal committee. Of course, not having passed the civil service examination, they could not be appointed under the law as it is. The person appointed is a first-class man—could not be better fitted for the position. But he had

passed the civil service examination. The hon. minister knows that if this law had not been in force he would not have made the appointment he did, for influence would have been brought to bear upon him to appoint one of the applicants. But, I think that this clause will be unfair to those who have passed the civil service examination. A man can be appointed acting clerk, and so there will be no use in his passing the examination.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The effect of this section has been stated better than I could state it by the Minister of Justice. This amendment to the law will limit and circumscribe the powers that the department now has under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MONK. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was limited before.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A preventive officer can be assigned to the duty of a clerk, the maximum salary of whose position would be $1,000 or $1,200 a year, and he could be paid $1,500 or $1,800 if the department thought fit. We do not do that, but it could be done under the law. If this section passes, that will be contrary to the law. Therefore, I say, the power of the department is circumscribed by this section. Now the argument of the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) was that it was not intended that preventive officers should be appointed and thus escape the necessity of passing the examination—they should pass it within a year, for, he says, if they do not pass it within a year, that is evidence that they are unfit for their positions. If the hon. gentleman will say that all temporary officers must pass the examination within a year or leave their positions, then, he will put out some three or four hundred men, some of whom have been in the service for ten, twelve, or fifteen years. They will all have to go. There would be no fairness in drawing the line if, because a man who is appointed now cannot pass the civil service examination at the end of the year, that is proof that he is unfit to discharge the duty; that reason must equally apply to the men who have been there ten or fifteen years. You cannot draw the distinction. If the purpose be to secure efficiency it must apply to all that are in that position. I do not know that we need to be careful about this clause. If you strike it out you are leaving more power in the hands of the department than it has at present.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think the hon. gentleman is very logical in his conclusions. It has been suggested by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that after the temporary officer has occupied the position for a certain time, if he has not then passed the examination, he should cease to hold the position. That seems to be reasonable, and I think it is feasible. Perhaps it might be for a longer time than was suggested; instead of six months the period might be made a year, when certainly it would be time for him to pass his examination. I think the minister could meet the difficulty by providing that a temporary officer should not occupy the position longer than six months, or at all events until the next examination. Now, with reference to the other part, which I think is really of more importance, it is argued that it would be unfair to those who have been in the position for several years as temporary officials. I do not think we should be guilty of any unfairness on this account. We have in this country recognized that vested rights must be respected, and it would be a serious injustice, one of which the opposition would never be guilty at all events, and of which I hope the government would never be the perpetrators. It would be unjust to say that after a man had been in that position for ten or fifteen years, he should now by reason of a new law, be subjected to an examination. We can prescribe that the period during which a temporary employee should occupy that position shall not exceed a certain number of months from the next examination, and that the rights of those gentlemen who have served well and faithfully, and grown old in the service, shall be protected.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman says 'have served well and faithfully.' But to accept an amendment of this kind is to say that one who does not pass an examination cannot serve well and faithfully.

Mr. CLARKE. It would be a hardship for the men who have been in the service fifteen or twenty years and who are not competent to pass an examination, to make it apply to them. But the case would be different with applicants for employment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This clause is for the purpose of restricting the scope of the Act as it has been construed in the past, because it is alleged to have operated to the detriment of the service. It would only be fair, if this amendment should pass, to make it apply to all those who are in the service as well as to those who are to be appointed. Why draw a line of demarcation between those who came in under an improper construction of the Civil Service Act and those who are brought in now? Is there not a reason for the rule that has existed for the last twenty years? I do not say the rule has been improperly established, on the contrary, I think it was properly established, and it has worked out well in results. I will show how it works out well. Take, for instance, a man appointed as an appraiser in the customs. That man requires to have had some actual experience of

business, and if he has been in the business for ten, fifteen or twenty years, he has some value as an appraiser. But how many of these men who have been in the business during all these years are competent to pass an examination ? How many of them could pass ? How many of them would be disqualified simply because they could not pass Men perform the duties of an appraiser better if they come in after those years of service than if they had simply got that book knowledge which is required to pass the examination. It seems to me the rule that has been established by my hon. friend is a rule that operates usefully. But it is better to make the rule clear, to make is absolutely apparent to parliament what we are doing. I think it is better to restrict the Act and prevent what has been done in the past from being done in the future.

Mr. CLARKE. The Minister of Justice complains of abuses under the late administration. He will have an opportunity of making a comparison of the defects which existed at the beginning of the hon. gentleman's career and those which exist at the present time. The Minister of Customs has promised to bring down a statement of the number of the employees of the customs in Toronto, which will include a list of those who have been temporarily appointed during the last five or six years, and he will be shocked to learn what numbers of men have been appointed there temporarily, and have been there for years, without passing the examination at all. They are there in utter disregard of the requirements as regards qualifications and age. We heard the statement made the other night that one-fourth of the total number of the officers have never passed an examination at all. We say that if this Bill is passed it will open the door and there will be a larger percentage twelve months from now who have not passed the civil service examination than there is to-day.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand the hon. minister to approve of the practice which has been in existence for twenty years of violating the Civil Service Act and that we should continue it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is not a technical violation of the Act. The Act provides for the appointment of preventive officers without regard to the civil service examination. You can take any man whom you choose and appoint him a preventive officer in the outside service. There is no Act in existence that I am aware of which defines the duty of a preventive officer. The practice in the department has been, as I am informed—of course I speak subject to correction—when a preventive officer has been appointed to assign him to the performance of these duties under schedule (b). The result has been that at times a man has been appointed as a preventive officer with a fixed salary and he has been appointed to the performance of the duty of a clerk and while in the performance of this duty without being regularly appointed under the Civil Service Act, he has been appointed at a salary larger as a preventive officer than it would be possible to give him if he were regularly appointed under the Civil Service Act. My object in suggesting the amendment is to do with parliamentary authority what has been done in the past, to make it possible for the Minister of Customs to give temporary employment to a man instead of appointing him a preventive officer, assigning his duties at the time he is appointed, and thus provide that a temporary clerk shall not be in receipt of a sum in excess of the sum to which he would be entitled if he were appointed permanently. I think the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) misunderstood me. What I meant to say was that if these are abuses the abuses originated before 1896, and they have been carried on to the present day. We are all responsible for them. I do not mean to apportion the responsibility. I mean to say that if these abuses are in existence we inherited them and we want to see how far we can restrict them.

Mr. CLARKE. There is no improvement up to the present time on the old order of things.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Perhaps only in the character of the individuals appointed.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are many men in the service temporarily who are good officers and the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) thinks that they should be put on the permanent list. I agree with him and I might put them on as preventive officers. While the law gives me that power I try not to do that because I have invariably asked them to pass the civil service examination. If they do not pass it, in cases where I have felt that they were good officers, then, I have availed myself of that power. He suggested that there ought to be an Act passed whereby all in the service in that position should be placed on the permanent list. I do not hesitate to say that my own personal view is—I do not commit the government—that it would be a desirable thing to do, but the hon. gentleman will see that if I were to become a party to that, then, I would become a party to making a declaration that my firm belief was that His Majesty's service in the customs could be well and faithfully performed by men who had not passed the civil service examination. I would be recreant to my duty if I came down and proposed that we continue to take into the service of His Majesty men unfitted for it. But, according to the rule laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite, the very fact that these men have not passed the civil service examination is a declaration that they are unfitted for the service. I do not accept that. If I believed that I could not ex-

press my own individual view in favour of doing this by a specific Act and placing them all upon the permanent list. It is to be applied to men who cannot pass and if the fact that they cannot pass the examination is proof that they are unfit to hold positions in the service of His Majesty is it proof that the men who have been employed ten or fifteen years are unfit to serve His Majesty ? I do not believe it. It might be suggested that I am arguing against the Civil Service Act. Well, I am not careful to say that I am a great admirer of the Act in so far as practical benefits are concerned in the working of the outside service of the customs. I do not think it is an advantage. We cannot work the outside service without temporary officers. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not say that I should not avail myself of the services of such officers, but they say that they must pass the examination within a year. I would like to get them to pass it if they are equal in other respects. I would like them to pass before I appoint them at all, but my experience as a business man extending over a good many years, is that you may find a person who would have the literary attainments perhaps, or the knowledge, to pass this examination which is a literary one in relation to matters of geography and history of this country and other countries, that you might find a young man who has passed that, but when it came down to the discharge of the duties of an appraiser, or a clerk, or a landing waiter, where judgment has to be exercised, he might not be the best officer by any manner of means. If you want to continue your Civil Service Act and apply it to your inside service where your work is largely clerical, all right. I am speaking of the outside department of the customs, and I do not believe that you are going to secure a better class of men if they do pass the civil service examination. So long as this is the law I endeavour to get all I can to pass it, but where I find men——

Mr. CLARKE. How have you been succeeding in Toronto in getting men to pass the examination who have been employed during the last five years ? Have you made very much progress in getting these men to pass the examination ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, I think so.

Mr. CLARKE. How many have passed during the last twelve months ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will find out. I do not think many of the old appointments have passed, but I think some who have been appointed since I have had charge of the department myself have passed.

Mr. CLARKE. You are still urging them to pass ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are urging them to pass. The men themselves are very anxious to be put on the permanent list for the reason that if they are on the temporary list and they lose a day through sickness, they lose their pay and they do not get their holiday. More than that, where a man is on the temporary list his services can be dispensed with by a letter from the minister. If he is on the permanent list an Order in Council must be passed to dismiss him. They feel that they are safer in their tenure of office upon being appointed on the permanent list, that a mere whim on the part of the minister, or an unworthy feeling, if the minister were capable of entertaining an unworthy feeling, could be exercised in an arbitrary way and they could be dismissed without any real cause. For that reason they want to get on, and they apply, and when they do, I say I will be happy to put you on and it will give me pleasure to do so, if you pass the examination. I say that to men who were years in the service before I was minister, men not in sympathy with me politically ; I treat them all alike. But there are some men who hesitate to try, and they tell me it is so long since they were at school that they could not pass the examination, but they would like to be on the permanent list. The only way we can do that is by appointing them preventive officers, and after they are appointed as such they are assigned to the duties they have been doing for years and have been doing it well. This circumscribes the power of the minister instead of enlarging it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) The fact seems to have been overlooked that no person over thirty-five years of age can present himself to pass the civil service examination.

Mr. MONK. But they can be appointed preventive officers.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) And they are better qualified preventive officers than a great many who have passed the civil service examination.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister says that he approves of putting old and tried officers on the permanent list, but in the next breath he told us that if he did that there might as well be no examination at all. He has put a large number on the permanent list, but he has not put others who are perhaps more entitled to it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I said that if I entertained the views of gentlemen on the other side, I would not be in favour of putting these men on the permanent list who have been ten or twelve years in office, but I do not share the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite that it is a disqualification for a man because he does not pass the civil service examination.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The point I am making is that this Bill will enable the minister to appoint a person to a higher grade than that of a preventive officer. It

is not the desire of any one on this side of the House to interfere with the appointment of temporary officers, but it is my opinion at least that those positions which now require the examination should be protected. If the minister passes this law he will have to take the nominations made by the political committees which is now done in many cases. Probably, as the minister says none of us could pass the examination off-hand, but I am satisfied that the minister or any of us could do so if we gave it a few months study. Suppose the minister should appoint an acting officer, then although that officer might not be as good an officer as one who could pass the civil service examination, yet if there was a change of government, I for one, would certainly be opposed to removing him from an office which he had occupied for years.

Mr. CLARKE. Does not this amendment leave the door wide open to the minister to appoint a person to any position in the service without an examination ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Under the present law we could appoint any person we chose as a preventive officer and continue him in the service temporarily and assign him to such duties as we may think proper.

Mr. CLARKE. And if this becomes law it will not be necessary to appoint a person a preventive officer, but he may be appointed to any position ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You could appoint an acting landing waiter, but not a landing waiter.

Mr. CLARKE. We have the explanation of the Minister of Justice that the law now gives permission to the minister to appoint preventive officers without examination and assign them to various duties. If this clause becomes law the minister need not appoint a person as a preventive officer, but he can appoint him to discharge temporarily the duties of any position in the outside service of the Customs ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Then that leaves the door wide open and the minister should have the courage of his convictions and abolish the civil service examination altogether. I never myself could see why gentlemen should have to pass a qualifying examination to discharge the duties of landing waiters but, be that as it may, if the minister is logical the proper thing for him to do is to abolish the examination altogether.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are landing waiters, tide waiters, clerks, &c. We appoint a man acting landing waiter or acting tide waiter, or acting appraiser, and give him that title ; but if he wants to become a permanent officer, and have the title of the office, he must pass the examination. If he cannot pass the examination, we may appoint him a preventive officer permanently, and give him the position of acting land waiter, or whatever it may be.

Mr. MONK. I have no intention of doing what I think would be an injustice, that is, touching those who, by virtue of this abuse have been in the civil service for a number of years. There is no doubt that this amendment does not touch them ; but in case it should be so interpreted by the Minister of Customs, I will not insist upon it. But let me point this out to the hon. Minister of Justice, that I think he is mistaken in regard to the abuse which he contends that this section cures. Will he look at this section and tell me if, after it is passed, it will not be still possible for the Minister of Customs to name a preventive officer, and then assign to him the duties of a clerk, for instance, in a division where such a clerk would be only regularly paid $400, while the preventive officer would be drawing a much larger salary. The Minister of Justice, I am sure, has no doubt about that, because there is no doubt. It will be open to the Minister of Customs to begin by naming a man a preventive officer, and then assign to him any duties or any position he chooses, except that of deputy minister, because, as the Minister of Justice pointed out, the law does not define the duties of preventive officers. The only thing that would happen is that the Minister of Customs, without reference to the character or qualifications of the preventive officer, would name him an acting officer in one of the classes refered to. I think there is no doubt about that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is right.

Mr. MONK. But he would continue to name him preventive officer, and give him any salary he chose, and assign to him any functions he deemed suitable. I do not wish to continue the discussion on this point. We are breaking into the Civil Service Act by this provision. The abuse has existed in the past, and we are legalizing it. It is sufficient to refer to the Civil Service Act, sections 47a, b, c, and d, to see with what care the legislature in the past, rightly or wrongly, has surrounded entrance into the civil service, providing that if a temporary officer is employed continuously, his salary must be specially voted by parliament. All this is done away with by this clause, and I do not think it will effect any good.

On section 5,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Questions sometimes arise as to whether goods come under a certain designation and bear a certain rate of duty, and they are determined by the board of customs. They meet and give a decision, which, if approved by the minister, has the force of statute law, subject to an appeal of the Governor in

Council, which, however, is very seldom taken. A decision by the board might be contrary to what had been the practice in some ports for some time previously, and it might be that we had been collecting in some cases a higher rate of duty than that fixed by the board of customs, or in other cases a lower rate. In the former case there would be a refund, while in the latter case the importer would be asked to make another entry. This is to provide that such a decision shall prevail in future, but it shall not apply to previous transactions.

On section 6,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The present Act requires that the invoice shall be made out in the currency of the country in which the goods are actually purchased. This permits the invoice to be made out in other currency. Then there is a provision to help us better to guard against frauds.

Mr. KEMP. In what cases are goods not invoiced in the currency in which they are purchased ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The commissioner tells me that there are many cases in which the invoices of goods from the continent are made out in sterling instead of in the currency of the country. He tells me that at times invoices are made out in Chinese or Mexican dollars.

On section 7,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I explained when the resolutions were going through what that meant. This is to provide that when an article is composed of different materials, that that component part which is of the greatest value shall determine the rate of duty.

On section 10,

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Why should damaged goods be destroyed when they cannot be sold for sufficient to pay the duty ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If a person abandons goods and will not pay the duty, we destroy them if we cannot sell them for sufficient to pay the duty. The reason is that if we destroy them other goods will come in to replace them, on which we will get the whole duty.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). You are at liberty to sell them if you get enough to pay the duty, not unless you do ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The duty is supposed to take precedence of everything else.

Mr. LENNOX. It is alright perhaps that the duty should take precedence. But if you can collect one-half of the duty by selling the goods, why not sell them ? The hon. minister says that they are destroyed in order to induce the importation of other goods to take their place. That is not a good principle. Why should goods be voluntarily destroyed when their sale would realize a portion of the duties for the mere purpose of inducing other goods to be brought into the country.

Mr. CLARKE. I presume that the clause is all right, but I find it difficult to understand where three-fourths of the duty could be realized, the government should not sell the goods. Suppose the goods are worth $1,000 and the duty amounts to $250, according to this clause if the goods did not bring more than $225 or $200 they would have to be destroyed. I do not see why the country should lose in this way.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That has been the law for years.

Mr. CLARKE. Evidently the hon. gentleman has money to burn.

Mr. HENDERSON. In my opinion, the hon. Minister of Customs is right. It would be unfair to sell the goods for a portion of the duty. Suppose the goods are valued at $1,000 and the duty amounts to $200. If you were to sell those goods and they realized only one-half the duty, they would go into the country in opposition to other goods which paid the full duty. We want to protect the public.

Mr. SMITH. I cannot see any great difference to the public in selling the goods for $200 or $199. If you can get $200 then you can sell them, but if you can only get $199 then you must destroy them, because otherwise you will injure the public by throwing them on the market. The fact that this has been on the statutes for years, does not make any difference.

On section 14,

Section 65 of the Customs Act, as amended by section 15 of chapter 14 of the statutes of 1888, is amended by adding the following subsection thereto :—

3. All material imported to form medicinal or toilet preparations alone or with other articles or compounds, to be put up, labelled or sold under any proprietary or special name or trade mark, shall be valued for duty under the provisions of subsection two of this section. The Minister of Customs may, however, refer to the appraising officers for valuation such of the materials as have a fair market value in the ordinary course of trade.

Mr. KEMP. Is this section general or only applicable to specific articles ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That and the next section are embodied in the Tariff Act.

Mr. KEMP. Does it refer to undervaluation generally—the original clause which it is supposed to amend ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, not generally.

Mr. KEMP. The reason I wanted to understand about this clause more particularly was that when the matter was up

a few days ago, I referred the hon. minister to the law of the United States in relation to undervaluation. I had not, at that time, the clause of the American tariff under my hand, but I have it now, and with the permission of the committee I will read it. This is the Act of June 10, 1890, section 29, article 400 :

If any owner, importer, consigner, agent or other person shall make or attempt to make any entry of imported merchandise, by means of a fraudulent or false invoice, affidavit, letter, paper, or by means of any false statement, written or verbal, or by means of any false or fraudulent practice or appliance whatsoever, or shall be guilty of any wilful act or omission by means whereof the United States shall be deprived of the lawful duties or any portion thereof accruing upon the merchandise or any portion thereof, embraced or referred to in such invoice, affidavit, letter, paper or statement, or affected by such act or omission, such merchandise or the value thereof, to be recovered from the person making the entry, shall be forfeited, which forfeiture shall only apply to the whole of the merchandise of the value thereof in the case or package containing the particular article or articles of merchandise to which such fraud or false paper or statement relates, and such person shall upon conviction be fined for each offence a sum not exceeding $5,000 or be imprisoned for a time not exceeding two years, or both in the discretion of the court.

That is the section to which I referred in discussing this matter, and I would press upon the minister some amendment to our Customs Act of a severer character than that which exists at the present time. And I would like to know if the department intend to recommend any amendment along the lines of what I have just read ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The Act now in force in Canada. It hardly goes so far as that read by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp), but I think it goes as far as the department would be inclined to recommend. It provides that, in case of smuggling or attempt to pass any fraudulent invorce or any attempt to defraud the revenue, the goods may be seized. The person fined the value of the goods, and also subjected to a penalty not more than $200 or less than $50, or imprisonment for not more than one year or less than one month, or both fine and imprisonment.

Mr. KEMP. Does not the hon. minister think the government might approach nearer the United States law—perhaps not to the extent of a fine of $5.000, but something more than the fine already imposed, which is only $200, I believe ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We have had cases under this law in which the judge recommended that we should not claim the full penalty of the law, saying that he had not the power under the Act to mitigate it—you get the value of the goods and $200 for every separate entry—but the accused, he thought, should not be subject to such a penalty. I think our law is sufficiently strong. If we are weak, it is in there being fraudulent importations we have not been able to detect.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to draw the minister's attention to the large number of scales being imported into this country from Dayton, Ohio. I am informed on creditable authority that these scales have been sold to the consumer for $60 or $70 each, and yet have been imported into this country at a valuation of $6 or $7 each. I would ask the hon. minister if this has been brought to his attention, and if so what action has been taken ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The matter of scales has been before us several times, and the Commissioner of Customs tells me that he is having inquiries instituted. The hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Lavell) mentioned it the other day, and I asked him to give us any names or other information that would help us to find at what port these goods had been entered. Of course, it would be outrageous to allow scales to be brought in at $6 or $7 that were sold in the regular way at $60 or $70.

Mr. BLAIN. Have the scale manufacturers of Canada brought this before the department ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I find that there have been no letters with regard to the class of scales referred to by the hon. member (Mr. Blain). The manufacturers have two or three times in the last year reported to us that scales coming from the large manufacturers—large scales—were not properly valued, and we had a special valuations made. But there has been no complaint made recently, and no complaint at all of what the hon. gentleman has referred to. It was quite new to me when it was mentioned the other night. As I say, if hon. gentlemen, or any one conversant with the facts will tell us at what port the entry was made or will give us any clue I shall be glad to have the matter looked up.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before the Bill is reported, I would like to ask the minister, as the word surtax appears in this Bill, if there is any information in the possession of the government that they can give to the House and country with regard to the attitude of Germany to Canada in connection with the surtax.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). We have nothing official. Of course we have seen the statements in the public press which the hon. gentleman has seen, but we have nothing official.

On section 17, subsection u,

For reducing the duty on any or all articles, whether natural products or products of manufactures, used as materials in Canadian manufactures ; and any such materials specified in such Order in Council shall be subject to such reduced duty of customs and no other for the time and under the conditions therein provided.

Mr. CLANCY. The government, as you will see, Mr. Chairman, is taking very extraordinary powers by this subsection. This matter came up when the resolutions were being discussed at a former stage. Now I want to point out to the Minister of Customs that he is seeking here a very extraordinary authority. It is no answer to say that the present law provides that you may take the duty off altogether. That is a very wide power, I admit, but it is not near so wide as the power to say what shall be the duty, or that there shall be no duty at all. When the hon. gentleman proposes to take power to revise the whole list of articles coming within the meaning of that section, he is asking for a most extraordinary power. Why, the hon. gentleman can revise the whole tariff so far as these articles are concerned, he can fix such a scale of duties as he may think proper. I protest against such legislation, I think it is wholly unwarranted. If a deputation comes to the hon. gentleman for some additional protection because of unfair competition by a foreign country, he may say, I cannot take off all the duties, because I must have a revenue ; but I will take off some of the duties, and I will give you relief in that way. I say it is a power no government ought to have, it may be improperly exercised.

Mr. KEMP. What particular class of manufactures is this proposed to affect ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is confined to manufactures. We have power now in the Act to deal absolutely, but it does not give the lesser power.

Mr. KEMP. I want to know what class of manufactures the hon. gentleman had in his mind that this would affect.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not any particular class. Some Orders in Council have been passed, but I have not any particular class in my mind. But cases might arise.

Mr. CLARKE. Could the hon. gentleman bring us down those Orders in Council, allowing this Bill to stand in the meantime ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It will stand for the third reading.

Mr. CLANCY. Why insert this section if no cases have arisen ? Why this urgency ? Why is the hon. gentleman reaching out his hand for more power in that direction, when he tells the committee that no cases have come under his notice that demand such authority ?

Mr. CLARKE. I think it fortunate that our attention has been drawn to this clause, which gives the minister such extraordinary power. He says there have been Orders in Council, we should have a memorandum of them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There have been fifteen or seventeen.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had a very full discussion of this question at an earlier stage of the debate, when the resolutions were in committee. The whole question was thoroughly threshed out. But before the third reading is taken my hon. friend can have these Orders in Council which have been published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Bill reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY—IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before that motion is adopted I desire to say that I gave notice on Monday last of the motion which I proposed to move at the earliest opportunity when the House should be moved into Committee of Supply. It was moved into Committee of Supply the next evening, but I had arranged in the meantime to proceed with the conference as to the Redistribution Bill, which was held that evening, and therefore I could not proceed on that occasion. I am ready to proceed with the motion now as far as I am concerned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) desires to proceed with the motion now, we quite recognize his right to do so, but I suspect hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and this side as well, have found that we have rival attractions to-night. I think the circus has proved to be a greater attraction than the hon. gentleman's motion, or my proposals. I hardly suppose he would like to go on with the present thin House, and we would certainly prefer to have all matters in connection with the tariff taken up in their proper order rather than on a motion in amendment to supply. However, if the hon. gentleman is content to postpone it and bring it up at his own convenience at a later day, we would gladly concur in the suggestion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as I am concerned, I am quite ready to proceed with the motion now, but I am ready to meet the convenience of the government. If the hon. Minister of Finance thinks it more convenient to postpone it to a later day, I am content to allow it to stand until as late as Monday. Further than that I cannot say at present.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All right.

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

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to government steamers, $250,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Prefontaine). Mr. Chairman, there is an increase of $25,000 in this item, and I suppose that is the reason why an explanation is required. It is easily explained by the fact that, although there was only $225,000 voted last year, there was spent this year $240,560. The increase is explained in the following manner: The following amounts were spent for repairs to vessels: 'Newfoundland,' $1,193; 'Contest,' $1,690; 'Aberdeen,' $14,784; 'Lansdowne,' $4,680; 'Quadra,' $1,896; 'Stanley,' $8,827; 'Minto,' $5,521; making a total of $38,522. The increased expenditure is also due to the increase in the price of coal. As regards the 'Stanley' and 'Minto,' it is easily understood how it is impossible to say beforehand how much the expenditure connected with the repairs will amount to. It depends entirely on the use they have had during the season.

Mr. MONK. There are several items contained in this vote, such as investigation into wrecks, removal of obstructions on navigable rivers and the winter mail service, and I may perhaps shorten the work of the committee by asking the minister to state what is the policy of the government in respect to facilitating the approach of steamers to Montreal, such as lighting the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec so that it may be navigable at night. The minister has been connected with municipal affairs and with the harbour board of Montreal, and he knows the interest taken in that question. What policy does the hon. gentleman intend to follow in that respect? Then there is the important question as to the equipment of the port of Montreal itself as to which we expect an announcement of policy. The minister will remember that last fall he took an active interest in matters concerning the port of Montreal and he wrote to the harbour commissioners inquiring what works were necessary in order that the new wharfs might be fully equipped for the handling of freight. Does the hon. gentleman intend seeing that these improvements are carried out promptly at the national expense. May we expect from the policy of the hon. gentleman that we shall make of the port of Montreal a national port. We would like to hear his opinion on that before we pass this important item. There is an item for the removal of obstructions to navigation and investigation into wrecks. The minister can do a great deal to place the port of Montreal on a better footing as regards underwriting. He is aware that the port of Montreal is now discriminated against in the matter of marine insurance. What steps does the hon. gentleman intend to take in order to place the insurance rates of the port of Montreal on a parity with the rates in American ocean ports. Then there is the question of winter navigation between Quebec and the sea. The hon. gentleman is aware that two or three winters ago an enterprising newspaper in the city of Montreal expended quite a large sum of money in experimenting with regard to this matter. It has been urged by experts that if we employed these large ice-breaking steamers which are used by the Russian government, the season of navigation would be extended for perhaps two months longer than at present. Has the minister any policy upon that question. These are matters which it is right and proper that the minister should enlighten the committee on before we pass this item.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The item under consideration does not cover the vast field which the hon. gentleman has exploited. We are considering an item for ocean and river service now, but the hon. gentleman has spoken of the lighting of the St. Lawrence, the question of winter navigation from Quebec to the sea, and the equipment of the port of Montreal, a matter which is not dealt with in the items of the Department of Marine and Fisheries as they are before the House at the present time. However, I have no objection to answer the hon. gentleman in a general way as regards the different questions he has put. The port of Montreal is now being equipped and I hope that within this season and next season it will be capable of handling the trade of the country. As regards winter navigation, that question has been before the people for the last twenty-five or thirty years. The hon. the Senate of Canada took the matter up as far back as thirty years ago, and there are voluminous reports on the question. It was also taken up by the harbour board of Montreal to my knowledge, and a further study made of it. I think the most pressing question at the present time, not only for the port of Montreal, but for the whole country is to have the harbours of the St. Lawrence equipped in such a way that they may be able to cope with the trade that is coming to them. It is admitted on all hands that the port of Montreal (and the port of Quebec as well, for that matter) is not properly equipped. Works are going on there now as fast as possible in consideration of the means and resources of the country. I will not undertake to speak of the port of Quebec because I know a good deal less about it than I know about the port of Montreal, but as regards the port of Montreal, I know that since 1898 the harbour board, assisted by the present government, have been going on with the works there as speedily as possible. I know that the harbour commissioners of Montreal decided in 1898 to have two shifts of men, so that the work should go on day and night; and since then, with the approval of the present government, the work has been pushed ahead in that way much more rapidly than it could have been done under the old system. It has been published that to com-

plete the equipment of the harbour of Montreal would require an expenditure of about $3,000,000, besides something more than $1,000,000 which the harbour commissioners have still available under the law passed in 1899 and 1900. They have come to the government and have asked for authority to borrow this $3,000,000 in order that the work may be proceeded with as rapidly as possible. The policy of the government will be announced in a few days, I hope, when hon. members will be in a position to discuss it. The government are alive to the situation, and I know that it is their desire to have the necessary works for the equipment of the port of Montreal completed as soon as possible, that is to say, during this season and the next season. As regards the lighting, although I should not anticipate the next item, which is lighthouse and coast service, I may say that the intention of the department——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think probably it is just as well for me to make a remark here, as nearly all these items are becoming subjects of discussion. In order that the committee may make progress, I think it would be well for hon. members to confine the discussion as nearly as possible to the item under consideration. It is quite within the right of any member to discuss almost any question under the general item of ocean and river service. Sometimes the committee agree to discuss the whole item, and then take it up item by item; but I think hon. members should confine themselves to the item.

Mr. CLANCY. This is a very large vote, involving a very large sum of money—$308,600. Did I understand the Chairman to say that we must confine the discussion to each item composing the general item ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No. The rule is that the committee may decide whether they will take up each item in succession and discuss and dispose of that, or have a general discussion upon the whole vote. The hon. member can remark upon any item in this vote, and after the general discussion is over, then the committee may take up each item.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Chairman, the vote is before you in the shape of one resolution, and I have a right to put any question concerning any part of this resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is what I say. You can put a question or discuss any of the items under this resolution.

Mr. MONK. That is what I do. I furthermore stated that I had done this in order to shorten the time—not to have to get up on all the different parts of the resolution. But there is no doubt that I can discuss any of the questions which I have discussed, under the resolution before the Chair.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would submit that some of the questions which my hon. friend has discussed are not in the resolution at all I agree with him that he can discuss any item under the resolution; but what I want to call the attention of the committee to is this, that we must take the resolution either item by item or as one vote. Our practice has been to take it up item by item. I submit that if we do that we should confine the discussion to the one item before us. If we take the resolution up as one vote, and roam over all the items, we cannot after that take it up item by item.

Mr. MONK. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. Take the first item—maintenance and repairs to government steamers, $250,000. Does the hon. leader of the government contend that upon this item I cannot ask all the question which I have asked ? Surely I can ask what is going to be done about lighting the St. Lawrence, about improving the port of Montreal, about underwriting. Before we vote any money, we can bring up any question or grievance, and these are distinct grievances. If the hon. leader of the government wishes to fragmentize the discussion, it will take a longer time. Under any circumstances, it is all the one resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will read the rule, so that it may be understood. I think that a general discussion may take place on the resolution, and after the discussion each item may be taken up and dealt with. Here is the rule :

> Sometimes there are a number of items in a vote or resolution, and each of these may be generally discussed as forming a part of a single question. Each item may then, if the committee think proper, be taken up as a distinct question, and so discussed and amended.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The point I make, Mr. Chairman—and I do it only in the spirit that we may not wander too far—is that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has been discussing some questions which are not embraced in any of these items, and I hope that we shall all be confined to the subject which is immediately before us in the estimates.

Mr. CLARKE. In this connection, I would like to say that I have in my room copies of the Weekly London 'Times,' issued during the fall and winter, in which reference is made repeatedly to the unsatisfactory condition of things in the St. Lawrence; and I certainly anticipated, when my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier asked the question of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the answer of the minister would be as to the condition of the St. Lawrence, and what was to be done to improve the very serious condition of affairs that now exists.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that is quite proper.

Mr. MONK. What I want the hon. minister to do is to indicate the policy of his department and of the government on these

matters relating to navigation, and then we can take up each item, having obtained that information on the discussion of the resolution itself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman desires that there should be a general discussion as to the policy of the government on matters not touched in this resolution. For example, he wants the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to declare what is the policy of the government relating to the public works in the harbour at Montreal and the equipment of that port and so forth. But not one of these matters is within the scope of this resolution. Anything touching the navigation of the St. Lawrence pertains to this item, but there is nothing in this resolution which calls for a general discussion of the policy of the government with regard to the port of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman is very severe in limiting discussion on a question raised in supply. I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that while occupying his present position, he inquired by letter from the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal what improvements they considered necessary to complete the equipment of that port. Will the hon. gentleman pretend that, when we are called on to vote the sums asked by the department, I am not entitled to ask the hon. Minister of Marine what is the policy of the government on that particular subject ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As not one of the items in this resolution has any relation to the improvements of the port of Montreal, I think I may contend that the hon. gentleman cannot properly bring up that subject on this motion. All I ask is that the Chairman should see that we discuss, in a broad and liberal spirit, questions within the scope of the resolutions. Questions outside that scope, important as they may be, will come up in their proper order.

Mr. MONK. I am quite ready to accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and I will point out to you that I asked the hon. Minister of Marine if, at the time he made that inquiry of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, he was really carrying out the policy of the government, and if at the present moment he is prepared to inform us what is the policy of the government as regards the improvements at the port of Montreal. If you, Sir, at the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Finance, rule that I am out of order, I shall bow to your decision.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not asked for any ruling against my hon. friend. But, speaking generally, expressed the hope that we would confine ourselves to the scope of the resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As the policy of the government with regard to the equipment of the port of Montreal is not embraced in any of the items of the resolution before us, my ruling is that hon. members cannot discuss that policy until we come to some item relating to it.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the port of Montreal on the St. Lawrence ? And is not the equipment of that port part and parcel of the whole system of expenditure on the St. Lawrence ? And surely we are quite in order if we ask what is the government's policy, in the equipment of the St. Lawrence, with regard to the improvement of the port of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That will come up on the next item. The present resolution deals only with the ocean and river service. It does not touch at all the port of Montreal. I have no objection to answer any of the questions put, but I think we would shorten discussion if we would confine ourselves to the subject matter of the resolution before us.

Mr. SPROULE. This resolution includes a number of matters which are a part of the equipment of the St. Lawrence, and as long as we are asking for information regarding any one of these, we are quite within our rights.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am quite ready to answer any of those questions which refer to these items.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. minister inform us under what system the repairs to the government steamers are made, where they are made, by whom, and are they made by day labour or contract ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The repairs are done sometimes by day labour and sometimes by contract. It depends entirely on their importance. Sometimes they are done in the government shipyards at Sorel. We had some repairs made to the 'Stanley' at the Sorel shipyards during last winter. When the department thinks it is in the public interest to call for tenders, we do so.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is the hon. minister in a position to tell us how much he expects to spend this year on those repairs on our steamers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know what repairs may be necessary in the course of next year. We provide for a certain amount, taking into consideration what was spent in the previous year. We can never tell in advance the extent of the repairs that may be required on the fifteen or twenty steamers belonging to the department. The different repairs made last year were

The 'Newfoundland'..	$ 1,193
The 'Countess'..	1,690
The 'Aberdeen'	14,754
The 'Landsdowne'..	4,608
The 'Quadra'..	1,896
The 'Standard'..	8,827
The 'Minto'..	5,521
Total..	$38,522

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How many steamers has the Department of Marine and Fisheries under its charge, and where are they located ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are twelve—that is for the marine service. There are some other steamers under the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but they will come under another vote.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask if the steamer 'Scout' which was in charge of the Department of Railways and Canals on the St. Lawrence river has been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, she was taken over by my department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was the transfer made for any special reason ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We took over their lights.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We are discussing the item of maintenance and repair of government steamers for which the hon. gentleman is asking $250,000. I did not understand the hon. minister's explanation, and I would like to know what steamers this applies to ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The estimates for the ocean and river service for 1903-4 is as follows : The 'Quadra,' expenses, $31,000 ; the 'Lady Laurier,' $3,500—she is a new boat—the 'Aberdeen,' $45,000 ; the 'Lansdowne,' $30,000 ; the 'Stanley', $35,000 ; the 'Minto', $44,000 ; miscellaneous, $7,000.

Mr. REID Grenville). Where does the 'Scout' come in ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In the lighthouse and coast service.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What is the number of men, as a rule, employed on these steamers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They differ in that respect. For instance, the wages on the 'Quadra' amounted to $13,680, fuel, $4,500, provisions, $5,300, ship chandlery, $1,800, &c. The wages on the 'Lady Laurier' amounted to $13,000, fuel, $8,000, provisions, $5,000, &c. The average crew is between twenty and thirty.

Mr. MONK. I suppose that in this vote of $250,000 the expense of supplies is included. Are supplies purchased by tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Are the tenders called for publicly, or is a note written to two or three parties asking them to tender for furnishing the supplies ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think there is a call in the public press. That would entail more expenditure than it would be worth while to undertake. But those in the trade know that these supplies are needed every year, and that every one is free to tender. Of course, circulars are sent around calling for tenders.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) is like other ministers,—no better and no worse than the rest. It amounts to this, the department writes a note to some friends of the government, and the contract for the supplies for the steamer is given——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To the lowest.

Mr. MONK. No, there is no such system. I have followed the vote in every department whose estimates have been under discussion so far, and there is no such thing as a system of tender publicly called for.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. MONK. No, I have asked the question with regard to every department, and I find we have no public calls for tender. I do not mean to blame the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He is no greater sinner than his colleagues are. I still cling to what I asked the hon. gentleman when we began this discussion. I do not pretend to say that the hon. gentleman has yet become familiar with all the details of his department. Still, it seems to me that the questions I raised were of such a general character, that the hon. gentleman, who has been a long time in public life and long a member of this House, ought to have a policy to declare to us on these subjects, which interest us in the district of Montreal particularly. But, at the suggestion of the Minister of Finance, I am debarred by your ruling, unfortunately—and, I respectfully claim, not quite justly—from obtaining from the minister whose estimates are under discussion a fair and categorical statement of his policy in regard to the port of Montreal. We are debarred from getting a declaration of policy on that most important point from the minister who represents our own district and who is now asking us to vote about a million of money for these purposes. It may be that the technicality is well founded, but it is not a broad interpretation of the rights of members of this House in Committee of Supply. But, in regard to the lighting, there is no doubt that my question is relative. What is the policy of the department with regard to that point, a most important one in connection

with the navigation between Quebec and Montreal. There is an item here for the removal of rock. Surely, it is relevant for me to ask the minister what steps he intends to take to equalize the rates of insurance between Montreal and Quebec with those existing in American ports ? Why are our Canadian ports discriminated against ? The hon. gentleman ought to have a policy on that question, and it is not a question of detail but a question of the utmost importance. The question of winter navigation I think, had already engaged the attention of the minister long before he took a seat on the treasury benches. It is not an answer to tell us that the question has been under discussion for thirty years. The hon. minister is now in a position where he can solve, at any rate in part, that question. What, then, is his policy on the subject ? Has he thought it out ? Is he prepared to make experiments ? I do not wish to retard the hon. gentleman in obtaining these his first estimates, but surely these are questions on which we may expect a declaration of policy when we are called upon to vote these large sums of money.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. minister be good enough to explain the work that these steamers have to do, and in what part of the country they are located ? The 'Quadra,' we all know about, but I would like some explanation with regard to the other steamers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The 'Quadra,' as every one knows is on the Pacific Ocean. She is engaged in the service connected with the buoys, lightships, &c., and in aiding in the marine service. The 'Lady Laurier', the new steamer is situated at Halifax. The 'Aberdeen' is in Quebec in charge of the district below Quebec and the lighthouses in the gulf. The 'Druid' does the river service at Portneuf and further down. The 'Lansdowne' is in New Brunswick. The 'Stanley' and the 'Minto' are doing the winter service at Prince Edward Island.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Then the steamers on the St. Lawrence are attending to the lighthouses and so on ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and the fishery protection at the same time. They have 600 miles to look after.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The 'Stanley' and the 'Minto' are engaged in some other occupation than the winter service, are they not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Does the 'Stanley' attend to supplying the lighthouses ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They help during the summer, as soon as the repairs are done.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Would the minister say what amount of this sum of $250,000 he proposes to put on the steamer 'Stanley' in repairs the coming season ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot inform the hon. gentleman until the report has been received. We have had the steamer examined by Mr. Stephens, and we expect the report in a day or two.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understand, in answer to a question I had on the paper today, that the minister did not intend to send this steamer across to the old country to have repairs made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has it not been found necessary to send her to some shipyard in order to make repairs ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to inform you that last year and the year before, reports were sent into the government that this steamer did need to be sent across to a proper shipyard to be repaired, both as to her machinery and as to her plates and hull ; and this was not done.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I am informed there was no official report to that effect.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am informed there was a report made by engineer MacMillan, saying the ship did need certain repairs, but they were not done. At any rate, whether a report was sent in or not, I know, and people competent to judge whether a ship is fit to be on the winter service to cope with the ice, know that the 'Stanley' was certainly in an unfit condition to cope with the ice between Prince Edward Island and the mainland last winter, and partly by reason of the neglect of the government to have her put in shape the season before, was due the disaster which resulted to shippers in Prince Edward Island last year. Now, while the 'Stanley' was off Summeside harbour in the ice jam, I myself, with the port warden of the town and several others, went over to examine her, and the captain himself reported that it was almost impossible to operate that steamer in the ice, because, when she went into it head on her sides were so corrugated by impact with the ice—she is now fifteen yeas old—that she could not back up, and the steamer, on account of these defects, could work stern foremost better than she could forward in heavy ice. That is one of the causes why such a bungle was made of the winter service last year. Now, I understand the minister does not intend to send this steamer across to be fitted up this year. I would like to know where we have a ship

yard on this side where these repairs can be made. The heavy plates on the side of the 'Stanley' will have to come off and be straightened, and I am sure she will not be able to take up the winter service successfully until these repairs are done. The 'Stanley' should now be on her way across to the builders to be put in shape for next season. I asked some time ago about the loss to the shippers of perishable goods of fish and meats that were sent down to Georgetown for shipment, and on account of the defects in these boats and their not continuing the service, these fish were spoiled and had to be thrown into the field. I asked if the government had received a petition regarding a refund to the shippers for part of their losses, and the answer was that they had, and they were considering the matter. Attached to these questions there was the following memorandum and letter which I shall read to this House :

A letter has been received from the Secretary of State Department inclosing a petition from residents of Prince Edward Island who were engaged in shipping smelts and eels, asking the government to consider their claims, amounting in all to $3,180.17, for fish alleged to have been spoiled during the winter season owing to the fact that the 'Minto' became disabled. It is stated that the 'Minto' was taken off the route without any notice and sent to the assistance of the 'Stanley,' and that the 'Minto' was ice bound and helpless between the 21st of February and the 17th of March, 1903.

It is alleged that it was impossible to dispose of the goods, and consequently all the smelts and eels held at Georgetown for shipment were totally spoiled, entailing a serious loss to the shippers.

The report of agent Lord on the subject of sending the 'Minto' to the assistance of the 'Stanley' is as follows :

I acknowledge that the result turned out very disastrous, but when this action was thought best, in the conference held in my office at which Mr. Farquharson, M.P., Captain Finlayson, Postmaster Brecken, and others with myself were present, the steamer 'Stanley' was and had been for over twenty days on two meals a day, and by no other means could provisions be placed on board.

And here I want to say that the 'Stanley,' before she was carried away in the drift ice from Summerside, had been ten days in the ice with ample time to provision the vessel, but the captain never sent ashore for help, for fuel or for provisions for the vessel. She was carried off down the ice in the condition that this whole House is aware of, and the steamer 'Minto' had to be sent to her assistance, and thus the loss occurred to shippers of these perishable goods.

Her coal supply was very low, and should she be left to her fate and drift out around Cape North into the open between Cape Breton and Newfoundland the consequences might have been serious for the department, and especially this agency. Captain Finlayson's prompt assertion that it was no use for him to try Pictou as the whole waters from Pictou light down to the east end of Pictou Island and over to the mainland on a line with Arisaig, was completely blocked with heavy ice which no steamer could break through, it was considered the only right thing to do to save the lives of the crew of the 'Stanley,' and perhaps the ship.

This last statement, I would like to remark, does not correspond with the remarks of the minister when this matter was up once before, for he left this House to understand that the failure of the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland was because the steamer 'Stanley' was on the Summerside route. That is certainly not a fair statement when we have the captain of the 'Minto' saying that he could not get into Pictou as the whole water from Pictou light down to the east end of Pictou Island was completely blocked with heavy ice, and that was so for a long period of time. To go on with this report of Captain Finlayson :

After consulting with Mr. Lord at the agency office and with Mr. Farquharson, M.P., we decided that the 'Minto' should go and try to relieve the 'Stanley,' and it was not possible to get to Pictou at that time on account of the heavy drift ice jammed in between Pictou Island and Pictou, which no steamer could break through ; so we filled the 'Minto's' bunkers and took on board about 120 tons of coal and some stores for the 'Stanley.' On the morning of the 28th of February we left for the 'Stanley.'

We got to the 'Stanley' about ten a.m. Before we reached the 'Stanley' Captain Brown marked the best place to begin to break. After butting at the ice for some time, we broke in about two lengths of the 'Minto,' when the three blades of the propeller broke off all at once close to the hub.

Under these circumstances it is quite clear that both the agent and Captain Finlayson considered it imperative to go to the relief of the 'Stanley' and the statement of the petitioners that the 'Minto' could have taken perishable goods on the 21st of February and would have had no difficulty in getting into Pictou, is not substantiated, but on the contrary Captain Finlayson was of the opinion that Pictou could not be reached. That the port of Pictou would become clear of ice in a few days afterwards, could not be foreseen. As a matter of fact the 'Minto' had been detained in Pictou harbour from the 3rd to the 10th of February. A barrier of ice had formed across the harbour entrance and the 'Minto' could not penetrate this barrier.

As a matter of fact part of the fish was shipped to Georgetown when it was known that the 'Minto' could not reach that port

The department last January issued a public notice which was posted in many places in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, notifying the public that perishable goods would be at the risk of the shippers. While this was intended to refer to taking goods on board the steamers yet it was sufficient notice to the public that the department would in no way consider itself liable for perishable articles and that all goods intended for shipment on board the winter steamers would be entirely at the risk of the owners.

It is generally recognized principle that when a vessel is in danger, another vessel whether a carrier of goods or not will go to

the assistance of that vessel, where lives and property are in danger, in fact if the 'Minto' had not gone with coal and provisions to the 'Stanley' it is probable that the 'Stanley' would not have been released for some time after she was released and the consequences might have been serious.

(Sgd.) F. GOURDEAU.

I would just like to read the reply to that letter of Mr. Gourdeau from the gentleman who is the deputy port warden of Summerside, and who is more experienced in seafaring than the hon. minister or some of his advisers. The reply is as follows :—

Summerside, P.E.I., May 27, 1903.

Jas. A. Morrison, Esq.,
Summerside.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your favour covering Mr. Gourdeau's memorandum in re the case of the fish shippers claim against the Department of Marine and Fisheries about the steamship 'Minto,' for loss of fresh fish, I have to advise you, that the claim set up by the Department of Marine, is not well taken.

The 'Stanley' was in no danger that the 'Minto' helped her out of, as is proven by the fact that the 'Stanley' saved the 'Minto,' the latter vessel had already supplied the 'Stanley' with coal ; food could at any time have been supplied to the 'Stanley' and there is absolutely no question about the fact, that due diligence was not used to take the perishable goods.

The notice 'at shippers risk' cannot be pleaded, as an excuse unless due diligence is exercised by the common carrier. There is no question in my mind, but had the 'Minto' been a private vessel instead of a government ship, a suit in court would go in favour of the shippers.

Captain Finlayson's 'prompt assertion,' that it was no use for him to try Pictou, could, in the nature of things, only apply to the then present moment, as there were ever changing conditions and there is no doubt in the mind of any person who has the capacity to judge, that the 'Minto' could have taken the perishable effects over long before they spoiled and long before the 'Stanley' and 'Minto' were relieved, if she had not gone to the rescue of the 'Stanley.'

In going to the rescue of the 'Stanley,' who was deserting the shippers perishable goods to have saved the other government property, therefore, on the principle of a general average claim, the thing sacrificed, has to be paid for by the thing protected, in short, the crew nor the ship 'Stanley' were at any time in danger that other means than the 'Minto' could not have relieved her from, it was neglect to have her short of coal or provisions at any time, for she lay off Summerside for eight days where coal contracted for by the government, was in abundance and could have been put on board ; and as for provisions, and two meals per day, that was silly nonsense, I have good reason to believe that the two meals per day was a matter of convenience to the cook and to the men, who by reason of their idleness, must have suffered by eating three square meals.

The propeller of the 'Minto' was not, I am informed, broken by the ice pan in which the 'Stanley' was imprisoned, but by backing against a clumpet detached from it.

The evidence of the men sent to use dynamite to relieve the 'Stanley' goes to show that they were of no value, but, that they had to get out of the steamers way when they let her work at full speed.

I have talked with Mr. Dunn the master of the 'Jubilee,' one of the three men sent, and he declares that the ice pan could easily have been broken by the 'Stanley' if they had tried her, for in no place was the ice two feet thick.

The last paragraph of Mr. Gourdeau's letter is misleading, as in the case of the 'Minto' and the 'Stanley,' both vessels belonging to the same owners, the recognized principle of vessels going to the assistance of others, to the loss of a third party, does not apply ; in the one case the salvors are actuated by motives the very opposite of the other, the department undertook to save their own property to the detriment of their patrons.

Captain Brown was advised by the 'Port Warden' of Summerside, in the presence of A. A. Lefurgey, Esq., M.P., that where his vessel was, off Sea Cow Head, that ice would likely break off inside of her and she would go adrift, therefore, she should have been coaled up and provisioned so as to be in readiness for any emergency, when there would have been no necessity for the 'Minto' going to her assistance.

The 'Stanley's' drift would have been identically the same, if the 'Minto' had never went to her.

The 'Stanley' had as much coal on board when she got to Pictou as the 'Minto' had given her.

I remain,
Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) JOSEPH READ,
Deputy Port Warden, M.L.A., &c.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I contend that the loss to these shippers was occasioned by the 'Minto' in returning to Georgetown after the first trip she had made to the Stanley,' and taking her provisions and coal instead of taking the perishable goods, as the shippers had requested the agent of the department to do, to Pictou. The 'Minto' made this second trip to the 'Stanley' when there was no need of it, when neither the lives of the crew nor the safety of the vessel was in danger. As a consequence, the 'Minto' was disabled, and it was not until the 'Stanley' took her into Pictou that the 'Stanley' could go back and get these goods. By that time they were absolutely spoiled. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. minister, as also his colleagues, will see that the people who suffered in this regard are certainly entitled to some recompense for the loss. The amount they are asking does not cover any more than the bare cost of the goods, and is in no way compensating them for the increased value they would have had if they had been able to market them at New York or Boston, where these fish were being sent. I would further say, before sitting down, that I consider that the action of this department in not sending the steamer 'Stanley' to the old country to have the necessary repairs to her hull made will result next year in very much the same difficulties that we have had this year. Unless the department intend putting in their estimates an amount for the building of a new winter steamer, the result to the people of Prince Edward Island will be found to be still

more disastrous. We not only want the 'Stanley' repaired; it is not only necessary that we shall have the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' to carry on the winter trade of Prince Edward Island, but it is absolutely necessary that we should have a third steamer. The business has increased to a very great extent within the last fifteen years, and we have an increasing quantity of goods for shipment each winter. When we got the 'Stanley' she could not cope with the trade and we had to get the 'Minto,' and now these two steamers cannot handle it. I would like to hear from the hon. minister what policy the government has in regard to fulfilling the terms of union between the island and the mainland during the coming winter.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I think it would be almost unreasonable to send the steamer 'Stanley' home to Scotland, or England, to be repaired.

Mr. POPE. Send her to Sorel.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) We have a dry dock at Halifax that is so large that the American government had to send the largest of its steamers there to be repaired. We have all the materials for strengthening and repairing the largest vessels sailing from Quebec to Montreal, and we have the men to remove the plates and repair the steamers as they are doing in several instances. If the 'Stanley' requires to have her plates removed or to be strengthened it can be done in Halifax just as well as in England.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Although I am new to the department yet the general rules of business should I suppose apply all over. I am informed that we have two capable officials, Mr. Stevens and Mr. Hill. I do not know them personally, but I believe no one will contest Mr. Stevens' ability as an engineer competent to deal with machinery, and Mr. Hill is reported as a competent authority on hulls. These two gentlemen have been instructed to examine the 'Stanley' and the department will have to be guided by their report. We will not take newspaper gossip or the statements of a certain Captain Reid—I do not know whether he is a 'captain' or not.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am told he has never commanded anything, but if the hon. gentleman says he has I will stand corrected.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Yes, and he is a very capable man too.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This gentleman undertakes to give a lesson to Mr. Lord, the agent of the department at Charlottetown. I do not know, Mr. Lord, but he appears to have been appointed under the late government. He was considered until now to be a good official, but we will inquire into the matter and if the facts alleged against him to-night are proved, of course there will be nothing else to be done than to dismiss him. Captain Finlayson of the 'Stanley' is an old employee, and he is reported as one of the most efficient officers of the department. The department relied on the advice of Mr. Lord and Captain Finlayson and Captain Brown, and if it is found that they are incompetent, of course we will have to consider what shall be done, but surely we will take the advice of some one more competent than Mr. Reid before we condemn Mr. Lord or Captain Finlayson or Captain Brown. We have all the facilities in Canada necessary to repair the 'Stanley.' There is a dry dock in Halifax and another one in Quebec.

Mr. MONK. And there is going to be one in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The dry dock in Montreal is not ready yet, but I hope it will be some of these days. I am informed that the 'Stanley' will not even have to go into dry dock, and there is no use in making matters worse than they are. The trouble about this winter navigation seems to be due to the fact that for the last two years two steamers were put on two different routes, and if only one line had been maintained probably this accident would not have happened last winter. As it is well to profit by experience I can promise the hon. gentleman that next winter there will be only one route.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What route will that be.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will decide later on.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We are entitled to know it now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be probably Pictou and Charlottetown, and Georgetown.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. These steamers are all built in England, and if any new one is to be built I would invite the minister not to forget our own country. I was a minister at the time, and I am to some extent responsible for the last two ships, but I have found out since that the specifications were so drawn that English articles were indicated and that our Canadian builders had no show whatever, although they were perfectly competent to do the work.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am sorry that the minister has come to such a hasty decision on the route for winter navigation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES I am open to conviction.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am satisfied that when the minister is better acquainted with the circumstances which led to the disaster this last winter, he will change his opinion. If he consults his predecessor he

will be told, I think, that the Summerside-Tormentine route was most successful, as the Hon. Mr. Sutherland himself stated in the House. If the minister will take the trouble to read the speech I made some time ago he will find that it is quite certain that the miscarriage of the winter service between Summerside and Tormentine was due to the fault of the department. It is all very well to blame Mr. Lord or Mr. Finlayson or Mr. Brown, but the responsibility is on the department. Last winter was not the only winter in which the department was neglectful, but last year has been the worst under all circumstances since confederation. The breakdown of the winter service was the fault of the department and not of the route between Summerside and Tormentine. If the minister studies the facts he will not decide that Georgetown—Pictou is the only route. He will find that Captain Finlayson states in his report that for, I think, a fortnight it was impossible for any steamer to get into Pictou.

Now, the conditions which prevail to close up Pictou harbour leave Summerside and Cape Tormentine open; and, as I have pointed out to this House numerous times, the formation of the tides there, meeting and parting several times a day, leaves the ice always in a loose condition, and the only difficulty is in entering Summerside harbour. Suppose Summerside harbour is absolutely closed for two or three months of the year, we have asked the department to build a pier at Carleton Point; and if they do that, during the two months in the worst season, February and March, when Summerside cannot be reached, the steamer can run to Carleton Point. The distance between Summerside and Cape Tormentine is only sixteen miles, and the distance between Cape Tormentine and Carleton Point is only eight and a half miles, where the vessel can make several trips a day. So that the minister must see that the advantage is with the western route as against the Georgetown-Pictou route, where the distance is fourty miles, and where the steamer can only make one trip over returning the following day, except in extremely fine wether. I trust that the minister will look into this matter this year, and that the petition for a pier at Carleton Point will not be left over from year to year, as has been done in the past, but that the necessary amount will be brought down in the supplementary estimates for the construction of this pier. I would like to ask the minister what has been the report from the soundings taken there by the engineers just before the close of navigation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say in answer to the hon. gentleman that if he has come to the conclusion that I have decided the policy of the government or the department for next winter, he is mistaken. I have expressed the opinion that, in view of the facts, it would probably be necessary to consider whether it would not be more advantageous next winter to have two steamers on the line between Georgetown and Pictou. The reason I mention this line is that it has been represented to me as the best of all the lines that have been mentioned, by one of the ex-Ministers of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davies. That is also the opinion of Captain Finlayson and Captain Brown. Under these circumstances, I am unable to pronounce in favour of the western line. Before deciding anything, I will certainly go into the facts and circumstances, and will moveover take the opportunity of visiting Prince Edward Island and judging for myself from the information that I gather from competent and well-informed men.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Might I ask how many trips the two steamers have made between Cape Tormentine and Summerside, that we may judge whether the trial has been fair or not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry I cannot give the information to the hon. gentleman; but I will obtain it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is very important, I think, that we should have such a communication, because the question is whether that line or the other line is the best. If a fair trial has not been made, perhaps it should be made, so that we may know exactly how the matter stands.

Mr. LEMIEUX. While we are speaking about the steamer 'Stanley,' I may repeat the request which I made some years ago, and which I have made nearly every session since, for a trip at the end of December between the mainland and the Magdalen islands. I think Prince Edward Island is too selfish. It ought to give a chance to the Magdalen islands, which are shut out from communication with the mainland during five or six months of the year. I have been promised years ago that the trip I request would be made. It appears that Captain Finlayson is opposed to it. I am informed by the best captains of boats, and by some reports which I have read in the Marine and Fisheries Department, that the trip can be made. During the month of December not only is navigation between the Magdalen islands and the mainland possible, but it actually exists between Newfoundland and Cape Breton all the year round. During the month of March also the sealers from Newfoundland are seen near the Magdalen islands. I would ask the hon. minister not to forget that there is a population of 6,000 souls on the Magdalen islands, and that they deserve the consideration of the department.

Mr. HACKETT. The questions involved in the item before the committee are of

such great importance to the people of Prince Edward Island that I cannot allow the item to be carried without making a few remarks. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) has said that the people of Prince Edward Island are too selfish, and that they should be generous with regard to their fellow countrymen on the Magdalen islands. I want to say, Sir, that they are not selfish. We do not care if the hon. gentleman can secure a steamer for keeping up navigation with the Magdalen islands all winter. What we ask is that the terms guaranteed in the contract entered into between the province of Prince Edward Island and the Dominion of Canada shall be carried out, and that steam communication, winter and summer, shall be carried on continuously between the island and the mainland. While we do not insist on the pound of flesh, we do say that justice should be done to us, in accordance with the terms of union. With regard to the expense, we desire as much as the people of any other part of Canada to economize and save the public moneys of this country; but this communication is not altogether for the benefit of the people of Prince Edward Island. It has been the means of developing the trade between Prince Edward Island and all other parts of Canada.

At the time when the 'Stanley' and 'Minto' were fast in the ice, there were a hundred cars of freight at Pictou waiting to be carried across to the province of Prince Edward Island. This freight came from Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John, and at Georgetown there were some 80 or 90 cars of freight awaiting transhipment to the mainland. This shows the immense trade development in consequence of winter navigation having been instituted between the island and the mainland. I regret that the hon. gentleman is not disposed to send the 'Stanley' to be placed in the shipyard where she was constructed and there thoroughly repaired and refitted. It has been said that an official of the department reported in favour of sending the 'Stanley' across the ocean for repairs. I am reminded by my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) of the facilities at Halifax for repairing ships. I may add that when crossing from Cape Tormentine to Summerside I had a conversation with engineer McMillan, who has been engineer of the 'Stanley' the last fifteen years and who understands the condition of the steamer and the repairs required. He said that she required to go into the yard where she was constructed and where they had the proper facilities and understood what repairs were necessary. She required to have her hull examined and to be thoroughly overhauled, and to have additional braces added to her frame and new plates, as the old plates were bent through contact with the ice. If these repairs were made, she would be in as good a condition as when first launched. The government are practising false economy. Last year they spent nearly $9,000 on the repairs of the boat and she was still unfit for service. They will spend $25,000 perhaps this year on repairs again and eventually they will have to send her across to have her properly repaired in the yard where she was built. There are no facilities in Charlottetown for making the repairs. They may have them in Halifax and in Pictou and I believe that the best facilities are at Sorel. But according to Mr. McMillan, she should be sent to the yard where she was constructed and be thoroughly repaired. The hon. minister said off-hand that he believed communication will be maintained between Georgetown and Pictou next winter. That is contrary to the statement he made the other day. He said that he intended taking a trip to Prince Edward Island to view the situation for himself and then decide as to where the boats shall run. If he does that, he must arrive at the conclusion that one of the boats should be placed on the western route and the other on the eastern route. If he does that and if his captains used proper diligence and care, he will maintain a good service between the island and the mainland. Something has been said with regard to Captain Brown. It is well known that he made no efforts to extricate his ship from the position she was placed in off Sea Cow's Head. The people of Summerside walked out to the boat and asked the captain, after the boat had been only one day in the ice, what he was going to do. He said that he was not going to hire one man or pay one dollar to relieve the ship, but was going to stay there until March. This can be proved by dozens of people who boarded the vessel. Of course the ice accumulated around the boat and she was carried away with it and the service of the ship was lost to the people of the province. What is the result? Claims are being made against the government for damages in connection with the frozen fish and fresh meat business. Large quantities of those products were awaiting shipment and claims have been made on the government for about $6,000 damages on the ground, as can be proved, that the loss sustained by those shippers were largely due to the fact that proper diligence and energy were not shown in connection with the government ships. While the amount of $6,000 may be a small sum for the government to pay as damages, to the poor men who lost their time and spent their money providing those products for market it is a considerable amount, and I trust that the government will see their way to reimbursing these men for their losses. Reference was made to Captain Reid, the port warden at Summerside, and the hon. minister rather sneered at him and would make it appear that he was a kind of a long shore sailor. Let me tell the hon. minister that Captain Joseph Reid has sailed ships on

almost every ocean, that he is a deep sea captain, that his experience and knowledge of navigation cannot be excelled by any captain either in Canada, the United States or Great Britain, that he has the highest recommendations from the British Board of Trade, and stands first as a ship master in this country. In addition he has the confidence of at least the Liberals of the province of Prince Edward Island because they elected him to the local legislature to support the Liberal government in that province, yet the hon. minister would endeavour to cast a slur on Captain Reid and the report made by him. This question is one of such importance to the people of Prince Edward Island that every effort should be made by the government to maintain winter communications. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for East Prince, the construction of a pier at Carleton Point only eight and a half miles from Cape Tormentine in New Brunswick, would obviate the necessity for another route, because it would be simply a ferry between those points, and winter and summer this communication could be maintained between Cape Tormentine and Carleton Point. There is, I understand, a measure before this parliament asking for the incorporation of a company to establish a ferry there, and pending what might be done by that company, the government should undertake to place immediately a sufficient sum in the estimates to construct a pier at Carleton Point. The engineer has been making surveys there during the first part of the winter and no doubt his report is in the department. I know that a petition from all parts of the province has been signed asking for the construction of that pier, and I trust that we will not have occasion again to discuss this matter here. I make no apology, however, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, because the question is one which not only affects the province of Prince Edward Island but the whole Dominion.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that this item was $200,000 two years ago and last year it was increased to $225,000. This year the hon. minister is asking for $250,000. I notice that the revenue two years ago was $19,000 and that last year it had fallen off to $11,000, being a decrease of $8,000. Will the hon. minister be good enough to explain this decrease when everything was so very prosperous ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The winter before last, the revenue from the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' was $11,308.55. Last winter, when the service was so very bad according to some hon. gentlemen opposite, the revenue was, from the 'Minto,' $11,111.57 ; the 'Stanley,' $4,178.40; total, $15,289.57. This is an increase of nearly $6,000 during last winter, though the service was impaired through the steamers being caught in ice. I am informed that the reason the revenue in the previous year, that is three years ago, was only $8,000, was that the service began a great deal later in the season. Last year it began early, though it was interrupted, the revenue was more than the year previous and nearly double what it was three years ago. As to the increase of expenditure, I have explained that. This year we have an additional boat, the 'Lady Laurier,' which has had to be equipped.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that in the discussion last year the minister said that he had purchased, or was about to purchase, two new boats, one to cost $184,000, and the other $207,000. In that discussion, it was suggested that these boats would require considerable repairs when they came over for service.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These must have been the lightships.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand not. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries last year said that they were purchased from Fleming & Ferguson, of Paisley, Scotland.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The 'Lady Laurier' is one and the 'Druid' the other. The 'Druid' was in commission last year, and the 'Lady Laurier' came in this winter.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask if there was any large expenditure on either of these two boats after the full amount of contract was paid ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Only in fitting them up.

Mr. LEFURGEY. In answer to the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) the hon. minister said that he had come to the conclusion to put the boats on the Charlottetown, or Georgetown route, having consulted the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) Captain Brown and Mr. Lord, I would advise the hon. minister to find out these things for himself and not depend on any statements of Sir Louis Davies, for there are other people on Prince Edward Island more competent to judge, and the trials proved that the hon. ex-minister was long enough in office to know the situation better and has been long enough out to realize his mistakes and prejudices and the work does not justify the position he has taken or that of the present minister and we trust he will not fall heir to the local prejudices that coloured the judgment of his hon. adviser. It is also known and believed by the people of Prince Edward Island that Captain Brown came up there with the understanding that he was to give that route a black eye ; and the actions of Captain Brown during last winter and the previous winter show conclusively that he was not using his best efforts to give that route a fair trial. We have also, the opinion of the hon. member for West Queen's (Mr. Farquharson) whose opinion

should be taken equally with that of Sir Louis Davies, and his opinion is that the route between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse is the natural route. That hon. gentleman advocated that route last year and has advocated it this year in this House. Moreover, the hon. member for St. Mary's (Mr. Tarte) has asked here to-night what was the result of the trial of the 'Stanley' at Summerside during last winter. Now, I took occasion to give the facts with regard to that steamer on May 11th last, and, to refresh the memory of the minister, and in case he has not the report from his department, I may read it. The steamship 'Northumberland' made the last trip on December 10th, 1902. The steamer 'Stanley' should have begun plying, but not until the eighteenth did the 'Stanley' arrive from Pictou. This is the record :

The ss. 'Northumberland' made last trip from this port December 10, 1902.

December 18, 1902. The ss. 'Stanley' arrived about 10 a.m., from Pictou. At 1 p.m., left for Tormentine in a snowstorm laid outside Summerside light all night. Next morning, 19th, proceeded to Tormentine (without returning to Summerside to take passengers that arrived on evening train, who had to stay in Summerside till the 20th), returning about 4.20 p.m.

" 20. Left for Tormentine with local mail, returning 21st without any mail.

" 22. Made round trip, returned about 1.15 p.m. No mail coming.

" 23. Made round trip, returned about 1.15 p.m. No mail coming.

" 24. Made round trip, returned about 3.15 p.m. No mail coming.

" 25. Made round trip, returned about 3.15 p.m. Mail both ways.

" 26. Did not cross. Went outside harbour and returned.

" 27. Made round trip, returned about 4 p.m., with mails.

" 28. Sunday at wharf.

" 29. Made round trip, returned about 5 p.m., with mails.

" 30. Made round trip, returned about 3 p.m., with mails.

" 31. Made round trip, returned about 4.30 p.m., with mails.

January 1, 1903. Made round trip (change of time), leaving, returned 4.30 p.m. Mails.

" 2. Made round trip (change of time), leaving, returned 3 p.m. Mails.

" 3. Made round trip (change of time), leaving, returned 3 p.m. Mails.

" 4. Sunday at wharf.

" 5. Made round trip, returned about 2.25 p.m. Mails.

" 6. Made round trip, returned about 3.30. Mails.

" 7. Did not cross.

" 8. Snowstorm, went outside harbour and returned at 11 a.m.

" 9. Left at 9.30 a.m., returned to Tormentine over night. Returned on the 10th about 11.15.

" 11. Sunday at wharf.

" 12. Left about 7 a.m., in a gale of wind from west and very cold. Should have laid at wharf.

The circumstances that day were not such as to warrant the steamship leaving the wharf. The captain was advised by both his pilot and mate to stay in harbour. The glass showed that we were going to have one of the biggest storms of the year. Now, we have here the report of the working of the steamer that will show at no time since the Pictou-Georgetown route was established, have they had more successful crossings than those of the period when the steamer was running between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. As I pointed out before, and if the minister will take the trouble to read this speech of May 11——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman must know that all this is in the department.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It may be, but while we are discussing this subject it is well that the House should know the situation of affairs. I want to say that up to the 12th, the time when that vessel was caught in the ice off Summerside harbour, the crossings at Summerside were the most successful in the history of the island since confederation; and had the captain used the due diligence that any private ship-owner would have used to get his vessel out of that ice, the service between Summerside and Cape Tormentine would have been kept up all winter. We have also the advice and testimony of competent persons who have removed vessels from Summerside harbour that were in as bad a predicament as the 'Stanley,' that had proper means been used when that vessel was in the ice she could have been freed in two or three days. I cannot understand why the minister should say that it is the policy of the department to have Georgetown and Pictou as the terminal of the winter route between the island and the mainland. I was glad to hear the minister afterwards retract those words, and state that he was going down to look into the matter himself. The people of Prince Edward Island will welcome the minister, and we trust he will look into this matter in an unbiased way, leaving out of consideration the reports of Sir Louis Davies and of Captain Finlayson, and will take the evidence we have of the tests between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, and weigh the matter carefully for himself.

Mr. POPE. I am surprised that the minister should question the advice tendered him by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lefurgey) in regard to possessing knowledge in reference to this question. The minister is paid to know these things. What else do we pay him for ? He is drawing now a stated salary to know something about his department in this service. We have applauded his appointment to the position he now occupies, not that we expected he possessed extraordinary knowledge in regard to marine and fisheries, but because

we expected that if we paid him a stated indemnity of seven thousand dollars a year, he would acquire special knowledge with regard to these various steamers and their running from the island to the mainland. Sir, I fancy that the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) is entitled to have his request granted. It is not extravagant that a gentleman representing a coast so extravagantly large as the county of Gaspé should request that only once in twelve months communication should be had between some islands there and the mainland. I am surprised, Mr. Chairman, that since he says he has often made this request for the last two years, and has not been able to get even a single service during the year, he should still remain so faithful a supporter of this government when they are so mean and stingy as to begrudge him that service. Sir, I trust that this appeal of the member for Gaspé will bear some fruit, and that before the next meeting of this parliament the hon. minister will have acquired the knowledge that will to some extent entitle him to draw the special salary which this country is paying him. Now, Sir, the minister has said that he does not know captain so and so, that he does not know captain this and captain that. Again, Mr. Chairman, I say we pay him for knowing these people, the hon. gentleman should know these people. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I think these items would advance much more rapidly if the rules of this House permitted some gentlemen who are sitting near him to speak instead of the minister himself. In fact, I do not think he is a good telephone, I do not think he has taken a lesson from that history I gave in this House a little time ago about the parrot, I do not think he repeats well. He has close to him a gentleman who possesses all the knowledge in the department, the minister can whisper in the ear of his deputy and get the information that we want. Surely he ought to be able to tell us something about captain this and captain that and captain the other. But instead of that, Mr. Chairman, here we are at a loss, we landlubbers. I acknowledge I am not possessed of a knowledge of marine matters; but, as a farmer coming from the interior of this great country, I expect to get information from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now, Sir, I am going to ask him a question to find out whether he knows anything about his department. I would like to know from the minister how much supplies he buys for these steamers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The allowance is mentioned in the item of $220,000. That comprises maintenance and repairs.

Mr. POPE. Not at all, Mr. Chairman. That item of $220,000 is a bulk amount for the salaries and everything else, as I take it, for the maintenance of these steamers. What I want to know is the amount for supplies, provisions, corkscrews.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I read a moment ago the amount that is allotted to each steamer ; I will read it over again if the hon. gentleman insists.

'Quadra'—

Wages	$13,680
Fuel	4,500
Provisions	5,500
Ship chandlery	1,800
Docking	800
Coal oil, &c	30
Miscellaneous	1,400
Engine room repairs	3,500
	$31,000

'Lady Laurier'—

Wages	$13,000
Fuel	3,000
Provisions	5,000
Supplies, deck	1,000
Supplies, engine	900
Repairs, hull	1,000
Repairs, engine	1,000
Uniforms	600
Miscellaneous	4,500
	$30,000

'Aberdeen'—

Wages	$13,500
Fuel	9,000
Provisions	9,000
Painting and dockage	2,500
Engines and deck supplies	5,000
Uniforms	600
Repairs	5,400
	$45,000

'Druid'—

Wages	$ 8,000
Fuel	7,000
Provisions	4,000
Painting and dockage	1,000
Engine and deck supplies	2,500
Uniforms	500
Engine repairs	2,000
Hull repairs	2,000
Miscellaneous	1,000
	$28,000

'Lansdowne'—

Wages	$11,000
Fuel	2,500
Provisions	5,000
Repairs, hull	5,200
Repairs, machinery	2,000
Ship chandlery	2,200
Supplies, engine room	1,200
Miscellaneous	900
	$30,000

'Stanley'—

Wages	$ 9,100
Fuel	9,250
Extra labour in winter	2,000
Provisions	5,000
Painting and dockage	2,500
Engine room supplies	1,500
Miscellaneous (repairs, &c.)	3,650
	$35,000

'Minto'—

Wages	$12,750
Fuel	13,500
Extra labour in winter	2,000
Provisions	7,000
Dockage and painting	2,500

Engine room supplies..	$ 2,250
Ship chandlery..	2,000
Engine repairs..	2,000
	$44,000

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If I have been able to catch the figures which have been given, I think that for coal and provisions the hon. gentleman will spend over $60,000. Is that about right ? I could not catch the figures very well but I think that is about it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For provisions about $35,000.

Mr. POPE. What about coal ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will require 14,000 tons of coal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is the coal bought by circulars or by tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. By tender. Sometimes a steamer is at a wharf and in want of coal and they buy a small quantity.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has the department a store into which these provisions are put ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Each agency has a store.

Mr. POPE. What do you call an agency?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a station at Halifax, one at Pictou, one at Sydney, one at St. John, one at Quebec and one at Charlottetown.

Mr. POPE. Who is at the head of these agencies ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are under the officers of the department.

Mr. POPE. Are these provisions that amounted to $35,000 purchased by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I could not say they are purchased by tender——

Mr. POPE. I want you to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If you will allow me——

Mr. POPE. Yes, I will allow you.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Do not be too fresh.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot say they are procured by public tender. In different agencies circulars are sent out in order to know the market prices at which these provisions can be bought.

Mr. POPE. To whom are these circulars sent ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To the trade generally, I suppose.

Mr. POPE. Exactly so. We have arrived up against the same point that we have in regard to all the purchases of this government. The system is absolutely rotten. There is no longer any public tender demanded.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is not the case.

Mr. POPE. Not the case ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No it is not.

Mr. POPE. Well, the hon. Minister of Justice will have a chance to prove whether it is the case or not.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, I will and I will do it too.

Mr. POPE. You are not on trial.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. You are making statements which are not true.

Mr. POPE. The Minister of Justice should not become passionate. The Minister of Justice ought to be able to balance the scales most accurately, while we see him exhibiting such passion, what justice can we expect from him as Minister of Justice ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. POPE. The laughter and the cheer come. It is a cheap cheer. You can buy it from them. We have heard it in this House for years. It does not scare anybody nor does the hon. Minister of Justice frighten anybody.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He does not try to frighten anybody and he cannot be frightened either.

Mr. POPE. Pale as he may be under anger at this moment I am still not frightened. Now, perhaps, I may be permitted to address my remarks to the hon. minister in charge of these items. The question has been raised here, not alone by myself, but, by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House from year to year, in regard to the purchase of supplies by hon. gentlemen on the other side representing various departments of the government. They are buying supplies under a system of absolute fraud, a system that is permeated from beginning to end with fraud. In the first place, we find that when tenders are called the specifications are loaded with conditions saying that supplies to be furnished under these tenders shall be of a certain manufacture, or bear a certain brand, or be manufactured under a patent which is under the control of friends of their own. It is well known in Montreal, Toronto, Halifax ; in fact, there is not a centre of commerce in Canada where this fact is not positively well known. The

friends of these hon. gentlemen are the selling agents of certain patents, certain brands of goods bearing certain marks that are useful in public works and in other directions and the tender goes forth that the tenderer shall supply goods bearing these particular marks. The minister does not know how the circulars are sent out or whether they are sent out to the trade generally or to friends of the government particularly, but he 'supposes.' He is paid to know the facts and not to 'suppose' and he may recline in his chair if he likes, but he will have to give us the information. We did not ask him to bring his estimates before the House to-night, and there is plenty of time now for the minister between this and the early frosts of September to learn something about his department. We will give him three months study and then he can come back and submit his estimates when he knows something. Why should he make an exhibition of himself. A new minister should try to make a favourable impression and if he likes he has his deputy there and a number of clerks to learn from them The time is passed when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or any other minister can ask the representatives of the people to vote hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money to be spent without public tender. If there was a particle of principle among the Liberals in this House they would be the first to denounce the letting of contracts without tenders, because they preached against it for years when in opposition. I feel to-night that there is in this House, notwithstanding the dumbness of the hirelings who sit behind this government——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Chairman. I call your attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) refers to members of this House as hirelings.

Mr. POPE. Do we not get $1,500 a year ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, sit down.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We have had enough of this sort of thing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is unparliamentary to say that an hon. member is a hireling.

Mr. POPE. It is unparliamentary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You will be kind enough to withdraw it.

Mr. POPE. I am very glad you decided that it is unparliamentary, and I shall bow to your decision and withdraw the word 'hireling,' and I trust that the hon. gentlemen who so faithfully support this government and who applaud them when they violate all their principles will see the error of their ways. I trust the time will come when they will realize the full effect of applauding the men who sit in front of them for the violation of all their principles. I think we had better let this item stand. The minister does not know anything about it, and we want some information. I understand that I have offended the Minister of Justice and I have even dived into the heart of the Minister of Finance, but I regret that because it always pains me when I offend great statesmen. No matter how humble a member on this side of the House may be, he must be pained when he finds he has occasioned passion in the mind of the Minister of Justice. Perhaps the Minister of Justice did not intend to exhibit that passion, and I suppose he will apologize when I sit down. You, Mr. Chairman, can remember better than I can when the Liberals in this House were loud in support of the rights of the people and loud in denouncing the very thing that they now applaud. When we find this government who say to the people of Canada : Observe us as to righteousness and purity, when we find them doing such things we have the right to object. We have here the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who has had his education in Montreal, an education that is well known throughout the length and breadth of this country, a man who denominated the public works of Montreal, a man who has put a stamp upon Montreal and left a reputation there that you can tumble into on the sidewalks of Montreal far and wide. When they call a man of that character to the Cabinet, we expect from him justice; such justice as he tendered to the city of Montreal, such justice as he is offering to the people of Canada in his department. The minister says he assumes, but we do not want any assuming ; we want facts. We want to know whether these circulars were sent to the trade generally or whether they were sent to special friends of the government.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. minister has just stated that included in this item are ten or twelve boats, For these boats he must of course have supplies. If his department is not equipped in the way I am going to explain, with a store at each place, would it not be well to ask for tenders, as the Department of Public Works has done ? When the Yukon line was under way, and we wanted supplies, we called for public tenders. We got them, we opened a couple of stores, and from those stores the employees drew what they required, just as is done in the way of business everywhere else. I do not know whether the same rule is applied in the hon. gentleman's department or not; but when supplies to the amount of $40,000 and 14,000 tons of coal are to be bought, I think it would be a good rule to follow. Then each boat would draw from the stores what it required, as is done in any well organized business. I think that suggestion is worth looking into. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to tell us whether such a rule has been applied ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed that the rule has not been applied at all, for the simple reason that the supplies are bought at the different

places as they are wanted at the lowest market price, and the provisions are ordered through the agent. Most of the coal required in the maritime provinces is bought at the mines.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I speak in a general way. The hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, would be in a position to ask his officers how much butter, how much pork, how much beans, how much flour, would be required for such and such boats. The captain of each boat would give the information. When these reports are in hand, would it not be well to ask for public tenders for so much beef, so much flour, and so on ? I think it would be a very good rule to follow if it has not been followed in the past. The goods for Halifax would be delivered there and the goods for Quebec would be delivered at Quebec. That was what the Department of Public Works did in the Yukon. We asked for public tenders, the goods to be delivered at Vancouver, at White Horse, and so on. I am just asking the hon. gentleman to follow a system which I followed myself. If it is not applied in his department, I think it should be applied there. These are pretty large amounts of money to spend for supplies, although I quite grant that if the coal is bought at the mines, he could not perhaps do better. But, all the same, when 14,000 or 15,000 tons are required, I think public tenders should be asked.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think my hon. friend is right in assuming that there is any difference in the method of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries Department and that of the Public Works Department. When he speaks of public tenders, does he mean tenders by public advertisement ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We did that for the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that to a certain extent my hon. friend is mistaken, for in some instances, for the supplies for the Yukon tenders were invited by circulars.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, what took place was this. We asked for public tenders first. Prices were sent in, and goods were obtained for one year. Last year the contract was renewed at the same prices.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend is mistaken if he implies that that was done by public advertisement in all cases. I am quite satisfied that his tenders for supplies were obtained by circulars.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, for small amounts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been no change in the method of ordering supplies in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The method is the same as that which prevailed in former years. The only question is whether the supplies have been obtained at fair and reasonable prices. That is a proper question for inquiry in the Public Accounts Committee. I am quite satisfied that every article has been ordered in good faith and under the fullest supervision, and we challenge the most thorough investigation in the Public Accounts Committee as to whether the prices paid are fair and reasonable. As to issuing public advertisements for tenders for the supply of coal, what would be the use of putting advertisements in the newspapers ? There are only half a dozen mines in Nova Scotia, and when coal is to be supplied at Pictou, you would hardly bring it from Sydney or Cumberland. You would necessarily get it from the mines in the locality where it was wanted, and I am satisfied the prices are obtained from the various mines in that locality. So in every other case the effort is made to get the goods required at fair and reasonable prices.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that he sends out circulars for everything required at the opening of navigation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And that a price is then made ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And that price is the same all the year round ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, all the year round.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If circulars are sent out in large numbers, the system is not as bad as it might be. Will the hon. Minister of Finance permit me to say that I am not far from the mark in stating that if public tenders were asked when large amounts of provisions are wanted, twenty-five or thirty per cent would be saved. In the Yukon we had the very same experience. We started buying, just in the way pointed out now. Later on we invited tenders, and prices went down. I was criticised in the Public Accounts Committee, as it was the right of the opposition to criticise me. I am not far from the mark in stating that if public tenders were asked, say for meat, tea, coffee, and a group of merchandise, to be delivered at Halifax, Quebec or elsewhere, the department would save trouble and criticism for itself, and save money for the country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can neither admit nor deny my hon. friend's statement with reference to the Yukon, because I admit that he has a better knowledge of that than I have; but, as respects these supplies, if he thinks he could save

twenty-five or thirty per cent, I am bound to say I differ from him. I do not think my hon. friend will say that when he ordered goods in the Department of Public Works by circular, we thereby lost from twenty-five and thirty-five per cent. No doubt he believed that by that method he obtained fair and reasonable prices, and if that were possible in the Public Works Department it is equally possible in the Marine and Fisheries Department. I know as a matter of fact that in some of the ports where these supplies are furnished, they are obtained at very moderate terms—so much so that people hardly care to compete for the furnishing of them. Take the case of Halifax, of which I have personal knowledge, the agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department there is a gentleman who has been in the service many years, and who has certified that every item in the account is charged at a fair and reasonable price. I am sure that he would not certify to items that were charged at from twenty-five to thirty-five per cent over what is fair and reasonable.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would it not be worth trying ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why more to-day than when my hon. friend was minister ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friends opposite say hear, hear, but two blacks do not make a white, or two whites a black. It is a question of business, and business men will, I believe, share in the views I have just expressed. So far as the Yukon telegraph is concerned, there was a large amount involved, and if I remember aright, some of my colleagues were of the opinion that public tenders should be asked, and I asked for public tenders. I remember very well that in the Department of Public Works at Ottawa, when small amounts were in question, we asked for prices by circular, but these were very small amounts indeed. However, I have called the attention of the minister to this point, and do not want to insist on it. Now that I am on my feet, might I ask the hon. gentleman whether he has made any inquiry as to the reasons why the 'Stanley' could not maintain the winter service between Summerside and the mainland—whether there is any official report on that question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The papers were all laid on the Table two months ago.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will the hon. gentleman give, in a few words, the reasons why the efforts were unsuccessful ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is well known that the failure was due to the weather. The question came before the House and all the facts were explained. The 'Stanley' was caught in such heavy ice—as thick as four and a half feet—that it was impossible for her to move either one way or the other. That is why the 'Minto' was called to her assistance, but unfortunately, she broke three blades of her propeller and was disabled. It was only after two or three weeks that the 'Stanley' succeeded in extricating herself from the ice and she towed the 'Minto' to the port of Pictou. It was an accident quite uncontrollable.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Statements have been made in the House that no efforts were made to work the boats. I was very much surprised, because to my knowledge the steamers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries are very well manned as a rule, and good discipline is maintained on board. I have visited them often and am glad to say that no steamers could be better kept. What I wanted to know was whether any inquiry has been held regarding the statements that the captain made no efforts.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He made every effort, and it is quite clear to the department that the accident was unavoidable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to suggest, in answer to what has been said by the hon. Minister of Finance, that it does not seem much of an argument against the advertising of the supplies that the ex-Minister of Public Works did not always do it. There does not seem to be much cogency in that argument. There would, however, seem to be more force in the statement of the ex-Minister of Public Works that having tried both systems, he thinks there will be very considerable saving if the system of advertising in the newspapers be adopted. If the supplies can be obtained in that way, what is the objection ? I have heard something in Nova Scotia about the way these circulars are sent out, and the information that has come to me is that they are given a very restricted circulation, much more limited than was the case under the late administration ; and as far as my hon. friend's observation with regard to the Committee of Public Accounts is concerned, he knows that if the committee sat every day, instead of once or twice a month, as it has been doing, it would not be able to make any such investigation of these items as would justify the removal of any public safeguard. Under the circumstances, I cannot see any force in the observations of my hon. friend or any possible objection to putting advertisements in the newspapers with regard to supplies required by the departments.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe that we have experienced no difficulty in the past in having investigations before the Committee of Public Accounts. During last

session a very considerable portion of the time of that committee was taken up in answering the criticisms of hon. gentlemen opposite on expenditures in the Department of Public Works, which were held to be rash and extravagant, just as the expenditures now being criticised are considered to-day. But upon full investigation, these charges were found absolutely unjustified, and I believe that an investigation to-day with respect to the Department of Marine would have precisely the same result. It is easy, in this House, to make general statements that purchases are extravagant, but these have not borne investigation successfully in the past and will not in the future, I am satisfied. As regards the method followed in former years, the government in former years purchased these supplies from their friends, and I presume the present government does so. Why should we not be frank on that subject? There is no change in the system and the only question is whether the prices are fair and reasonable. If purchasing from friends of the government leads to excessive prices, that is an abuse which no practice in the past can justify, but unless the hon. gentleman can show that the prices are excessive and that these certificates given by men like Mr. Lord, of Charlottetown; Mr. Parsons, of Halifax; Mr. Harding, of St. John, and others, are false, it is not fair to assume that there is any extravagance in the prices.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I hope my hon. friend will not put in my mouth words that I had no intention of using. I never charged the Department of Marine with extravagance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Others have.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I was speaking for myself. I have that right—the only one that may be left me. I did not want to make any change of the kind, but was speaking in a general way, and I spoke, I think, the language of a sound business man. The hon. gentleman says truly that the government have a right to favour their friends. But there are certain limits to that right. Governments should not go beyond these limits. For instance, it would be very pleasant to be able to give contracts for wharfs and lighthouses without tenders, but they do not do it. We ask for public tenders.

Mr. MONK. Why?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Because the law is there. The spirit of the law is that when a large expenditure is to be incurred, as a rule tenders are publicly called for. I was simply speaking in that direction. Here is an expenditure of $40,000 or $50,000, and I suggested that perhaps the country would save money by publicly asking for tenders. But if the hon. minister is satisfied that there is no money to be saved he is responsible for his statement. I am responsible for mine.

Mr. MONK. There is no doubt but that the Minister of Finance is absolutely mistaken, and so is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. When the Minister of Finance says that an investigation is necessary to show that we could save 25 or 30 per cent on these purchases he is mistaken. That investigation has been made, and we find the results in the Auditor General's Report for last year. If hon. members will take the trouble to consult that report as to the purchases of supplies for government steamers, they will be persuaded, not that we could have saved 30 per cent only, but that we could have saved 40 or 50 per cent at least upon provisions had we called for tenders publicly. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that circulars were issued, and that a comparison shows that fair market prices are secured. I shall not take the trouble to read the Auditor General's Report, but if hon. members will take the trouble to read it, they will find that the saving would be as great as I have said.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are not all bought in the same place.

Mr. MONK. Because the hon. minister will not carry out the rule the adoption of which we are advocating. Take the case of groceries, for instance. Surely it would be possible for the minister to call for tenders for groceries to be furnished during the summer season to the government steamers. Here in the Auditor General's Report, beginning at page P—9, the hon. minister will find instances where groceries have been bought by the thousand pounds at as high prices as we pay at retail in Montreal. In the city of Montreal we have, as other cities have, large wholesale houses that would be glad to tender for these supplies, and—I am speaking of groceries only—would be able to supply the country at a saving of 40 per cent on the prices that have been paid. How, then, can the Minister of Finance say we must make an investigation before the Public Accounts Committee to establish what is here proven? The same thing applies to the furnishing of green groceries, and the same thing to hardware. I am not as conversant with hardware, but I venture to say that if tenders were publicly called for we would gain over 30 per cent. Why not let it be done? It is no answer for the minister to say it has not been done in the past. The public expenditure is increasing and we are here to call attention to the existence of wise rules. There can be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable man that in articles that are required in large quantities—when it is a question of a few dollars' worth——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We could not do it.

Mr. MONK. We could not do it—but, in an expenditure of $40,000, we could save $15,000. I think that the hon. minister, now that he is just taking hold of his department, should apply this rule in purchasing supplies for the steamers. This is reasonable. Then why not do it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is this difference between the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and myself: When he says that 30 or 40 per cent could be saved on these purchases, he assumes that his mere saying it proves it; on the other hand, I confess I cannot accept that reasoning at all.

Mr. MONK. I can give instances.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) cannot give instances, because he has no knowledge of the circumstances under which these purchases take place. What I do know is that in all these cases—I am speaking generally—reputable officers, many of them appointed under former governments, certify, with respect to these items, that the prices are fair and reasonable. This is the evidence of a man on the spot, a man whose duty it is to know the facts. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier says that we must dismiss that and take his own statement to the contrary. I do not think that is fair.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I can cite one instance that came under my notice since I became a minister. Circulars were sent out in the city of Quebec for the purchase of provisions for two or three steamers there. We received about twenty tenders, and the articles which were lowest were chosen from the different tenders. Our agent there reported as to every article that he recommended to be bought from the different tenderers that the prices were reasonable according to the current market prices. Our officer has been there for thirty years, and is in a position to know the facts. Of course, there are articles for which tenders cannot be had, for instance, the articles the supplies of which are bought daily. In that case, our agent is directly responsible, because he must certify that the prices paid are not higher than the market prices. Two years ago, a great fuss was made about some bread furnished in Quebec for the steamers, which appeared in the Auditor General's Report as being double the price of bread bought in Halifax. After investigation, it was discovered that the loaves of bread in Halifax were a certain number of pounds, while the loaves in Quebec were double that weight, explaining at once the difference in price. Another point was made that brick had been bought at $40 a thousand when ordinary brick was selling at $7 or $8 a thousand. It was discovered that a few fire brick had been imported to repair a furnace, and they had been paid for at the regular price in the market. As regards coal, as I have explained, it is bought in different places. In the maritime provinces, it is usually bought at the mines, and the prices are the lowest at which coal can be bought. In Quebec and other places where we are not near the mines, circulars are sent out calling for tenders. The prices are compared by the agent with market prices, and he takes the responsibility of certifying that they are fair and reasonable.

Mr. BELL. Why does the hon. minister say that coal is bought at the mine ? Is it not delivered at the steamer's side ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Delivered at the steamer. But bought from the producer. Take Pictou, for instance. The coal bought at Pictou was all got by tender at the mines for $3.75 f o b on the wharf. At Sydney we paid $3.

Mr. BELL. How many steamers are coaled at Pictou ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It depends entirely on when they pass there. Sometimes they would coal two or three times in the summer. One may coal three or four times and another only once.

Mr. BELL. Is the contract invited for the whole season ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). When the minister says bought at the mine, does he mean purchased from the mining company, or purchased at the mine through some agent ? In other words, is there any commission on this $3.75 for coal at Pictou ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was purchased from the Intercolonial mine by tender. At Halifax it was purchased for $4.75, there is no mention from whom it was bought. At Sydney it was bought from the Dominion Coal Company at $3.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know whether the minister is aware of it, but I have understood that sometimes in these public contracts the full weight of coal does not always materialize. What steps has the minister taken to see that the coal is delivered in proper weight ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not heard there is any deficiency in the weight.

Mr. MONK. The Minister of Finance has made an argument that seems to me so puerile that it is not worth while answering. He says that when he has a certificate from an officer of the government that the goods have been delivered and that the prices charged are reasonable, that ought to be

sufficient, tender or no tender. Let me tell the Minister of Finance that if he will take the last report of the Auditor General, at page P—9, he will find a purchase amounting to $580.57, made at Quebec for groceries, at prices for every article that far exceed the prices we pay in Montreal in retail stores, even the largest stores. Is the minister going to pretend that if he calls for tenders for large supplies of those articles giving every man in the Dominion who is in business a chance to tender, he would not get them cheaper ? I venture to say that that item of $588 would be reduced to less than $350. I can find numberless instances. For instance, here is coffee, 40 cents at one place, 35 at another, more or less at another; when we can get it for 30 cents, of the very best quality, in Montreal from wholesale grocers if they were allowed to tender. There is no question about the principle. The question is that the minister is asking us for $250,000, and he will not pledge himself that the citizens of this Dominion will have a chance to tender as the law requires.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say there is no such law, that is my first point. In the second place, the hon. gentleman quoting coffee at 40 cents a pound, does not prove anything at all. There is coffee and coffee, everything depends on the quality and on circumstances. No doubt many a man in this House pays more than 40 cents a pound for coffee, and does not consider that he is being robbed. Everything depends on the circumstances under which the goods are supplied, the quality of the goods, the condition of the market, and many other things of which my hon. friend cannot possibly have any knowledge. But if on any of these goods we have information that the prices are excessive, I am sure that on inquiry we will be glad to have his assistance in showing it. But we should not assume that the prices are excessive upon any such information as he has yet given us.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Can the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tell us whether he has asked tenders from wholesale men ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If the hon. gentleman asked for tenders by circulars from wholesale grocers such as Martin & Co., or Chaput & Co., there would not be great objection. But let me assure him that if he looks carefully into the report of the Auditor General he will find that on many occasions, not only in his department, but in others, things are bought at retail prices. That should not be done. Last year I was placed in that same position. I will mention one fact which the Minister of Finance will remember. We had asked for tenders by circular in British Columbia for the Yukon telegraph. Prices came down here that we regarded too high. I applied to some wholesale grocers in Montreal, Martin & Co. and Chaput & Co., three or four wholesale grocers, and I found it advantageous to buy in Montreal and to ship the goods to Vancouver. The Department of Public Works has a record of that. Now the Minister of Finance should not lose sight of these facts. These are hard facts that no argument can gainsay; and my hon. friend is wrong when he lays down as a principle that when the certificate of a local man, of the engineer or the foreman, is on the paper, it should be taken for granted that the prices are right. I am speaking after an experience of nearly six years and a half as Minister of Public Works, and I state boldly that if the chief officials of the department here did not control the certificates of their local men, there would be abuses that the Minister of Finance has no idea of. He has no conception of the abuses that would prevail if the chief officers of the department did not control the certificates of the local men. I have been caught myself unwillingly, my officers have been caught unwillingly on several occasions. This is not a rule that should be followed, and I do not think the Minister of Finance means that it should be absolutely followed. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will follow my suggestion he will save money for the public treasury. Let him ask for prices from wholesale firms in several places. Every business man would ask for tenders from wholesale houses in several towns and cities, knowing that he would then get fair prices. My hon. friend said a moment ago that the price of coffee in Montreal is 30 cents. I am buying my coffee at this moment for 30 cents a pound, the best coffee in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not like that coffee.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I can assure him that I know what good coffee is. For 30 cents a pound you can get the best coffee in the Montreal market.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With regard to these certificates that prices are fair and reasonable, the hon. gentleman seems to assume that his officers in the Public Works Department kept their eyes on these certificates, and that there were no officers in the Marine and Fisheries Department who do likewise.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, I did not mean that at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has officers to supervise these accounts, and if there seems to be anything excessive, either in the Public Works Department or in the Marine and Fisheries Department, undoubtedly it would be the duty of the higher officers to call attention to it. All I claim is that when you have that certificate from a reputable officer,

it is prima facie evidence that the prices are fair and reasonable until somebody shows to the contrary.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I did not accuse the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries more than any one else, nothing of the kind. I am only laying down a principle that I believe is sound. I believe that the officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department are just as good as any other officers; to my knowledge they are honest men, and I have nothing to say against them, far from it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I know something about wholesale groceries in the city of Halifax, and I would say that in no instance can it be found that there is 5 per cent or 10 per cent overcharge. If the hon. gentleman will look at the prices in the city of Halifax he will find that the government has been supplied at as reasonable prices as would be charged any other buyer, because these purchases are made by men of the highest reputation. I know, that, in the case of hardware, some Halifax merchants stated to me that they would sooner not have supplied these goods that they would have done better by filling their own orders all over the country, because the prices have been reduced so low that there was no inducement for them to supply these goods to the government vessels. If you go minutely through the list of supplies that have been furnished at the port of Halifax you will find that in no instance has there been an overcharge. I know that coal is supplied by the mines of Cape Breton and shipped on board vessels to be carried here and there at the very lowest price. This year a case came under my own personal knowledge in which coal was supplied as low as three years ago.

Mr. HACKETT. My hon. friend from Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross) says that hardware was bought at a very low rate in Halifax. I have under my hand the accounts for a quantity of goods known as software that was purchased for the 'Minto' in the port of Halifax, and I would like to read it for the benefit of the committee:

James Scott & Co., Halifax: Soda water, ginger beer, apollinaris and lemonade, fourteen dozen, $14.10.

I would like to know if this is a fair price for soft goods in Halifax. As the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in the habit of issuing a circular inviting tenders he no doubt issues a schedule of quality stating the kind of goods required. I notice in the Auditor General's Report at page P—26 the following charge:

Sanderson & Co., Charlottetown, Turkish cigarettes, two tins, $4.75 per tin.

I would like to ask the hon. minister whether he received a tender for Turkish cigarettes, and if he would consider that was a fair price or not and I would like to ask him in what way Turkish cigarettes are used in the navigation of steamships? I think he at least must have added $2 a tin to the ordinary price of Turkish cigarettes on that occasion. I would like to know how many tenders he received for the supply of these cigarettes and if the offer of Sanderson & Co., of Charlottetown, was the only one received, and if this government vessel could not have proceeded on its voyage just as well without these cigarettes.

Mr. POPE. The hon. Minister of Finance said that we would find a variation in prices in the different localities in which supplies were purchased. Of course, we may be critical in regard to these matters, but it is the duty of an opposition to ascertain the facts in connection with public expenditure. I would not say that for every expenditure of $500 the rule of advertising for tenders must be observed, but where it means an expenditure of a considerable amount of money the government must allow that it is open to criticism and at least to suspicion if tenders are not invited. It is not necessary for us to go through all these items that are contained in the Auditor General's Report. It is impossible for the members of this committee as a whole to attend the Public Accounts Committee. It is impossible for us to investigate. If we did attend the Public Accounts Committee, the expenditure of this government in all its departments, as it is represented in the report of the Auditor General, and if we were to follow the rule laid down by the hon. Minister of Finance, we would be confronted at once by the statement that we had got all these particulars in the Public Accounts Committee. I am sure the hon. Minister of Finance will not lay it down as a principle that we should not criticise any detail of the expenditure in any department unless we had investigated it in the Public Accounts Committee, because that would be a principle impossible to carry out. The Public Accounts Committee would have to sit year after year and this House never would rise if we were to follow out that principle. Taking up the question of a single item, I will give the committee a comparison of the prices charged for the article of potatoes. I find that at Rimouski there was a charge of 40 cents a bushel, at St. Andrews, a charge of $2 a bushel, at Shelbourne, 50 cents a bushel, at Souris, 33 cents a bushel, at another place 60 cents a bushel, at another place $2 a bushel.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Would that not be $2 a barrel?

Mr. POPE. Two dollars is a little high, Mr. Ross, even under your administration. At another place 60 cents a bushel, at another place 78 cents a bushel, and so on all through you find this variation in connection with that article. Even if I had the long long years of training of my hon. and venerable friend from Victoria, N.S., I do not think

that I could accept a variation between 33 cents and $2 a bushel without making an inquiry of the hon. minister. I would not be expected to go to the Public Accounts Committee to warrant me in rising in my seat and criticising such items as these. Now, Sir, all this criticism and all this suspicion can be avoided if the better system were followed of calling for public tenders. I am sure that we would accept it from the hon. minister as being more or less satisfactory if he would say to-night that in future, he will adopt the system of asking for public tenders in connection with the general supplies required by this department. It is quite easy after the years of experience we have had in operating these steamers and it would be very businesslike also for the department to make an estimate based upon the expenditure of years gone by of what the requirements would be in the year to come in the various articles such as groceries, coal, &c. That is only business. It is done by every business firm in Canada or in the world, so far as that goes, and it is very easy for the hon. minister to make a reasonable estimate of the supplies that would be required and ask for a public tender for the quantity needed during the year. Let him advertise for these tenders and when he receives these tenders let him act upon them without any undue influence, which I am sure would not be exercised by the hon. minister and if he did this the duty of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would be simple. It would be much easier and more satisfactory for all of us. When we look through these items and find the wonderful variation in price which no distance warrants we are certainly justified in protesting against such a system as this. There is no distance in all of Canada that warrants a difference between 33 cents and $2 a bushel.

Mr. MACKINNON. Is it $2 a barrel or $2 a bushel ?

Mr. POPE. It is $2 a bushel.

Mr. MACKINNON. It is six barrels at $2 a barrel.

Mr. POPE. They may have been seed potatoes, but there is entered here one bushel at $2. If the hon. gentleman thinks he scored a bull's-eye, let him take his prize. The gentlemen on this side of the House would be absolutely derelict of their duty if they did not absolutely protest against the method of purchasing these articles and the prices paid for them. The minister is starting in a larger sphere as a responsible minister of the Crown, and it would be to his credit if he would get up now and state that in future these supplies will be obtained by public tenders. Is he going on with the old system of buying these supplies in future as in the past, or will he invite tenders ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. POPE. No, it is not carried. I have asked a fair question, and I want an answer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not my intention to change the system.

Mr. TAYLOR. We paid F. X. Drolet, of Quebec, $6,663.51, and I want to know whether we bought from him by tender or if the prices he charged were what he thought fit to charge ? We have an item here for rope specially made for steering gear, 130 feet at 50 cents per foot. That is an outrageous price for a foot of rope.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed that this party is a machinist, and that it is an account for the work and material he has furnished for the steamer in the regular way.

Mr. TAYLOR. This work was not done by tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There could be no tender for such repairs as that.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Who are the wholesale grocers in Quebec from whom he asked tenders ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are mostly all asked, but I know the firm of Turner.

Mr. CASGRAIN. A very good firm it is. You say that tenders were asked from Whitehead & Turner ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and they got part of the contract.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Who were the other firms ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There were twenty. As far as I can remember, there were amongst others Coleman, and Dion, and Thibaudeau.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Dion is not a wholesale grocer, and Coleman is not a wholesale grocer, either.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, he is.

Mr. INGRAM. Do these boats carry passengers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Those which do the winter service to Prince Edward Island carry passengers.

Mr. INGRAM. There are many charges of luxuries of a very expensive character, and if they did not carry passengers and supply meals, these items would be very extraordinary.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Prince Edward Island steamers supply meals.

Mr. INGRAM. The expenditure on these boats is $452,526; now what is the revenue from these boats ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The revenue, as I have already given, from the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' was for 1901-2 $11,308, and this year from the 'Minto' $11,111.57, and from the 'Stanley' $4,178.40, making $15,289.

Mr. INGRAM. So that while the total expenditure of the department on these boats is $450,000, we have a revenue from them of about $15,000. The hon. Minister of Finance approves of the principle of purchasing supplies laid down for years by both parties ; but I beg to differ from him with regard to that principle. I contend that a government party have a perfect right, when they ask for tenders, all things being equal, to give the contract to their friends ; but it is no answer to say that they have purchased supplies from their friends and paid a reasonable price for them. The only true principle is, first, to call for tenders, and then, all things being equal, to give the contract to your political friends. When the government go outside of that principle, they are not doing what I believe to be in the best interests of the people of this country. When you look over these items, notwithstanding the statement by the hon. member for Victoria that men are to be found who are so patriotic in spirit towards the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that they furnish things for less than cost——

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I made no such statement. I repeat the statement I made. I confined myself to the port of Halifax, because I do business there, and know something of the character of the gentlemen who supply these articles.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page P—26 of the Auditor General's Report, he will find a large number of items there for which excessive prices were paid.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). By whom supplied ?

Mr. INGRAM. By Sanderson & Company, of Charlottetown ; and by James Scott & Company, of Halifax.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Give the prices.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not wish to take up the time of the House unnecessarily ; but I will give a few : Bananas, 2 bushels, $5.75 ; fancy biscuits, 15 pounds at 20 cents ; pilot biscuits, 384 pounds at 7 cents ; breakfast and dinner biscuits, 13¾ pounds at 50 cents ; sugar and opera wafers, 1 dozen, $5.50 ; Turkish cigarettes, 2 tins, $4.75 ; crystallized fruits, 20 pounds at 60 cents ; figs in cordial, Indian relish, stuffed olives, truffles. I could quote many other things.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentlemen want me to take up a few hours here I will do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, go on.

Mr. INGRAM. Do the hon. gentlemen wish to listen to me for a few hours ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, certainly.

Mr. INGRAM. I shall be very glad to entertain them if they wish. I did not rise for that purpose this evening. I would rather assist the Minister of Finance in getting through the estimates ; but on some other occasion I will be glad to entertain them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend has mentioned the name of a reputable Halifax firm, and has conveyed the impression that that firm charged extravagant prices. I know the members of that firm, and I am satisfied that they would not charge a price that was not fair and reasonable, and if the circumstances are investigated, I am sure this will be established. It is not fair for hon. gentlemen to convey the impression that a reputable firm had charged extravagant prices unless they are prepared to establish it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does the hon. Minister of Finance think the people of Canada should pay for these luxuries to be furnished to the men employed to run these boats ? Why are we called on to furnish them with cigarettes ? I do not think this is a laughable matter at all. The question is why the ratepayers of Canada should pay for these luxuries; and when the price paid for coffee is pointed out, what answer do we get from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ? A very jocular and laughing answer, that he did not drink thirty cents coffee. Well, I am willing that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or any one else should drink as expensive coffee as he pleases if he pays for it himself ; but I do not believe the ratepayers of Canada are required to buy the best things in the market——

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, it is not carried ; and the gentlemen might as well keep their mouths shut. I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that I represent a constituency, and I am not going to be bull-dozed by any of their horse laughs at anything I am saying. What I was saying is, why should we be called upon as ratepayers of the Dominion of Canada to furnish luxuries for the men working the boats on the St. Lawrence or the Atlantic ? I do not think we are called on to furnish cigarettes, these delicate waters, and all this other stuff to men in every-day life. I do not blame the hon. Minister of Finance so much, because he was not in this House, but he is advocating quite a different principle to-night from that which his party advocated when in opposition. If the prin-

ciple was not a good one when we were in power, can he say, in any fairness, that it is a good one now ? The hon. gentleman's friends strongly denounced this practice in the past, but those gentlemen are doing the very same thing now which they condemned then. They are doubly guilty—more than that, they are hypocrites. There is the Postmaster General, he remembers when he was in opposition.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Tell us what I said.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would not use the language you did in parliament. We never descended on this side to criticising items such as the washing of napkins and that sort of thing at Government House. We never criticised on this side of the House the Prime Minister's livery bill. Our criticisms are on a higher plane. I would not descend to criticise the washing of napkins at Government House when I was invited to dine there and helped to soil them. We are called on to furnish luxuries for gentlemen managing these boats. We are spending thousands and thousands of dollars in buying these luxuries, which the ordinary ratepayer of Canada is not able to purchase for his own table. As a representative of a rural constituency, I protest against this expenditure on luxuries, which the great bulk of my electors are not in a position to purchase for their own families. We had better call a halt on this line. Does it follow that because we made mistakes in the past and did not call for tenders, this business administration, which has been heralded all over the country as a business administration, should do the same thing.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We have had the assurance several times during the debate that these prices must be all right because the officials of the government have certified to that effect, and we have been challenged over and over again to point out particular items of over charge. Let me call attention to a few items which will be found on page 22—P of the Auditor General's Report. On the very first line, I find, among supplies furnished to the steamer 'Minto,' 985 pounds of beef at 10 cents; six pairs of chickens at one dollar; 799 pounds of mutton at 12 cents. Hon. gentlemen from Summerside can say whether these are fair prices or not. Beef 10 cents per pound; eggs, 25 cents per dozen; Royal Baking powder at 55 cents, an article which is put up at 25 to 30 cents; sardines, two dozen at $4.90 per dozen; salmon, two cases at $7.75; vinegar, 75 cents per gallon. It is well known that the very best domestic vinegar can be bought at 40 cents per gallon, and give a handsome profit to the retailer. All through you have the evidence that these gentleman who certified to these prices are just figure heads and would certify to anything.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a very grave accusation. Very much depends on the circumstances under which these goods are ordered. It is not possible from the mere reading of the figures from the Auditor General's Report, to form any conclusion, without a knowledge of the circumstances. With regard to the luxuries, I know the circumstances under which the cigarettes were purchased and they cost $2 or $3, but the other articles are only such as would appear on the table of the commonest railway restaurant in the Dominion. You will find India relishes and things of that kind on the table of any restaurant and they are not luxuries in a ship which carries passengers.

Mr. COCHRANE. They do not carry passengers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, they do. They are not luxuries in the sense in which the hon. gentleman says they are.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I was quoting the prices of necessaries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend who spoke before the hon. gentleman spoke of luxuries.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Here is a charge for beef, 985 pounds at 10 cents. I am informed that it is an article which can be bought at 6 or 7 cents. Mutton at 12 cents is surely an exorbitant price.

Mr. INGRAM. Will any one pretend that we could not buy sugar in large quantities at less than five cents per pound. Here is one firm which charges five cents per pound. Everybody knows that that is an excessive price. Tea, coffee and sugar are staple supplies which you could buy in large quantities, and distribute to these vessels as required. I could understand your paying excessive prices at certain points for perishable articles such as bananas, but the staple articles you should purchase in large quantities and under contract. I do not care what the past system has been, the present system should be changed. The system of the past was a wrong system and there is no reason why it should be continued. If the government change the system there will be no reason for such complaints as have been made to-night. But, in relation to such a system as we now have, the criticism is perfectly proper. It is clearly in the interest of the country that the system should be changed.

Mr. HENDERSON. There may be much in what the Minister of Finance said with regard to the condition under which the articles are purchased. But, when I find that in the city of Quebec a purchase of 984 pounds of sugar was made at five cents per pound, another purchase of 349 at five and one half cents and, from another grocer, 296 pounds at five cents per

pound, it seems quite evident that there is something wrong. The conditions at Quebec are much more favourable for the purchase of sugar than the conditions in western Ontario. Now, I speak of something of which I have practical knowledge when I say that in western Ontario thirty-five miles west of Toronto, after paying water freight and inland freight by rail, sugar one year ago—the time when these accounts were made up—was sold to the farmers of that section at a profit at four cents per pound. This was standard granulated No. 1, and I have no doubt that the sugar here referred to was not one whit better, for it is a standard article. It is evident, that, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier said, in that item alone the price is from twenty-five to thirty per cent above actual value. With many other articles there may be differences. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Richardson) referred to baking powder. That is sold at varying prices. He also referred to vinegar, the price of which is well known. I think the hon. gentleman is within the mark in saying that for such an article as would be required on board a steamer 30 cents or 40 cents would be a fair price, and it is astonishing to find an entry here of ten gallons of vinegar at 75 cents or five gallons at 60 cents. Now, take another article the value of which we all know—fresh water. In Charlottetown the government paid 50 cents per thousand gallons, while at Gaspé they paid 50 cents per hundred gallons. Surely there cannot be such a difference in the conditions as to justify a price in one place ten times as high as the other. I believe they can secure fresh water at Gaspé just as cheaply as they can at Charlottetown.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At Charlottetown they have a system of water works, while at Gaspé, I should suppose, they have not. That would make all the difference in the world.

Mr. HENDERSON. And at another place the government are charged for 700 gallons at the rate of 50 cents per hundred gallons. Again, I find where it is sold by the ton. In one case ten tons at $1.12 a ton, and in another 65 tons at 56 cents per ton—one price exactly double the other, though there seems to be no difference in the conditions. It is manifest that there is something wrong with the system. I do not want to charge any one with giving an erroneous certificate. But there is so much in the Auditor General's Report that is not susceptible of explanation by the ordinary reader that I think the matter is worthy the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ; and, as he is starting out fresh in the business, I hope that he will make such changes that when we discuss the matter of supplies again, we shall not have to criticise his department in the way which it has been criticised to-night.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the hon. minister of Marine and Fisheries, in spite of what has been said, to announce that he intends to continue the present system. When this government came into office, it was loudly proclaimed as a business government, one that would carry on public affairs on business principles. Is the hon. gentleman acquainted with the Ontario and Richelieu Navigation Company ? I am sure he is, for the head-quarters of that company are in the city to which he belongs. They have a fleet of steamers, just as the hon. minister is entrusted with the fleet of steamers for the people of Canada. Will he copy the business methods of that company ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If they are good.

Mr. TAYLOR. That company furnish passenger steamers altogether, and they know the average price of every staple article supplied to those steamers.

Do they go to retail merchants in the various cities for their supplies ? No ; they receive tenders from wholesale houses and they buy the supplies wholesale and distribute them among their steamers. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has eight or ten steamers requiring large quantities of staple supplies. Yet, he buys from the retail man at exorbitant retail prices. One hon. gentleman referred to Scott, of Halifax. He said that was a reputable firm and would not overcharge. Let me give him a few articles. Rice, 25 pounds at seven cents per pound.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where is that ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Auditor General's Report. Page P—19.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) That is the ordinary price in Halifax.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Halifax, N.S.) That is the ordinary price for the best quality.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then we have a charge of 25 pounds of currants at 12 cents. And everybody knows that you can buy three pounds at retail for 25 cents. Then I find at page P—17, Charles F. Francis & Co., St. John, charging for beans at $1.95 per per bushel and peas at $1.95 per bushel. Every farmer in the country knows that $1.95 for peas and beans is an outrageous price. If the government were buying these in a large quantity and delivering them to their several steamers, they could get much lower prices, and the same with all staple articles, such as sugar, rice, flour and so on.

Mr. TOBIN. I suppose that the hon. gentleman is aware that last year——

Mr. TAYLOR. When I get through, my hon. friend (Mr. Tobin) can answer me or can ask all the questions he likes. Or, if he

wishes to ask me a question now, I have no objection.

Mr. TOBIN. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the wholesale price for beans last year was from $1.80 to $2 according to the quality ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The quantity of peas and the quantity of beans bought in this case was one bushel each.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the price was $1.95. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin) cannot find that these articles were sold at such prices as he states in any market.

Mr. TOBIN. I bought them in my own line of business.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let the hon. gentleman ask the hon. member for Essex who sits near him, and he knows the prices.

Mr. STEPHENS. Beans were shipped from the county of Kent last season at about $1.75 per bushel. The farmers received from $1.50 to $1.60 per bushel.

Mr. TAYLOR. Whether the system is right or wrong, I ask the government to do business on business principles, as they promised to do. I ask them to adopt the system followed by the Richelieu Navigation Company, and every other company in Canada having big steamers to supply, and who buy their staple supplies from wholesale firms by tender, or from some friends at wholesale prices. But do not go about the country to these little two penny ha'penny stores and buy at prices two or three times higher than they could buy at home in every part of Canada. There is not one hon. gentleman on the treasury benches who is paying the prices for goods in his own home that are charged here for the supply of these steamers. Every man on the other side of the House must know that some of the prices that are certified to are exorbitant and extravagant prices, that they would not pay for goods of the same kind to be used in their own homes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would ask the Minister of Finance one question. Shortly after the government came into power they adopted the system along the St. Lawrence river of calling for tenders for the supply of goods. That system was carried on for a couple of years, when they ceased doing that, and the last five or six years the supplies have been purchased from retail merchants along the line, and certified to, as I understand, by the officer in charge at the place where they are bought with the words 'prices fair and just.' But the minister knows that that officer gets his instructions from the department that employs him, he has purchased his goods from a certain retail merchant in that town, and that officer knows well that if he did not certify to the prices as fair and just his head would be cut off within twenty-four hours, because that retail merchant would have him dismissed, there is no doubt about that. The head of the department would not stand that officer criticising the prices. Now why did the Minister of Finance change that system of calling for tenders and go back to the system that is now being complained of?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not aware that such change has taken place as the hon. gentleman alleges. Of course, that is a matter for the Department of Marine and Fisheries to attend to, but I do not think any such change has taken place.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I never said it took place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He says it has taken place in certain contracts, but my impression is that he is mistaken. As to the other point about the local officials, his statement is a very remarkable one ; I hope it would not have been true under the late government, I know it is not true under the present government. He stated that an official is obliged to certify to fraudulent accounts otherwise he would be dismissed. My hon. friend treats that as a light matter. He speaks as if he would have considered that the regular method under the old government. I trust that it was not done under the late government, I do not believe it was ; I know it is not done under the present government. I am sure that any officer who would report to the head of the department that the prices were too high and ought to be reduced, would be commended, as he ought to be, for the performance of his duty. But the suggestion that an official of this department, or of any other department, is obliged to certify to accounts which are not fair and just, is a very unfair one, and I am sure the hon. gentleman, on reflection, will not justify it. I know it is not justified with regard to these officials to whom I have referred, and who were appointed by the late government. I have only to say that if they were asked to give such certificates of prices being fair and reasonable when they knew they were not, they are manly enough to throw up their places at once rather than hold them on such a condition.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to say to the Minister of Finance that under the late government that system was not required by the Auditor General until shortly before we ceased holding office, and it was on account of prices at different points being higher than he supposed they ought to be that he insisted on those words being put on the invoices. Now I know for a fact that officials who are in charge of certain works do and have certified to accounts such as I have mentioned, and I know well enough that if they did not certify to the accounts that were handed in, their heads would be cut off, and the ministers at the

heads of the departments know it too. Their officials are told to purchase from certain parties, and I know well that these same officials can purchase goods cheaper from the same parties for their own use. I am not finding fault with the officials, it is their bread and butter to hold their positions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do find fault with those officials. An official who will certify that a price is fair and reasonable when he knows that the certificate is false, has no right to be in the public service.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How is the official to know? Does the Minister of Finance mean to say that if he has complaints made to him against this official for objecting to the accounts he would not be hauled over the coals and dismissed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He would be dismissed if he did not object.

Mr. BUREAU. The hon. gentleman asks how the official is to know. He stated just now that the official bought goods for himself cheaper than he bought for the government, and that he certified to an account for goods bought at a higher price for the government.

Mr. BIRKETT. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) stated in the fore part of the evening that certain lots of hardware had been purchased, and that all the way from 20, 25 and 30 to 40 per cent had been paid over and above the market value. I thought that was rather an extravagant statement, and my curiosity induced me to refer to the Auditor General's Report, and I find that the statement made by my hon. friend is well within the mark. On page P—9, I find there are 8,780 pounds of ordinary iron charged at three cents a pound. Now that iron at the time it was supplied to the government could be sold in those quantities by any wholesale hardware man for $1.95, or by any extensive retailer for about $2.10 or $2.25. That was sold at Quebec, and the prices I am giving you are the prices at which you can buy it at Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is the name of the Quebec dealer?

Mr. BIRKETT. F. X. Drolet. I also find an item for 994 pounds of zinc, equal to about two casks, and that zinc is charged at the rate of 15 cents a pound. When this was purchased, zinc by casks, was selling at 6½ cents. I am speaking of something about which I know. To-day, zinc is higher than it has been for the last three years, and it is selling at 7 cents. If you buy it from a Tory you can get it for 7 cents. Iron is dearer than it has been for the last three years, but you could buy iron for $2.25 per hundred pounds in any retail store in Ottawa. I will sell you all you want for $2 per hundred. I find that the government paid 3 cents a pound. Another item is 93 pounds of Magnolia metal at 40 cents a pound. There is only one quality of Magnolia metal made and you can get any quantity you want of it for 22½ cents a pound. Another item is machine steel of which 761 pounds were purchased at 6 cents a pound. That is retail. I cannot give the size because the size is not given here, but the standard size which is ¾ inch is selling in any retail store for $3 per hundred. I could go through the list and point out many similar charges. I think I have shown sufficient to convince this committee that when the government are spending public money, supplies ought to be furnished by public competition. I do not go so far as some hon. members here who say that probably the heads of departments when certifying to these accounts as being fair and just do it without the information. Probably they may have done it without the information, but we have to bear in mind that their information is limited to the extent of these circulars. I suppose the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will tell me that it is a machinist company which supplied these goods. I admit it is a machinist company that supplied these goods, but these are the prices that it has charged for the goods themselves. There has been no work put upon these goods because 2,369 hours of work is charged for at the rate of 35 cents an hour. The prices which I have quoted are the actual prices paid for these goods, and I have also given the prices which these goods ought to have cost if they had been purchased in any store in Canada.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Mr. Chairman, I knew that I was not far from the mark when I stated at the beginning of this debate that if some system of tendering were adopted—I am not accusing any one department more than another—we could save at least from 25 to 30 per cent. I passed through the mill. I changed the system in the Department of Public Works. We were buying in that department right and left, just as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is buying now. We opened a store in Ottawa and we have saved between 30 and 40 per cent since that store has been opened. It is true it is not perfect, but since we have had that system we have, I repeat, saved between 30 and 40 per cent The hon. minister is just taking hold of his department, and I would suggest to him to adopt the same system. Let him open stores. Let him ask for tenders, even if he does not ask for tenders in the public press, but simply asks for tenders from wholesale merchants as big companies do. I am not inclined to go so far as some hon. gentlemen here who say that every time the government must ask for public tenders. If we follow the rule of asking for tenders from wholesale merchants we will save from 25 to 30 per cent

every time. But, I insist specially on this point, and I give this suggestion in no unfriendly spirit, that the hon. gentleman should open stores and let the officers from the different ships draw from those stores. If he does he will control the expenditure which is not controlled now. Before taking my seat let me say that I do not share the views of those hon. gentlemen who say that officers in the public service must not have some little luxuries. I went into that question when I was Minister of Public Works. Take the case of the commander and officers of the ships of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. They spend seven or eight months of the year on the water. They must have some little luxuries. When a case came before me I went to the Canadian Pacific Railway, president and managers, and asked them what their rule was. They told me that their rule was to give their officers mineral waters, Apollinaris and so on. Cigarettes, of course, is going a little too far. Mineral waters and things of that kind, I think, should be allowed to public officers in cases such as we have been discussing. This country has no necessity to be mean. We are a very big country and we are growing bigger every day. Let us treat our officers as we deal with ourselves. They are gentlemen. Let us not allow them to make useless expenditures, but let us not go too far the other way. If the hon. minister takes the suggestions which have been made in the proper spirit, I think he will derive some benefit from what has been said. There is no doubt whatever that from 25 to 30 per cent can be saved from the adoption of the plan which I have suggested. That system was adopted by my own department a year or two ago, and I found it not only very economical but more comfortable.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the hon. minister submitted to the committee, or has he under his hand, a statement showing the cost per man per day on each of the government steamers for rations and pay? There should be such a statement prepared regularly and it should be submitted to the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It cost 33 cents and a fraction per man per day.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Finance again in connection with the system of calling for tenders that shortly after the Liberal government came into power they advertised for tenders for supplies for the St. Lawrence canals. They did not say how much of each article they required but they gave a list of supplies that would be required.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are discussing Marine and Fisheries now.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That may be, but I am pointing out that the system has been changed in connection with the St. Lawrence canals.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The system of the Marine and Fisheries Department is the one we are talking about now.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Before that they purchased their supplies the same way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are not under discussion at all.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is the same principle. The hon. minister states that there is no officer of the government who would certify to prices unless he thought they were fair and just. Take an instance of that kind. I want to refer to it although it is not in the Marine Department. On the St. Lawrence canals, tenderers were advertised for, and the officer had that tender to guide him that the price was fair and just, but that system has been abolished by this government. You will find now that at Cardinal, Mr. Stewart, the superintendent will pay 21 cents for coal oil, and five miles east he will pay 18 cents while if he bought it at Iroquois for 18 cents he could take it down to Cardinal at no cost whatever. The officer is told to purchase from certain parties in each town, and if the officer does not certify to the accounts he would not hold his position for forty-eight hours.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend's conception of Liberal government is entirely erroneous.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The facts prove I am right.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The facts do not prove it. The hon. gentleman says that if that officer did not certify to what is practically a fraudulent account he would lose his office. He has no warrant for that. If he could show any instance where an officer has lost his head because of that he would have good ground to go on. I suppose the hon. gentleman did not intend it as such, but it is a reflection upon every officer in Canada who certifies to these accounts, and it implies that these officers are forced by this government to certify fraudulent accounts. The hon. gentleman would not go so far as that, but that is a fair deduction from what he says.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not say they certified to fraudulent accounts, but they certainly have to accept the accounts of the parties who furnish them and the officer takes the word of the seller for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If an officer certifies to an account as fair and reasonable the certificate is true or it is not true.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). The Minister of Finance must be quite well aware that the member for the constituency who is supporting the government tells the officer

where he is to purchase these supplies. It is not a matter of choice with the officer, and he goes to the store where he is told and certifies to the accounts when they are rendered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Regardless of whether they are fair or not ?

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). How does he know ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is his business to know.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). The officer has no choice in the matter. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Birkett) who is a hardware merchant tells us that fifteen cents a pound is twice too much for zinc, and if you go through all these estimates, you will find that the government is paying from 100 to 150 per cent more for these supplies than they could be purchased for in the ordinary retail way, and these accounts are certified to by the officer who is forced to go there by the Liberal member who represents that constituency. The member for Kent (Mr. Stephens) will be able to tell us that my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Birkett) is quite correct in what he says.

Mr. STEPHENS. The hon. member from Ottawa (Mr. Birkett) quoted the price of iron and he says this iron was supplied by a machinist. To my mind part of the work done on this machine steel and iron was done in the factory and charged with the price of the iron, which is the common way of doing it in machine shops. The smaller the iron the more it counts, and the price he has quoted may have been for a smaller size of iron.

Mr. BIRKETT. Are the prices I gave on standard goods correct ?

Mr. STEPHENS. We do not know whether this iron is common iron or whether it is Swede or Norway iron.

Mr. BIRKETT. We cannot buy Swede at any such price, and we know that the Quebec merchants are not in the habit of selling goods at much less than cost.

Mr. STEPHENS. We do not know whether it is angle iron or round.

Mr. BIRKETT. That would not make any difference.

Mr. STEPHENS. As a rule angle iron is more expensive than square or round.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). There is 761 pounds of machine steel at six cents a pound, and is not that 100 per cent too much ?

Mr. STEPHENS. There may have been workmanship on it and it may not have been too much.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). The workmanship is charged extra in every case.

Mr. STEPHENS. You cannot tell from the statement in the Auditor General's Report whether it is or not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. These accounts are for articles purchased two years ago, some of them, and I do not suppose that we can carry in our heads what the prices were then. The Auditor General's Report is so condensed that you cannot get a proper understanding of such matters from it. I do not remember as much about hardware as when I was a boy serving in a hardware store, but the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Birkett) is familiar with the trade, and he knows that Swede iron is very much more valuable than common iron. Now the Auditor General's Report is very much condensed, and it may be possible that part of this is Swede iron and part of it common iron. When these accounts were examined two years ago there was a mystery about one of them, and we found it was another article altogether that was charged for it. The hon. member for Leeds the other night in going through the accounts of my department stated that certain prices were outrageous and I promised him that I would inquire into it. There is an officer in the department who has been in the employment for years, and I asked him next morning for an explanation, calling his attention to the remarks that were made. I must say that Mr. Bleakney, the officer in question, gave me a very satisfactory explanation. I asked him how he came to go to that place, as I had not told him to go to any particular place. He said that he had a letter from the private secretary stating that another house was entitled to a share of the patronage ; but he said he had bought very little there, because he could buy the goods cheaper elsewhere. I asked him if he scrutinized every account so carefully. He said most certainly he did. I suppose the other officers do the same. We cannot judge from the condensed report given by the Auditor General. It looks to me, from the price of sugar, as I know it, as if some of these prices might be a little high. I cannot carry my mind back to say how the sugar market was two years ago. Sugar fluctuates, and I know that iron and steel have varied very much within a few years.

Mr. BIRKETT. How many years ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know, but I know that we had to raise the invoices tremendously.

Mr. BIRKETT. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, in iron and steel in some cases 50 per cent. So it does not do to make sweeping reductions. I am sure that under the officers of my de-

partment the prices will be found to be right.

Mr. BIRKETT. I have no desire to misquote or misrepresent anything I find in the Auditor General's Report. I have given one item of which there is only one quality made, that is, magnolia metal; and for that 17½ cents a pound more is charged than you could buy it at any time in the last three years. There has been no change in that. With regard to iron, two years ago I sold it at $1.95. There has not been any great change in the price of iron or steel.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, yes.

Mr. BIRKETT. I beg pardon. I am dealing in it every day. I know that sometimes the government will insist on an amended entry, on information which they get from the 'Iron Age,' which is their only authority. You might as well take the ordinary daily report in our newspapers. You can go to the manufacturers and buy iron at a price, but all you get in the 'Iron Age' is the current retail price; but the Customs Department, not only here, but in every other city, swears by that as by the Bible. There is where they make a mistake. So far as iron and steel are concerned, I am perfectly correct in the quotations I have given. The hon. member for Kent says nothing about zinc, which is worth from ½c. to ¾c. a pound more to-day than it was last year, and it was still lower the year before. Here the government is charged for it 15 cents a pound, or 100 per cent more than it is selling at to-day, the highest price the market has reached in the last four years. With regard to iron, I gave the base price. Three-quarter inch is the base; each one-sixteenth-inch less is 5 cents per hundred weight more until you reach three-sixteenth inch, so that even if it was the smallest iron that was produced, the price is extravagant. The hon. member for Kent said that probably this was Swede iron. These people in Quebec are not such fools as to send invoices for 5,800 pounds of iron, and not mention that it was Swedish iron if it was so. The accounts are prepared in such a way as to make the best show, and if it were put at a price basis to correspond with that of common iron, it would cost five or six cents a pound. The price charged for steel is also 100 per cent more than it could be bought at if it was standard size. When I first mentioned the matter, I told you what size the iron or steel was; but presuming that it was base size, the price of the iron is $1.05 more than should be charged for it, and for base steel 3 cents per pound, or 100 per cent more than ought to be charged for it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have given attention to the hon. gentleman's statement, because I know that he is engaged in the iron trade; but what he has said has shaken my confidence.

Hon. Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. BIRKETT. I cannot help that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. When he says that there has been no variation in the price of iron and steel for five or six years, I cannot agree with him. I know that within a much less period than that we have raised the invoices from 25 per cent to 50 per cent, and I am not sure but 100 per cent. The hon. gentleman must know how steel and iron went up in price.

Mr. BIRKETT. The hon. gentleman is completely in error. Three years ago iron was cheaper than it is to-day.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman is bringing it down to three years now. I was perfectly sure in what I said, going back, as he said, six or eight years. I thought the rise would perhaps be within three years; but I will make a point of looking it up and ascertaining when we had to call for these amended entries. There were many contracts given for future delivery, eight or ten months afterwards, and during that time the price went up 50 per cent, and in some cases more.

Mr. BIRKETT. I said that if the hon. gentleman would go back three years he would find that iron was cheaper three years ago than it is to-day. Iron is a thing that fluctuates. But when hon. gentlemen talk of twenty, fifty and in some cases one hundred per cent increase, no such change has taken place since the big change took place when fifty cents per hundred pounds was put on in 1878. Iron then went up very rapidly because it was nearly all imported, but I am quite positive that three years ago we sold iron at $1.85 and two years ago at $1.92½, and last year at $1.95. I am quite within the mark when I say three years. The hon. Minister of Customs says that there is a price quoted in 'Iron Age.' If the customs officer says that black is white, the burden is on the importer, of proving that it is not. The customs officer says, we cannot accept that, and the importer has to prove why it should be accepted.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. Minister of Customs has said that he is not well versed in the price of iron as he is in some other matters. He ought to be fairly well versed in the price of sugar, and if he will go back two years, that will not make the matter any better with regard to the quotation given by the hon. member for Halton. Two years ago standard granulated sugar was lower than during the past year. Take another item in which the hon. minister should be well versed—the item of biscuits—the pilot or water biscuits are charged at different prices, from six to eight cents a pound. The hon. gentleman should have some idea whether that is a fair price. Mixed biscuits are charged at seventeen to eighteen cents per pound. It must be a pretty fine article at that price. I

did not look over the Auditor General's Report until this evening, and I find that there are columns of items at from twenty-five to thirty per cent higher than they could be got for by tender. We have been assured by the Minister of Finance that because these accounts were certified to by officials as reasonable and fair we should accept them, but evidently what would be reasonable and fair in any other business transaction does not apply to government supply. It is quite evident that these men know what they are certifying to, and that this debate has brought out the assurance that the contract would be given to friends of the government. I do not know whether this will be satisfactory to the country, but I am inclined to think that it will not.

Mr. LAW. Having had some thirty years experience in the business of tea and coffee, perhaps my silence would be taken as endorsing the criticism of the opposition. It seems to me most unfair that hon. gentlemen should attempt to criticise the purchases of these supplies by taking items out of the Auditor General's Report without knowing the quality of the goods. Take the item of tea. We have in our store at present, tea which we sell at ten cents, and also tea which we sell at fifty cents, and it is most unfair to criticise the price of tea without knowing the quality. The hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said that the very best quality of coffee can be bought in Montreal at thirty cents a pound. I do not wish to contradict my hon. friend, but if his statement is correct, you can buy coffee cheaper at retail in Montreal than at wholesale. We have a coffee which we purchase at Montreal and which costs us thirty-two cents per pound at wholesale. I am positive that they do not retail that coffee at thirty cents.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The next time I come up I will send a pound to my hon. friend.

Mr. LAW. I do not wish to be understood as not believing what my hon. friend has said, but if he pays thirty cents he does not buy the very best coffee.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is the very best quality and I know what coffee is.

Mr. LAW. There is the matter of baking powder, which can be bought at $2 to $6 per dozen. How can hon. gentlemen opposite look at the price of that and judge as to the quality. As regards sugar, that is now in the hands of a combine, and whenever there is a change in price, a telegram is sent and the change must take place immediately. When a telegram is sent from the refinery every wholesale merchant must raise and lower his prices at once. The price of beans, $1.60 and $1.95 has been referred to. As a wholesale merchant I know that beans at $1.60 and $1.95 or even $2, any time within a year and a half, is a very low price lower than they have been sold at in the western part of the maritime provinces at retail. With reference to currants at twelve cents per pound, there is a difference between ordinary currants and those put up in one pound packages. Personally I have had some little experience in supplying goods to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Unfortunately I never had a chance of supplying very many goods, but when I did supply any, I never met sharper men than the shipmasters of the government, and it would be almost impossible for anybody to overcharge them. The hon. member for Northumberland thought that the captain and the crews of those boats were too well treated. If he had had the experience with captains that I have had, he would find that the best quality of goods is none too good for people that go to sea, and I do not blame them for getting the very best. Under all the circumstances, I do not see anything in the grocery list that shows any over charge.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I would like to make a few remarks with regard to this account of F. X. Drolet. The hon. member for Kent, in his defence of the charges in this account, particularly in connection with the charge for steel and iron, stated that he could not give an answer to the question put to him because there might have been a certain amount of work put on this steel. Turning to page P—9 of the Auditor General's Report I find that that account reads 'repairing steam engine, making shaft, screw condenser keel and steam connections to boiler, $250.' Going further down you will find time charged up by these parties: 387½ hours at 50 cents; 1,336½ hours at 40 cents; 2,369 hours at 35 cents; 4,909 hours at 30 cents; 1,717½ hours at 25 cents; 2,757 hours at 20 cents; 160 hours at 15 cents. Now, I think there was sufficient time charged to make all repairs necessary, and there is no doubt that this six cents was charged for steel. No amount of sophistry by the hon. Minister of Customs will get over that. Machinery steel, two years ago was not more than $2.75 retail. That would buy the best quality of hard machinery steel. Here we are buying almost half a ton at $6 per 100 pounds. Then zinc, which can be purchased in casks at from five to six cents is charged at fifteen cents. There are large quanties of zinc charged elsewhere at the same money. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Stephens) knows that the magnolia is a standard article and retails everywhere at 22½ cents, yet 40 cents is charged. Talk of ten, fifteen and twenty per cent advances, they are not in it with this. There is anywhere from 100 to 150 per cent overcharge here in hardware. I believe it would be in the interest of the department and the country if the minister would call for tenders for these articles rather than continue buying by this system.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But, if a job is sent to a mechanic's shop, can you first get tenders for the materials, buy them at competitive prices and send them to the mechanic and oblige him to use them? If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thomson, Grey) sends for the plumber to do work in his house; will that plumber charge the hon. gentleman for materials at wholesale prices? Surely, the charge will include a profit. So, when you send work to a mechanic's establishment you must expect him to charge for material with a profit. It should be a fair and reasonable profit of course.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I submit that the answer of the Minister of Finance is not satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hardly expected the hon. member (Mr. Thompson) to be satisfied.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). It will not be satisfactory to the country. Here we find an article that when bought in small quantities sells at six cents, charged at fifteen cents per pound, though about half a ton was bought. At page P—32 of the Auditor General's Report, I find 225 pounds of zinc charged at 15 cents per pound, though it can be bought in quantities at five cents per pound and retail at six cents per pound. Now, these are facts, and it is for hon. members of the committee to take note of them and judge whether a system which leads to such charges is a good system or not.

Mr. STEPHENS. There is no doubt in my mind that the explanation of these charges is that work was done on material furnished for repairs. As to magnolia, the hon. gentleman says that only one quality of magnolia is made. I believe that, as a rule, that is the case. But the hon. gentleman knows that they could make magnolia worth a good deal more money and it is likely that a special order was given for magnolia for this purpose. Hon. gentlemen talk about coal oil, which is bought at one place for 21 cents and another place for 19 cents. Hon. gentlemen know that coal oil fluctuates from one season to the other. American coal oil would probably cost 25 cents, while Canadian oil would be cheap at 20 cents. Then, take the case of iron pipe. I have no doubt that this is cut into lengths The iron bolts would be cut into lengths and turned in the lathes. The pipe, no doubt, was cut into lengths and threaded for the purpose of making railings and so on. This would explain the cost.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). We find 16 feet of one inch pipe charged. Does the hon. gentleman say that that is cut in lengths and the charge made in this way?

Mr. STEPHENS. It might be.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). What reasons has the hon. gentleman to believe that?

Mr. STEPHENS. Because, in building a boat they would not use one length of pipe 16 feet. It is used in short lengths for railings, and so on. It would probably be cut into lengths, threaded and coupled up.

Mr. WILSON. What is there in the item to lead the hon. gentleman to suppose that these charges include work? When hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side they took a different view of the Auditor General's Report. The Minister of Customs did not take the same view that he takes to-night.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You had it put then so that you could understand it.

Mr. WILSON. The item shows plainly that too much has been charged.

Mr. BIRKETT. The illustration of the plumber given by the Minister of Finance is a fair one. But it does not apply altogether to this case. If you employ a plumber, he is supposed to buy his material at first hand, he charges you the retail price. If that was all in this case, we should be quite satisfied. The hon. gentleman knows that the plumbers bill always comes in—so many pounds of pipe, so many pounds of solder, and so many pounds of everything else—even putty—and then so many hours of time. I am perfectly satisfied that the Minister of Finance in drawing his comparison with the plumbers' bill was perfectly honest. And it is quite fair to say that these contractors are entitled to retail prices for these goods. But, they are away in excess in their charges for iron and steel.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice an item here of 28 pounds of solder at 40 cents a pound. The regular price of solder is 25 cents, as almost any gentleman in the House is aware. Here are two hammocks bought from W. C. Blakiston, Quebec, at $5 a piece. Page P—21 of the Auditor General's Report. I find varnish, 17½ gallons at $6 per gallon; 2 wheelbarrows at $7 a piece. There are several items here that I am perfectly convinced are at least 50 per cent and in some cases $100 per cent higher than they could be supplied to the government under contract. Now there is an important principle involved. The Liberal-Conservative party say that these goods should be supplied to the government by tender, the government say, no, these goods shall not be supplied by tender, and the minister now says that notwithstanding the criticisms that has been offered he will continue in that policy, and will refuse to ask for tenders for goods to be supplied to the government. I wish to remind the hon. gentleman that in the province of Ontario, from which I come, every municipal council gets its supplies by tender. If they want the minutes of council printed, though the expense is only $50 or $60, if they want to make a purchase of nails or supplies for the corporation, they ask for

tenders. There is hardly any corporation who is purchasing supplies, no matter how small a quantity, but ask for tenders. When the Liberal-Conservative party were in power the hon. gentlemen opposite criticised the former government for not buying everything by tender. I do not say it is possible for the government in every case to buy every dollar's worth of goods by tender. But here is a line of steamers which are supplied with goods of the same class every year; they require so many pounds of sugar, so much varnish, so much iron—the same class of goods every year, the boats plying between the same places year after year. The minister knows very well that he will require the same goods every year, and I think it is only fair to the people of this country, when he is asking us for $250,000, on which only $15,000 revenue is returned, that he should ask for tenders for the supply of these vessels. If there are some goods that cannot be bought by tender, I am willing he should buy them from his friends. That is fair play and the Liberal-Conservative party well understand it. For myself, I object to this large expenditure and the very high prices, extortionate prices in some cases, that have been charged during the last year. I say it is fair to the people and it is fair to this committee that the minister should now stand up and say that in future these large supplies shall be bought by public tender.

Mr. MACKINNON. I think a good many of the criticisms made by hon. gentlemen opposite about the Marine Department are made under a misconception. So far as I understand it, the Marine Department, in all the leading articles it requires, has been in the habit of asking for tenders every year. But the debate has been going on under a different impression entirely. It is asserted that no tenders have been called for, and the kind advice is given to the new minister to call for tenders. If he has been doing that in the past and is doing it now, that advice is gratuitous. What if a few small potatoes for the crew, and a few scraps of iron for the use of the steamer are purchased without tender ? The officers must purchase these small things in the ports where they stop.

Mr. THOMSON. There was one item of over $6,000.

Mr. MACKINNON. For a number of articles included in that item, I think you will find probably that the minister called for tenders, he takes an offer from the person who is doing the repairs. I think that has been the practice of the department in the past. Now this debate has taken a wide range, and I wish to reply to some of the reflections that have been made on some of the dealers in Prince Edward Island. Some hon. members have referred to them as charging unduly high prices. I think you will find in Charlottetown as fair dealing men as you will find anywhere else in Canada. They have mentioned bananas, and pease and beans, which I am sorry to say we have to bring down from Ontario. Articles like these may be charged a little higher price because they have to pay freight on them. For bananas and fruit, of course, the price is higher there because they have to be imported in small quantities. Reflections are made upon the Marine Department and upon the minister for paying too high prices. The agent of the Department of Marine in Prince Edward Island, Mr. Lord, has been there for a great many years. He has been employed under the Conservative administration, and is a most careful man. I do not think he would certify to any prices as fair and reasonable unless he really believed they were so. Many of the prices charged in Prince Edward Island are very moderate, they are not nearly equal to the prices charged in other places in Canada. A reflection has also been made on the officials in charge of the steamers because it is alleged some of them use cigarettes, or some of them did not do their duty in managing the steamers during the winter. I have not taken the trouble to speak on this subject, because if there is one thing more than another I dislike it is airing grievances, when those grievances are of a very flimsy character. Captain Brown has been specially named, the captain of the 'Stanley.' I know that there is no more capable, no more honourable and conscientious captain sailing across the Atlantic ocean to-day. There is not a man of any standing in Prince Edward Island who would reflect upon his character. Captain Finlayson of the 'Minto' has been for twenty or thirty years conducting the service across the straits, as captain of that boat. He is a capable, economical and faithful officer. Both of these men are exceedingly capable and prudent. I am sorry to hear reflections cast upon them and especially by hon. members from our own province, because these reflections that are cast upon these men should be directed towards those who are circulating stories and rumours against these officers. I must admit that there was a lot of trouble during last winter but it was caused by the fact that there was more ice in the straits of Northumberland separating the island from the mainland than there had been for twenty or twenty-five years past. We should not undertake to abuse these officers simply because nature was against us last winter. We were unfortunate in our effort to conduct this service simply because of the ice. There were three miles of ice around the 'Stanley' and she was kept there month after month. It is a matter that we are all seeking to remedy, but there is no remedy in abusing the officers who are connected with the Department of Marine and Fisheries. We have capable men in the service and I think it is wrong to reflect upon them.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Are the quotations right that we have been giving you ?

Mr. MACKINNON. I do not hear the hon. gentleman. I think we can remedy the difficulties down there and we have some plans by which we hope to provide a remedy. I am sorry to hear hon. gentlemen casting reflections upon our province. Its relation to Canada is the same as the relation of the eye to the body. If you injure the eye you injure the body. Prince Edward Island is a small part of Canada, and if you reflect upon Prince Edward Island and the business men of Prince Edward Island, you reflect upon Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. Who did it ?

Mr. MACKINNON. I would not have made these remarks at all but for the attacks made upon the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, who are good men, some of them Conservatives, and all men who have had a long experience.

Mr. AVERY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackinnon) who has just taken his seat, seems to find fault with this side of the House because we are criticising the extravagance of this government. I claim that this government has been extravagant in many ways and particularly because they have not adopted the practice of inviting tenders for supplies. There is no use in finding fault with us because we condemn such extravagance. We are here to represent the wishes of the people, and if the people are not satisfied with being robbed in this way it is our duty to protest against the system. I find, for instance, that beans have been purchased at from $2 to $2.25 a bushel, when we all know that beans have never been worth that. If they are to be purchased at that price, why not give the people throughout the country a chance to put in tenders for such supplies as these. It has always been customary to do that when furnishing supplies to county councils, cities and towns, and why should not the government carry out the same system ? The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Stephens) says that iron and machinery have been bought and work added to them. That is not the case, because I have been purchasing iron and machinery in machine shops, and the rule is that they charge so much for the iron and they charge for the number of hours work that they put upon them.

Mr. STEPHENS. Would the hon. member (Mr. Avery) say that iron is never partly worked up and not charged for ?

Mr. AVERY. No, it is not customary for any machine shop to put work upon iron without charging for it.

Mr. STEPHENS. Does the hon. gentleman say it is never done ?

Mr. MacKINNON.

Mr. AVERY. It has never been done in my case. They charge for the number of pounds of iron purchased and they charge for the number of hours labour they put upon it, either round iron, or square iron as well as the metal they run. The hon. gentleman is only making a statement that he thinks to be so, but he has no proof. I have proof that they charge for the iron in its raw state and they charge for the work afterwards. I think it would help the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries considerably if he would adopt the plan of asking for tenders. It would relieve him of a lot of trouble.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is under an entire misapprehension. I said that tenders were asked for standard goods when a certain quantity was required at a certain point, but that there were articles for which we could not ask for tenders.

Mr. AVERY. Would the hon. minister say that he would ask for tenders from this out for whatever staple goods he required ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have always done it. It has been the custom of the department for years. I found the custom of the department to be that, and I proceeded in the same way this season when the time came to put the steamers into commission. I did that in Quebec. I had twenty tenders for groceries alone.

Mr. AVERY. Did the hon. minister advertise or send out circulars ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I sent out circulars.

Mr. AVERY. Would it not be better to advertise and give the merchants of the country a chance to tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a question of calculation. In a place where you wanted $200 worth of goods would you pay a newspaper $100, or $150, or $200 for advertising ? If you think that is good policy I do not think it is.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Would the hon. minister inform the committee if he asked for tenders for zinc ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) is not serious when he asks that ? Zinc and magnolia belong to a class of articles that are entirely different from staple goods. You could never ask for tenders for them. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me how tenders could be asked for them ? Could you say in advance that this vessal will require $500, or that vessel will require $300, or another vessel will require $100 worth of repairs to be made, and ask for tenders for these repairs?

It is impossible. No business man would do it in that way.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). There is no business man who would pay fifteen cents a pound for zinc.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are we to understand from the hon. minister that he has advertised for all the staple supplies he requires for all the steamers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not advertised. I have sent circulars to the trade.

Mr. TAYLOR. All the supplies for these government steamers, the flour, the sugar, and the coffee, ought to be purchased in bulk and divided between the different steamers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course, that is what I did for the standard articles that we are in need of at every moment.

Mr. TAYLOR. What ports ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Quebec, Halifax, St. John, Montreal, Victoria.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister bring down the tenders he has asked for and the replies ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister says he has adopted this rule of advertising for tenders for all the standard staples, and he will bring down the tenders he received.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At the different ports ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The statement I made last night with reference to the customs accounts rendered by Charleson was that nail pullers were bought at $1.50 each and locks at $125 a gross, and I said that I bought as good a nail puller as could be bought for our factory for $1. He says these locks are sent out to the ports, but he can get one of them back, and let him produce it and lay it on the Table, and I will venture the statement that any hardware man will declare that it is an outrageous price for it.

Mr. PARMELEE. Bring it up in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will

Mr. BLAIN. How much was expended on supplies for these boats last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $35,000 for provisions.

Mr. BLAIN. Out of that $35,000 how much was supplied by tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Everything.

Mr. BLAIN. Everything ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Except a few items, may be. If a boat put into port and wanted fresh butter or potatoes, we would not ask for tenders and wait eight days to get the tenders in.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister takes issue with this side of the House, and answers our criticisms by saying that he has already adopted that policy.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course.

Mr. BLAIN. Now, what amount of this $35,000 was supplied under tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nobody could carry all the details of these small items in his head, but I will get them. I will lay the statement on the Table of the House with the schedules.

Mr. BLAIN. Would not this be a good time to have them ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If the minister says he will bring it down, it is all right.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was there a tender for sugar at the port of Halifax last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed by the deputy that there was.

Mr. TAYLOR. The lowest tender would be accepted for the supply of all the sugar at that port ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Did the minister receive a tender from Charles A. Parent, of Quebec ? At page P—12 of the Auditor General's Report I find the following charges made by him : 31 pounds of flax packing at 90 cents a pound, which should have cost about 35 cents ; 14 gallons of gasolene at 75 cents a gallon, which every hardware man knows retails at 35 cents ; 5 gallons of lavender paint at $2.50 a gallon, which costs from $1 to $1.10 a gallon. Probably the member for Kent (Mr. Stephens) can tell us whether this is perfumed or not.

Mr. STEPHENS. That paint costs $1.40.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). There is a charge for 15 gallons of terra cotta paint at $2.50 a gallon, which should cost the same as the light lavender, namely, from $1 to $1.10 a gallon. I find in this account also 891 pounds of zinc at 15 cents a pound.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That seems to be the current price.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Yes, they seem to have a fixed price for this department. But I may inform the hon. minis-

ter that that gentleman had a profit of about $80 on that one item. If that is the case, you should have a different purchasing agent from the one you had last year. I could give you almost any item in connection with the purchase of supplies in the hardware line for that department, and show that it stands in about the same proportion. Prices are in most cases 100 per cent above the retail price. I think it would be well to have some change made in the system of purchasing these supplies. I would like to ask the hon. minister if tenders were asked?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly, tenders were asked, and the accounts in Quebec are examined and passed by the agent there, Mr. Gregory, an employee of the department for the last forty years. If you put his honesty and capacity in doubt, it is a matter that will have to be looked into in the regular way, in the Public Accounts Committee. I would not take the accounts of the Auditor General. They are not the true accounts as rendered by the department. They are grouped in such a manner that they do not show the real price of the goods.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I have an account of another department, and the reason I refer to it is that the hon. minister says the Auditor General's Report is not correct.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not say it is not correct. I say it is not properly compiled.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). In this account of another department the prices charged are very much the same as those we have been referring to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not undertake to say that the Auditor General's accounts are not correct; but we say that the method of grouping a number of accounts together does not enable hon. gentlemen to form a fair opinion of the prices without knowing the quality of the article and the circumstances under which the goods are supplied. We had just such general charges made a year ago, as we had made to-night, and in every case when the matter was looked into, it was found that there was a satisfactory explanation, and I have no doubt it will be so in this case.

Mr. HENDERSON. I must say that I do not think the way in which the Minister of Finance has put the matter just now is quite fair to the criticism that has been offered from this side of the House. I can instance the case of sugar, in which there was no possible contention that the price was fair and reasonable, or that there were any conditions which should cause an increased price to be paid. Granulated sugar ought to be cheaper in the city of Quebec than in western Ontario; yet I know of my own knowledge that twelve months ago standard granulated sugar was sold in western Ontario, inland, where railway as well as water freight had to be paid, at four cents a pound, when the government was charged five cents and five and a half cents a pound at Quebec. The conditions were altogether in favour of the government purchasing as compared with others; and yet they were charged from 25 to 30 per cent more than a single barrel of sugar was sold for to the farmers in the country. I think the suggestion that has come from this side of the House ought to be adopted, that all these supplies ought to be purchased by public tender—not by circular but by public notice, so that every one would have an opportunity of tendering; and if in any instance two tenders were the same, let the government certainly give the patronage to their own friends.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the Minister of Finance, who desired to hear of any items, in respect to which criticism might be made, ought to be pretty well satisfied with some of those mentioned to-night, about which there seems to be no question on the one side or the other, on the part of gentlemen familiar with the prices. For instance, I have not heard any one claim that 15 cents is a fair price for zinc, and it cannot be said that that is a material on which any work was done. If there are any special conditions which affect the price of these articles, then in justice to the vendors themselves, the information ought to be brought down by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and furnished to the House at a later date. As to some of these items, we cannot have the slightest doubt that the price is very high. I do not know that you can attach much blame to these men, if the government are willing to pay the prices; they will put them pretty high if they can pass the officers. I do not say, in the absence of proof, that there is any wrong doing; but there is certainly material calling for some explanation. I do not ask that the item should stand; but I ask that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shall bring down an explanation of these prices, if there is any.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am unable to agree with my hon. friend. The mere quoting of these prices from the Auditor General's Report, without any reference to the circumstances under which the goods were supplied, does not give us an intelligent view of the situation. I state that because that has been our experience in the past. Similar cases were brought before the House last year, they were looked into, the explanation was given, and the prices were found to be fair and reasonable; and I have no doubt, speaking generally, that if these prices were inquired into, they would be found to be in the main fair and reasonable. I would suggest to my hon. friend to take two or three of these items

and let us investigate them before the Committee of Public Accounts, and if it can be shown that the prices are excessive we have the same interest as my hon. friend in seeing that we are not imposed upon, and will join them very cordially in putting an end to any fraudulent practices.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. gentleman make standard granulated sugar one of the items.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Even in the case of sugar, I would prefer to know the circumstances under which the goods were ordered. I can imagine that if an order were given down in one of those ports to supply a certain quantity of goods and deliver them on board the ship, it might make a difference. I decline to form a judgment without the information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where you find a standard price of between five or six cents per pound, and the article charged at from twelve to sixteen cents per pound. I think that before we go to the Committee on Public Accounts, we should get an explanation from the department of the special conditions which warranted our paying such a price. Why cannot the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries see his officers and give an explanation to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no doubt that in any case to which the attention of my hon. colleague is drawn, he will do his best to see that he is not imposed upon. I should think that my hon. friend's would desire to have an investigation, and if it be shown that any of these officials have certified that prices were fair and reasonable when they were not, it is high time that we made some change.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood from the hon. gentleman from Yarmouth that it was the captains of the vesels who made the purchases ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In some cases.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was rather surprised, but so understood him, and he spoke of the particular shrewdness of these men in making the purchases. As regards any one of these officials certifying to the fairness of the prices of all these supplies, it would be utterly impossible for one man to certify to the value of everything required on board a ship. He might be a good judge of groceries and know nothing about hardware. I would not accuse a man of making a false statement even if he did make a mistake, as it would be utterly impossible for him to be an expert in every article. No doubt he acted in good faith, but perhaps was misled.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I might add with regard to the observations of my hon. friend from Yarmouth, that we can quite understand what he means. If goods are ordered at Quebec, they are ordered by the purchasing agent of the government who is there, but if ordered at Yarmouth, where there is no purchasing agent, the captain will buy what he requires and be the judge of the prices.

Mr. THOMSON. (North Grey). Some of the purchases we complain of were made at Quebec.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is what we want to investigate.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I did not say that the captain is to blame nor the agent of the department, but it is the system that is wrong. A recommendation is made by the representative where these supplies are to be purchased, and the captain is compelled to purchase them at the price recommended, and at whatever price the merchant sees fit to charge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must take exception to the last part of the hon. gentleman's statement. It may be quite correct that the captain is directed to buy his supplies at a certain place, but it does not follow that he must pay whatever price is asked. He is only bound to buy at a fair and reasonable price.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I understand that the supplies are asked for by means of circulars, but do all the merchants in certain towns get these, or are these circulars sent to only one or two ? In that case, it would be easy for the two merchants to combine and each charge his own price and divide up the order between them.

Tidal service, including the salary of an assistant clerk beyond $400 notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $22,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why this increase of $15,000. ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is to provide for the maintenance of the steamer 'Gulnare' which we require for the tidal service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is it necessary to have a steamer ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The work was not done satisfactorily. Representations were made by the shipping interest and there are reports by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper and Sir Louis Davies on the subject. I found that the British Admiralty had a boat doing tidal service, which was somewhat too small for ocean work. It was all fitted up for this particular work and could be bought very reasonably—something like $30,000. The inspector at Halifax reported that the work could not be satisfactorily done without a steamer, and the work was an urgent necessity to the shipping interest.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman say a few words about what the steamer does ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. She is in charge of Mr. Dawson and staff, and takes the current and the soundings in different parts, the facts being made the basis for a chart which is reported to the admiralty office and furnished to those interested in shipping. The work has been heartily endorsed by those interested.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This does not mean that the service will be increased annually by $15,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. There is no additional cost except the maintenance of the steamer.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is that $15,000 a year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN. How does the minister explain an increase of $15,000 for the maintenance ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have the steamer and we must maintain it. Other steamers cost about $30,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will the hon. minister give some details ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are the wages of the crew, provisions, fuel, and the rest.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is the crew ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The salaries will be $2,400, and so on.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is not enough. What are the other items ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Say fuel, about $3,000, provisions about $2,000—

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is, if you buy them by circular ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know how else they could be bought. Then you have ship-chandlery, docking, miscellaneous, making up about $15,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is a pretty big 'miscellaneous.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well, you have ship-chandlery say $1,000; docking say, $500; coal oil say, $20; miscellaneous say, $1,400. And then there are repairs.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That makes about $10,000 altogether. The hon. minister is only about $5,000 out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This seems a pretty large sum for the maintenance of a thirty thousand dollar steamer. But this is an important work in which Mr. Dawson is engaged, and any reasonable expenditure would be generally approved. But this seems a very considerable amount considering the size of the steamer and the amount for which she was purchased.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I was not present when the item was called. May I ask if this will be a permanent service ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We cannot promise. It will be maintained as long as the department thinks it useful.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is to be gained by this service ? What is really the purport of it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The best way to explain it is to read what Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper said on the subject.

Mr. HENDERSON. I heard that years ago.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have nothing more. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) had better read it and refresh his memory.

Salaries and expenses of cattle inspection, $3,300.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase here of $500.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is for an inspector at St. John, New Brunswick.

Unforeseen expenses generally, $5,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I was not here for a time, and would like to ask as to the investigation into wrecks. For instance, would the expense of an investigation into such a case as that of the 'Campana' grounding, come out of this item ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has any investigation taken place in reference to the grounding of the 'Campana ?'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed that she was got off without damage and no investigation was asked.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. But if the hon. minister would allow me, I think this is a case of pretty large importance. Here is a boat drawing eighteen feet that grounds although the channel has a depth of between thirty-two and thirty-three feet. Evidently there is something wrong.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Harbour Commissioners in Montreal are perfectly satisfied with the ex-

planation of the pilot. He mistook the light of a barge that was standing at a certain point for the light of the channel and so he went aground. He was out of the channel at the time. The Harbour Commissioners thought it unnecessary to spend money to investigate a fact that was admitted particularly when there was no damage.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think that this is a case that deserves attention, and I will tell the hon. minister why. There was a steamer anchored in the middle of the channel as the 'Campana' was coming up. The pilot mistook the light on that steamer for a light on shore, as the hon. minister has said. That is the best evidence that the light on shore is not what it should be. Instead of it being a fixed light it should be a revolving light, that no mistake may be possible. I believe that a small private yacht grounded near the same place for the same reason. So, I believe there is ground for an investigation and for a change in regard to these lights.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have arranged to provide the lights suggested by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte). They have not been installed—have not arrived yet. But they will be here within the next thirty days.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Very well.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is now two o'clock, and I suppose we shall not take up another item at this hour.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is willing to reserve any item that any hon. gentleman may wish to have reserved. I hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will agree that we have not made much progress and we might make a little more advance before we retire.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have been discussing matters of a good deal of importance, and going over the Auditor General's Report. I think we have done enough for to-night.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are two or three items on which there will be no discussion.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not think the hon. gentleman will gain anything by going on. It is now 2 o'clock. Of course, we have just as much endurance as our hon. friends have.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I should think my hon. friend ought to have, because he has not given us the pleasure of company for much of the evening.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Well, I will now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We might skip the item 175, and pass the other items.

Magnetic Observatory, $2,700 ; meteorological service, $82,803 ; hydrographic surveys, $35,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Where are those stations ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The magnetic observatory is at a village near Toronto.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Where have the hydrographic surveys been made this year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On Lake Winnipeg and Lake Superior, for the present.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Who has charge of those surveys ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Stewart. The captain is Mr. Zealand, a new appointment, who comes from St. Catharines.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the cause of this increase of $850 in the meteorological service ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is caused by increases of salaries to different officers on the survey.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Have you had any maps made of the surveys ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Hon. Mr TARTE. I have not seen any maps of the lakes prepared by the Ottawa government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. While I was in the department, the surveys made under the direction of Mr. Stewart were sent to the Admiralty in England, they were approved of and the letters returning them highly commended the work of the Canadian officers. The maps are printed and distributed, and include the work done by Mr. Stewart up to last fall.

Mr. TAYLOR. By whom are they distributed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are sold. They are distributed by the British Admiralty.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am asking the question because I know that on the lakes nearly all the maps employed are American maps. I have not seen any Canadian maps of the lakes. These maps do not seem to be procurable anywhere. For the trip I took last year I was obliged to buy American maps.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is to remedy this state of affairs that this department is being organized thoroughly.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am just informed that there are Canadian maps, but I have not seen them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will distribute some to the members of the House.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The American maps are very fine. They are among the best in the world, but if we can do as good work as they do we will not have much to complain of. We have no survey of the harbours and ports on the lakes. In past years the Department of Public Works and the Department of Marine and Fisheries were each of them doing their own work. If the Department of Marine and Fisheries takes over this work there is no objection, I suppose, but I call the hon. minister's attention to this deficiency.

Mr. HENDERSON. My recollection is that last year we were having a survey made of Lake Erie. I would like to ask the hon. minister if that is completed, and if it has been filed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed that there is no survey of Lake Erie, but that the survey of Lake Huron has been completed.

Steamboat inspection, $30,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase of $1,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is for increases of salaries.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Who has charge of the service now ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Adams is chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspection.

Mr. POPE. Have there been any new duties imposed upon these officers to warrant these increases ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The salaries were very low.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business may we expect to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) is not present, but I understand that he proposes to proceed with his Bill in regard to the railway commission, and if there is time we will take up one or two other Bills on the Order paper, as to which some progress may be made, if not supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.15 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, June 5, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister when the terms of the Treadgold Commission will be laid on the Table. I rather gathered the right hon. gentleman's assent to the view that the terms of the commission might be brought down pending the appointment of some commissioner or some commissioners.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think they will be brought down probably during the present sitting.

THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). When will the terms of the Transportation Commission be brought down ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). The Order in Council appointing the Transportation Commission was laid on the Table a week ago, and it contains all the information that is at present to be had.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not aware of that.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Laid on the Table in blank ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No; a complete copy.

FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Trade and Commerce said he would have an announcement to make to the House to-day with regard to the fast Atlantic service.

The PRIME MINISTER. Two tenders have been received, and they will be laid on the Table of the House during the present sitting.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and Consolidate the Laws respecting Railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 122,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I think we can improve this section by striking out the

word 'lots' on line 41 and substituting the words 'portion of land proposed to be taken on each lot,' and by substituting the word 'board' for the word 'minister.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I have no objection to that, but I call the attention of the minister to this: Section 123 of the present law provides that the company shall make this plan in sections if it so desires. It works out this way: A railway going through several counties makes its plans in sections and goes on with the work in one county even before they may have their lots registered in the counties further on. If the plan is not made in sections this could not be done, and disputes might arise. Does the minister think that the law at present would allow them to proceed with the whole plan or with only one part of it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would, and that is one of the things we want to remedy. They could lay their plan on a particular section and we approve of it, whereas if we saw the whole plan we might not allow it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I understand the section to mean that prima facie the company are to make a plan or profile of the whole railway, and that the minister intends that they shall not proceed with any part of the railway until the whole plan is before the board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They may be required to make the plans in section.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On subsection 2 of section 130,

Nothing in this section shall be taken to authorize any extension of the railway beyond the termini mentioned in the special Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to amend this subsection by commencing with the following words:

The board may, either by general regulation or in any particular case, exempt the company from submitting a plan, profile and book of reference as in this section provided, where such deviation, change or alteration is made or to be made for the purpose of lessening a curve, reducing a gradient, or otherwise benefiting the railway, or for any other purpose of public advantage as may seem to the board expedient, provided such deviation, change or alteration shall not exceed three hundred feet from the centre line of the railway located or constructed in accordance with the plans, profiles and books of reference deposited with the board under this Act.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand this to be a proposal that in case the company desire to reduce a curve or lessen a gradient all the procedure that is ordinarily applied shall not apply. I can see that there may be good reason for that proposal. But at the same time there may be a very good reason for opposing it. It is not advisable, of course, to hamper railway companies too much, but it appears to me that the right of the adjoining owners might be very seriously jeopardized by that line of procedure. I do not know whether I am right in assuming that under the ordinary procedure the owner of the adjoining land would be notified. At all events, I presume, if not notified in the ordinary sense, yet there will be registration which will be notice to him, and in this case I presume the whole matter might be carried through without the land owner having any means of raising an objection before the board. I will submit to the hon. minister that this is probably a dangerous change to make in the law. I can understand very well what the hon. minister has in view, which is very commendable in the broad sense, but yet I am inclined to think that it is likely to introduce a greater evil than will be compensated by any advantage that will result from the alteration of the law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The subject, I am free to admit, occasioned a good deal of consideration before I finally came to a conclusion, but I thought it would be as well that this change should be made. I was strengthened in coming to that conclusion by having my attention called to the English Act. It has been for some time on the statute-book in Great Britain and provides for a possible deviation under these conditions of a hundred yards. One can understand that while you are engaged in the actual construction of a railway thousands of miles away, as in this country, the necessity of having your whole plan recast and of making an application for sanction for a deviaton of a trifling distance, perhaps two or three feet, would be a very serious inconvenience and we could scarcely imagine that there could be any disadvantage which would justify us in refusing to allow such a deviation to be made. The adjoining owner whose lands may be encroached upon or taken for this deviation has precisely the same rights and the same proceedings would be required to be taken as in the expropriation in the first instance, so that, he would not be subjected to any disadvantage at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is correct in his objection. The hon. minister does well enough to state that these things may be required to be done for the reasons which he has given when looking at it from the railway point of view, but I have not heard the hon. minister say yet whether the convenience of the public should not be considered a little more in this matter. If the law remains as it is without this amendment I understand the difference would be that the owners of property where land was going to be taken, by going to the registry office, would ascertain exactly where the lands were that were going to be taken. Let me put a case like this to the hon. minister: Knowing

where the lands were which were going to be taken by the railway by the plan filed and by making a little inquiry about it a man who was undertaking to improve his property would put buildings and other structures in one place that he otherwise would put in another place, probably some 300 yards away from where the railway was to go according to the plans filed. It will be said that if this deviation is made he will be compensated in damages by the arbitrators for the lands taken and the damage done to his buildings, but no damages in money that a man gets fully compensates him in many cases. The arbitrators have to do their best to see that he does not get too much or too little as far as money can compensate him, but if a man puts his property in shape for permanent living and he has to take the market value in money for damages done to it, such money damages do not compensate it. It is not well that such a state of affairs should be brought about, because, if he has to give up his property, he must necessarily be obliged to take money for the damage done it. The mischief I see is that a man does not know where the railway is going. He has no notice of this deviation. This subsection would take away the necessity of this deviation being registered, as I understand it. I understand it gives the board power to allow any deviation without all these preliminaries being gone through.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only formality that is not required to be gone through is that the whole location is not required to be shown on plans and profiles as is required to be done in the case of the original location. The law as it stands now gives the Railway Committee of the Privy Council power to allow a deviation to be made.

Mr. LANCASTER. But only to the extent of 300 feet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is unlimited.

Mr. LANCASTER. But there must be a refiling of the plans.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they have to refile their plans. They could not go upon another man's land and take land from him without going through the same formality that is necessary in order to expropriate as far as registration is concerned.

Mr. LANCASTER. But the refiling of the plans is what they get away from.

Mr. LENNOX. I would ask the hon. minister if what is aimed at by the proposed amendment is to prevent the railway company from having to apply to the board for permission to make an alteration in the plans ? In other respects they will have to go through the ordinary formalities of the Act. They will have to register the deviation in the registry office the same as in any other case. Am I right in understanding it in that way ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is right.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 131,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does that amend the old Act in any particular ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We simply embody in this one section what previously had been contained in two, without making any alteration in the principle.

On section 132,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to amend that section by striking out the words 'or build' and substituting the words 'the line of,' and to insert after the word 'thereof' the words 'nor construct the same nor any portion thereof.'

Amendment agreed to.

On section 132, subsection 2.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that clause retroactive in any respect with regard to lands already owned by railways ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see how it could affect anything that has been done.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It might affect lands that were granted, but for which patents have not been issued.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It could not affect any one's right prior to the passing of this Act.

On section 133,

1. No owner, lessee or occupier of any such mines or minerals lying under the railway or any of the works connected therewith, or within forty yards therefrom, shall work the same until leave therefor has been first obtained from the board.

2. Upon any application to the board for leave to work any such mine or minerals, the applicant shall submit a plan and profile of the portion of the railway to be affected thereby, and of the mining works or plant proposed to be constructed or operated, affecting the railway, giving all reasonable and necessary information and details as to the extent and character of the same.

3 The board may grant such applications upon such terms and conditions, as to protection and safety of the public, as to the board seem expedient, and may order that such other works be executed, or measures taken, as under the circumstances appear to the board best adapted to remove or diminish the danger arising, or likely to arise, from such mining operations.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely this must mean within forty yards of the track. If not, miners would be prevented from work-

ing their mines within forty yards of any railway station or railway line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is as well to keep on the safe side.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this provision in any other railway Act ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is taken from the English Act.

Mr. LENNOX. I think this section is liable not to work very satisfactorily. I think that to provide that a mine must not be operated within forty yards of a railway property, is limiting the rights of the mine-owner too much. There must, of course, be reasonable regard paid to the safety of the travelling public and the safety of the railway property; but it does not appear to me that in any case forty yards from a railway property as distinct from a railway track is required for that purpose. I understand the minister to say that this is a new section. It is new, at all events, as far as Canada is concerned. It is true that the rights of the mine-owner are protected to some extent by providing that he may make an application to the board ; but that is a matter of delay and expense, and will not always, I suppose, work satisfactorily. I think that this section, if passed at all, ought to be narrowed down to some extent. I think there is a greater measure of protection afforded to the railway company here than is necessary.

Section agreed to.

On section 134,

No company shall take possession of, use or occupy any lands vested in His Majesty, without the consent of the Governor in Council ; but with such consent, any such company may, upon such terms as the Governor in Council prescribes, take and appropriate, for the use of its railway and works, but not alienate, so much of the lands of the Crown lying on the route of the railway as have not been granted or sold, and as is necessary for such railway, as also so much of the public beach, or of land so vested covered with the waters of any lake, river or stream, or of their respective beds, as is necessary for making and completing and using its said railway and works ; and whenever any such lands are vested in His Majesty for any special purpose, or subject to any trust, the compensation money which the company pays therefor shall be held or applied by the Governor in Council for the like purpose or trust. 51 V., c. 29, s. 99. Am.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have changed some portions of this section. What is the object of inserting the words 'so vested' ? Then, you have struck out the word 'canal,' so that a railway cannot go over a canal now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It refers to lands vested in His Majesty.

Mr. LENNOX. This, I presume, is very much in line with the old Act, and probably it has been carefully considered by the minister ; but it is dealing with an exceptionally important subject, that of rivers and streams cut off, perhaps, by a railway running along their edge. That, I presume, would be considered by the board when the application came before them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Governor in Council controls the whole thing.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood that the question of location was to be laid before the board ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is right.

Mr. LENNOX. That is one of the points to be considered, if the public interest is to determine the location.

Mr. LANCASTER. This would allow a railway to cross a canal. The old Act would not.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is the same thing, only it is put the other way.

Mr. LANCASTER. I see that this clause provides that with the authority of the Governor in Council a company may appropriate, for the use of its railway and works, but not alienate, so much of the lands of the Crown lying on the route of the railway as have not been granted or sold, and as is necessary for such railway, as also so much of the public beach or lands so vested, covered with the waters of any lake, river or stream——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Formerly 'canal' was included. We struck that out.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How are you to cross a canal if the Governor in Council has not been given power to consent ?

Mr. LANCASTER. That is what I was about to point out. If we cannot cross a canal, should we not amend this so that we may do so on some terms or other. In my locality, the Grand Trunk Railway intends building across the new Welland canal an overhead bridge, where the locks are very close. Where is the authority to come from to do that ? There ought to be some provision to allow railways to cross canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not interpret this clause as preventing the Governor in Council from giving a railway company permission to cross a canal.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is not that implied ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so. When parliament gives a charter to a railway to pass between the two points, that gives it the right to pass over everything between those

points, and section 181 provides how a railway may pass over a canal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As the canals are specially struck out from this clause there is evidently need of a further clause to empower a railway to cross a canal. If a railway company came to a canal, and the department or the government have not the power to allow it to build across the canal, the only possible way that power could be got would be by Act of parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Parliament gives a charter for the construction of a railway between two different points, and there is a canal between those two points, parliament has conferred on the company the right to cross the canal, and section 181 provides for the regulation by the board of such crossing.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When parliament gives power to construct a railway between two points, it does not give power to pass over a single particle of Crown lands of any description. Provision is made in this Bill by which the Governor in Council may give the company permission to pass over these Crown lands and navigable streams, but there is none giving power to cross a canal.

Mr. LANCASTER. Take the case of a road which runs alongside a canal and has to build a spur across a canal, will you have to get a special Act to allow it to cross the canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all. Under its charter, it may build between certain points and then build six mile branches wherever the Governor in Council may approve.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the company have power without a special Act to cross a canal under those circumstances ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They would have the power to cross without a special Act as they have to cross with a special Act, because the General Act is sufficiently comprehensive.

Mr. LANCASTER. But the position is peculiar. No doubt the hon. minister grasps it, but I want to make sure. Until to-day they have had the power under the General Railway Act. But now we are passing an Act which repeals that. It does not affect the works already constructed, but it repeals their rights for the future.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This section is intended merely to give the Governor in Council power to vest certain lands and property in the company. Among other things, the Governor in Council had the right under the old law to vest a canal in the company. If a company were chartered to build a road from point A to point B, they might get the right to pass over all the lands intervening and, if they came to a highway or canal, the Act of parliament which is their charter might give them the right to pass over it. This clause, as I understand it, is merely for the purpose of regulating the mode of user of the rights conferred by the charter. These rights are always subject to the limitations of this Act. So, the effect of the amendment is merely to take from the Governor in Council the right to vest in a railway company any portion of a canal. That is all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should hardly have supposed that the Minister of Justice would go as far as he has gone. If you give a company the right to build a railway from point A to point B, they cannot build except upon their own land. They must have the power to expropriate.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The same consideration applies to any argument with regard to this. You may say that a railway has power to build between two points. But if there is a canal or a highway intervening, they must get power to cross it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They get that power under another section.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not examined the section, but I thought the Minister of Justice went further than I would be prepared to go. It appears that we have the same ideas with regard to the matter. The power to expropriate private lands must be given by the statute if it is given at all, and the same with regard to the power to cross a highway or canal. Do we find it in the statute ? I did not quite observe whether the hon. minister thought it was to be found in this section.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This section confers upon the Governor in Council the right to do a certain thing. Under the old statute, section 99, the right was vested in the Governor in Council to make a conveyance of land in a canal to the company. This takes away from the Governor in Council that power. But when we come to deal with the question of crossing a canal, section 181 provides the method.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How can they get over without owning the land ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They do not.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is not intended that they should.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But they cannot construct a bridge, or pier or perhaps an abutment in the stream without owing the property.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But they do not own the bed of the canal.

Mr. INGRAM. I have been trying to bring a possible case before my mind. Take,

for instance, a harbour. A railway company has the right to build a line of railway down to the harbour and alongside the piers for its own purposes, and has built the road. But an afterthought strikes them, and they want to cross a river or canal running into the harbour. Would the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) say that this would give the company the right to do that—to build on both sides of the harbour and monopolize it to the detriment of other railway companies that wished to go there? And would the government be justified in spending large sums of money to improve the harbour and then give a railway company a monopoly of that harbour? Surely that is not it. Would they have the power to do that? Where would they get the power to do that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They would have to get it from parliament.

Mr. INGRAM. There is no question about that? They would have to come to parliament to get that charter or authority. They could not get it under this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all. I would like to call the attention of the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) to the Railway Act, section 99. It provides as follows:

No company shall take possession of, use or occupy any lands vested in Her Majesty, without the consent of the Governor in Council; but with such consent, any such company may, upon such terms as the Governor in Council prescribes, take and appropriate for the use of its railway and works, but not alienate, so much of the lands of the Crown lying on the route of the railway as have not been granted or sold, and as is necessary for such railway, as also much of the public beach, or of the land covered with the waters of the lake, river, stream or canal, or of their respective beds, as is necessary.

And so on. It might be claimed under that section that the Governor in Council could actually give a title to land over which the waters of a canal were flowing—the bed of the canal. Now, that is not a power, it appears to me, that can properly be given. Therefore, it seems desirable that we should strike out the word 'canal,' and, in doing so, we are only, as I interpret the Act, divesting the Governor in Council of power to give a title to the bed of a canal. Taking the different sections, you confer the right to a railway to cross a canal through the air on a bridge, but you do not confer upon them the slightest title in the bed or waters of the canal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think I understand the case of the Minister of Railways and Canals in so far as his discussion of the policy is concerned. He thinks it inexpedient that the government should have power to alienate the bed of a canal for the purposes of a railway company. As a statement of policy I would be disposed to agree. But, under sections 134 and those following, you have provision made for the right of way. The first thing you deal with in the section before the committee is the right of way of property of the Crown. In section 137 you deal with the right of way over lands of other companies. Then, you deal with the power to take the lands of private owners. Is not that the scheme?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, except that—

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The only point in controversy between the Minister of Railways and Canals, the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster), so far as I can see is this: Whether or not, in striking out the word 'canal' and thereby taking away from the company, even with the consent of the Governor in Council, the power to invest itself with the bed of a canal, you have not gone too far and taken from the company the power to get across the canal at all. That is the only question, and it is a question largely for the hon. minister. We have pointed out the difficulty, and it could be remedied by a few words.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The question is whether section 181 is wide enough.

On section 137, subsection 2.

Such approval may be given upon application and notice, and after hearing, the board may make such order, give such directions, and impose such conditions or duties upon either party, as to it may appear just or desirable in the public interest; and in case the parties fail to agree as to compensation, the board may, by order, fix the amount of compensation to be paid in respect of the powers and priviledges so granted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to strike out the words 'in the public interest' and to substitute 'having due regard for all proper interests.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I would suggest to say instead 'having due regard for the public and all proper interests.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection to that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the effect? Just as it may appear desirable in the public interest?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To make such orders as may be considered in the public interest.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If there are other interests to consider than those of the two railway companies, then the board steps in?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly. I wish to go back to the interpretation clause and to amend sub-clause f, by inserting after the words 'Superior Court' the words 'or county court.'

Amendment agreed to.

On section 141—power to take or use lands for ballast pits, water, and materials, and for right of way to same.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the minister why he takes away the precaution of having a certificated land surveyor make the plan and description. We have always found that desirable in order to secure accuracy of description. It is very difficult to know where lines go without a perfect description. It sometimes depends on where a line runs, within a foot or two, whether a man accepts an offer or not. I think it would be well to have in the Bill the words that were in the old Act, providing that the plan and the description shall be made by a licensed provincial or Dominion land surveyor.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection to incorporate that in the Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER moved to amend the section by inserting after the word 'thereof' in the thirty-fourth line, the words 'cause a land surveyor duly licensed to act as such in the province or an engineer to,' and after the word 'respectively' in the thirty-eighth line, the words 'and duly certified by such surveyor or engineer.'

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 144—authority to certain persons to sell and convey lands to the company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This section has the expression 'femes-covert.' That should be amended, Mr. Chairman, by doubling the 'm' making it 'femmes-covert.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that as it is in the Bill is the proper way of expelling the old legal word.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would it not be better to use the word 'married women,' for that is what the expression means.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It means a woman under the authority of her husband.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With us, 'femecovert' means a woman during the period of her marriage. In the old law French, I think there is only one 'm,' though there are two in the modern French word.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is evidently not modern French, for then it would be 'couvert,' not 'covert.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is the old Norman-French expression.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Better leave it as it is.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 112) to incorporate the Canada Industrials Corporation, Limited. — Mr. Thompson.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 189) to incorporate the Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company.—Mr. Birkett.

Bill (No. 191, from the Senate) to incorporate the Home Bank of Canada.—Mr. Russell.

Bill (No. 192) to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine river water power.—Mr. Puttee.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

On the Order being called for——

House in Committee on Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has given notice of an amendment to this Bill, and he is not in his place to-night. There are very few members in the House, and as this is a very important Bill I think this should be allowed to stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I notice that the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill is not present, and as nobody is authorized to take it up, I think it ought to stand.

Mr. BELL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Marine Department—salaries and allowances to light keepers, $238,000.

Mr. BELL. There is an increase here, and no doubt the minister will explain it. I think the hon. minister should give some explanation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have to provide for salaries of light keepers for lights now under construction, including Pelee and Belle Isle. Those two will cost something over $2,000. There are others for which salaries will have to be provided.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where are the other lights being constructed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Here is a statement of the

new lights and increased expense of old lights, owing to improved machinery, for 1903-4 :

Above Montreal—

Middle Ground, Cape Croker, Little Gros Cap, Otter Head, Port Colborne, Point Edward. 'Scout' (including twenty-six gas buoys, new). Saugeen, Slate Island, Point Aux Pins, Collingwood Harbour, False Ducks.

Quebec—

Isle la Aigle, Belle Isle, Father Point, Isle Marie, Fame Point, Varennes, Port Daniel, Contrecour, St. Antoine, Barachois, Point Echourie, Matane, Anticosti Lightships, Vercheres.

New Brunswick—

Buctouche, Caraquet Range, Cape Split.

Nova Scotia—

Port Felix, Duffus River, Wolfville, Canning River, Louisburg, Port Hood, Low Point, Bourgeois Inlet, Cape de la Ronde, North Sydney Bar, Port Beckerton, Digby Pier Light.

British Columbia—

Portier Pass, Dock Island, Mouth Fraser River, two lights, Coffin Island, Danger Reef.

Prince Edward Island—

Wood Islands.

Mr. CLARKE. It is to be regretted that the hon. minister did not take the opportunity last night of making a fuller statement of his policy with respect to the improvement of the St. Lawrence. Last year the navigation of that river was very unsatisfactory. When the first item was being considered last night, I took the liberty of drawing attention to the unfavourable comments in the London 'Times' on the condition of the St. Lawrence. I understand that the hon. gentleman's predecessor in office appointed Captain Spain to investigate into and report upon the causes of the accidents on that river. In a matter of so much importance, we might have expected that the hon. gentleman would have laid Captain Spain's report on the Table and give some information as to the findings of the commissioner and the recommendations made by him. I notice in the London 'Times' of November 28, a particular reference, under the heading of 'The Lloyd's and Marine Insurance Companies,' to the conditions of navigation in the St. Lawrence. In another issue of that paper, the statement is made that the insurance rates on vessels navigating the St. Lawrence are double those of vessels sailing to New York, Boston and Portland. This is a condition of things eminently unsatisfactory, and I am sure that the committee will support the hon. minister by voting any reasonable sum necessary to remedy it. In the 'Times' of November 28 last, this statement appeared :

The latter part of the St. Lawrence season has hitherto been regarded as the best for navigation so long as the water was free from ice, but this year has been exceptionally unfortunate. The steamers, 'Loango,' 'Bengore Head,' and now the Allan liner 'Sicilian' have been aground this month; and the important strandings during the season amount to eleven. This number is considerably in excess of the average for recent years. One good feature, however, has been the absence this year of total losses. The 'Sicilian' has put back to Quebec, and will be repaired with all speed in order to get away before the navigation ceases. The number of recent casualties has caused the dock and repairing resources of the St. Lawrence ports to be severely strained. The 'Iberian,' which went ashore last month, the 'Bengore Head,' and the 'Sicilian,' all boats in the regular trade, are being repaired against time, and apart from the risk they run of being detained all the winter by ice; the cause of repairs executed in such an urgent manner must be a much greater burden upon underwriters than would be the case if more time was available. The Allan Line, as the oldest company in the St. Lawrence trade, has been granted specially favourable terms by underwriters; but the line has not of late been blessed by good fortune, and doubts are expressed as to the adequacy of the rates which have been charged.

These rates are alleged to have been during last season of navigation double those charged to vessels sailing to New York and Boston :

The 'Sicilian,' which is of 6,125 gross tonnage and was built in 1899, is valued at £68,000, of which the owners hold a considerable line themselves. The light at Bellechasse, where the 'Sicilian' grounded, is being made occulting under the Canadian government's scheme for improving the St. Lawrence.

We ought to be able to get this information from the responsible head of our own department, and not have to obtain it from papers printed on the other side of the Atlantic. There is also in the 'Times'' issue of December 12, a further reference to this matter, under the heading of 'The Canadian Shipping Question' :

The St. Lawrence season which has just closed has been an unfavourable one as regards the number of casualties to large steamers, but, thanks to the improvement in salvage appliances, the season has passed without a total loss. The number of strandings recorded is eleven, against five in 1901, when also there were no total losses. In 1900, on the other hand, out of five casualties four were total losses; in 1899, one casualty was total out of four, and in 1898, three total losses occurred among five strandings. The feature of the past season was the four casualties during the last six weeks of open water, and the race to get out on the part of the damaged vessels. 'Bengore Head' and 'Sicilian' succeeded in being patched up in time to get away, but the 'Iberian' will have to remain at Quebec all the winter. The new Canadian Minister of Marine has been inspecting the St. Lawrence himself recently, and is reported to have expressed the intention to have the river so lighted and buoyed as to make navigation as safe by night as by day. Much can, no doubt, be done in this direction, and it is better business for Canadian ministers to face the dangers of their great river and endeavour to lessen them than simply to abuse underwriters for charging high insurance premiums.

In my opinion the advice is sound, and the head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries ought to follow it. He ought to take the committee into his confidence and let us know what he proposes doing so as

to make the St. Lawrence navigable by night as well as by day. Appended to this article is a list of the vessels damaged by running ashore during the season of navigation, from June 1 to December 8, 1902. It is a very unsatisfactory record. The ships damaged were :

'Sahara,' 'Indiana,' 'Monteagle,' 'Kildona,' 'Manchester Importer,' 'Numidian,' 'Manchester Engineer,' 'Iberian,' 'Loango,' 'Bengore Head,' 'Sicilian.'

That is rather a ghastly showing of vessels which have come to grief in the river. The first vessel entering the gulf this season also came to grief.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The second.

Mr. CLARKE. In view of the prejudice which seems to exist in certain quarters, in view of the discrimination in insurances, the committee are entitled to much fuller information than we have yet received as to what the intentions of the government are. There is a condition of things existing which ought not to be allowed to continue any longer. I could implement the citations I have given by many more statements of a similar character, which have appeared during the last six months on the condition of the St. Lawrence in the English newspapers. I hope that the hon. minister will give us more information as to what work he proposes carrying out to improve navigation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall have much pleasure in furnishing all the necessary information to the committee. But it must be borne in mind that early in the session there was laid on the Table the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries of last year. This voluminous report goes into all the details connected with the improvements suggested in the way of aids to navigation That report can be consulted by hon. members.

Mr. CLARKE. Does that contain the finding of that commissioner appointed by the hon. gentleman's predecessor ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. CLARKE. I mean the report of Captain Spain, who was appointed to inquire into the causes of the accidents last year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was coming to that. I was a member of a delegation from the board of trade, the Harbour Commissioners, the Corn Exchange and the shipping interests, which waited on the government and made very strong representations to the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davies. A very long discussion then took place, at which the representatives of the underwriters were present. We went over the whole ground, and it was decided to proceed as rapidly as possible with the improvements of the St. Lawrence route, both above and below Quebec, and from Montreal to the great lakes.

Mr. CLARKE. What do you contemplate doing during the coming season ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have just read the list of the lights that are under construction in 1903. The fact that these aids were installed during 1902 and are being added to this year has already had the effect of inspiring more confidence in the underwriters. Hon. members know that the Canadian Pacific Railway have been enabled to secure insurance of their fleet at a very considerable reduction on former rates. It is argued, of course, that the Canadian Pacific administration enjoy so much the confidence of the underwriters that, even if the improvements to navigation were not what they should be, they would receive the reduction. As a matter of fact, it is well established now that these improvements having been made, they have made the St. Lawrence route a great deal safer than it was before.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. minister know whether the Canadian Pacific Railway are going to have their steamers brought in and out of the St. Lawrence by the same system of pilotage that exists at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The law provides that certain regulations shall be followed, and I think they cannot do otherwise. But the fact is that the six wrecks that took place early in 1902 were fully investigated, and we have in the department a full report—a very voluminous report—on each and every one, made by Captain Spain, aided by experts. That report is to the effect that not one of these accidents was due to want of aid or improvement in the channel.

Mr. CLARKE. To what were they attributed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To fault of the pilots or carelessness of the captains.

Mr. CLARKE. Is not that document of sufficient importance to justify the hon. minister in having it printed and distributed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was my intention to have that document printed and distributed. It is of great importance.

Mr. CLARKE. It is a pity it was not distributed before the estimates were considered. The hon. gentleman made some improvements in Belle Isle light. But I see, in the 'Times,' from which I have taken some extracts, certain extraordinary statements with regard to the location of that light and the difficulty navigators have in

picking it up. I can send the hon. gentleman the statement. We should have Captain Spain's report before us, that we may have the benefit of his conclusions. It would be better that one of these items stand, then have that document printed and circulated so that we may discuss the items intelligently. Notwithstanding these improvements that the hon. gentleman and his predecessors have made in the navigation of the St. Lawrence, I find in the Montreal 'Herald' of to-day the following :

Quebec, June 5.—The Norwegian steamer Trohector, 3,400 tons register, went on the rocks yesterday at the mouth of the Saguenay, and lies firm in her position, with two fore compartments full of water.

Navigation has been opened for only about six weeks, yet in that short time we have had two accidents. I think the importance of the subject and the necessity of our knowing—if we are to discuss these estimates intelligently—where we stand, justify us in asking for all the information necessary on this subject. The hon. gentleman has not yet given us all the information we have a right to expect with regard to his plan, and it seems to me dereliction that Captain Spain's report has not been presented to the House before now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Surely, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) does not think that I should bring here all the documents in the department concerning this question. There are volumes of these papers. If there is any particular information the hon. gentleman requires, I am ready to furnish it, and furnish it in the shortest possible time. But it surely is not fair to ask me to be ready with all these documents particularly when I am ready to give all the information and have promised that the documents that he refers to shall be printed and distributed to the members of the House.

Mr. CLARKE. I drew the attention of the committee to the fact that the hon. minister's predecessor was so impressed—as I presume—with the importance of obtaining information with regard to the unusual number of disasters last year that he appointed Captain Spain to inquire into the subject and report. I think we cannot intelligently discuss items for the improvement of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, we cannot intelligently vote sums of money to be spent on improvements during the next twelve months, unless we have that report before us. We do not know what the recommendations are, what the causes of danger are, how these accidents might have been avoided or what steps the minister intends to take to avoid such accidents in the future. As the hon. minister has not seen fit to print and distribute that document among the members of the House, we have a right to expect a pretty full digest, in the form of a speech, of the contents of that report. Of course, we do not expect the hon. gentleman to have these reports all piled up about him, but we do expect that, when he asks votes for such a large expenditure, he will give us full information as to how and where the money is to be expended and what he hopes to accomplish by the expenditure of it. These requests are reasonable and we cannot discuss these matters intelligently without that information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The information in the department is what I have already stated to the hon. gentleman—that not one of these wrecks that took place last year was due to the faults of the route. That is the effect of Captain Spain's report. I have told him also that I am ready to have this report printed and distributed. But it seems to me that that should be perfectly satisfactory. Now, as regards what has been recommended by the committee of Lloyds there is a large correspondence in the department, beginning in the month of September. There are suggestions made by Captains Wm. Owen, Stewart, Webster, Williams, Murray and Sheldrake for the improvement of the navigation of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these the recommendations of Lloyd's agents ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These are the recommendations made by a certain number of captains who were chosen specially to submit recommendations ; but they coincided entirely with what the agents of Lloyd's recommended.

Mr. CLARKE. Was it the department that asked these captains to make recommendations ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, they volunteered, at the request of the shipping interest to make suggestions. The department was very glad to receive these suggestions as a means of assisting in our work for the improvement of the St. Lawrence channel.

Mr. CLARKE. Were the recommendations of Lloyd's agents and the captains——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were perfectly in harmony.

Mr. CLARKE. Did the officers of the department consult with them on what they recommended ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will read the report :

Lloyd's, September 24, 1902.

To the Honourable James Sutherland,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Canada.

Sir,—I am directed by the committee of Lloyd's to inform you that the committee and several underwriters at Lloyd's interested in the trade with Canada received, with much

pleasure, the visit of the Hon. Sir W. Mulock, Postmaster General of Canada, and the Hon. W. S. Fielding, Canadian Minister of Finance, and heard with great interest the remarks those gentlemen addressed to the meeting which was held here on the 31st July. For your information, I beg to forward herewith a copy of the report of that meeting.

It was clearly pointed out at this meeting that the committee of Lloyd's in their official capacity have no control over the rates of insurance charged by underwriters and that these rates are governed by the ordinary laws of competition. This competition is constant, and effectually prevents any premium permanently rising above the point required for the risks incident to the business.

I am, however, instructed to beg that you will be so good as to inform the government of Canada that the committee of Lloyd's are anxious to do everything in their power to assist them in their efforts to improve the navigation of the St. Lawrence. With this end in view my committee have taken the opinions of a number of steamship owners and others interested in the trade.

The general opinion seems to be that the navigation of the St. Lawrence will always be difficult on account of climatic conditions. The gulf has to be approached along the coast of Newfoundland, where fogs are frequent, ice not uncommon and where the change of variation is very rapid. A ship's position is often very doubtful as the thick weather not only prevents astronomical observations being obtained, but also renders it more difficult to correct compass errors, a matter of the first importance always, but particularly so in waters where there is a rapid change of variation. It is stated that the variation is as much as seven degrees in the short distance from Belle Isle to Anticosti Island.

It has been suggested :—

1. That a complete survey of those portions of the gulf and River St. Lawrence (not yet thoroughly surveyed and chartered) should be made.

That is being done.

2. That the standard of efficiency of the pilots should be of the highest, constantly and rigidly maintained, and that compulsory pilotage might with advantage be extended to a point beyond Anticosti.

This question is under consideration by the department. I hope, before the end of the session, to submit amendments of the Pilotage Act that will satisfy, as much as possible, the shipping interest in this matter.

3. That the lights in the St. Lawrence, which, with few exceptions, have an average range of fourteen or fifteen miles, should be improved and that the lights and fog horns should have a more distinctive character.

4. That lightships with good fog signals should be established at turning points on the coast so that a navigator could ascertain his position without going too close to the land in thick weather, such points, for instance, as :— the east point of Anticosti, Rich Point, west coast of Newfoundland, the Bird Rocks, Cape Ray and Miquelon Island.

That is being done.

5. It has also been suggested that better graving dock accommodation should be provided.

Hon. Mr. PREFONTAINE.

The graving dock question is being studied.

Mr. CLARKE. Graving docks are not a pressing necessity.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand that. I am reading what this committee have recommended.

The committee trust that the suggestions made above may be of assistance to the Canadian government in their endeavours to improve the navigation of the St. Lawrence, success, in which, would doubtless have an important effect upon the maritime trade of Canada.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your most obedient servant,
(Sgd.) JOHN B. WATSON,
For the Secretary.

The following are the suggestions made by Captains Wm. Owen, Stewart, Webster, J. Williams, Murray and Sheldrake for improving the facilities for navigation of the St. Lawrence :

Rich Point. Should have a fog signal and the light improved.

Flower Ledges. Should have a powerful fog horn.

Heath Point. Interval at present fifteen minutes should not be greater than every two minutes. (Fog signal).

South Point. Fog signal at present a whistle. Should be something more powerful.

Fame Point. Should have a powerful fog signal.

Father Point. Fog signal requires improving.

Cock Point. Should have a gas and bell buoy.

Cape Norman. Fog signal at present not nearly powerful enough.

Bird Rock. Fog signal at present every fifteen minutes, should be less.

Sambro Fog Signal. Should be improved and the interval between the sounding of it should be lessened.

Cape Ray. Whistle not nearly powerful enough.

Halifax harbour buoys. Not nearly large enough, want considerably improving.

Cape Whittee. Should have a light.

St. Peter's Bay. Should have a light and fog horn.

Little Mecattina. Should have a light and fog horn.

Matane. Should have fog signal.

Little Metis. Should have a fog signal.

All the captains urge there should be a chart of the Belle Isle straits taking in sixty miles round Belle Isle. At present when in the vicinity of Belle Isle they have to consult three charts all of a different scale.

On the 13th November, 1902, the chief engineer of the department made the following report :

Ottawa, November 13, 1902.

To the Honourable James Sutherland,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir,—As directed, I beg to submit the following report on suggestions for improvements in aids to navigation in Canadian waters, submitted by Sir Alfred L. Jones, of Elder Dempster & Co., London, England.

In consequence of my almost continuous absence from Ottawa since Sir Alfred Jones'

letter was received, and in consequence of immense pressure of work whenever I was here, in connection with the radical improvements we are making in aids to navigation this year, it has been physically impossible for me sooner to give to the letter and its inclosures the attention it deserved. I have now gone carefully through it and examined the charts submitted with the recommendations, and am impressed with the knowledge of the needs of the St. Lawrence route displayed in the correspondence and pleased to know that in very many cases the conclusions reached by the department have anticipated the suggestions made by the officials of the Elder Dempster Line.

It is always an advantage for government officers to obtain the views of practical seamen in considering proposed changes in aids to navigation, though seamen cannot always be posted on the practical difficulties in the way of carrying out some of their ideas.

Taking up in order the suggestions made by six of the Elder Dempster captains for improvements in the St. Lawrence, I beg to submit the following notes :

Fog alarm at Rich Point—

The difficulty in maintaining a fog alarm here is that there are reefs lying outside the point, across which, sound will not penetrate. Many years ago a steam fog alarm was established at this station, but the acoustic conditions were found to be so unfavourable that it was removed and utilized at another point. I fear that for this reason the re-establishment of a fog alarm here would be more likely to lead a vessel into danger than to help her.

Fog alarm at Flower Ledge—

This light station is immediately opposite to Greenly Island and Point Amour stations, on the other side of the Strait of Belle Isle, at each of which a fog alarm is already in operation.

The question of providing a fog alarm at this station has been considered many times, but there are quite as many masters, of opinion that, three fog alarms in operation within sound of each other would be more likely to confuse than to help ships, as there are in favour of an additional alarm. The 'Labrador' side of the strait, on which the existing alarms are maintained, is certainly the more foggy of the two. It is for this reason that the department has not already established a fog alarm on Flower Ledge.

Heath Point—

It would be very difficult, if not dangerous to the operator, to fire an explosive fog signal as often as every two minutes. The interval of fifteen minutes at this station has been reduced to ten and to five minutes whenever a vessel is heard off the station. However, it has for a long time been known that no fog alarm on the Island of Anticosti could be effective, in consequence of the wide extent of shoal water extending off the south shore ; this so disturbs the homogeniety of the air that all our fog alarms on Anticosti have been utter failures, and the fault is one inherent in the locality, which no increase in the power of the alarm would in any way remove. Recognizing this difficulty, the department has decided to establish a lightship in deep water off East Point, altogether outside of the Anticosti shore, and a contract has been let for the construction of a suitable ship, at a cost exceeding $100,000, and we hope that the vessel will be on her station in good time next season. She will be provided with the strongest modern fog alarm machinery, and will greatly lessen the danger at the dreaded east end of Anticosti.

South Point—

The fog signal here is already a ten-inch whistle of the most powerful type, a signal that gives good satisfaction at many other stations. The fault here is exactly the same as explained above, and is common to all stations on the Island of Anticosti. There is absolutely no remedy for this failure in sound signals due to local atmospheric conditions.

Fame Point—

A fog signal has just been established at this station, and it is proposed to greatly increase the power of the light here.

Father Point—

A seven inch Scotch siren is now being installed at this station, and the power of the light has just been increased at least ten-fold.

Cock Point—

To maintain a gas buoy effectively it is necessary that it should be watched constantly, and that a tender equipped with gas compressors should be able to visit the buoy frequently. A gas buoy liable to be left without this constant supervision would be often out, and thus more dangerous than no gas buoy at all.

In consequence of the remoteness of Cock Point from any headquarters of a gas buoy tender, it would be impossible for us to maintain an efficient service under present conditions. However, the representations made, with regard to this matter will receive further attention, and if anything can be done to improve the present buoy, it will be done next season.

Cock Point should not be a danger to a carefully navigated vessel, as vessels ought to give the shore here a good berth outside of Cock Point.

Cape Norman—

The trouble with the fog signal at this station arises from the fact that there are reefs between the fog signal and the channel, which break up the sound. That the trouble is not with the instrument may be inferred from the fact that the signal is quite as powerful as that at Cape Bauld, only a few miles distant, which has always given great satisfaction. It is proposed to differentiate between the Cape Norman signal and that at Cape Bauld.

Bird Rocks—

In consequence of the difficulty of landing supplies on this island, where there is no shelter, and all goods landed must be hoisted out of small boats up a perpendicular cliff, it is practically impossible to establish a steam fog alarm here, and it is very difficult to fire explosive bombs very much oftener than they are now fired, namely, every five minutes, when vessels are heard in the vicinity of the island. The danger here is not great, because the island is steep too on all sides, and no vessel can be in its vicinity without being aware of the fact. It is intended to greatly increase the strength of the light at this station next season, and to render it more distinctive.

Sambro fog signal—

This is another of those unfortunate stations where the trouble is with the acoustics in its vicinity, sound being absolutely unable to pene-

trate the non-homogeneous air that always covers the reefs lying all around the island. When we had a steam whistle at this point it was utterly condemned as inefficient; yet the same machine, when removed to Chebucto Head, where it is now in operation, has proved an eminently satisfactory fog signal. The only safeguard for mariners in fog is to give Sambro a very wide berth. It matters not whether signals are given every fifteen minutes or every fifteen seconds, they would be ineffective, and any vessel relying on hearing fog signals at Sambro Island and shaping a course to hear them, would be more likely to be wrecked than to be guided by them.

Cape Ray—

I am afraid that the trouble with the fog alarm at this station is also the acoustic defects of the locality, but as this has not been proved, and as we are anxious to do everything possible to improve aids to navigation, the most powerful fog signal practicable will be tried here before the effort to make the warning a serviceable one is abandoned.

Halifax Harbour—

The whole question of improving the aids to navigation in Halifax Harbour is now under the consideration of myself and of our local officials in Halifax. Some improvements in the buoys have already been made. Considerable improvements in the lights and any further improvements necessary in the buoys will be carried out.

I may state that these improvements have been carried out at Halifax, and that the gentlemen representing shipping interests of Halifax have passed a resolution complimenting the department on what has been done.

My impression is that the buoys used in Halifax are the largest now in service in the Dominion, and that their apparent want of size is due to the great distance at which they are observed rather than to their real smallness. However, this suggestion will have further consideration.

Cape Whittle, St. Peters Bay, Little Meccatina—

These three points are on the Labrador shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, a coast bristling with hidden dangers, and the department has heretofore made a special point of refusing to place aids to navigation on this shore, because it is desirable to discourage vessels from attempting to coast it. At none of the places named can a station be established that would not have reefs lying three or four miles outside of it. The consequence is that a vessel trying to make any of these aids would be in danger of wreck on some of these hidden rocks. I am strongly of opinion that it is much safer to force mariners to run from the east end of Anticosti directly to Point Rich or Greenly Island, than to attempt to coast the north shore. This is the more desirable, because fog is more prevalent on the north shore of the gulf than on the Newfoundland shore.

Matane—

A first rate fog siren will be established here next year. The machinery for this alarm is already constructed.

Little Metis—

I very much fear that, in consequence of the long line of reefs existing outside the shore at this station, it will be impossible to make the sound of a fog alarm penetrate to the channel. This acoustic difficulty I have reported several times, and feel as well satisfied as a man can be, without actually experimenting, that a fog alarm here would be a failure, and therefore a snare to a sailor rather than a help.

The chart of the Strait of Belle Isle is a matter in the hands of the Hydrographer of the Admiralty, and not of the Canadian government. I have no doubt that representations from the shipping interests of Great Britain made to the Lords of the Admiralty would result in the production of a chart such as desired by the Elder Dempster Company's captains. I know that what they state with regard to this matter is perfectly true, and I suggest that this department join in representing to the Admiralty the desirability of having a large scale chart of the approach of Belle Isle from the outside.

As the Admiralty is now engaged in a resurvey of Newfoundland, I am sure they would the more readily grant such a request.

Mr. CLARKE. Whose report is that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is the report of the chief engineer, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. CLARKE. Sent in reply to the letter with some inclosures of Sir Alfred Jones?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is not Sir Alfred Jones' letter there?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not the letter of Sir Alfred Jones, but as I remarked, the engineer goes over every point that has been suggested by Sir Alfred Jones and the captains who were delegated to make suggestions.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.) I would like if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries could tell me where the 'Sahara' was wrecked, at what season of the year she was wrecked, and whether or not there was a pilot on board?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She had no pilot on board, and she simply went out of her course.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I can scarcely understand why it is that so much complaint is made about the condition of the St. Lawrence route when my hon. friend bears in mind that this ship came up with a valuable cargo of rice in April or May, and instead of staying at pilotage ground, as she ought to have done, proceeded without a pilot. When she reached Sydney, the captain notified the agent in Quebec that the vessel was coming up and asked him to have a pilot ready, but instead of waiting at the pilotage ground the vessel came on up towards Rimouski and ran right on a rock. My information is to the effect that

the captain had never been on the St. Lawrence before. He came up in the early spring and did not take the trouble to get a pilot on board and the vessel ran on the rocks. There is another case of a ship, the name of which I do not recollect at this moment, that ran on the west point of Anticosti Island, a ship that was going down the St. Lawrence and supposed to be going to sea, but the first thing we heard that the ship was aground on the west point of Anticosti. Investigations were held into the cause of these accidents, and I think it would be important not only for the information of the House, but for the information of the public, and especially for the information of the underwriters in London, that the results of these inquiries should be published so as to show whether or not these accidents have been caused exclusively by the conditions existing on the St. Lawrence route, or by defective equipment of the ships, or whether they have been caused by any defect or neglect on the part of the captains. I remember that last summer I attended an inquiry at Quebec, where it was shown that the captain, while going through the Traverse, one of the most dangerous points on the St. Lawrence, thought it proper to go down and go to bed and leave his ship under the control of the pilot and one of the subordinate officers. If, under these circumstances, accidents happen the underwriters must not be surprised, and it seems to me that it would be important to know all the facts and circumstances connected with each one of these wrecks so that we may know whether the fault is attributable to any defect in the condition of the St. Lawrence route or to the unskilful mariner who is in charge of the vessel, or to the fact of negligence on the part of the mariner. I think it will be shown in most cases that the accident is more the result of the imperfect equipment of the ship, or of negligence on the part of the captain, than as a result of the conditions of the St. Lawrence route. Let me illustrate what I mean. Last summer the 'Ariadne,' Admiral Douglas' vessel, came up from Halifax to Quebec. The sailing captain started from Halifax and brought his ship to Quebec on his own chart—a vessel drawing thirty feet of water—without the slightest difficulty.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not a fact that admirals in the imperial service are obliged to do that?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In the imperial service they have proper officers and properly equipped vessels, and when they came to the St. Lawrence they navigated the river without difficulty. The only accident that happened on the St. Lawrence route to an imperial vessel was in the case of a ship going from Quebec to Montreal and the accident happened when there was a pilot in charge. She had just left the harbour of Quebec when she ran aground. I agree with all that the hon. gentleman said in respect to the improvement of the aids to navigation in the lower St. Lawrence. It is important to do all that we can do to improve the condition of the St. Lawrence route, so that that great waterway may be from the great lakes to the ocean as perfectly equipped as any great waterway can be. Nature has given us the greatest waterway on the continent and it only remains for us to so equip and improve that waterway that we may be able to avail ourselves of the great advantages that may come to it. We must not only spend our money in the way of dredging, but it is also important that we shall provide those aids to navigation which will enable the mariners to take advantage of the work we are doing. I venture to make the suggestion that we ought to take advantage of the information afforded by the officers in our department. These officers are competent men and we should also at the same time, if necessary—and I offer this suggestion because of the interest I have in that part of the country—consult the Lloyds people and say that we would be willing to pay the expenses of any competent man they would suggest to come out and visit the work we are doing and make such suggestions as they thought necessary in order that we might meet all reasonable demands of the underwriters. I would also suggest that when an accident occurs we should thoroughly probe the cause of the accident, so that we may know whether or not it was caused through any defect in the St. Lawrence route, or whether through the defective equipment of the vessel or defective seamanship. It is important in cases of accidents to know exactly what has been the cause of the accident, and I think that when we have done that we will show that the St. Lawrence has been very much maligned in the past and that a great many accidents that have occurred have not been due to any defect in the St. Lawrence route, but that they have been due to defects in the equipment of vessels and to the imperfect knowledge of the seamen passing through that route.

Mr. CLARKE. I may say that the hon. Minister of Justice is to be congratulated upon coming to our assistance on this side of the House in demanding that the information which we have been trying to obtain from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries shall be forthcoming as soon as possible.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is no politics in this question.

Mr. CLARKE. Certainly not, and we could not have approached it on this side of the House with any desire to make political capital, because, in the few remarks I have made, I declared that we were quite willing to vote any reasonable sum to equip that route and to make it the best route on

this side of the Atlantic. I think the hon. minister can appreciate the difficulties which landlubbers like myself labour under in intelligently voting the appropriation that is now asked for by the department when the fullest possible information is not vouchsafed to us as to what these expenditures are for and why they are being asked for. The hon. minister has drawn attention to the fact that the injury which happened the steamship 'Sahara' was due to the circumstance that she had not a pilot on board and that the captain was practically in ignorance of the route.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This report will be printed and distributed. I am able to state from the information of the officers of the department that a separate document will be printed and distributed because the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries contains Captain Spain's report, dated 23rd of September.

Mr. CLARKE. I must confess that I was not aware of that fact and I am very glad to know it. I have read from two editions of the London 'Times' unfavourable references to the St. Lawrence route. I did so for the purpose of drawing the attention of the committee and of the hon. minister to the fact that the route is being misrepresented and that unreasonable insurance charges are being made upon vessels navigating it. It is of the highest importance, as the Minister of Justice has pointed out, that when an accident occurs the causes should be inquired into forthwith and the blame placed on the responsible shoulders. If wide publicity were given to the findings of the commissioners, the black eyes that the St. Lawrence route receives from time to time would be less frequent. Our desire is not to make political capital, but to have at our disposal all the data in possession of the department so that we may vote these items intelligently. Can we have that letter from Sir Alfred Jones.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly, it will be laid on the Table.

Mr. CLARKE. I draw attention to the fact that although navigation has only been opened a few weeks, whatever may be the cause, there have been two accidents, and not to large ships but to moderate sized vessels. I hope the minister will have an immediate investigation into both. It is sometimes said that the pilotage system is defective.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Very.

Mr. CLARKE. The Minister of Justice holds that sometimes those in charge of the navigation of the ship are to blame, and that state of things can certainly be remedied.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will look at the plans that have been prepared within the last year or two in reference to the lower St. Lawrence, he will see that a comprehensive scheme is ready for endeavouring to supply those aids to navigation which are so necessary. Last year over $200,000 was expended in the carrying out of this scheme, and if we proceed on these lines in the future we will soon equip the St. Lawrence as it ought to have been equipped years ago. But that is not all. The pilots are an essential factor in the navigation of the St. Lawrence and it seems to me that the sooner we take effective control over the pilots the better it is going to be. It would be absolutely useless for us to expend our money on aids to navigation if we have a defective pilotage system.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The sooner that is realized the better for all concerned. I make the statement, subject to correction, that the pilots are not examined with respect to coloured blindness except only once a year. There is nothing more important than that the vision of the pilot should be perfect; not only that it should be perfect with respect to distance, but also with respect to colour so much depends upon the colour of the light, not only the port and starboard lights of the ship, but the lights on the shore. It is well known that railway locomotive engineers are examined every two or three months to test their sight as to colour. It is as essential, if not more essential, that the vision of the pilot should be perfect than the vision of the railway engineer. If my hon. friend looks at the rules that exist on the Mersey he will notice the great caution that is exercised there with respect to the pilotage system. On the St. Lawrence where we have equal opportunities to afford a safe way for navigation as they have on the Mersey and the English channel generally, it seems to me we ought be able to do for the St. Lawrence what the English authorities have been able to do for the navigation of the English channel and the Mersey. I trust that we may be able to follow their example as closely as we can.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) refers to the report of the Marine Department, 1902, pages 27 to 40, he will find the reports on the accidents that have occurred in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. CLARKE. When was Captain Spain appointed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He has been an officer of the department for many years.

Mr. CLARKE. I am aware, but I am advised he was appointed commissioner to inquire into these accidents last fall.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and his report is in the blue-book. This report of Captain Spain was sent to Lloyds and to the Admiralty for which we received thanks, and the result was that the captain of the 'Sahara' was put on trial in England and found guilty, and lost his certificate.

Mr. CLARKE. Was there any communication from the Elder Dempster Company concerning Belle Isle ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and we are putting an additional light and fog alarm at the north of the island to meet that complaint.

Mr. CLARKE. I saw a statement from the commodore of the Elder Dempster line published 'in the 'Times' last fall, complaining of the Belle Isle light. Was that complaint sent to the department ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was a special complaint and we are trying to meet it. It is contained in the communication I will lay on the Table.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Before leaving this part of the discussion I wish to express my regret that the department did not print in its annual report the results of the investigations held in Great Britain in connection with the accidents on the St. Lawrence. In almost every case where an investigation was held by the British Board of Trade it was found that the accidents were due to negligence or want of knowledge on the part of the steamships' officers. That is a thing that should be known not only on this side of the water, but on the other side as well. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries printed these investigations in his report it would have the effect of removing to a great extent the misrepresentations with regard to the St. Lawrence route. As I say, these English investigations show that in almost every case for the past two years, the accident was the result of incompetency or neglect on the part of the steamships' officers. I do not say that at all to imply that the aids to navigation should not be continued in the direction we have commenced, or that in every case where the system is found to be defective, a better system should not be adopted. At the same time it should be known here and throughout the world that the route is not at all to be blamed to anything like the extent which it is understood to be, both in this country and the old country.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. How much was spent last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Three hundred and twenty-two thousand dollars.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. member for Toronto to the report of the inquiry into eleven casualties in the St. Lawrence river. He will find that the result of this investigation is that five casualties were caused by the inexperience or carelessness of some one or more of the officers or pilots on board the ships, but in not one case was the accident caused by inefficiency or deficiency in the aids to navigation.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries regrets that the English report has not been published or circulated ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the department intended to have published the results of the investigation in Great Britain, which was furnished to us in a return from the Board of Trade, under whose auspices these investigations are held. I think it would be a good investment and a proper thing for the House to order that that report should be printed as a return and distributed both here and in Great Britain.

Mr. INGRAM. We have the findings of Mr. Spain, the commissioner, but we have not the evidence before us. In the report there is a very remarkable statement made, which I cannot altogether fathom. It is as follows :

> There appears to be, I regret to say, a certain amount of indifference in regard to these inquiries on the part of some shipowners when the conduct of their own officers is involved.

It seems curious to me that the owners are so careless about the officers they have managing their vessels, when, by reason of these accidents occurring on the St. Lawrence river, their insurance rates are higher than they ought to be. I would like to see the evidence that bears out that statement. Then, I find in the report the following statement :

> It will be noticed that in all but two instances the captain was found in fault, and either his certificate was suspended or he was reprimanded.

I cannot understand how the owners can be so careless as to have these incompetent captains. It is very important that we should have the evidence before us, so that we could see whether it bears out such extraordinary statements. The hon. Minister of Justice has stated that the accident to the 'Sahara' was caused by having no pilot on board. The vessel called at the point where the pilot was supposed to be, and the charge made against the captain was that he did not wait a sufficient length of time to get the pilot. We have nothing to show what detained the pilot on the arrival of the boat. Why was he not there, if that was the place where he should be, for the captain to pick him up ? It is

shown in this case that the captain used precautions. It was very foggy, and his boat was going at a slow rate of speed. I see another statement to the effect that the captain was not conversant with the waters he was navigating.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will give the hon. gentleman an example of that. There were two accidents a short time ago in the channel of Lake St. Peter, between Quebec and Montreal. The first accident was of no consequence. The vessel simply touched and went on. The pilot, although required by the rules to report, never reported.

Mr. CLARKE. What happened to the pilot?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is going to be proceeded against. We discovered that from the report handed to the department a few days ago. Another vessel 'The Carrigan Head,' went ashore near the same point. It was found that she was out of her course, because the buoys had been displaced. It was probable that they had been dragged by the first vessel when she had grounded. It is also probable that the second accident had happened partly through the fault of the light-keeper in not reporting to the department on seeing that the buoys were not in place. The result was that the light-keeper was dismissed, and replaced by a competent man. It is proposed by the department, in order to avoid any such accidents in future, to have a small boat to patrol the channel, especially between Quebec and Montreal, as is done between Montreal and Kingston, to ascertain every twenty-four or forty-eight hours the state of the buoys, and to see that they have not been dragged or displaced. That has been suggested to the department, as a result of these two last accidents, so that the department is perfectly alive to the situation. With regard to the aids to navigation, we know the sentiment of the House. There is no politics in this matter. Everybody agrees that, in the interest of trade and commerce and of navigation, the route of the St. Lawrence should be made perfectly safe. I may state that it is the intention of the department this season to have the channel between Montreal and Sorel, a length of forty-five miles, perfectly lighted, so that in that stretch the navigation of the river will be as safe during night as during day. It will probably be impossible for two or three years to have all the necessary aids to navigation between Sorel and Quebec, on account of the channel at certain points especially at Cap a La Roche, not having the proper width; and not offering security to steamers to navigate that channel during the night. But between Sorel and Montreal, by the 1st of July, or at the latest by the 1st of August, the channel will be perfectly lighted on both sides.

Mr. INGRAM.

Mr. INGRAM. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that there should be no politics in this matter at all; and, so far as I am concerned, there is no politics. It is a very serious question, and one that has been discussed for years, and I do not think we should do anything to discourage trade from going over the St. Lawrence route. When a statement of this character is made, I would like to know, whether the owners of the vessels are ever present at these investigations and in what manner they show their indifference ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have pointed out the fact that the owners were informed that the vessels had touched at that point, but rather than be troubled by an investigation or detained, they preferred not to mention it, and the vessel went back without any investigation being held.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. With respect to the indifference of the owners, my hon. friend will bear in mind that the great majority of the owners reside on the other side of the water and also that a great number of the steamers are owned by many people. A ship is divided into sixty-four shares, and in many cases there are as many as sixty-four owners to one ship. The agent at Quebec or at Montreal represents the owners. When an accident occurs, in nine cases out of ten, the vessel is abandoned to the underwriters and the owners pay no more attention to the matter. They simply wash their hands of the whole affair and leave it on the shoulders of the unfortunate underwriters. Last year I am informed, and my information can be verified by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock), that a vessel of the value of $500,000 came to the St. Lawrence and was penalized to this extent, that the owner paid for insurance, $5,000, over and above the ordinary rates to American ports, and as the vessel made five trips, he paid $25,000 additional insurance. That meant $25,000 out of the pockets of the consumers and the producers of this country.

Mr. CLARKE. The worst feature is the damage done to the reputation of the route.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In addition, my hon. friend will bear this in mind, that investigation can only be held by the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the purpose of finding out what takes place in the St. Lawrence. The department has no control over the captain's certificate. That must be dealt with by the board of trade in England. To show how careful these investigations held by Commander Spain were, let me point out that the results of his investigations have been confirmed in almost every instance by the board of trade in England. Ship masters have had their certificates taken from them or been suspended or reprimanded in conformity with

Commander Spain's report. I may add that I have had some experience of his investigations and have always found him most competent for the purpose. There is a line of steamships which has been coming to the St. Lawrence for the last twelve years—the Holme Line, of which Kennedy and McLean are the agents. These men exercise particular care in the choice of their captains, and the result has followed that there has not been a single accident to one of their steamers during all that period. My hon. friend should bear in mind also that the vessels which come to the St. Lawrence, with the exception of a few regular liners, are tramp steamers. They are under the control of masters who are not competent. Two thirds of them have not the requisite experience and capacity to guard against the difficulties attendant on river navigation. You have in the St. Lawrence, not only the difficulties connected with the shoals, rocks and reefs, but with the currents, which is one of the most serious difficulties you can meet in a river. In addition you have these other difficulties, resulting from the immense mass of iron deposits on both sides of the St. Lawrence, and in consequence of which you never can tell whether your compass is true or not, so that you have to exercise the greatest precaution because of the effect on the compass of these iron deposits. Therefore you require competent men, but all these difficulties can be overcome by the exercise of care and skill. The St. Lawrence can be made as safe a route as exists anywhere in the world. You have no difficulties there on that route that you have not got on the English channel and the river Mersey.

Mr. CLARKE. I was not aware that the report of captain Spain was printed in the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department. I note what the hon. Minister of Justice said with regard to the findings of Commander Spain and also the very high character which he gives him which, no doubt is well merited. Let me draw the hon. minister's attention to what is said in that report :

1. These five casualties were not caused by any inefficiencies or deficiencies in 'Aids to Navigation' on board any of the steamships.

2. These five casualties were not caused—not a complaint being heard or reported of any one light, fog signal or buoy—by any inefficiencies or deficiencies in the 'Aids to Navigation' on the route of the river and Gulf of St. Lawrence.

3. These five casualties were caused by the inexperience or carelessness of some one or more of the captains, or officers, or pilots.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The pilots were punished in every case.

Mr. CLARKE (reading.)

We recommend that owners only employ careful, experienced captains and officers ; and also that the pilotage system of the St. Lawrence be put under government control.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Hear, hear. I agree.

Mr. CLARKE. I find that in the more extended report, regarding the 'Indiana' investigation that the commissioner found directly against the captain of the ship. There is a similar report in the case of the inquiry into the 'Rustington.' Captain Spain finds against the captain of the ship, but with respect to the 'Manchester Importer,' he says :—

We are informed that the pilot has been suspended for six months, but as the greater part of that time there is no navigation in the river St. Lawrence, and the monetary loss is partly replaced by his confrères subscribing a sum of money for his benefit, it is tantamount to giving him a holiday.

And he gives his finding :—

3. The casualty was caused by an error of judgment on the part of the pilot and the inexperience of the master in the navigation of the St. Lawrence.

In the case of the 'Loango,' captain Spain says :—

As the vessel, at the time of the accident, was entirely under the guidance of Pilot Alfred Frenette, who has had his certificate suspended, I consider that a formal inquiry is not necessary.

In the case of the 'Iberian,' he says :—

I consider this casualty attributable to the pilot mistaking Red Island lighthouse for White Island lightship, and also to his leaving the bridge and going below, where he was at the time of the disaster. His certificate has been suspended for eighteen (18) months. I have also to point out that the master was down below when the vessel struck.

I consider a formal inquiry necessary in this case.

Now, the Minister of Justice, discussing this item, has pointed out that many of these accidents are due to the inexperience or inefficiency of the officers navigating these ships. There seems to be no doubt about that from the report of Captain Spain, and that report has been confirmed, I understand, by the formal courts held on the other side of the Atlantic. The Minister of Justice pointed out that the Department of Marine and Fisheries has nothing to do with the suspension of certificates of the officers navigating these vessels. But the department has to do with the pilotage board. The hon. minister is responsible for the efficient pilotage of this river.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We can amend the law.

Mr. CLARKE. If hon. gentlemen have the power to amend the law, and do not do it, then, in view of the report Captain Spain has made, and in view of the recommendation, more than once repeated, of the necessity of dealing with the pilotage system, if action is not taken by the government this session, it will be our duty to hold the government responsible for dereliction of duty.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are doing it.

Mr. CLARKE. Doing what ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Considering the necessary amendments.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope the session will not be allowed to close without the amendments being brought down for the consideration of the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Notice was given yesterday.

Mr. CLARKE. Three or four years ago an attempt was made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that time to deal with the question of pilotage. As near as I can learn—I am not an authority on these subjects—the sooner the system of pilotage is improved the better it will be for all concerned.

Mr. BROCK. Before this item is passed, I would like to make a few remarks, more in a general way than in the way of fault-finding with the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec, especially on the St. Lawrence, must agree that enormous interests are involved in the St. Lawrence route, and the question of insurance is one of the great questions in connection with that. I think it has been pointed out by the Minister of Justice that vessels are sent out to this country on which there is very serious moral hazard, and the insurance people of England, having enormous business all over the world, do not regard the insurance on the St. Lawrence route as they do that on the route, say to New York harbour. They will insure vessels going by the St. Lawrence route that they would not insure going by the New York harbour. As the minister has said, they are called, in many cases, tramp steamers. Through this abuse, the greatest possible injustice is done to the St. Lawrence route. I wish you to understand that the extra cost of $5,000 which, as has been pointed out, is put upon a vessel going out by the St. Lawrence route, is a discrimination of the exports of this country. We have been talking very learnedly about the transportation problem, but it has been left out of account that an enormous quantity of our breadstuffs, cattle and so on, exported from this country are diverted from the St. Lawrence route, largely because it has been made unpopular through the enormous loss made in connection with incoming vessels. The insurance companies are themselves to blame, for they are taking a moral hazard that an ordinary fire insurance company would not think of taking. Another matter that has been mentioned here is that of pilotage. Hon. members may think that in speaking of this, I am a crank on the union system. I understand that these pilots have been a most tyrannical union on the St. Lawrence, that they have controlled elections, and that we ordinary politicians hardly dare to speak a word against their interest. I am glad that the hon. Minister of Justice has the courage to say that this is a matter that should have been taken hold of by the government, and that should be taken hold of at once, for I do not see why any number of pilots, no matter how respectable, should demand consideration that interferes with the rights and interests of all the people of Canada. They should not be allowed to make the route unpopular which should be the great route, not only for Canada, but for the western states—as it would be if it were properly managed and made as popular as it might be made. I may say that I am very strongly in favour of unions; I am in favour of workingmen uniting to maintain their own interests, but not for the purpose of opposing the interests of others. Therefore, no union of pilots on the St. Lawrence should be allowed that is opposed to the interests of all the people of Canada. The matter mentioned by the Minister of Justice is the key-note of the system. A vessel coming into the St. Lawrence is owned by fifty or sixty people, each having a very small interest. It reminds one of the adventurers of old times—each one of these owners takes an adventure. They send a vessel out well insured. If she makes a successful voyage, they make money ; and if the voyage is unsuccessful, the St. Lawrence route gets a black eye, and the insurers put their hands in their pockets and pay the loss. That is not a proper system of business—it is not business at all—it is brigandage. Therefore, there should be a united effort in every direction to discourage that kind of thing and every inducement given to encourage legitimate business. These magnificent steamers that come to our ports should be given every inducement to come. Just as we hold out inducements to internal navigation by making our inland waters free, so we should make the St. Lawrence route as free as possible, and particularly free from the exorbitant rates of insurance which hamper those who, like myself, endeavour to bring into this country every dollar's worth of goods we can by Canadian routes and over Canadian railways. When exports are forced to go by American routes, the effect is to make our imports by Canadian routes cost us more than we ought to pay, for the return cargo is the great matter, if you hope to make the St. Lawrence route successful. We must face the problems of how to make the St. Lawrence route all that both sides of the House desire it to be, to make it as safe as it can be made, to keep it free from political influences and political appointments, and to see to it that the public in England interested in shipping are kept as well posted as possible as to the real cause of the accidents that have tended to make our route unpopular.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It may be interesting, since I have referred to the letter of Sir Alfred Jones, that I should read it to the committee. It coincides entirely with the suggestions that have been made. Sir Alfred Jones is quite au fait with what has taken place and, as will be seen, he is quite of the opinion that the accidents are not due to the conditions of the channel. The following is the letter :—

4 St. Mary Axe,
London, August 29, 1902.

My Dear Sir,—While your colleagues are across here we thought it was a good opportunity to take up a question as to the possibility of improvements in the St. Lawrence with a view to the benefit of the public and ourselves as we are large underwriters on our ships and cargo. We have seen Sir William Mulock and he informs us we had better put all the documents before you, therefore we beg to hand you copies of letters from our lighthouse department in Liverpool together with charts and suggestions. We think ourselves the suggestions made are all in the right direction, but if you will wire to our Montreal office they will send you a couple of our most experienced captains to confer with you as to the possibility of improvements all round. We feel sure that all the ministers are as equally anxious as ourselves to make the St. Lawrence route as popular as any other to the mainland. At present we are handicapped. The underwriters say we are in more risky navigation than northern ports of the United States, but it is nevertheless a fact that we have completed during the last three years about eighty voyages from Canada without a mishap. Therefore we are indignant that our ships should be charged eight per cent as against New York three per cent, and it depends upon ourselves to convince the underwriters they are wrong. It will do no harm in trying to accomplish this to recognize in any way any deficiency we may have had such as fog signals and buoys. Then can you make the draught of water a bit deeper and the turnings a little less difficult ? Anything we can do on this side—we are so deeply interested—we beg of you to command any assistance we can render.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) ALFRED JONES.

Hon. James Sutherland,
Minister of Marine,
Ottawa.

This letter was duly acknowledged by my predecessor, and because of it the department asked the different captains whose names I have given to submit suggestions, which suggestions were made and some carried out, while others are being carried out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the date of that letter ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. 29th of August, 1902. Now, the Minister of Justice has drawn attention to the fact that the examination of the pilots as regards their eyesight is only made once a year. To show the members of the committee how slow these improvements go, I may mention that it was only in 1898 that the harbour commissioners of Montreal began to force the pilots to submit to an examination as to their eyesight. Formerly they were only examined when they were admitted, or after they had attained the age of sixty-five. When I was a member of the Board of Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, I succeeded in having the by-laws amended and this new rule imposed on the pilots. I have been informed since that it is not sufficient to have the pilots examined as to their eyesight only once a year; I have also been informed by a competent oculist that the kind of examination is not what it ought to be. I have been informed that some oculists—I will not mention names or places—are ready to give a certificate that the person is quite competent to be a pilot and that his eyesight is perfect, while another oculist, better aware of his duties, will refuse. The question is under consideration, and I intend to consult some specialist, and to have this rule amended so as to make the examination as accurate and as reliable as possible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How does the hon. gentleman propose to have the pilots examined as to the quality of their eyesight ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not in a position to state now, but I will be guided in that question by professional men. I should think that if the examination is properly made, once a year would be often enough, made at the opening of navigation. But the information I have is that once a year is not enough. In former years when there was an examination only upon the admission of the pilot, they were allowed to remain in the service for forty or fifty years without being examined again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose that some assistance might be obtained by ascertaining how often railway engineers are examined as to their eyesight, and what precautions are taken.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have written for information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have been informed that railway engineers are examined at least every three months.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I understand that in England very strict rules are enforced for the navigation of the English channel, and I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could not do better than to see how far he can adopt the system of controlling pilots, and the special system which exists with respect to the examination of their eyesight. They have a very effective system there, and also on the French coast.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state what it is.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would not like to undertake to do that, because I am speaking only from the imperfect information which one gets from having practiced in the admiralty court, and that is the only knowledge I have. But I know there is such a system, for I have had occasion to look into the rules that exist on the other side. My hon. friend will find in the department a letter that was written after the meeting of the British Medical Association some years ago. A young Canadian doctor was over there, and he wrote me a letter pointing out the difficulties that existed in this country with respect to the examination of pilots, and the difficulties that would result from the imperfect examination that was held. I passed the letter on to Sir Louis Davies, and I think he will find that there is in the department a letter from Dr. Cooke, of Quebec, pointing out all these things, and suggesting plans for following out the rules existing on the other side, and indicating what those rules are.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are seeking for information from the other side now. What induced me to ask for information was a letter I received from a competent oculist of Montreal a few weeks ago.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the cases that have occurred of which there was some record in the report of the department—to which I have not been able to give the attention no doubt it deserves—in the report of the wrecks that have taken place, is there any statement as to the number of cases in which the defective eyesight of the pilots has contributed to the accident?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Up to the present we have not received such information. There are no cases where the accident was attributed to defective eyesight.

Mr. BELL. I observe that one point is insisted on with a good deal of force in the report of Commander Spain, that is that the pilots should be taken under control of the Dominion government. At present, as I understand, they are under the control of the harbour commissioners of Quebec and Montreal. Those that practice their calling in the lower St. Lawrence, I suppose, are under the control of the harbour commissioner of Quebec. Now, has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made any arrangements to take these pilots from under the control of the harbour commissioners of Quebec and place them under the control of his department?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is the intention of the department to add one of our officials to the board of examiners, especially in Montreal.

Mr. BELL. Has the hon. gentleman authority to do that now?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, we will ask for the authority this session.

Mr. BELL. Because any regulations that might be established would probably be ineffective unless the department had authority to enforce their views upon the harbour commission of Quebec. I find in looking over the report made by the commander that there is a reference to the large number of losses that occur upon the St. Lawrence river. Commander Spain commences on page 27 to speak of these matters, and his reference to these losses is found on pages 28 and 29, losses that have occurred in various years, beginning with 1898, but not including the wrecks that occurred during the past season. I find that although these losses are attributed to the defects of the St. Lawrence route, and I suppose have contributed a great deal to make the route as expensive from an insurance point of view as it is, in every one of these cases mentioned on pages 28 and 29 the losses have always occurred upon the coast of Newfoundland, and mostly upon the eastern coast. Now, if this represents anything like the proportion of losses which occur on the St. Lawrence route, by far the greater proportion of them are really losses that occur on the coast of Newfoundland. But the whole discussion to-night has had reference more particularly to the river St. Lawrence, and the gulf of St. Lawrence, upon this side of Newfoundland. We have been speaking about different points in the river, the lower part of the gulf of St. Lawrence and Anticosti, but a very large portion, I may say, in fact, every one of the cases cited on these two pages refers to wrecks not in the gulf of St. Lawrence, but upon the Newfoundland coast.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) is aware that we have no control over that.

Mr. BELL. I was going to say that no matter what efforts are made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries of Canada to make the St. Lawrence a safe and cheap route from the insurance point of view they would apparently be ineffective unless the government of Canada should endeavour to make this coast of Newfoundland a much safer one to approach than it is at present. I know from information I have gathered in the past that the neighbourhood of Cape Race on the south-east coast of Newfoundland is, if I am not mistaken, the most dangerous point in the whole of the navigation, and that it has contributed most largely to give the Gulf of St. Lawrence the very bad reputation that it unfortunately seems to have in the opinion of the underwriters. The fact that it is not inside our own geographical limits does not

preclude the department from doing some work there. At different points, on the Straits of Belle Isle, on Belle Isle Island and elsewhere, there are lighthouses and fog alarms maintained by the Dominion government of Canada. It would seem to me that perhaps the most important work that could engage the attention of the hon. minister and his department now would be, in case the government of Newfoundland cannot afford, or is indisposed to make this navigation secure, to take the necessary steps and incur the necessary expenditure to eliminate as much as possible the dangerous features from the navigation in the neighbourhood of Cape Race. I would like to know if the hon. minister has given this subject any attention, and if his estimates for the coming year include any expenditure to be made in that neighbourhood, or if he has made arrangements or is about to make arrangements to get a credit from parliament to enable him to reduce the dangers of the south-east coast of Newfoundland ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This matter has been considered and is being considered by the department, and all that can be done to remedy whatever evils may exist and to provide whatever improvements will be necessary will be done by the officers of the department.

Mr. BELL. That is a very indefinite reply. This subject would not appear to have given such thought to the department as, to my mind it is really necessary that it should have given. If the hon. minister will take the trouble to look at the chart indicating where the wrecks have occurred on the St. Lawrence route he will find that the coast near Cape Race is really studded with wrecks and it is hopeless to undertake to make the St Lawrence route a safe one until he can improve the navigation of these waters.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This point is shown on the chart which is on the Table now. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to look at the chart he will see that it is referred to there, and the improvement of the navigation there, is being considered by the department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I went to look at the chart in view of what my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) was saying, and I do not think it discloses very much about the east coast of Newfoundland.

Mr. BELL. It shows the coast, that is all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It shows Cape Race.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The chart does not really show very much in the way of precautions in the neighbourhood of Cape Race, and I would like to endorse what my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) has said as to the urgent necessity of special attention being given to that part of the coast. However, the hon. minister says that his officers have that in mind. Look at the chart and you will see that Cape Race has a siren and a flash light and that at Cape Pine a siren is recommended.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All this was explained fully when the hon. gentleman was not here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it has been explained I do not want the hon. gentleman to go over it again, because I will read it all in 'Hansard.' Before that discussion on this item closes, I would like to ask the hon. minister what view the officers of his department are now taking in regard to the establishment of a lightship off the coast of Halifax harbour? I had occasion to bring that matter to the attention of Sir Louis Davies when he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, at considerable length two years ago, and since that time it has engaged public attention a good deal in the city of Halifax. There is a very strong feeling among people familiar with the approaches to the harbour, and especially among captains of steamers which make regular trips to the port, and generally among those capable of forming a judgment, that a lightship should be provided as soon as possible. Some demur has been made to that for the reason that, I think, fifteen or twenty years ago a lightship was put in place and did not prove a success. I was more familiar with the facts in regard to that two years ago than I am at present, but I understand that it is contended by those who are advocating the establishment of a lightship there, that modern methods as applied to the establishment and securing of lightships would make it perfectly easy to have a lightship at a place outside of the outer harbour at Halifax, where it is very urgently needed indeed. I explained the matter very fully, from the standpoint of those who are familiar with it, in some remarks which I made to the House two sessions ago. I have just sent to the library for 'Hansard,' but it has not arrived yet. However, I can give the hon. minister the reference to it. It would be just as easy for him to make that reference as if I should repeat my remarks now. I could not get from Sir Louis Davies at that time any reply which could be regarded as very satisfactory. He repeated the statement then and afterwards that in the opinion of his department a lightship would not be practical or something of that knd, as far as I remember. Still, that does not seem to be in consonance with the view which is entertained by people of very great experience in the city, and I think that this subject might well be taken up by the hon. minister, because there is no doubt whatever that wrecks have occurred off the

mouth of the harbour, or off the approach to the outer harbour, which would have been prevented if a proper lightship had been in position there. I would ask my hon. friend to give that matter his consideration, and at a later stage in the session, either upon his estimates or his supplementary estimates, I will take the opportunity of mentioning the matter to him again and of asking him to make a fuller statement in regard to it than he is able to do at present, though I would like to hear from him now whether the question has been considered by his officers, and whether he has any opinion that he would care to give in regard to it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As regards the lightship in the port of Halifax, the matter has been gone into fully by the officers of the department. We have all the information necessary with regard to it, and we have a resumé of all representations that have been made on the question. It is estimated that the cost of the lightship would be $120,000 and its maintenance about $10,000. The question was fully considered with the representatives of the Halifax Board of Trade, and in view of the extra aids to navigation which we placed there last fall and this spring, they said: We are of opinion that a lightship is necessary, but in view of what you have done it is not urgent, and we would rather wait for another season and see what the result would be. We have put in a steam fog alarm and three steam whistling buoys. These gentlemen came back to Ottawa and they presented me their hearty thanks for what the department had done in the way of improvements. These facts can be established by the documents if the hon. gentleman wishes me to bring them down.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As a matter of convenience, perhaps the hon. gentleman would let me look over them, but I do not want to delay the House now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will send the documents to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am very glad that the minister has had the matter so fully under consideration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The St. Lawrence route has had a very bad reputation in the past, but I am glad to say that public opinion is changing in that regard, and as an instance of that I will quote from the 'Shipping and Mercantile Gazette,' of London, England, an article which was published on the receipt of the report of the department. The article is long, but it is perhaps as well that the committee should know the present state of public opinion as to our St. Lawrence and coast lights.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The 'Weekly Shipping and Mercantile Gazette,' of London, England, says:

Canadian Coast Lighting.

In this country the lighthouse authorities never condescend to furnish the nation with an annual account of their proceedings. Happily, however, the colonies do not encourage what we may call the cult of obscurantism. Our fellow subjects across the seas have the habit, pleasant or otherwise, of wanting to know exactly what is done with the money which they provide for lighthouse purposes, and, odd as it may seem to us, the lighthouse authorities have not the slightest objection to presenting once a year a full account of their stewardship. We have before us a Bluebook, issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in Canada, which contains particulars of the light service of the Dominion in complete detail. This particular department, following our insular examples, might easily lay claim to a double dose of prescience and perspicacity, and profess that its secrets were so profound and the result of so much study that to unbosom them would be equivalent to casting pearls before swine. Oddly enough, however, the Canadian government sees no reason why its lighthouse organization should be surrounded with mystery of the Egyptian hall type, and it is fearlessly frank in taking the Canadian public into its confidence. We suspect that it loses nothing by this practice. Rather, we imagine, is it the gainer by courting criticism. We look through this book in vain to discover any sign of a desire to hide the department's light under a bushel. It is rather the other way about, for, while the volume has statistics galore, it also includes a couple of dozen pages of illustrations of lighthouses, buoys, steamers and life-saving stations. Here is a hint which our own lighthouse authorities might well take to heart. It may be—we know not—that there are insuperable reasons why they should not rush into cold print with an elaborate account of their exertions in behalf of the mariner. But could not the thing be compromised somehow? If typography is banned, might not the shipowners of the country have the services of the camera? This would at least enable them to form some idea of the way in which the lighthouse boards of the three kingdoms are disposing of the money of which they are trustees. The notion, we acknowledge, is a little irregular, since trustees are not usually called upon to furnish accounts by the aid of photography. But the Canadian example must be the excuse for a suggestion which, if adopted, would at all events open up the prospect of a quite delightful series of picture postcards. Lest it be suspected that Canada's lighthouse service is of the toy-shop order we had better give a few particulars. There are, according to the latest returns, no fewer than 713 light stations, lightships, and fog-alarm stations in the Dominion, and these between them show 899 lights. In addition there are 91 steam whistles, fog-horns, bells and guns. The number of light-keepers and engineers of fog-alarms, together with masters of lightships, is 719. The expenditure for maintenance of lights and coast service for the last fiscal year was $537,300, and there was disbursed on construction $158,700, making a total of $696,000. This latter sum is in excess of the outlay of the previous year by $117,000, which scarcely suggests a cheese-paring policy. Now if Canada can light and buoy her extensive and dangerous coasts for £140,000 a year, the problem which at once arises is why British shipowners should be taxed to the tune of

£500,000 a year for a similar purpose. We are quite aware that it is risky to make comparisons. When some one had the temerity to hint that the English lighthouse service is dear as compared with that of France, the explanation was at once forthcoming that the French are content with lath and plaster construction, whereas the British and Irish lighthouses are built for all time. No doubt the same ingenuity in apologetics could be relied upon in the present instance. We should be told, perhaps, that the Marine Department of Canada is comprised of mere 'prentice hands, who do not understand the responsibility of their task, and who never will until they have the power of spending other people's money unchecked. Yet, as far as we can see, it has a pretty fair conception of what is demanded of it. Indeed, it is impossible to glance at this report without observing that the exceptional dangers of the Canadian coasts are recognized to the utmost, and that the department is straining every nerve to facilitate safe navigation in Canadian waters. Withal, there is no effort at concealment. There is a report from the chief engineer which occupies scores of pages of print, and is thoroughly comprehensive. We learn from it, for instance, that the department has made experiments with a view to the use of acetylene as a lighthouse illuminant, and that it is carrying out a series of tests with the diaphone, an instrument which is to have a chance of showing what it can do against the Scotch type of siren approved at the Trinity House experiments. Further we get full particulars, not only of new works, but of repairs as well, and there is the most complete information as to the work accomplished by the department's steamships during the year. One naturally asks why in the case of our own lighthouse authorities it is not possible for detailed statements to be prepared under these and similar headings. If publicity has, as Canada finds, a wholesome influence when the lighthouse service is conducted by a government department at the national expense, can a single plea be advanced for shirking it when unlimited and unchecked control is given to non-representative and practically irresponsible bodies, entrusted with the proceeds of a tax levied upon a particular class of the community ? The matter is really beyond discussion ; so much so that, in presence of a vast amount of adverse criticism, the lighthouse authorities of this country find it quite impossible to take up a pen in defence of the indefensible.

I could quote in the same sense from the 'Marine Review' and 'Marine Record,' of Cleveland, Ohio, which is an authority on the question, and which gives the same praise to the department as regards the lighting of the coast.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries a matter that will entail a less expenditure than a lightship at the mouth of the Halifax harbour. It is the need of a buoy for the eastern point shoal or reef off Lunenburg harbour which has been solicited from the government on several occasions, two years ago and last year. I scarcely meet a fisherman or a mariner from that locality, and the surrounding country without being asked, when is that buoy for eastern point going to be placed ? I have been told by the government that the officer in charge of that branch of the department considered that it was not necessary. Well, I beg to differ most decidedly with that officer. There are no persons possessed of a better knowledge of the necessity for a life-saving signal than the mariner and fisherman. They have to enter that harbour at all seasons of the year, and the fishermen at all times, night and day. All I ask is a bell buoy ; and, as a proof of the necessity for it, I mentioned the loss of two steamers, which were driven on shore and totally lost in consequence of there not being a bell buoy at that point. I may be told that when entering the harbour, boats might take the western entrance and be guided by the automatic buoy, off Ovens, or Rose Head. That may be all very well at certain seasons ; but a fisherman, when out in his boat, and seeing night coming on, and perhaps a storm approaching, regards the eastern entrance as the only way by which he can reach his harbour of destination and safety, living, as he does, in close proximity to Eastern point. I would ask the hon. minister to seriously take this matter into his consideration, and view the situation as shown on the map, and he will see clearly that no more reasonable request could possibly be made than that which I am making on behalf of these people. I do not ask for an automatic buoy, because there is one at the western entrance. What I ask for is a bell buoy, which will cost very little ; and the fishermen and mariners will never be satisfied until they see it placed in position off Eastern point. I will ask the minister to give this matter his careful consideration. It is a life-saving service, and I am sure he would not refuse so reasonable a request when it is made by every one belonging to that port. I want the hon. minister to understand that the port of Lunenburg is a very important one, next to Halifax, I therefore, ask the minister to consider the matter, in such a favourable light that may, in the near future, see a bell buoy placed in the position asked for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed that this matter has been under consideration in the department for quite a while. I do not know the particulars of the case ; but it is one of those cases that I shall have to investigate personally when I visit the maritime provinces, as I intend to do during next summer.

Mr. KAULBACH. If the minister will kindly give me a call when he comes there, I shall be pleased to see him and take him to the place.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. With the greatest pleasure.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister has been making tests of certain lights. Would

he give us an explanation of that, and state the cost of the lights ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As regards the light, the test has been successful, but I have not the technical information to give to the House at present. It will probably be annexed to the report.

Mr. INGRAM. My object was to get at the cost of the lights as they are now—the cost per light.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are 770 lights.

Mr. INGRAM. About how much per light do they cost ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The total cost of maintenance is given in the report. If there is any particular light which the hon. gentleman wishes to inquire about, I will procure the information from the department and furnish it to him.

Mr. INGRAM. I have no technical knowledge of these things myself ; but I was trying to find out about what these lights would cost. I believe you are experimenting on acetylene.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The engineer is not in a position to give information. The reason why experiments were made to ascertain the value of ascetelyne lights is because it is easier to manage than other lights and it gives clearer light.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has it any greater penetrating power in a fog ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not decided yet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There have been a good many experiments in the last few years as regards the transmission of sound through fog, and some very curious results have been shown. A fog whistle has not been heard at a distance of three or four miles, and yet it has been heard at the further distance of eight or nine miles. Is the department making any experiments in this line ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My engineer informs me that he is.

Mr. BELL. Is anything being done by the department to acquire knowledge as to the currents on the Newfoundland coast, to which a very large number of wrecks are attributed, where vessels are lost upon that coast ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is an officer at present making such investigation with the 'Gulnare.'

Mr. BELL. I see that a lighthouse in Pictou has been burned recently. What steps have been taken to replace that light ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be replaced at once.

Maintainence and repairs to lighthouses, including salary of Mr. U. P. Boucher, engineer in charge of buoys between Montreal and Platon, $330,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The explanation of the increase here is the maintenance of new lights and the expenses connected therewith.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman is following the same system of purchasing supplies that he did in connection with the items we discussed last night. I find on page P—260 of the Auditor General's Report that J. B. Coté, of Quebec, gets $2,989 for a quantity of supplies. Then I find that Mr. Drolet, of Quebec, got $6,701. He charges for labour 292½ hours at 50 cents. That amounts to $5 per day. Also 1553 hours at 40 cents, or $4 per day. There might be an immense profit on mechanics when they are charged for at $4 and $5 per day. He also charges for 3,943 hours at 35 cents. Why could not the government have this work done by contract ? In every province we find goods purchased from retail merchants. I could just refer to one on page 62—Mr. Lewis, of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is he a retail merchant ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, he is a wholesale merchant. He supplied the department with 925 pounds of putty at $2.10 per 100 lbs. Why does not the government buy all they require from him at that price, instead of paying 3, 4, and 5 cents per pound to retail merchants. Why not buy all your supplies from wholesale merchants at wholesale prices. On page 61, I find J. U. Gregory was paid $1,440. Who is he ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is the agent of the dement at Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. In his bill there is an item of $8 for spruce bushes for decorating on St. Patrick's day. I am willing to have these decorations on St. Patrick's day, but will the hon. minister put the same amount in the estimates to decorate on the twelfth of July ? The hon. minister has not explained why he does not buy these goods at wholesale prices.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This matter was threshed out four hours last night. Surely we are not going to begin it again to-night.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the hon. minister is asking for a quarter of a million of money.

Mr. BIRKETT. Just as I entered the Chamber I heard my name mentioned—I do not know why. During last night—in the course of the four hours used in threshing out these items—I had a little friendly talk with the Minister of Customs. I would

much rather refer to the matter when the hon. minister is present, but I would like to correct what he said, as I have the invoices and other documents here. He stated that some five or six years ago there had been an increase in the price of bar iron of from twenty-five to fifty per cent, and in some cases even to one hundred per cent. My reply was that I thought he was entirely in error. For his information, let me give a few figures of what iron has been sold for since 1897. Bar iron was sold by the manufacturers in Montreal as follows :

1897	$1 35
1898	1 30
1899	1 25 to $1 50
1900	1 40
1901	1 40 to 1 60
1902	1 70 to 1 80
1903	1 80

This corroborates the statement I made that in the last three years iron has been dearer than it has been in the preceding three years.

Mr. HARTY. That depends on the quality.

Mr. BIRKETT. What quality does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Harty) want ?

Mr. HARTY. What quality is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Birkett) giving us ? I suppose he is dealing with one grade of iron all the way through ?

Mr. BIRKETT. What grade does the hon. gentleman want and I will give him the price ?

Mr. HARTY. I am not asking for any grade.

Mr. BIRKETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand what information the hon. gentleman wants.

Mr. HARTY. I was asking if these prices were for one grade of iron.

Mr. BIRKETT. What grade do you want ?

Mr. HARTY. The price should be quoted all through for one grade, X, XX, or XXX.

Mr. BIRKETT. There are no grades of X, XX, and XXX in iron. The grades are ordinary rolled bar, forged bar, refined bar and Swedes bar. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Harty) knows more about steel for locomotives than about bar iron.

Mr. HARTY. I was merely trying to get some information from the hon. gentleman and asking a question in a courteous way.

Mr. BIRKETT. We will give the hon. gentleman all the information he wants. And I hope, if the information is satisfactory and the prices are equally satisfactory, he will give us an order. Now, to confirm the prices I have given, I have the invoices here, and I will show them to any hon. gentleman who cares to see them. In further confirmation, I may say that we sold iron in the city of Ottawa which costs the same to deliver here as in Quebec, at the following prices :

1897	$1 60
1898	1 55
1899	1 65
1901	1 70
1902	1 85
1903	1 95 to $2 00

And, though we have been selling iron even this year at $2, the government paid this firm of Drolet, in Quebec, $3 per hundred pounds.

Mr. HARTY. For what grade of iron ?

Mr. BIRKETT. I asked the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that last night and he could not tell me. The only information we could get was from the Auditor General's Report. It seems to me that the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty) is talking about something he knows nothing at all about. If he wishes to ask me any question, let him stand up that we may see who he is, and let him tell us what he wants. I notice, in going through a few more of these accounts, that Drolet, of Quebec, is still charging this enormous price of $3 per hundred for bar iron. I also notice that he has raised the price of his zinc. He has supplied twenty-three pounds, for which he charges twenty-five cents. Perhaps the hon. member for Kingston knows something of the value of zinc. Here is an item of spelter and solder. Now, spelter is not used for solder, it is used for brazing. Any mechanic knows that it is not used for solder. There is a charge for twenty-six pounds of it at fifty cents per pound, which is five times more than spelter ever was sold for. Why, antimony is not worth anything like that, to say nothing of spelter. I notice also that Drolet has charged as high for labour as fifty cents per hour. I refer hon. members to page P—60 of the Auditor General's Report. I wonder what sort of mechanics or labourers were paid for at fifty cents per hour. He has 202½ hours charged at this rate, also 1,503 hours at forty cents; 3,943 hours at thirty-five cents—in fact, he has over 10,000 hours, or three years time of one man, and all this labour spent on 4,802 pounds of iron. There is no use saying one thing and thinking another; there must be something wrong in this. No man or company of men could put in three years work on four thousand pounds of iron. And the prices charged are something enormous. These prices are higher than retail prices, and far beyond what would be charged by any wholesale man in Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, or elsewhere. As I said last evening, the government are simply the trustees of the people and should not pay such prices. And if they would publicly call for tenders they could get the supplies they require at fair market prices.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I repeat what has been said during the discussion. If the hon. gentleman wishes to ascertain whether the accounts which he mentions and which he finds are scandalous, are extravagant, he can do so before the Public Accounts Committee. There he will discover an entirely different story. It is easy to take the Auditor General's Report and pick out certain items charged there, and which are not explained in any way, and to say that the prices are enormous. But it is necessary to know the circumstances connected with each account. It may be that they are half French and half English, and the French has to be translated into English, and people who don't know anything about it will make entries that cannot be understood, even people who may know the prices of merchandise but who do not know the prices charged by a competent engineer in making difficult repairs of boilers and high class machinery. Mr. Drolet, I am informed, has about 100 men in his employ. He is not an ordinary blacksmith, but he has the best shop in Quebec, and it is probably the only place in Quebec where work of this kind could be done. Instead of sending the boats to Montreal or Halifax, we thought proper to get him to do the repairs. The accounts are certified in the regular manner by competent officers. If these engineers have certified accounts which ought not to be certified, they should be censured. The department has no control directly or indirectly over these things. A piece of machinery gets broken or damaged, and a competent man is asked to do the work, and who is better able to judge of the quality and the value of the work than the engineers themselves? If the hon. gentleman can suggest any other manner of doing it, I would be glad to accept his suggestion. But it is not fair to brand Mr. Drolet as a man who would overcharge the department. I have telegraphed for an item about which a good deal was said last night, that is about the metal called magnolia. It appears there is another metal called munse.

Mr. BIRKETT. What is the difference between munse and magnolia? The hon. gentleman says it is sometimes called magnolia and sometimes called munse. I would like him to tell us what is the difference. He says that I have been finding fault with Mr. Drolet. I did nothing of the sort, I did not refer to Mr. Drolet at all. When the minister says that there is no other man who can do the work, I am not prepared to accept that. I do not believe Mr. Drolet is the only machinist in Quebec who could make these repairs. They could have been done in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It would not be convenient to have the work done at Montreal. It is better to have these repairs done in Quebec where there are dock yards. Besides, it is necessary that the repairs should be done at the earliest possible moment so that the ships can get out on the opening of navigation and they can get out ten days earlier from Quebec than from Montreal. I know Mr. Drolet personally very well, though I know he is a very reputable man in his line of business, and as a mechanical engineer, he is far and away the best man and has the best equipped shop in Quebec.

Mr. BIRKETT. It is not absolutely necessary that the repairs should be done in Quebec.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. These repairs can only be done in the winter time. The vessels come in at the very end of the season, and it would be almost impossible to get them to Montreal. Navigation between Montreal and Quebec closes earlier than it does below Quebec.

Mr. BIRKETT. The explanation of the Minister of Justice is more reasonable.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I want to explain about the charge for time. I know it to be a fact that Mr. Drolet is the only man who does work of that sort in Quebec. There is another firm at Lévis, George T. Davie and Son, who have a dockyard at Lévis. When the repairs are not done in a properly equipped shipyard it is necessary to carry the tools from the shipyard to the place where the work is being done, and the charge of so much an hour for labour includes so much an hour for the tools employed and other apparatus necessary in doing work of this sort.

Mr. BIRKETT. I would like both the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Justice to understand that I have not found any fault with the price charged per hour for labour. When they charge fifty cents an hour for labour they are also charging for the wear and tear of their tools. The difference between fifty cents and what they pay the mechanic, is what they charge the government for the wear and tear, rent, running expenses and so forth. But I want it to be understood that I am not finding any fault with the price charged for this work or the way the work was done. I am simply finding fault with the price charged for raw material, for what is called raw material. The Minister of Justice said that this work was done in the winter.

Mr. INGRAM. We have not found out whether it was done in the winter or summer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The repairs are made in the winter.

Mr. INGRAM. What means have you of knowing ? Have you got the account there ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The repairs were made during the winter previous to putting the vessels in commission, in the months of February and March.

Mr. BIRKETT. No, that will not do.

Mr. INGRAM. We know perfectly well that it is a common thing throughout the country that parties selling goods to the government invariably expect to get more from the government than from a private individual.

Mr. BUREAU. Not in our part of the country.

Mr. INGRAM. I have been too long here and I know. What we find fault with is excessive prices paid in many instances and we believe we are justified in finding fault.

Wages of crew and maintenance of Lurcher's shoal lightship (revote), $10,000. Wages of crew and maintenance of lightship, East Point, Anticosti, $10,000.

Mr. COPP. I would like to ask the hon. minister when these lightships will be finished ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One lightship will be delivered on the 15th July and the other on the 15th October.

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, $322,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the item that the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) wants reserved and there is no objection to the balance of the items going through. He has a telegram from one of his friends saying that he desires to say something in regard to this item and that he would like it reserved.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The really awkward thing about reserving that particular sub-item is that we reserve the whole group of items. However, as I understand that the remaining items will be regarded as unobjectionable, we will reserve this item if my hon. friend wishes it.

Item allowed to stand.

To provide for the expenses of the Montreal Pilot Commissioners' Court, $2,000.

Mr. BELL. Perhaps we might get a little information about the pilotage commissioners' court. This is a new court that was established some time ago to deal with pilotage matters.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was established two years ago in Montreal.

Mr. BELL. This about covers the cost of the commissioners and assessors ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Are there many cases dealt with by the court ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There were four cases last year.

Repairs to wharfs, $3,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before this item is closed up, I want to inquire if Mr. Gregory had the minister's authority to spend $8 for spruce bushes for decorating on St. Patrick's day. I understand he is going to give instructions to spend a similar amount on the 12th July.

Building and maintenance of fish breeding estimates and lobster hatcheries, $95,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase of $3,000 here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is for new hatcheries.

Mr. TAYLOR. All right.

Fisheries protective service, including maintenance of new vessels in British Columbia, $130,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase of $10,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The increase is due to the development of the fishing industry in British Columbia, the North-west Territories and Manitoba.

Building fish-ways and clearing rivers, $3,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase of $2,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is an increase of $2,000 because the department has been found neglectful in not providing fish-ways in many places and the demands upon the department have increased very much. We intend, for the protection of fish, to give more attention to this question.

Mr. BELL. On what river is it intended to make this new expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No river in particular. We have been asked in many cases to attend to this question. The individual expenditures are very small, varying from $50 to $100.

Mr. BELL. Such an amount as that would not provide a fish-way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, they are small works.

Canadian fishery exhibit, $4,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase of $2,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are making a new installation on account of the old exhibits having been left at Paris and destroyed at other exhibitions.

Mr. BELL. Before the whole item passes may I ask the hon. minister to give us a little more information in reference to the building and maintenance of fish-breeding establishments. I see there is an increase of $3,000. How many new fish-breeding establishments are the government providing and in what localities ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are three new lobster hatcheries to be provided, two in New Brunswick and one in Prince Edward Island. There is also under consideration the establishment of a fish hatchery in the Northwest Territories and one on the great lakes.

Mr. BELL. Would $3,000 provide for the building and maintenance of these three and possibly five fish hatcheries?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed by the officers of the department that it will. They are not very expensive.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 8, 1903.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PENNY BANKS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) introduced Bill (No. 198) respecting Penny Banks. He said: The object of this Bill, as its name implies, is the cultivation of thrift in small matters, the encouragement of small savings of a class not reached by the government savings bank. A year ago we had application from some public-spirited gentlemen of Toronto, who wished to obtain a special charter for the establishment of a bank of this character. We thought it better, however, if such banks were to be established, that it should be done under some general law which would apply to all established under similar circumstances. The gentlemen in Toronto very readily assented to that view, and we have prepared a Bill of a general character which will meet their case, and also, if they should arise, cases of a like character elsewhere. The design is that these institutions may be established by letters patent issued by the Governor in Council, and shall all come under the general rules laid down. It is intended that they shall not be money-making or money-lending institutions, but that they shall be entirely money-saving institutions. Indeed, it would not be too much to describe them as practically collecting agencies for the government savings bank. It is proposed that a small proportion of the funds they receive, 5 per cent, shall be held by the penny banks to meet the daily demands; but the balance shall be deposited with the government savings bank, and shall only be withdrawn when required by the depositors. The penny bank shall not require to have a capital; but the persons organizing it shall be required to have $10,000 as a guarantee of good faith. It is to be understood, not as a commercial undertaking, but rather as a benevolent institution, which will be established by churches and benevolent societies. For the money deposited in the government savings bank we propose to allow ½ per cent above the ordinary rate of interest, though the institution itself will not pay a larger rate of interest than the government savings bank. But to meet the expense of management, we propose to encourage the very worthy object of these gentlemen by paying to the bank ½ per cent higher interest than we pay to the ordinary depositor. If it should be found that ½ per cent would more than pay the cost of management, it will be reduced; but I do not anticipate that that will be the case. What I anticipate is that gentlemen establishing institutions of this character will do it for benevolent purposes, and will have to put their hands into their pockets and help to pay the expenses. They will be allowed to invest their own guarantee fund in reasonably good securities, but the money of the depositors must be deposited in the government savings bank. These in brief are the main provisions of the Bill. We shall be very glad, when it reaches a later stage, to have any suggestions that may be offered to improve it. It has been prepared at the suggestion of the gentlemen in Toronto to whom I have referred; but we have thought it well to devise a system whereby, if similar savings banks should be started in other parts of the country, they would be brought under the operation of this Act.

Mr. KAULBACH. Is there any maximum amount that can be deposited ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it must not exceed $300.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. I would like to ask the hon. minister if we have any coin in Canada equal to a penny, or what he means by a penny ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will consult the dictionary he will find that, although in England a penny is described as a copper coin of a certain weight and character, it also means a small coin of any kind. In the United

States a small coin is called a penny, and the term is pretty well understood in that sense. In our decimal currency we have not anything which is technically called a penny ; but our Toronto friends who originated this proposal wished that the term should be adopted, and we have gratified their wish.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman know of any place outside of Toronto where there are such banks ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Bill is general, and such a bank may be established anywhere; but the movement is led by these gentlemen in Toronto, who are anxious to establish such a bank.

Mr. INGRAM. I think there are banks of this kind at other places which have been established longer than they have been in Toronto.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But they have no charter. If they wished to have the stamp of authority, they would have to come under the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose that such banks would not reach anything that could not be reached by the savings bank. There is no limit in the deposits of the savings banks ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, a dollar deposited at one time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose these organizations might reach places which would not be reached by the government savings bank.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would be possible, but hardly likely. They will most likely be established in connection with some benevolent organizations in the large cities and towns.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that there is a description of penny bank or small savings bank which has come into vogue to some extent on the continent of Europe, and also in the United Kingdom, and which not only receives money on deposit, but lends money in small amounts to its own shareholders; and I am informed that there is a bank of that character established at the present time at Lévis. This proposed enactment, I gather from what the hon. gentleman has said, does not at all relate to institutions of that kind ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the question suggested itself to the government as to whether or not banks of that kind should be given any legal status in this country ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes ; several members of parliament, in conjunction with a gentleman who is officially connected with this House, recently called upon me and described to me the bank which is now in operation at Lévis, based on a similar principle to banks which exist in some European countries. I have promised that I will look into the matter, though I do not anticipate that we shall take any action upon it during the present session. But the banks to be established under this Bill will in no way conflict with such an institution, because these are not to be money-lending banks at all. The banks the hon. gentleman refers to, do lend money in a limited sphere.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Only to their own shareholders.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Only to their own shareholders; and I understand that there is the very wholesome rule that the directors shall not lend to themselves. But this will in no way conflict with such institutions if later on we should decide to make provision for them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE GOOD SHEPHERD REFORMATORY.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 199) respecting the Good Shepherd Reformatory, in the city of St. John, N.B.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman kindly state the purport of the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This Bill is on the lines of the provisions respecting the Andrew Mercer Reformatory, the Ontario reformatory for women, contained in chapter 183 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. The suggestion for the legislation which I now introduce originated with the recorder, or chief magistrate, of the city of St. John, and is approved of by the Attorney General of the province of New Brunswick. The Bill is limited to the Roman Catholic reformatory in St. John, and will be applicable only to women and girls of the Roman Catholic faith. Its intention is to allow the magistrates of St. John to commit young girls and women of the Roman Catholic faith to this reformatory, which is a religious institution under the control of the Catholic Church, instead of being obliged to send them to jail as at present.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have the same thing at Halifax.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 195) for the relief of James Reid Steele.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 196) for the relief of William Allen.—Mr. McCreary.

FISHING WITHIN THE THREE-MILE LIMIT.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a matter concerning which I have received information from Nova Scotia. It is reported to me that on the 3rd of June, at seven o'clock in the morning, twenty-nine American fishermen and seiners were fishing within the three-mile limit off Guysborough. At the same time the cutter 'Osprey' was at anchor in Canso and the 'Kingfisher' in Arichat. It is known that the waters of Guysborough bay at that particular time were alive with mackerel, and these American fishermen were in pursuit of them. Still it is reported that no action was taken by the cruisers to prevent these Americans from fishing within the three-mile limit, and they continued to fish, and, in some cases destroyed the nets set by the local fishermen. It is not a matter of sufficient importance to move the adjournment of the House, but I would like to know what information the government has received.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no information in the department that any violation of the law has taken place, but a telegram dated the 3rd of June has been received reporting a large fleet at Arichat accompanied by our cruisers, and that they are kept outside the three mile limits by our two cutters.

Mr. BELL. Is that an official report from the fishery officers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

QUESTIONS.

PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. BROCK—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Have the government, during the past year, printed on any of its reports, documents, or publications, issued from the Printing Bureau, the label, or imprint, of any labour organizations?

2. If so, what are the names of the organizations, and upon what reports, documents, or publications, did such label, or imprint, appear ?

3. What is the object in using such label, or imprint, on such reports, documents, or publications ?

4. If such labels, or imprints, are used by the government, are the organizations which they represent, Canadian organizations, or are they controlled from the United States, or allied with United States organizations ?

5. Are the funds collected from the members of such organizations, invested temporarily or permanently in Canada ; or are they invested in the United States ?

6. Where is the chief office of such organizations ?

7. In what country does the majority of the membership of such organizations reside ?

8. Does the government employ Canadians who do not belong to such organizations to work on such reports, documents or publications, upon which such label, or imprint, appears ?

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

The 'Labour Gazette' was issued with what is called the Union Label which was intended to indicate that the work was done by union labour.

As to the relations between labour organizations in Canada and the United States, the government have no information that is not in the possession of the public.

The government, in employing people in the Printing Bureau, make no condition as to membership in any organization.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON asked :

1. Referring to page B—7 of the Auditor General's Report for the year 1902, in which is given a very long list of amounts due to the Printing Bureau by members of parliament, ex-members and others, for printing, advertising, &c., why are so many arrearages allowed to stand from year to year ?

2. Have proper efforts been made to collect the above accounts ?

3. Whose duty is it to look after and collect these accounts ?

4. Why are all such bills not paid promptly on the delivery of the work, or within a specified short time after ?

5. Who is responsible for such non-payment?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). On September 22, 1897, the Treasury Board ordered as follows :

The board, after a careful consideration of the matter, direct that the Queen's Printer be instructed hereafter to give no further supplies to persons who are in arrears for supplies previously furnished.

This order is enforced.

GOVERNMENT BINDER TWINE FACTORY.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Has the following circular been distributed ?

GOVERNMENT BINDER TWINE FACTORY.

(Circular.)

Kingston, May 1, 1903.

Sir,—The factory at Kingston penitentiary will be able to supply about 300 tons (600,000 pounds) of first-class twine for use this season. Of this quantity about 40 tons (80,000 pounds) is of the brand sold last year under the name of 'Kingston Special,' 500 feet to the pound, as to which we have received many recommendations.

The rest of the season's output will be pure Manilla twine, well twisted, carefully balled and warranted to measure as per ticket attached.

The factory having been thoroughly overhauled and more perfect supervision of the work provided for, there is no reason to fear competition as to quality from any source ; while as to prices, the favourable comparisons of former years will be maintained.

To make sure of the advantages offered by the government factory, please send in your orders at once, stating quantity and grade. Your orders will be booked and invoices sent to you at once. When you desire the twine to be forwarded, send the money by registered letter, express order, P.O. order or bank draft, together with shipping directions, and the twine will be shipped forthwith. If you remit by bank cheque, please see that it is marked 'good' and made payable at par at Kingston.

Where it is at all convenient, it is advisable that farmers join and send club orders for ton-lots or car-load lots, through one of themselves, through the head of a farmer's society or union, or through any agent they may choose, provided they accompany the club order with a certified list of farmers who comprise the club, and show the quantity and grade of twine required by each. In this way they will secure the advantage of lower freight and save expense in registration, postage, commission, &c., in addition to the reduction in price of $5 per ton. 'Club Order' blanks will be forwarded upon request.

The quantity of twine manufactured at the government factory is but a small fraction of the amount annually consumed by the farmers of Canada, and the entire season's output will, doubtless, be ordered during the next few weeks. If you intend to order, do so at once. Should the following authorized schedule of prices be reduced before your twine is shipped, you shall have the benefit of any such reduction.

Schedule of prices (to farmers only).	Cents.
Pure manilla (650 feet to lb.)	11½
Pure manilla (600 feet to lb.)	10¾
Kingston special (500 feet to lb.) .. .	9½

¼ cent per lb. less on ton lots.

Terms:—Cash with order. All f.o.b., Kingston.

Address all communications and remittances to the warden of the penitentiary, Kingston, Ont.

J. M. PLATT,
Warden.

(650 ft. twine all sold a few days after this circular was issued.)

2. If so, in what places ?

3. Has it been translated into French ?

4. Has it been sent, thus translated, into the parishes of the province of Quebec ?

5. In which parishes has it been so distributed ?

6. Has the department, in any way, made the farmers of the province of Quebec aware of the advantages of purchasing this binder twine at Kingston ?

7. If so, in what ways ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) :

1. Yes.

2. To all farmers in Canada who have in the past purchased binder twine from the penitentiary, or inquired regarding binder twine, and to the secretaries of all farmers' clubs and agricultural societies whose address could be ascertained by the warden.

3. Yes.

4. Not yet, but it will be the moment it is received from the printers.

6. Yes.

7. By sending a copy of the circular referred to above to all farmers who have in the past purchased binder twine from the penitentiary, or inquired regarding twine, and to the secretaries of all farmers' clubs and agricultural societies whose address could be ascertained by the warden.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Is the Government Printing Bureau in this city an 'open' office, or is it a union office ?

2. Are men who do not belong to the Typographical Union permitted to work as compositors in the composing room ; and if so, how many such men are now employed there ?

3. Were the demands recently made by the compositors in the bureau for an increase of wages submitted to the fair-wage officer of the Labour Bureau to report upon ; and if so, did he report favourably or unfavourably upon the demand ?

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

1 and 2. There never has been any obligation on the part of the government to employ union men only. It is now an open office.

3. The Typographical Union of Ottawa, composed of about eighty per cent of Bureau employees, adopted a new increased scale of wages, to come into operation on the 1st of June, without previous demand or conference. The scale was declared to be binding on all compositors. The government declined to adopt the new scale.

GOVERNMENT BINDER TWINE FACTORY.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. What are the residences and the post office addresses of the purchasers of binder twine from the Kingston penitentiary whose names are the following ?

Names.	Pure Manilla.				King Special.	
	650 feet.	Rate.	600 feet.	Rate.	500 feet.	Rate.
Moise Cocnier, club	2,000	11¼				
W. B. Comock, order	2,100	11¼				
A. M. Dunsmore, order			2,500	10½		
J. W. Drysdale			500	10¾		
Wm. Eades			500	10¾		
A. Malcolmson, club			3,000	10½		
Jno. McDonald	2,000	11¼				
Pioneer Farmers Union			20,000	10½		
Jas. Allan			125	10¾		
G. W. Beach, club	1,000	11¼	2,000	10½	500	9¼
J. W. Beaudoin			400	10¾	100	9½
C. H. Brown			200	10¾		
Wm. Chapman			200	10¾		
W. S. Duffett	75	11½				
P. Z. Dubé					1,000	9½
Geo. Dickie			100	10¾		
C. O. Gervais, club			4,000	10½		
D. Gavin			100	10¾		
J. J. Garneau			300	10¾	300	9½
R. Gardiner			200	10¾		
Wm. Gemmill			150	10¾		
Wm. Jamieson			250	10¾		
Thos. Kersey, club			2,135	10½		
W. T. Lucas, club			725	10¾		
Jos. Macartney			600	10¾		
Jos. Martin, club			1,000	10¾		
Frs. Art. Marcotte, club			1,165	10¾		
Jno. Montgomery, club			1,180	10¾		
Jas. H. Mountain			100	10¾		
W. R. McLeod, club	2,000	11¼				
E. McPhail			150	10¾		
Wm. Nixon, club			800	10¾		
P. O'Reilly			150	10¾		
Nazaire Pratte, club			1,000	10½	1,000	9¼
Hy. Raworth			200	10¾		
C. J. Russell			500	10¾		
S. B. Stevens			200	10¾		
All. Seward			150	10¾		
F. H. Smart, club			2,000	10½	2,000	9¼
A. C. Smith			150	10¾		
M. Tingley			400	10¾	200	9½
Geo. Wright, club	1,100	11½	200	10¾		
J. E. Belzille	300	11½				
C. Armstrong	100	11½				
Jas. Savage			100	10¾		
J. B. Daigle	500	11½				
F. H. Sadler	450	11½	50	10¾		
G. A. Palmer			50	10¾	50	9½
Wm. Fletcher			500	10¾		
Alex. Waugh			60	10¾		
S. W. T. Lewis	100	11½				
G. W. Sampkin			200	10¾		
J. O. Leroux, club	2,000	11¼				
Aug. Gagné	550	11½				
Manitoba Penitentiary	700	11½				
	14,975		48,290		5,150	

2. Did these persons give their orders before May 1, 1903 ?

3. Did the warden of the Kingston penitentiary employ any other means of making known to the public the quantity of binder twine on sale at his establishment, than the circular of May 1, 1903 ?

4. If so, what means did he employ ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I think that the hon. gentleman would be well advised not to press for an answer to this question. Those in charge of the industry tell me that it will not be to our interest to give at present the addresses of our customers dealing with the institution at Kingston. The following information will probably supply what the hon. gentleman requires up to the present, as to the quantity sold during May :

Province.	Pure Manilla.		Kingston Special.
	650 ft.	600 ft.	500 ft.
Ontario	2,825	14,175	3,550
Quebec	3,350	5,965	1,400
New Brunswick	.....	1,650	.....
Prince Edward Island	2,000	.....	.....
Manitoba	6,800	6,500	.....
North-west Territories	.....	20,000	.....
	14,975	48,290	5,150

2. No.

3. No.

4. Up to the present no other means have been used. Nearer harvest, perhaps in a week or two, advertisements will be inserted in the newspapers as usual.

CHIEF JUSTICE BOYD—HIS RELATIVES AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOY.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell)—by Mr. Morin—asked :

How many sons or relatives of Chief Justice Boyd, if any, are in the employ of the government ? What is the date of their appointment, and the salary paid to each ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Speaking under correction, there are no sons or relatives of Chief Justice Boyd in the employ of the government—at least, it is not known that there are any.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY—GUARANTEE OF SECURITIES.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole tomorrow, to consider the following resolution :—

1. Resolved, that the government may aid the extension of the line of the Canadian Northern Railway Company from Grandview, the point where what is known as the Gilbert Plains branch of the said railway ends, to a point at or near Edmonton, a distance of about 620 miles, and also of the Prince Albert branch of the said railway from a point 100 miles east of Prince Albert to Prince Albert, a distance of about 100 miles, by guaranteeing the principal and interest of the first mortgage bonds, debentures or other securities of the company to the extent of $13,000 per mile of the line, interest on the said bonds to be at the rate of three per cent per annum payable half-yearly, and the principal to be payable in 50 years.

2. Resolved, that the said bonds, debentures or other securities shall be secured by mortgage forming a first charge upon the lines of railway so aided, and all property and franchises in connection therewith, and all revenues derived therefrom by the company ; provided that with respect to that portion of the said line from the end of the Gilbert Plains branch to the westerly boundary of Manitoba, a distance not exceeding sixty-five miles, the said mortgage shall be a first charge to the extent of only $10,000 per mile, but shall also rank on the said portion next after the charges heretofore created ; provided also that the said mortgage shall be a charge next after a first charge of $13,000 per mile (to be created by the company) on that part of said Prince Albert branch.

3. Resolved, that the said mortgage shall also form a charge next after the charges existing thereon upon all the lines and branch lines of railway of the company now in operation, and all property and franchises connected therewith, and all revenues derived therefrom by the company.

4. Resolved, that the kind of securities to be guaranteed as aforesaid, and the forms thereof, and the form and terms of the mortgage securing them, and the form and manner of guarantee, shall be such as the Governor in Council approves of.

5. Resolved, that upon the said guarantee being signed on behalf of the government, the government shall become liable for the payment of the principal and interest of the securities guaranteed, and the said payment shall be a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

6. Resolved, that the rates and tolls to be charged for the transfer and carriage of freight and passengers upon the lines of railway so aided and upon the lines owned by the Canadian Northern Railway shall be under the control of the Governor in Council or of such authority, commission or tribunal as is designated or constituted under any Act of the parliament of Canada for the regulation or control of the business of railways.

7. Resolved, that the Governor in Council or any authority created by parliament for the purpose may also grant running powers over any portion of the lines hereby aided to any other line of railway upon terms considered equitable.

8. Resolved, that it shall be unlawful for the Canadian Northern Railway to lease or sell any of its lines or any portion thereof to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or to amalgamate with the said company or enter into any agreement with the said company whereby rates upon freight or passengers shall be pooled; but this provision shall not extend to traffic or running arrangements made with the assent of the Governor in Council.

9. Resolved, that any money paid by the government of Canada under the guarantee herein provided for shall be held to be paid in discharge of the liability of the government, but not in discharge of the liability of the mortgage securing them ; and the money so paid shall be held to be still secured by the said securities and mortgage, and the government shall be subrogated in all the rights of the holders of the securities, the interest upon or the principal of which has been paid by the government, and the government shall in respect of all the moneys so paid be in all respects in the position of security holders in respect of whose securities default has been made in payment to the extent of the moneys paid by the government.

He said : I may say, Mr. Speaker, that his Excellency the Governor General having been apprised of the purpose of this motion, assents thereto and recommends it to the House.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS ACT—SURTAX.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 174) to amend the Customs Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there not some information the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Paterson) was to give on the third reading of this Bill ? The third reading stood over for some special reason which I do not recollect at the moment.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There was some discussion, but with relation to matters that appertain more particularly to the estimates. There were several points on which information was to be given, and I am having that information prepared so as to be ready when the estimates come up again. But I do not remember that there was any information to be given particularly relating to this Bill. One subject discussed was the advisability of granting power for the employment of temporary clerks. But this was fully discussed and was agreed to. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) prefers that the Bill should stand, we will allow it to stand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it would not be any inconvenience to the hon. gentleman I would prefer it. I think the hon. gentleman who asked for some information, or for some reason, asked that the Bill be allowed to stand over, is not present.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 188) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.—The Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. BOYD. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Stewart) wished to be here when this Bill was under discussion. I do not see him in his place at the moment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Bill has already been postponed because of the absence of hon. members.

On section 1,

Section 29 of the Weights and Measures Act, chapter 104 of the revised statutes, is amended by adding the following subsection thereto :—

'Postal scales, when engraved and stamped as such, and of a capacity not exceeding four pounds, and not used for trade purposes, may be sold without inspection under such regulations as the Department of Inland Revenue prescribes ; but any person using such scales for other than postal purposes shall be liable to the penalties prescribed by subsection one of this section.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). That section was passed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It does not appear so by the Bill I have here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How are you to have any real supervision over the user or non-user of these scales ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I explained the other day. These scales are for letter use.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that. I remember the hon. minister's position. He says that these scales are to be used solely to weigh letters or other mail matter, and there is no reason to inspect them because the weights will be corrected by the post office department. That seems a very good reason, but what I am pointing out is something further : You issue these post office scales to men who are conducting an ordinary business. What provision have you to make sure that he does not use them for the purpose of his business ? How can you possibly supervise a thing of that kind ? Should not you limit in some way, the persons who use the scales or the places where they are to be used ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The department will have to pass a regulation regarding the sale and use of these scales. To a certain extent, they will be subject to the supervision of the office. If parties are found using these scales for other purposes than the weighing of mail matter, they will be liable to punishment. But I do not think they will be used for any other purpose than the weighing of letters. Although the present Act prohibits the use of any kind of scale without inspection, still, for the benefit of many people, we think it better to allow the use of these scales.

Mr. COCHRANE. A great many of the postmasters in the small places in Ontario are also merchants. I have in my mind's eye several in my own riding who are in that position. Why should not these scales, then, be inspected as well as any other, so that there could not be any possibility of merchants in post offices using fraudulent weights in dealing with the public ? As I understand it, if the postmaster has these scales, they are exempt from inspection except by some official of the Post Office Department.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The scales for the post office are supplied by the Post Office Department, and the rates of postage determined by private individuals by means of these scales are subsequently fixed by the post office authorities I now lay on the Table for the inspection of hon. members, one of the scales in question, which weighs from one-half ounce to one pound.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the hon. gentleman whether this is the only

description of scales that is suggested by the section ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is a sample of some of those scales, but there are many kinds.

On section 2 :

Notwithstanding anything in the said Act, the charge for the threshing of grain may, until a suitable scale or measuring apparatus therefor that may be verified, is provided and has been approved by an order of the Governor in Council, be determined by any device which records, automatically or otherwise, the number of discharges made.

The quantity threshed and upon which the charge for threshing is to be based shall be determined by check-weights on a properly verified scale, such number of times per day as is agreed upon between the operator of the threshing machine and the owner of the grain threshed ; and the aggregate quantity thus established shall be that for which threshing charges shall be payable ; and such charges may be recovered in any court of law or equity.

This section may be repealed by order of the Governor in Council whenever it is established to his satisfaction that an apparatus complying with the provisions of this Act is available.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Can the minister state what is the exact change made by this Bill ? Is it proposed to substitute this section for some section that already exists, or is it an entirely new provision ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is an entirely new provision.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the inconvenience in the present condition, and what is intended to be effected by this ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Last year we had a discussion with regard to scales to be adapted to threshing machines used in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. At the time I declared that I was almost sure that the weighing machine then in use did not meet the provisions of the Act which required that those scales should be inspected. Unfortunately that scale was not made according to law. Since then the owner of that scale, or somebody in his interest, has been working on it in order to perfect it, and I am informed that as now manufactured it would be considered sufficient, but it is not yet in our possession. In the meantime, to prevent other difficulties which have been experienced I understand for several years past, we introduce this clause, which may be repealed by Order in Council as soon as a scale is found suitable to answer the purposes of the law, and gives satisfaction to the public. As the clause reads, in order to avoid any difficulty between the owners of threshing machines and the farmers, we have asked that an inspected scale be used so that when any difficulty arises between the owner of the grain and the owner of the threshing machine in regard to the weight of the grain, the difficulty may be settled by check tests.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I observe that the provisions of this enactment seem to be dependent upon some check established by the second subsection : There are to be check weights on a properly verified scale. It seems to me legislation of that kind may be found unworkable, in some instances at least. You are making the operation of the Act dependent upon an agreement between the two persons interested. What operations will the section have then ? Of course if the man who owns the threshing machine and the owner of the grain come to an agreement, we really do not want any legislation. But if they do not come to an agreement, I do not see how you can make much progress under this section, because the whole of the section is dependent apparently upon the check established by section 2, and that check is based upon an agreement between the two parties. Well, is not that rather unworkable in the only case in which you might find much occasion to apply it ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have already explained the difficulty that arises when the farmer and the owner of the threshing machine do not agree. But even when they do agree, after the grain is threshed the farmer may begin to complain because there was no weighing machine attached to the threshing machine, and I am told that judgments have been rendered by the courts sustaining the farmer in refusing to pay. In order to remedy that difficulty we adopt a machine as a temporary measure, and until we have a machine that will give satisfaction to both parties we have thought it best to introduce this legislation. But in order to give satisfaction both to the farmer and the owner of the machine, we have made provision that if at any time, at any hour of the day, either one of the parties is not satisfied that the scale is working properly, they may weigh by another scale, and the inspected scale is used to ascertain whether the weighing machine is working properly or not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the statute meant what the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) seems to think it does I would be inclined to agree with him, but I do not think it does. If the second clause said that either party would have the right to have the weights verified not less than four times, or six times, per day and at intervals of not less than an hour, or half an hour, you could work it out, but where you make it dependent upon the agreement of both parties I cannot see how you are going to work it out except where both parties actually agree to that. The object of the statute is to effect a remedy in cases where the parties do not agree, where they are at arm's length. It does not seem that the statute carries out what the hon. minister has in his mind.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. As I have already explained, this is only a temporary measure. If these people cannot agree, even when they make a bargain between themselves, I do not see how any law can oblige them to be satisfied, unless we can make provision that they shall have an opportunity to try or test the weights any time in the day. If they are willing they can test them twenty times in the day. Both parties will be interested in having correct weights, first, the farmer who has to pay and the owner of the threshing machine who has to receive the money. I have inquired what we can do in that direction and I have come to the conclusion that we had better not fix the number of times in a day that a test may be made.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I do not see any particular benefit in that portion of the Bill. I think if the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue made the Act to read that it did not apply to grain coming from the threshing machine, it would answer the purpose he has in view in introducing this Bill. This matter which I brought to the attention of the House last year is one of very great importance to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I pointed out then to the hon. minister and to the government, the opportunities there were preventing, a man from collecting his bills and it was shown by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Stewart) that the amount of such threshing exceeded $5,000,000 last year, not one dollar of which could be collected by law. Last year I gave the hon. minister some instances of the trouble that had taken place in court, but, try as best I could and with the assistance of other hon. members, I could not convince the hon. minister of the importance of dealing with this question. The correspondence which I have in my hand was moved for and was laid on the Table of the House. The very thing that the minister is doing now, he, or his deputy minister, says here they cannot possibly do. Yet, they find now that they can do it. In the correspondence laid on the Table of the House last year there is a letter from Mr. Thompson, of Wolseley, complaining of the matter in regard to which we are complaining, on the floor of this House and, pointing out the disability under which they labour. In reply to that gentleman this letter from the deputy minister says :

> The department fully realizes these difficulties but they are such as cannot be overcome by legislation, but are of a character that can be removed by threshers requiring manufacturers of threshing machines to provide a properly constructed scale that will pass the government inspection. That this can be done I have not the slightest doubt, and the efforts of threshers should be exerted in that direction.

The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue was aware of this, although this letter was signed by his deputy, on the 15th April, 1902, but now, it seems that he can do something, or is trying to do something that he then said he could not do. He also had brought to his attention at that time a machine that it was believed would meet the requirements. I think portions of this correspondence cast a decided reflection upon the hon. minister himself. No doubt it was thought that the letter of the deputy minister would have an entirely different bearing and that it would be a reflection upon the members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The chief inspector, whom I designed as part blacksmith and part inspector, and I have seen no reason to revise that statement, winds up his report as follows :

> The members who are fighting the battle for the 'Grain Threshing Scale' makers, do not seem to see that they are unknowingly occupying a false position, opposed to their own interests and to the interests of those they represent. They have within reach an article that will meet the requirements of the law, which can be made by any manufacturer, without royalty, and yet they are trying to force upon the farmers of the North-west an inferior machine that is patented and exclusive property of one manufacturer.

It was the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue who brought that matter to the attention of hon. members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Here is the speech of the hon. gentleman last session in regard to it. I will refresh his memory :

> Some years ago one of our inspectors was instructed to inspect one of these weighing machines, and it was found to be so imperfect that he would not certify to its results ; but recently I have received information that within a short time a proper scale will be perfected, for attachment to weighing machines, and will be ready for use next season. Some weeks ago a manufacturer of these weighing machines was in the department, and from the way he spoke, and from information which we have received from our own officers in Winnipeg, we are in a position to state that within a few months, or before next session opens, that difficulty will be remedied.

It was the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue himself who asked hon. members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories to go to his department and see that machine working, and if there is any reflection cast upon any person by the report of this inspector, it is upon the hon. minister. I consider it a piece of gross impertinence on the part of any employee of this government to use any such language about hon. members representing their constituents ; yet, this gentleman is endorsed by the hon. minister and the deputy minister in doing that. While he was doing that he was reflecting upon the hon. minister, although he did not know it, because, it was the hon. minister who invited the members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories to go over to his department and see the machine there on exhibition at work. We said: We will be satisfied with anything that will give these people relief. I said then that

the department was derelict in its duty and I say so now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this section be adopted ?

Mr. BOYD. No, I want to hear what the hon. minister has to say about this business.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The movement was not started until the department had received complaints from people from the North-west Territories. As soon as these complaints reached the department we took measures to provide some remedy. One of our officers at Winnipeg, the inspector of weights and measures, informed the department that he was working on a machine which would be perfected in a short time. In order to ascertain if he was right or wrong, because he had occupied the dual position of inventor and inspector of his own machine, that gentleman came to Ottawa, and in presence of gentlemen from Manitoba and the North-west Territories his machine was put into motion. As the inspector was the inventor of the machine he could not very well pass judgment on his own invention, and we submitted it to Mr. Fyfe, who is well known throughout the Dominion for his ability in this business. Mr. Fyfe was then a scale manufacturer in Montreal, and he is now our chief inspector of weights and measures. Mr. Fyfe stated in presence of the inventor that the machine was not perfect, as it could not be verified, and, if I remember aright, Mr. Magness admitted it. When I stated last year that I expected a machine would be ready for this season, it was on the representation of Mr. Magness, who told me that the machine would give satisfaction to everybody. When the machine had turned out not to be perfect, correspondence took place whether between Mr. Magness or the Globe Manufacturing Company, and the department. Mr. Fyfe contended that even if changes were made the scale could not be admitted to inspection and verification, and in order to show that the department had left nothing undone to give satisfaction to the people of the North-west, I may read the following letter, which the deputy minister wrote on November 11th last to a firm of lawyers in Winnipeg, with whom he had correspondence :

As to the machine submitted being capable of weighing correctly when operated at the proper speed, the chief inspector to whom this matter was referred states that he has no recollection of the necessity for the machine being run at any specified rate of speed being marked thereon, and that even had such been done he could not recommend the verification of any weighing machine that required to be operated at an indicated speed as an essential feature of its weighing correctly. The department has been most anxious that a suitable scale, for use with grain threshers, should be constructed and is prepared to go aside from many less important features provided the essential provisions of the law and regulation be observed and that the scale is of a character to remove the difficulties complained of in grain-producing districts. I may even go further and state that the services of the chief inspector will willingly be placed at the disposal of any person undertaking the production of such a scale. I hoped that the scale submitted would be of such a character, and my disappointment is certainly as great as that of the gentleman who placed it before the department for approval.

If the scale originally submitted has been changed as respects the objectionable features pointed out in my first letter, the department will be glad to have another scale passed upon by the chief inspector.

I may admit that the law is perhaps not perfect, but it will be beneficial to have it on the statute-book until such time as a new scale will be invented, in order to prevent the difficulties which have arisen in the past.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to point out to the minister, the importance of this matter to the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west. The owners of these threshing machines are farmers, and they do the threshing for their neighbours as well as for themselves. Instead of doing all this work by hand, as was formerly the system, the apparatus has developed, until now there is a machine to do all the work of loading into bags and keeping count of every bushel measured. This is now done automatically, and time and labour and expense are saved. If you remove this device from the threshing machines in the west, it will mean an increased cost on the present amount of crop of at least $1,000,000 more to the farmers of the west. I assert that without this machine they would have to pay at least $1,000,000 more to handle their crop. I have here a lengthy reply to the criticisms of Mr. Fyfe, and I will read one or two paragraphs of it which refer to this machine. I am well aware, as the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) stated, that we were invited to see the machine tested in the minister's office. I was present myself, when the weigher made and used on the J. I. Case threshing machine, was in the office. Their agent was here, and their machine was criticised, and they, the officials of the department, explained all they had to do to manufacture it, showing how the bearings should be hardened in order that it might pass the inspection. Let me say here that there appears to be some misunderstanding about this matter. The minister states that Mr. Magness is the inventor of the machine, but I understand from the machine men in Winnipeg that two young men, Messrs. Leitch and Drummond, of the Globe works, are the inventors of this machine. I know that they are the men who are making it and are working on it. I quote the following from the inspector's report of March 19th, page 42 :

Referring to the inspector's report of March 19th, on page 42, it is admitted that the machine does not balance either with or without the load. As previously explained, about seven pounds of the load is required to be in the bucket before the machine is brought into equilibrium, but this in no way interferes with the accuracy in weighing of the machine. The principle of balancing is not at all applicable to this machine, as in actual work, it operates so rapidly that there would not be time for any one to inspect the weights after the predetermined weight of grain has been deposited in the bucket. In threshing with ordinary grain the bucket would fill and empty grain twenty or thirty times per minute, so that there would be no interval of time after the bucket has filled, for a farmer or any person else to inspect it for the purpose of ascertaining whether it correctly balanced with the load or without the load, but if any farmer, whose grain has been threshed, has doubts about the accuracy of the weighing, he can always test by weighing one or more discharges of the bucket on this platform scale.

The makers of this weigher considered the small sketch prepared by the inspector, which you kindly forwarded to them and, which, he states, 'would convey to them the groundwork of success in developing and perfecting of their grain weigher'; but, after carefully considering this sketch and with every desire to improve their machine by the utilization of Mr. Fyfe's idea, they are forced to the conclusion that the adoption of his ideas would not only not improve their machine, but would render it absolutely useless as a grain weigher. In this sketch Mr. Fyfe employs four more knife edge bearings that are in use in the Standard Grain Weigher, and he expresses the opinion that, if this sketch is adopted, it will weigh accurately and meet all the requirements of the Weights and Measures Act, but, in his subsequent report of April 1st, on page 52 of the report, he contradicts this by the statement, 'In my opinion, the use of a knife scale for the purpose intended is impracticable, as it is impossible to weigh correctly on account of the vibration of the machine in threshing.' In penning this last quoted sentence, he has evidently forgotten that, in his report of March 27th, on page 50 of the report, he states 'The nucleus of a good serviceable scale is embodied in the machine presented for admission.' In his report of April 1st, page 21, he speaks of his long experience as a scale manufacturer and of his employment by capitalists to investigate and report on patent weighing machines, and follows up with the gratuitous statement that 'the makers of the machine in question have designed it from a purely mechanical standpoint, without regard, not only to the Weights and Measures requirements, but without regard to the demands of science in the application of leverage and gravity.' The inventors of the Standard Grain Weigher are practical men, who, we venture to say, know quite as much of the demands of science in the application of leverage and gravity as Mr. Fyfe does. Not only this, but the machine in question has been submitted to the inspection of one of the largest scale manufacturers in the United States, who has given it his unqualified approval after careful examination, not of fifteen minutes, but an examination and test extending over several days. The makers of this device have given special study to the principles involved in the building of weighing machines, with a full knowledge of all the surrounding circumstances and the conditions under which it has to be operated, advantages which Mr. Fyfe has not enjoyed.

If this machine or any other weighs accurately, why should it not be admitted as a special weighing machine in this business? There is nothing that it weighs but grain, and when the threshing machine is worn out, it is thrown on the scrap heap.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I may say to my hon. friend that I would not have brought the name of Mr. Magness into the discussion if it had not been for the fact that the department was made aware that he was the inventor of the machine. On the 3rd of June, last year, he wrote the following letter:

I wrote Mr. C. Higman on May 27th, that it was important to me that he should make his report on the Standard Grain Weigher presented by me to the department, so that I could get a letter saying it was accepted or otherwise. I know it is necessary that I should forward a full sized machine for the standard room, also photo cut for circular. I intend to send one of the first batch made, but it takes some time to get the parts in quantities.

A party here is anxious to buy the Canadian right to build them, but I have no proof it has been accepted.

An early reply will greatly oblige.

Later on Mr. Magness, who was given every means to perfect his machine, was asked by the department to come down here with it, and was informed that he could not be both the inventor and the inspector of the machine. On the 17th of June, a letter was written to him, from which I take the following extract:

I have serious doubts as to the advisability of your being connected in any way, with the manufacture and sale of this thresher scale. I am not aware of the exact position in which you will stand at the time this scale will be placed upon the market. While it will be a great boon to the people of the west to have a properly inspected scale for use with the threshers, and while the matter is one in which the department is much interested, I am of the opinion that it would be most objectionable for you, as an inspector of weights and measures to be connected with its manufacture or sale.

We had no correspondence with any other gentleman in reference to that scale than Mr. Magness himself. After he received our letter of the 17th of June, he wrote to Mr. Gerald, the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, on the 10th of the same month, as follows:

In reply to your letter of the 7th ult., I beg leave to say that I hold a third interest in the Globe Machine Company, who own the Standard Grain Weigher; after my return from Ottawa our solicitor, T. J. Mathers, who is also solicitor for the Department of Justice, advised me to transfer my interest to him to hold in trust for me, which I have done, therefore, my name will not appear in any form when the company's Act of incorporation appears in the Manitoba 'Gazette.'

I intend to sell my interest in Canada at the first opportunity for anything like a fair price, which I cannot get now until the machine has proved itself in the field, which we will do this

fall ; then I know there will be parties ready to buy.

On the 7th of October last, Mr. Magness again wrote to the deputy minister, as follows :

Replying to your letter of the 7th of June, 1902, asking me to define my position re 'Standard Grain Weigher,' and my private letter replying thereto, I wish now to supplement or rather replace that letter :

I, therefore, beg to notify you that I have disposed of all my Canadian interest in that grain weigher, and am neither directly nor indirectly connected with its sale or in the profits arising therefrom.

I trust this may relieve the department of all the anxiety and annoyance my former connection in this matter may have engendered.

After we had this correspondence we wrote to the Globe Manufacturing Company, which I presume has supplied my hon. friend with a report and with the exchange of correspondence between Mr. Fyfe and the gentleman connected with that firm. The following message was sent to the Globe Manufacturing Company, Winnipeg, Manitoba :

Ottawa, May 29, 1903.

Please send department exact diagram or drawings of thresher scales as submitted to department.

W. J. GERALD.

The following answer came from the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company : —Give some address Globe Manufacturing Company. The following reply was sent to the Canadian Pacific Railway :

Address can be ascertained from R. Magness, inspector of weights and measures.

W. J. GERALD.

We received in reply from the Canadian Pacific Railway the following message :— 'Yours of the twenty-ninth to the Globe Manufacturing Company delivered.'

So that we were always under the impression in the department that Mr. Magness had something to do with the manufacturing of the scales, or rather that he was the inventor. But this is not the most important point. I may say, in passing, that we have never troubled Mr. Magness on account of his being the inventor, as we thought he was, but every hon. member will agree that it was preferable he should not inspect his own scales and that he should either stick to his invention or resign his position as inspector. But we never pressed him in that direction. The only correspondence that took place was for the purpose of informing him that if he was really the inventor and manufacturer and still retained some interest in the scale, it was not proper that he should inspect his own machine. With regard to the differences of opinion which might exist between our inspector and the gentleman who represented the interest of Mr. Magness, I have not much to say. I am not a practical man, and do not want to interfere between the two, but we have a report from Mr. Fyfe, who is considered not only a good practical man, but a man whose services as an expert have been utilized by large corporations such as the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. I do not suppose that my hon. friend would care to have to use a machine which could not be inspected according to the laws of the department, but we gave every facility to the Globe Manufacturing Company or anybody else to perfect a machine which would give satisfaction to everybody. This having failed, we thought that the best and surest way was to introduce legislation which, for a time at least, will remedy the evil of which the farmers of the west have complained. If we have not succeeded in placing on the statute-book a perfect law, we have done the best we could under the circumstances.

Mr. McCREARY. Was Mr. Higman in the employ of the department as chief inpector, and for what length of time, and what is his occupation now ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When we had no chief inspector, Mr. Higman used at times to inspect some of those scales, but he was never chief inspector of weights and measures. He was only chief electrician.

Mr. McCREARY. This matter is somewhat mixed up. In the correspondence I have before me, which took place between the solicitors of this weighing machine company and the department, I find a letter of June the 17th, 1902, written to Mr. Robert Magness, inspector of weights and measures, Winnipeg :

Ottawa, June 17, 1902.

I have the honour to inform you that the Standard Grain Weigher, manufactured by the Globe Manufacturing Company of Winnipeg, has been examined and tested by the department, and the same has been admitted to verification in Canada.

I have the honour to be,

O. HIGMAN,

There you have official information from the department, with the knowledge of the hon. minister, that the officer, who had for many years been the only chief inspector of weights and measures in Canada, notified these gentlemen who were interested in this machine that it had been admitted to verification. Subsequently that machine was brought down here to be inspected by the Manitoba and territorial members, and was found to be correct. But at a later date some new light apparently came on the department, a new light had arisen in Israel in the person of Mr. Fyfe, who went back on the statement of Mr. Higman, and gave a lot of technical reasons to show why the machine was not correct. He subsequently, in a communication which I have not before me, reflects on the members from Manitoba and the North-west, who advocated

this machine. Could they have done otherwise when they had the report of the highest official of the department that it was perfect ? Why does not Mr. Fyfe reflect on that official ? We have not heard the hon. minister say why that official was discharged or what he is doing now. But we have a verification of this machine—not by either one of these technically instructed men, men who were accustomed to see threshing done by the flail and weighed by the steelyard, and who know nothing about threshing as it is done on a large scale—but by farmers who have used it. I have letters from many of them, showing that this machine has done perfect work, and I would put their evidence every day against the evidence of men who have only technical knowledge. Another objection is that Mr. Magness was interested in the patent and should not be inspector. Well, if that were the case, it was the duty of the minister to dismiss him. As a matter of fact, I know that Mr. Magness had nothing to do with the patent. It is true that he acquired an interest in it, and if that was contrary to the rules of the department, the minister should have at once discharged him. I submit that this Bill should stand over, and if necessary we should have some farmers brought down here to give evidence under oath who have tested this machine. Ten or fifteen can be brought, and I think that any hon. gentleman will take their opinion, based on a practical test, in preference to that of Inspector Fyfe, with all his great ability.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have said already that Mr. Higman has never been chief inspector. I do not see why so much objection should be raised to this provision of the law, because it is only intended to allow the use of some machine. We are bound to do something, and, in order to enable Mr. Magness, or the Globe Manufacturing Company, or anybody else, to have the machine under their control or any other machine brought into use, we are introducing legislation in order that we may permit the use of any of these machines. Otherwise, they could not be legally used, unless we changed the whole law. This is a law of exceptions, it is a temporary law. I think that my hon. friend may be led into error in saying that Mr. Fyfe was discourteous to the hon. members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I do not so interpret his letter. The members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories were anxious that this machine should be supplied in order to be ready for last fall. What would be the result, even if farmers from Manitoba and the North-west were brought here to show that the machine was working well ? I do not say that it is not working well. But what I say is that, as the law is now it cannot be inspected ; and, in order to remedy that, and not to destroy the law entirely, I am now introducing a Bill by which that machine or any other may be used under certain conditions without inspection.

Mr. BOYD. Are there any special weighing machines at the present time in existence under license from the government?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have some. But a weighing machine is needed in the North-west Territories.

Mr. BOYD. I think that the evidence brought before the committee by the discussion that has taken place shows one thing very clearly—that through a spat, or misunderstanding, or whatever you call it, amongst the officers of the department over which the hon. gentleman presides, the farmers may suffer, or, rather, not the farmers, but those who have done five million dollars worth of work not a dollar of which they can legally collect for. And the correspondence brought down contains a letter from the chief inspector which was a gross piece of impertinence to the members of this House from Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The responsibility for that, if the truth were known, rested upon the minister himself and his officers, for the desire of the members from Manitoba and the North-west was not that any particular machine should be adopted—not at all. It was the minister and his officers that brought this machine to the attention of the members from Manitoba and the North-west. In order to relieve the situation, the members from Manitoba and the North-west were prepared to accept it. And then to have these imputations cast upon them by an employee, a man who we are paying, decidedly too much. But while he thought he was reflecting upon the members from Manitoba and the North-west, he was reflecting upon his own minister and his predecessor. As has been shown by the correspondence, Mr. Higman verified this machine. The minister, in his speech a little while ago said that Mr. Higman had done this without authority. But I have here the correspondence. Under date of June 3rd, Mr. Magness writes to the deputy minister :

> I wrote Mr. O. Higman on May 27, that it was important to me that he should make his report on the standard grain weigher presented by me to the department.

And, in the reply of the deputy minister, you will find this paragraph :

> I will bring the matter of thresher scale to Mr. Higman's attention as soon as he returns to Ottawa, and the stereo should be sent in as soon as possible.

Does the minister wish the committee to believe that Mr. Higman made the report without any suggestion from any other officer ? Was it not more likely that the matter was brought to his attention as the deputy minister said, and that, in pursuance of instructions given him, he inspected the machine and made the report read by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary).

And then, this man was brought in from Montreal and pitchforked over the heads of men who, I believe, and I am sure the majority of the officers of the department believe, were his superiors in their qualifications for dealing with this matter. And this man, when he comes in, says: I am going to do this thing myself; I am going to have a measuring machine that will measure which weighs about five hundred pounds and will hang on the top of the thresher twenty feet high. His action was enough to show that, as the hon. member for Selkirk said, while he could deal with matters involving flails and reaping hooks, he was utterly incompetent to comprehend the conditions under which the work must be done to-day. And the members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories whose constituents are suffering through this delay and this quarrel in the department, are supposed to stand by and wait.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) says that a reflection was cast upon the members from Manitoba and the North-west by this report. Let me read the portion of the report referred to, and I will leave it to the judgment of the House if there is in it any bad feeling or any manifestation of a desire to reflect on any hon. members of this House:

> The members who are fighting the battle for the 'Grain threshing scale' makers, do not seem to see that they are unknowingly occupying a false position, opposed to their own interests and to the interests of those they represent.

Mr. BOYD. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) and I may differ as to the capacity of this man, but I have stated, and I repeat, that he was not brought here because he came from Montreal, but he was brought here because he was recognized as the best man who could be found throughout the whole Dominion for this work. And if my hon. friend doubts that, if he will come to my office at any time I shall be glad to show him letters from the scale manufacturers and merchants, throughout the Dominion, men of both political parties, strongly recommending that Mr. Fyfe should be selected for this work. The letter goes on, still speaking of the members from Manitoba and the North-west:

> They have within reach an article that will meet the requirements of law, which can be made by any manufacturer without royalty, and yet they are trying to force upon the farmers of the North-west an inferior machine that is patented and exclusive property of one manufacturer.

So, Mr. Fyfe cautions the hon. members from Manitoba and the North-west against the danger of having only one machine, and tells them there is a machine all ready to their hands. And he says they should not compel the people to use or the department to inspect and verify a scale which is not complete according to the requirements of the law.

Mr. BOYD. Who introduced that machine to the attention of members of the House?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. Magness.

Mr. BOYD. Not at all, it was the Minister of Inland Revenue.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, we must not be mistaken. I have the whole correspondence here. Mr. Magness informed me that he was perfecting a machine which he thought might be inspected, and after he had submitted it to me, Mr. Higman, who I repeat has never been a chief inspector of weights and measures, asked Mr. Magness to come down with this machine in order to have it tested by a man of experience. Before that test was made, I presume the members of the North-west had examined it and found it satisfactory; still when we decided to inspect the machine, we called in the services of a man of experience. The objection is not against the machine itself. The real difficulty is to devise some means by which the farmers and the owners of the threshing machines may settle their difficulties without the intervention of a court. What would be the use of having a scale inspected which mighe be set aside by a court of justice, and thus multiply the expenses? We have done the best we could, and now we have come to the conclusion that, pending the time when we get a machine that will meet the requirements of the law, we had better introduce this legislation, which I hope will give relief to a certain extent.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, so long as we arrive at the desired end, I do not know that we need care just by what particular road the end is reached. I think the Bill will meet the object which we all have in view. It indirectly legalizes this machine which we are discussing, or any other machine on which the threshers and farmers may agree. I trust, therefore, that the Bill may pass. But I wish to endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) in regard to the attitude and action of this officer of the Inland Revenue Department. I am disposed to agree entirely with the minister, that Mr. Fyfe is an exceedingly clever gentleman; my own opinion is that he is too clever by half. I have read with some care the report that he has made regarding this automatic weighing device, and also the document that is at present in the possession of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Stewart) answering the objections made by Mr. Fyfe. In one paragraph of this report which has already been read to the House, he suggests that he has recommended one machine, and I would point out to the minister that in that ma-

chine which Mr. Fyfe himself suggests, there are some of the same defects that he contends exist in the other machine which he condemns. The paragraph of Mr. Fyfe's report which is complained of is the following :—

The members who are fighting the battle for the 'Grain Threshing Scale' makers, do not seem to see that they are unknowingly occupying a false position, opposed to their own interests and to the interests of those they represent. They have within reach an article that will meet the requirements of the law, which can be made by any manufacturer, without royalty, and yet they are trying to force upon the farmers of the North-west an inferior machine that is patented and exclusive property of one manufacturer.

The members from Manitoba and the North-west may perhaps be super-sensitive, but I am bound to say that I entirely agree with what has been said by my hon. friend from Macdonald with regard to this paragraph. Of course, we all know that there are men who think they can run other peoples' businesses better than those people themselves. I suppose it has always been the case that there are certain members of the civil service at Ottawa who think that they can govern this Dominion a great deal better than parliament, and that it would be a great deal better if parliament were abolished and the government were left in their own hands. That may be perfectly true, but so long as the people, under the constitution, elect representatives to frame legislation, I think it would be well for every minister of the Crown to see that the officers under him do not cast such reflections upon members of this House as are cast by this paragraph. So long as we are sent here as representatives of the people, I beg to say that we are under no obligation or necessity to put up with the insolence of language which this officer introduces in his report.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC PRINTING AND STATIONERY.

Bill (No. 182) to amend chapter 27 of the revised statutes respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery (the Minister of Justice) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick). The amendment is in the twentieth line in which the words 'not exceeding customary and fair commercial rates for similar work or supplies in similar quantities' are substituted for these words in the Act of 1893 'not exceeding that which would be charged for such printing' at the Printing Bureau. Under the Statute of 1893 authority was given to the government to have the printing which was required for the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway done elsewhere than at the Printing Bureau, and a provision was made in the Statute of 1893 that the cost of such printing should not exceed the cost at the Printing Bureau in Ottawa. That was found to be impracticable and as a result the work was always done at the printing offices in the maritime provinces at a cost exceeding the cost at which the work could be done at the Printing Bureau, and the King's Printer, Dr. Dawson, invariably certified the accounts as fair and reasonable. This went on from 1893 until November, 1902, when the Auditor General discovered that the certificates were not according to law, and as a result you will find a very protracted correspondence that was exchanged between the Printing Bureau and the Auditor General at page W—377 of the Auditor General's Report. The very minute the Auditor General objected to this certificate given by the King's Printer, the matter was referred to the Department of Justice, and we were obliged to report that the certificate was not sufficient under the statute, and that, while the custom had become almost equivalent to law, as objection had been taken by the Auditor General, there was nothing to do but to conform to the strict enforcement of the statute. As a result it has been found necessary to give statutory effect to the custom which has prevailed for years, and to substitute for the words in the old statute that at a cost not exceeding that which would be charged for such printing at the Printing Bureau ; these words 'at customary and fair commercial rates for similar work or supplies in similar quantities.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. Minister of Justice tell us what the average difference in cost is and what proportion of the stationery of the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway is done in offices other than the Printing Bureau ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) the difference in cost, but I can give the rates that are paid. In an Order in Council passed in December, 1893, the rates for this printing were established and I have the figures here. The Order in Council has attached to it a schedule of the prices allowed for printing, &c., done outside of the Printing Bureau for the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railways. These rates are as follows :—

Schedule of Prices allowed for printing, &c., done outside the Bureau for the Intercolonial Railway.

	Cents.
Composition, tabular..	70
Composition, plain..	35
Alterations from copy per hour.. ..	25

	Cents.
Press work, per token	25
Ruling per hour	40 & 50
Folding per 100	7 & 8
Gathering and stitching per 100	8
Pasting covers per 100	40
Perforating per 1,000	25
Padding, per pad of 100 (Av.)	2
Number, per 100	3
Paging, per 100	3

I cannot give the difference in cost between the two, but the superintendent drew my attention to the fact that a large portion of his work is the printing of tickets used on the railway and he says that to equip a department such as would be requred to have this work done would cost about $50,000, and that it would be necessary to have a room in which the officials would be kept apart and treated in the same way as the officials of the Bank Note Company are treated, because these tickets are equivalent to cash and they would be dealt with in that way. In addition to that my attention has been drawn, referring to the correspondence that was exchanged at the time this Order in Council was passed in 1893, to the fact that the Printing Bureau never have charged anything for capital, insurance, wear and tear and various other items that form a very considerable ingredient in the estimate of cost of work done in an ordinary commercial establishment. You have also to bear in mind that there are no customs duties to be paid in connection with work done at the Printing Bureau which would have to be charged in connection with the work done on an ordinary commercial basis. I am not able to give the difference in cost between the rates for work done in an ordinary printing office and in the Printing Bureau, because they have not done such work at the Printing Bureau and they do not know what it would cost. These are the difficulties which were pointed out when this course was adopted in 1893, and this course has since then proved perfectly fair and reasonable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think the amount to be paid should be in accordance with fair commercial rates, but if these fair commercial rates are somewhat higher than the rates charged at the Printing Bureau it would seem to be reasonable that this printing should be done at the Printing Bureau as far as possible. I can appreciate what the hon. minister says in regard to the tickets, but I should think that a large portion of the matter required by these railways could be printed at the Printing Bureau. The printing of forms and other printing of that character, I should think, could be done there because you know some time in advance how much you will require and there seems to be no reason why that should not be done in the Printing Bureau. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) could tell us what portion of the work is done in the Printing Bureau and what portion is done elsewhere.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I could not tell that very well at present. We are continuing the practice about on the same basis in that regard as it has been continued for a long period of years. The arrangement which my hon. friend the Hon. Minister of Justice says was made in 1893 was a well considered arrangement. It was reported upon and the views of the King's Printer were had on the subject. He argued the question, presented the reasons pro and con, the Auditor General agreed and it was submitted to the Governor in Council and approved of, and from that time down till November of last year the scale was continued uniformly and on the same basis and the printing was done at the various points along the route of the railway. The present action results from the view which the Auditor General took. I have not, in my mind, at the present moment, an accurate idea as to what portion of the printing is done in the Bureau and what portion outside. I would not like to state my view because I might fall short or exceed the fact, but I have no accurate idea of what portion of the printing is done in the Bureau or as to the difference between the charges, but the charges are based upon the rate which was adopted in 1893, and which has been uniformly continued for nine or ten years. I do know but that it is quite impossible to do a considerable portion of the work here. The distance is so great, and the necessity of sending the work back and forth for correction and so on, makes it impossible to do the work here with despatch. There are at present enough delays without needlessly increasing them. No public interest suffers by this. I would think that the clause which was decided upon after being well considered by the responsible and independent officers of the government in 1893, might very well be passed, as it is in this Bill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I wish to read from a letter written by the Controller of Stationery and Queen's Printer in 1893, when this legislation was first considered :

> In the case of items (as railway tickets and coupons) which have never been done at the Bureau the rates paid by other railways were ascertained and similar rates were allowed. This method was continued for the three months from January 1, 1893, to April 1. On that day a statute was passed providing that such railway printing as it might suit the convenience of the railway to have done elsewhere might be so done but that the price should not exceed that which would be charged for such printing at the Bureau.
>
> While the prices in the schedule above referred to are such as would be charged under the ordinary conditions of the trade, the charges made to the department of government by the Bureau do not include rent, interest on capital, taxes, customs duty, general management, light,

fuel. It therefore followed that, under one construction, the statute practically prohibited any work from being done outside the Bureau ; while the apparent intention of the Act was to do the very reverse ; for it seems to be contemplated by the Act that there is a class of printing which it suits the best interests of the railway to have performed upon the spot.

As respects the work done on tickets, he says :

As I have pointed out in my annual reports the Bureau is overcrowded with work during the session of parliament and there is not room enough in the building for the hands required. If a revision of the voters lists happens to coincide with a session of parliament the pressure is very much intensified. During the recess the work falls off and men are discharged, but the business of the Bureau is exceedingly uneven. The railway work, however, if done at the Bureau, would have to take precedence of all other work ; whether there be a session of the House or a revision of the lists going on ; for railway work is of such a nature that the utmost despatch is imperatively required. It would no doubt be easy to arrange that by extending the eastern wing of the Bureau ; and an estimate was made some time ago to do that when it was found that the cost would be about $50,000.

If my hon. friend will look at page W—339 of the Auditor General he will find that the cost of printing and lithographing for the Prince Edward Island Railway was $4,-698.19. I have not the returns for the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. PUTTEE. Where are the printing supplies obtained now ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As I understand it most of the tickets in use on railways in Canada are printed in Buffalo.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was under the impression they were printed by the Perrault Printing Company of Montreal, which it is said is well equipped for that business. I have not had occasion personally to have anything to do with it, so that I am not certain as to that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have been informed that nearly all the railway companies get their printing done in Buffalo because it cannot be done in Canada.

Mr. PUTTEE. As I understand it, the present law says that the Intercolonial Railway shall not pay higher rates for printing than the Government Printing Bureau at Ottawa could do the work for, and that this was not found to be practicable. The amendment is brought in so that the King's Printer may allow such just and reasonable rates as he thinks proper. That is the reason for the amendment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Partly.

Mr. PUTTEE. Does this refer to accounts which have already been incurred or to future work ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. To both.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are a number of printing bills unpaid since last November. They will not take the money that has been offered to them and at present if they do not do so they will get nothing.

On section 3,

Mr. PUTTEE. I suggest to the minister the striking out of the words 'with the approval of the minister,' so as to leave the Bureau under the control of a practical superintendent, who would carry it on the same as in an ordinary concern. I believe that involves the whole question of patronage in the Bureau, and that if these words be stricken out, political interference will be done away with and the Bureau operated with more profit and satisfaction to the country. Has the minister considered the striking out of these words ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, I have considered that. So long as we can have a King's Printer of the calibre of the gentleman at present occupying the office, I would feel perfectly safe, but no one can foretell what the future holds in store for us. I may safely say that there is no department connected with the government which is freer from political interference than the Department of Printing, but there must be some one responsible to this House, and that responsibility should rest on the shoulders of the minister. If you were to strike out these words it might mean that the House would hold the superintendent responsible. I think it is better that the responsibility should rest upon the minister.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Even with those words in I should think that the responsibility would be upon the minister.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I presume so, but a doubt might be occasioned.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would depend upon whether the general provision of the statute declared that this department was under the control of the Secretary of State.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I assumed that the general statute did that. It would not be the case if there was not a general statute to that effect.

Mr. PUTTEE. Is it not a fact that the Superintendent of Printing has practically no discretion at all in the employment or discharge of the employees in the Bureau, but that the minister alone, subject to all the pressure that is brought to bear upon him, puts in or takes out any that he pleases ? Is it not a fact that people who go to work in that Bureau can absolutely defy the officers of the Bureau ; that there is no officer there who has any power to discharge a man ; that if a man does not

do the work at all, or whether he is competent or not, or even if he appears there regularly under the influence of liquor, no one in the Bureau can discharge him ? This I think, is involved in that question of having the approval of the minister ; everything is involved in that. I do not wish the minister to understand me in any way to criticise the present Superintendent of Printing. I quite agree with him that if we could be sure of having such a Superintendent there in the future, it would be wise to give him full control ; but I do not think that even the present King's Printer is the only one, and that he can never have a successor. When the time comes, I think the minister will be able to choose just as competent and worthy a Superintendent of Printing as we have at the present time. I make this suggestion, because I believe it would do away with a good deal of the trouble which the government has had to shoulder lately in connection with the Printing Bureau.

On the schedule,

Order in Council.

On a report, dated 27th November, 1893, from the Secretary of State, stating that, with a view to prevent any unreasonable increase to the cost of work by gradual accretions to the rates of wages paid at the Printing Bureau, it is expedient to lay down the principle that the rates of wages paid to the operatives employed should be based upon the current rates for similar work throughout the Dominion, and that, for more special guidance to the officers of the department, it is advisable to order that the rates of wages in the cities of Montreal and Toronto shall, for the future, be taken as a standard not to be exceeded.

Mr. PUTTEE. May I ask the minister, has this been observed in the past ? Is that what is governing there now ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I understand that the rule laid down by the Order in Council has been strictly observed up to the present time.

Mr. PUTTEE. Of course, the minister knows that there has been a good deal of difference of opinion as to what are the rates of wages in the cities of Montreal and Toronto. There is no agreement on that subject at all, and I would like to know whether he has any plan of ascertaining what are the rates of wages in those two cities ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Surely it ought to be possible for a practical printer to ascertain what are the rates prevailing in a printing establishment in Montreal or Toronto.

Mr. PUTTEE. It is, as a matter of fact, a very hard question to determine, because there is a difference between the two cities in that respect. Toronto has a higher wage scale, so far as printing is concerned, than Montreal. But I think the point to be determined here is, what is to be taken as the rate of wages ? Is it the average rate ? If so, how is that average rate to be ascertained ? I would suggest that the city of Ottawa be included, or else that only one city be taken. As a matter of fact, you cannot get the average of three cities, because there would be no fair basis. If there is to be any real attempt to carry out the idea of this clause, it should be amended by adding that this rate shall be ascertained by the fair wage officer once every year or once every two years ; otherwise there is no way of being sure what is the current rate. Now, I am aware what this question involves, because it has been discussed lately. It is claimed that the men in the Bureau are getting higher wages than those which prevail in Montreal, in Toronto, or in Ottawa. It is claimed, without any proof being brought forward, that they are getting more than the union rate of wages in those cities. Most people who know very little about trades organizations maintain that a union fixes a rate of wages which every body must get—a maximum rate. In the printing business this is altogether wrong. The union only sets a minimum rate. I believe the minimum rate in Montreal is $12 a week. The current rate for competent men is far above that. There are plenty of men in the city of Montreal to-day getting twice what the union calls for. In the city of Toronto, I believe the minimum rate is $12.50. The current average rate would be about $15. Whether the minister recognizes the fact or not, the ascertaining of the rates in either of these cities is a very complicated question. In the Bureau at the present time there is a flat rate for every man, whether he is competent or not. The government have put in force that very principle which we object to in trades organizations, that a flat rate should be enforced, that ability should not be worth more than non-ability. At the present time the rate is higher than the minimum rate in either Montreal or Toronto. At the same time, if this provision is to go into effect, it should be understood whether it is the current average rate or the current minimum rate that is to be fixed, and some machinery should be provided for ascertaining the rate. The rates of wages in Montreal and Toronto have been gradually rising. In Toronto they are lower to-day than they should be, because two years ago the employers and employees signed a scale covering three years, and, although they are loyally standing by that agreement, yet, as a matter of fact there are very few men getting as low a rate as the agreement calls for. Therefore, I am sure that the minister will see that it is by no means definitely settled what the rates are in those two cities. Then there is this other fact, that the two cities differ materially. They have never had the same basis. Toronto has been never so low down as the city of Montreal. Again the institution to which this will apply is

not like any in either of those cities, and whether higher or lower, the rate should be fixed on the average actually prevailing.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The way we fix prices in Montreal is this: The employers and the printers talk the matter over. The employers discuss the prices with the leaders of the union, and these prices are fixed for the year. The agreement binds both parties, and either party has a right to put an end to it by giving so many months notice. I believe that that is a very fair way of settling things. We have no trouble whatever with our men. The men employed in the office with which I am connected are all union men. Their wages are fixed in the way I have pointed out, and I do not see why the same process should not be followed here. The King's Printer occupies the position of employer in any office where union men are employed. I believe that the way I have pointed out is a very fair way and that my hon. friend is taking a wrong standpoint. Let the men and the employers come together as closely as they can. One reason why there is no trouble between employers and printers is because we have daily relations together. I suppose that I see the men employed in my office ten times a day, I am glad to see them and they are not sorry to see me. We have one man who has been with us for twenty-five years, and who is counted as one of ourselves. My hon. friend is taking a wrong stand in asking for an outside party. Although I recognize the ability of some of the men in the Labour Bureau, I think that the best and most rational way is to have the employers and employees settle wages and their business relations together. That is what is done in Montreal. If my hon. friend will do us the pleasure to come and see us, he will find harmony and amity and good will between employers and employees. Again, I ask why the same process, which is successfully carried out in Montreal, should not be carried out here? My hon. friend takes a standpoint which is not right.

Mr. PUTTEE. Is the hon. gentleman referring to me or the minister?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am referring to my hon. friend just opposite. Let the King's Printer discuss prices with the recognized leaders of the men. If union men have to be employed in the Bureau, as they are in all the offices in Montreal, I do not see any reason why the King's Printer and the men should not live in peace and harmony.

Mr. PUTTEE. My hon. friend is mistaken in referring to me as wishing to go out to a third party. I object to this Bill because it goes out to a third party. It goes out to find the rates of wages in other cities. If that is to be followed there should be a rule laid down as to how it is to be carried out and what rate you are to find out whether a minimum or current rate. I think the hon. member for St. Mary's is mixing me up with the minister.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, I think if things were pushed to a right conclusion, there would be no necessity for a scale of wages at all, because it seems to me that the employees of the Printing Bureau should be placed on the very same basis as ourselves. There is no reason why they should be better treated and have less working hours, and there is no reason why they should be put on a better footing than printers elsewhere. Elsewhere we do not call upon anybody to discuss wages with our men, and we and our men are working in great harmony, indeed.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is there any difference in the scale of wages? I understood by the Ottawa papers that the strike in the Bureau was uncalled for, because the printers got more wages than the same class of men on the city papers. Is that the case or is it not?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot tell what is paid by the city papers. But I may say that the wages paid at the Bureau are higher than those paid at the city offices. There are also advantages connected with employment at the Printing Bureau that outside men do not enjoy. The minimum rate of wages paid at the Printing Bureau per week is $13.50 for forty-eight hours' work.

Mr. INGRAM. What class of men is that?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I apprehend that the best men are paid higher wages than the minimum rates, and in addition they have the following holidays, for which they are paid: New Year's Day, Good Friday, Queen's Birthday, Dominion Day, Labour Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day. In addition they are frequently granted holidays, such as a half a day during exhibition week or on other special occasions.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the maximum rate?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not know. I asked about the rate, and I received from the King's Printer a rather interesting reply. He said that if any person not familiar with the practical work of a printer will allow himself to be drawn into a discussion on such a highly technical matter as rates of wages and of classes of work, he would be as helpless as an ordinary layman would be in discussing points of law in the company of lawyers.

Mr. COCHRANE. He does not know as much about lawyers as we do in this House.

Mr. INGRAM. It would be interesting if we had the rates of wages paid all the men.

I think we would find some paid at $1.50 per week.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think that there are some boys from twelve to thirteen years old employed to carry paper from one room to another at a dollar and a half a week.

Mr. INGRAM. Are there not girls employed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is not in my department ?

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE DESJARDINS CANAL.

Bill (No. 183) respecting the Desjardins canal (the Minister of Justice) read the second time and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This Bill is fully explained by the recitals and by the statement of the hon. minister with regard to it on its first reading.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). It was explained more fully by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). It is an involved complicated question and he understands it better than I do.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 184) to amend the Patent Act (the Minister of Agriculture) read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

1. The deputy commissioner of patents may do any act or thing, whether judicial or ministerial, which the commissioner of patents is authorized or empowered to do by any provision of the Patent Act (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) or by any Act in amendment thereof; and, in the absence of the deputy commissioner and person performing the duties of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture pursuant to section 14 of the Civil Service Act may, as acting deputy commissioner, do any such act or thing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the provision of the Civil Service Act here referred to ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). It is that council may appoint a chief clerk to act for and do the work of the deputy commissioner, and consequently it applies to the portion of this clause which refers to the acting commissioner.

On section 2,

The section substituted for section 8 of the said Act, by section 1 of chapter 24 of the statutes of 1892, is amended by striking out all the words after the word 'inventor' in the thirteenth line thereof.

Notwithstanding anything contained in said section 8, or in the said substituted section, no Canadian patent heretofore issued shall be deemed to have expired before the end of the term for which it was granted merely because of the expiry of a foreign patent for the same invention.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the effect of this ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This affects one of the most important provisions of the present law. If the hon. member will refer to the present Act he will find :

Under any circumstances the existence of the Canadian patent shall expire at the earliest date on which the foreign patent of the same invention expires.

This has been the law in Canada for many years, and it was for some years the law in both England and the United States. Both those countries have repealed that provision of their law, and in consequence many cases of hardship have arisen to our own inventors. It is intended to make the life of a Canadian patent entirely independent of the life of the same patent in a foreign country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the object of inserting these words in the first instance ? I understand that this provision which is being struck out of this section does not now exist in Great Britain and the United States.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In England it was repealed in 1893 and in the United States in 1897. In a general way the patent office of the United States has quite approved of this, and has found its operation more satisfactory. The patent solicitors of Canada are all in favour of it, as well as the patentees. I may say also that last year an eminent authority on patent law in Great Britain, Mr. Lloyd Wise, stated that the working out of this change in the British law was eminently satisfactory, and strongly recommended us to do the same.

On subsection 2 of section 2,

Nothwithstanding anything contained in the said section 8, or in the said substituted section no Canadian patent heretofore issued shall be deemed to have expired before the end of the term for which it was granted merely because of the expiry of a foreign patent for the same invention.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will there be any difficulty in connection with patents that are supposed to have expired, and which have therefore been used generally in this country ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have later on in this Act a section which preserves all rights acquired. In section 14 it is provided that any acquired rights under

such expiry as the hon. gentleman alludes to shall be protected.

On section 4,

Every patent granted under the said Act shall, unless otherwise ordered by the commissioner as hereinafter provided, be subject and expressed to be subject to the following conditions :—

(a.) Such patent and all the rights and privileges thereby granted shall cease and determine, and the patent shall be null and void at the end of two years from the date thereof, unless the patentee or his legal representatives, within that period or an authorized extension thereof, commence, and after such commencement continuously carry on in Canada, the construction or manufacture of the invention patented, in such a manner that any person desiring to use it may obtain it, or cause it to be made for him at a reasonable price, at some manufactory or establishment for making or constructing it in Canada ;

(b.) If, after the expiration of twelve months from the granting of a patent, or an authorized extension of such period, the patentee or patentees, or any of them, or his or their or any of their legal representatives, for the whole or a part of his or their or any of their interest in the patent, imports or import or causes or cause to be imported into Canada, the invention for which the patent is granted, such patent shall be void as to the interest of the person or persons so importing or causing to be imported.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are one or two verbal changes only, but they do not in any way change the sense. The first strikes out the words 'or his assignee' in subsection A of section 4, these words being superfluous. The word 'any' is changed to 'an' because it is clear under the judgment of the Supreme Court that only one exception can be granted. The same changes are made in paragraph B, but the sense is not changed.

On section 7,

On the application of the applicant for a patent, previous to the issue thereof, or on the application within six months after the issue thereof, or on the application within six months after the issue of the patent of the patentee or his legal representatives, or on the application within six months hereafter of the owner of any patent heretofore issued and now in force or by this Act revived, the commissioner, having regard to the nature of the invention, may order that such patent, instead of being subject to the condition set forth in paragraph (a) of section four of this Act, shall be subject to the following conditions, that is to say :—

(a.) Any person, at any time while the patent continues in force, may apply to the commissioner by petition for a license to make, construct, use and sell the patented invention, and the commissioner shall, subject to general rules to be made for carrying out this section, hear the person applying and the owner of the patent, and if he is satisfied that the reasonable requirements of the public in reference to the invention have not been satisfied by reason of the neglect or refusal of the patentee or his legal representatives to make, construct, use or sell the invention, or to grant licenses to others on reasonable terms to make, construct, use or sell the same, may make an order under his hand and the seal of the patent office requiring the owner of the patent to grant a license to the person applying therefor, in such form, and upon such terms as to the duration of the license, the amount of the royalties, security for payment, and otherwise, as the commissioner, having regard to the nature of the invention and the circumstances of the case, deems just ;

(b.) The commissioner may, if he thinks fit, and shall on the request of either of the parties to the proceedings, call in the aid of an assessor, specially qualified, and hear the case wholly or partially with his assistance ;

(c.) The existence of one or more licenses shall not be a bar to an order by the commissioner for, or to the granting of, a license on any application, under this section ; and

(d.) The patent and all rights and privileges thereby granted shall cease and determine, and the patent shall be null and void, if the commissioner makes an order requiring the owner of the patent to grant any license, and the owner of the patent refuses or neglects to comply with such order within three calendar months next after a copy of it is addressed to him or to his duly authorized agent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this legislation founded upon legislation in any other country, or is it entirely new ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is practically identical with legislation which has been adopted in England recently. Mr. Lloyd Wise has worked out the problem, has submitted his conclusions to the parliament of Great Britain and has recommended them to us. I may say that the reason why this legislation seems to be necessary at the present time is that the Supreme Court decided that a patentee, being prepared to supply the goods in Canada on demand was not sufficient justification for the life of a patent. Until that decision of the Supreme Court, the patent officer had always held and the courts had also held that if a patentee was ready to supply the goods but did not manufacture them his patent remained valid. After the decision of the Supreme Court in December last in the case of Powell vs. Griffin, I think it was, it is evident that the practice of the department and these rulings of the courts were not sustained, and today, if the patentee does not actually manufacture or produce the article in Canada within a certain time his patentee becomes null and void. There are classes of patents under which it is practically impossible for the patentee to produce or manufacture the article in Canada. One of these classes refers to an article of great construction, a class of articles or things of which practically only one or two would be constructed in the country. For instance there is a graving dock or a lift lock, such as has recently been constructed on the canal, or an elevator, things that are patentable but the use of which is very rare, and to require that a patent shall expire if it has not been made use of and the thing has not been constructed in the country is certainly an in-

justice and is destroying the object and aim of the patent law of encouraging inventors to invent these things and get them patented. This Bill provides machinery by which, when the patentee has such a patent as that, he can apply to the commissioner and protect himself without actually constructing the thing or getting it constructed because he makes provision by which, if it is required in the country, it can be constructed, and this section puts into the hands of the commissioner of patents the entire control of the terms and conditions under which construction shall be carried out under a reasonable and fair basis to both the patentee and the person who wishes to use the patent. There is another class of patents which would come under this provision and that is the class called patents of processes, for instance, a patent for using a chemical process in manufacture. This is a class of patents which cannot be used unless the industry in which these processes are supposed to be useful is carried on in the country. If it is carried on and if the people who are carrying it on desire to use a patent such as this, then and then only, would the patentee be in a position to put the process into operation or sell his patent. Now, this thing is entirely out of the control of the patentee and it seems to me that it would be unreasonable that this patent should lapse and become void under such circumstances. That patent would also come under the provisions of this section; and enable the patentee to apply to come in under that clause and this enables the commissioner to control the arrangement under which he would retain his patent and provide proper facilities in the country for its use.

Mr. INGRAM. The commissioner has the right to extend the time beyond the two years ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The extension of time is the same under this clause as it is under the clauses of the other Act.

Mr. INGRAM. If the patent is not called into use within a reasonable time the commissioner would have power to extend the time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The commissioner does not require to extend the time under this clause. The extensions of time to which the hon. gentleman refers could only apply to patents which did not come under the provisions of this clause and there is no change with regard to that.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 7,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood from the minister that subsection (a) of this Act was intended to give relief to the patentee with respect to certain articles that could only be manufactured from time to time for a special purpose. On looking at the section I cannot quite see that it has that effect. Suppose that no one makes this application to the commissioner in what way is the patentee relieved. It cannot be a relief to the patentee unless some one applies, and the statute surely does not presume that he shall appoint some one to collusively apply.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When the patentee has made that application and it has been sanctioned by the commissioner, then the patent shall not be void from neglect to manufacture, sell or construct the article patented. The first part of the clause is really the important one and the remaining portions simply provide for the machinery. If the patentee was allowed to come in under this clause and then was allowed to make his own bargain with the licensee he could practically nullify the public interest in the patent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is perfectly clear.

On section 19, validity of certain extensions heretofore granted,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This clause is for the purpose of making valid certain patents which, in the judgment of the Supreme Court, have been practically declared to be null and void. The reason for this proposal to make them valid is that their becoming invalid was due to the wrong construction of the law by the department and by previous judgments, which wrong construction was in no sense the fault of the patentees. They fulfilled the law as it was read by the department and by the courts until the judgment of the Supreme Court was delivered last December. We therefore propose to render such patents valid.

On section 10, condition of validity of certain patents heretofore granted,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this provision new ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is to render valid certain patents the owners of which followed the judgment of the department delivered in the case of Barter vs. Smith in 1877, and it has always been the ruling of the department that patentees were not obliged actually to construct or furnish the invention, but that they should always hold themselves ready to do so. That reading was held to be within the necessities of the law, the department had decided a case in that sense in 1877, and it had always been acted upon since. Consequently, the department was, so to speak, particeps criminis if on that account a patent became invalid. This section will reinstate those patents which have become technically invalid by reason of this new interpretation of the law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the order referred to in subsection (b) to be granted upon a hearing ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This applies to existing patents which have had no opportunity up to the present to come under this licensing clause. We now give them six months to come under the licensing clause, just as in the case of new patents under section 7.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are there any words which require judicial determination ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. According to section 7, when the applicant makes application to have his patent put under the licensing clause instead of under the ordinary terms of the Act, the commissioner has to determine whether it is such a patent as ought to come under the licensing clause. After it has been so adjudged by the commissioner, he will issue an order for a license. In this case, under section 10, the same rule of procedure is followed, and existing patents which are allowed six months within which to come under the licensing clause, will have to be dealt with by the commissioner in exactly the same way as new applications for patents to be placed under the licensing clause. Under section 52 of the general Act the commissioner may make, subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council, the rules and regulations necessary for the purposes of this Act.

On section 11,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is to remove a difficulty in connection with section 39 of the general Act. It is contended by some parties that the $4 is not an additional over and above the usual fee for renewing the patent, and we want to make it clear that it is.

On section 12,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is to provide that applications for patents shall not be open to public inspection, and thus be exempted from the general provision that all papers connected with patents are opened to public inspection. The whole value of a patent may depend on the application being kept secret.

On section 13,

Notwithstanding anything in the said Act contained, in the case of any application to the commissioner made within the time prescribed by the said Act or by this Act, and pending on the 9th day of April, one thousand nine hundred and three, or of any such application thereafter made within such time, for an extension of time to construct or manufacture a patented invention or to import it into Canada, the commissioner may, until the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and four, grant such extension after the time so prescribed, and any extension so granted shall have the same effect as if granted within the time so prescribed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This requires some explanation. A case came before the department not long ago of an application made for an extension of the time within which to manufacture in the country. It has been usual in the department, where there was no opposition filed, to grant such extensions of time on the mere statement of the applicant. In this case there was an opposition, the case was discussed and the opposing views were represented before the commissioner. Eventually the case was referred to the Department of Justice, and that department gave a written opinion that no extension of time should be granted unless valid arguments were given in the application, and unless it was shown that it was absolutely proper to grant the extension, and the patentee was prevented by circumstances beyond his control from manufacturing within the specified time. This was an entirely new practice, but, with the written opinion of the Department of Justice to that effect, it is understood we must change our practice, and, for the future, only grant extensions of time when such cause is shown. It has been the practice for people to come asking for extension of time within a week or two of the date of expiry of their term. In many cases, where the patentee lives at a distance, it would be physically impossible for him to have his application returned with an explanation of what was required, and come back within the time required for proper consideration. We, therefore, ask that the commissioner be allowed until the 1st of January next to concede such application, even if the concession is granted a little while after the time specifically allowed. We believe that by the 1st of January the new practice in the department will be well known and all such applicants will have an opportunity of making their application well within that period. This is a mere concession in consequence of the change of the practice in the department.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the hon. minister if he has received any complaint with regard to any of these clauses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed by my deputy that there has been none. I may say for the information of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that this has been fully discussed with the patent solicitors of the country, the Department of Justice, and a number of the patentees who are interested in large patents, and it is quite in accord with their desires. At the same time, we have tried to safeguard the public interest and prevent any unjust discrimination.

On section 14,

In the case of any patent which has heretofore become void or the validity of which might heretofore have been impeached, and which is revived or protected from impeachment by any provision of this Act, any person who has, be-

tween the time when such patent became void or when the ground for such impeachment arose, and the time of the passing of this Act, commenced to manufacture, use or sell in Canada the invention covered by such patent, may continue to manufacture, use or sell in as full and ample a measure as if this Act had not been passed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is a saving clause to protect acquired rights. I may say to my hon. friend from West Toronto that my deputy informs me that there was one protest which came in lately against the provisions of this particular clause. This is the only protest of any kind we have had against any provision of the Act. This Act makes valid and legal some patents which have become void. In this clause we seek to provide that any rights which have been acquired during the invalidity of these patents shall be maintained and conserved.

Mr. CLARKE. Does this mean acquired rights by reason of patentees' neglect ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not that ; but patentees have been at fault in complying with the law. By the decision of the Supreme Court in December last it was found that patentees had not complied with the law and that their patents are null and void. Under this Act we make those patents valid, re-enacting them. During the period when they were invalid certain rights may have been acquired——

Mr. CLARKE. By other parties ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. We do not know that they have been, but they may have been. Under this section we protect any such rights.

Mr. CASGRAIN. May I ask that this Bill be allowed to stand in committee on section 7 until to-morrow or the day after ?

Progress reported.

PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 193) to amend the Public Works Act (the Minister of Public Works) was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Section 13 of the Public Works Act, chapter 36 of the Revised Statutes, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :—

The minister shall invite tenders, by public advertisement, for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in cases in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department, or in cases where the estimated cost of the work is less than $5,000, and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What change would this effect in the law ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). After the word 'Department' in the twelfth line, we have added :

Or in cases where the estimated cost of the work is less than $5,000 it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

I have not the Order in Council under which the department has been acting for many years, but I understand from the Deputy minister that it is a copy of the Order in Council which, in some cases, that were referred to by the Auditor General, it was decided was ultra vires, and we have not power under the Act to pass such an order. It would be impossible almost to manage the affairs of the department without such a provision as this. I have adopted the provision, because it was the manner in which the department had been working for so long. Those words are added to the present clause, and I thought it was better to re-enact the whole clause.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then the Order in Council which has been held to be beyond the powers of the Governor in Council contained provisions such as are proposed to be enacted in the remaining words of this section ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of it ? In the first place, you have power in cases where delays would be dangerous to the public interest. In the second place, you have power where the nature of the work is such that it can be more expeditiously and economically executed; then you are taking power in the third place, where the estimated cost is less than $5,000, and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders. What would be the scope of that in actual practice ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The first applies more particularly to cases of injury by floods, or fire, or unforeseen circumstances; the second and particularly third cases, apply almost altogether to cases where the amounts would be small, and in cases where it would be impossible for the officers of the department to prepare specifications.

Mr. COCHRANE. Did not the minister have that power where it is under $5,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. And this will cover a case where accidents might happen on a canal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the intention.

Mr. COCHRANE. The old Act covered a case like that, no matter what the ex-

pense was. Where unforeseen accidents happened you had the power to repair them at once ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is perfectly right. The Act does not provide for this, but it was thought it did, and an Order in Council was based upon it. I do not know why the amount was fixed at $5,000. It is like all other privileges that are given the department, it might be abused. But the intention is to allow the department latitude in dealing with these small matters. The minister will have to be responsible for any abuse of this power. I have talked the matter over with the deputy minister, and no other suggestion was made that would answer the purpose any better.

Mr. HENDERSON. Suppose a case where a public work would probably cost $20,000, and an appropriation of $5,000 is first asked for by the minister and expended, then next year the work is continued, and a further appropriation is obtained and that has been expended, then another appropriation of $5,000 is obtained, and so on until the work is completed. Now, does the minister consider that under this Bill he would have power to do all this work without asking for public tenders, or, it being a work that would cost the country $20,000, he would not feel under an obligation to call for public tenders ? If the Minister of Public Works could divide up the undertaking and continue it over year after year, there would be no difficulty in expending a very large sum of money without public tenders. I would like to know what the minister's views are on that question ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Speaking for myself, I should say that for a minister to proceed with a work as the hon. gentleman has put it, would be a straight violation of the spirit of the Act. I would not think of facing the House after having acted as he puts the case. The intention is that the minister shall have the power I have explained, and no more. If he undertook a work that would cost a large amount of money, and let it in small pieces year after year, I would look upon that as a subterfuge.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There does not seem to be any special reason why a wharf or public work costing less than $5,000 should not be performed by public tender, just as it would be performed by tender if it cost $20,000. The criticism I would be inclined to make upon this section is that it is rather too general in its terms. It gives to the minister an absolute discretion as to all sums under $5,000, and yet it seems to me that there is just as much reason for spending some of those sums by public tender as larger sums. Of course, I understand that in case of repairs where you cannot tell how much they will cost before beginning the work, perhaps it would be well to give the minister even a little more latitude than he has here ; whereas in cases of a new piece of work where no reason exists why a tender should not be called for, I think perhaps it would be better in the public interest that he did not have this discretion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not for a minute propose, nor do we now take advantage of this provision of $5,000, to defeat the spirit of the Act by not advertising for tenders. I think during the last month we have had several works under $5,000, and in every case they have been advertised for. I have had cases myself of accidents by storms where the amount required in the long run was over $5,000, and I have come to parliament and explained the conditions. So long as the minister keeps within the intention of the Act and advertises for public tenders for all works, there can be no danger.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

ACT RESPECTING INFECTIOUS OR CONTAGIOUS DISEASES AFFECTING ANIMALS.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 194) respecting infectious or contagious diseases affecting animals.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I must call attention to the fact that this Bill, the second reading of which is now moved, and several others which have been inscribed with the Orders of the Day, have not yet been printed into French. I must call the attention of the government to that fact, although we do not wish to delay the work of the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) objects to going on with this Bill. Of course, if there is any objection we cannot go on, but perhaps the hon. gentleman would allow us to proceed in committee and then if it is desirable the Bill can stand for further consideration.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am calling the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that we are reserving our rights.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. Minister of Agriculture intend to carry this Bill through its second reading and also the committee stage to-night ? I think we are proceeding too rapidly in regard to a Bill of this kind. I am quite satisfied that there are people in the country who ought to be consulted and only to-day had I the opportunity of sending a copy of the Bill to men who are interested in the breeding of cattle, with a view of getting information in regard to

it. I think an opportunity should be given to allow members to hear from their constituents as to what they think of the Bill. There will be abundance of time even if it lies over for a week. I have no objection to proceeding a certain stage, but do not press the Bill to its conclusion to-night so that an opportunity will be afforded for further discussion.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The Bill is not distributed here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, I have a copy.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I certainly have no disposition to press the Bill to a conclusion. If hon. gentlemen do not object to going into committee and discussing it, we can leave it in committee until such time as they have an opportunity of making inquiries. Perhaps the discussion upon it might elicit points upon which hon. gentlemen can get further information and be in a better position to discuss the Bill at a later stage.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Now that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has arrived with those papers, I suppose there is no object in objecting to this Bill going on.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The cat is out of the bag.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Why do you not go into Committee of Supply ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are not ready for it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We are ready for it.

Mr. INGRAM. They do not want supply.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In explanation of this section, I may say there are one or two slight amendments. For instance, in subsection (b) the expression 'foreign animals,' means animals not already introduced into Canadian territory outside of quarantine. The intention is that animals in quarantine are to be termed 'foreign animals' until they are released from quarantine. In the original Act they were not termed so.

On section 3,

Every owner of animals and every breeder of or dealer in animals, and every one bringing animals into Canada, shall, on perceiving the appearance of infectious or contagious disease among the animals owned by him or under his special care, give immediate notice to the minister and to the nearest veterinary inspector of the Department of Agriculture, of the facts discovered by him as aforesaid.

2. Any veterinary surgeon practising in Canada shall, immediately on ascertaining that an animal is labouring under an infectious or contagious disease, give similar notice to the minister and to the nearest veterinary inspector.

3. Every person neglecting to give notice as required by this section shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars.

Mr. McGOWAN. Does this section affect animals in transit through Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, if an animal passing through Canada in transit, or at the time of entry, has a contagious or infectious disease, notice must be immediately given to the Minister of Agriculture and the nearest veterinary inspector of the department, of that fact. The old Act required that notice should be given to the Minister of Agriculture, but not to the nearest veterinary inspector.

Mr. CARGILL. Does it apply to American export cattle going through in bond, and which are shipped by way of Dominion ports ?

Mr. McGOWAN. There are a great many cattle coming and going through Canada. It seems to me that these cattle should be subject to inspection and if there is any disease that the provisions of the Act should be applied.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These cattle will be subject to this provision and if disease is found amongst them the owner must immediately notify the Minister of Agriculture and the nearest veterinary inspector. My hon. friend asks whether it would apply to animals in bond. That is a legal question that I would not like to give an opinion upon, but it likely would. Animals in bond are not in bond as far as contagious diseases are concerned.

Mr. CARGILL. Will the government have an inspector at Toronto for the purpose of examining and reporting upon these cattle, because the parties owning them, if the animals are affected by disease, would not be likely to report ? In that case will some official notify the minister ? The person in charge of these cattle will not be likely to give that notice.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The railways are obliged to give notice to the department.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Is there an inspector at all ports where American cattle come in ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We know that this trade only applies to certain ports and at these ports we have inspectors. The customs collectors are bound to call a veterinarian in any case of suspicion, but since the quarantine arrangement was made between us and the United States we have not inspectors at all ports.

Mr. GILMOUR. Are the cattle which come through in bond and which are fed in Toronto, inspected on the frontier, or only when they come to Toronto, or are they in-

spected at all ? The present system of feeding this cattle at Toronto is a most dangerous one. We have little opportunity to know whether these American animals are free from disease or not. They are fed and watered in the Toronto yards, and then young cattle are taken into the same pens and purchased there and distributed throughout Ontario. It is in my opinion the most dangerous thing in connection with our cattle trade. It is, I should think, impossible to know when diseased American cattle may come upon the scene.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These United States cattle coming through in bond are all certified at the point of starting by the United States inspectors as being sound for export. They are allowed out in the pens at Toronto just like our own cattle and they are watched by the railway authorities who are obliged to report in case of disease. We must remember that this quarantine arrangement is only in existence so long as the United States is a healthy country, and when disease appeared in the New England states a short time ago we closed our frontier against New England cattle. We would do the same in case there was disease in the Western states. This quarantine arrangement has been in existence for six years and there has not been a single instance where the disease was traced to these cattle.

Mr. GILMOUR. It is a great pity that these American cattle cannot be examined before they cross the frontier. It would be a most unfortunate thing should disease break out in our country, because the result would be that we could not ship our cattle at all, and as we have no dead meat trade our cattle business would be paralyzed. Too much care cannot be taken in this matter. There is no way in which disease can be so easily introduced as by the existing arrangement. I trust that the minister will take every precaution.

Mr. McGOWAN. I wish to emphasize what my hon. friend (Mr. Gilmour) has said in reference to this. It would be most lamentable if disease were introduced into Canada by these cattle passing through in bond. The farmers of Ontario buy their stockers on the Toronto market, and if our animals should catch disease in these pens our whole cattle trade would be destroyed. I would like to impress upon the minister that there should be some inspection of these American cattle at the Toronto yards.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Does the minister know that all these cattle are inspected at the point of embarkation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They have to be certified by the United States authorities.

Mr. GILMOUR. But not by the Canadian authorities.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, We have a mutual arrangement by which we accept United States inspection and they accept ours; we having the same privileges to send cattle in bond to the United States as they have through Canada. No one would be more willing than I to safeguard our cattle.

Mr. GILMOUR. I know that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am perfectly satisfied that there is no danger because there is no disease in these states.

Mr. GILMOUR. When the minister says there is no disease in these states, it must be remembered that it is hard to tell where these cattle come from to Chicago. They may be from Texas, Mexico or a great many other states. I do not know whether these cattle are disembarked at other places than Toronto or Montreal, but it would seem to me that it would be most desirable that they should be fed and watered at some other point than the Toronto stock yards, even if it cost some expense to the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These cattle could not come from Texas or Mexico——

Mr. GILMOUR. I suppose that is so, but at all events they come from a very wide territory surrounding Chicago.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. The hon. gentleman mentioned Texas and Mexico, but these are countries which are infected with disease and we do not allow their cattle to come in at all. The United States authorities themselves do not allow cattle to pass from Mexico through New Mexico and Texas north of a line whch runs somewhere near the boundary of Missouri, and which is known as the Texas fever line.

Mr. GILMOUR. There is danger all the same. Would the minister think it would be useful to have an isolated yard, for the purpose of treating the cattle as they come through ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I appreciate the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, and shall be glad to look into the matter and see if any further safeguard can be thrown around that trade. But I would point out that this particular section only emphasizes the point which the hon. gentleman made, that when any animal is known to be diseased, the information with regard to it must be immediately sent to the minister, and to the nearest veterinary inspector.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, I understand that one government has no check on the other with reference to these contagious diseases of cattle ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are constantly communicating, and keeping each other informed. We have no check

except the honour of a great country, which has pledged itself to do certain things.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman not think that the United States has an advantage over Canada in that regard ? It is more to their advantage.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not like to say that we cannot depend on the honour of the United States government as well as they can depend on ours. Judging from the experience of the department in the past, I think we can do that.

Mr. POPE. I would like to ask the minister how this Act varies in this particular from previous Acts ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This section requires the parties to inform the nearest official of the department in addition to the minister, so that prompt action may be taken. That is the difference between this Act and the old one.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the meaning of the two words 'every person' in subsection 3 ? Do they apply only to the owner, the breeder, the dealer and the veterinary surgeon ? It seems to me to be a very broad expression, one which would include myself as well as the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour), so that we would be liable to the penalty if we failed to report to the nearest veterinary surgeon. I think the wording of the clause, if read carefully, means that and nothing else.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. If the hon. gentleman reads it carefully, he will see that it applies to every person neglecting to give notice as required by this section. It only applies to the people defined by this section.

Mr. HENDERSON. That may be the meaning of the minister, but the language would not strictly convey that idea. I think it would be unfair to make a private individual liable to a penalty of $200, particularly when he would get no compensation for the trouble he was going to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The wording of the section does not mean that at all.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Put in the words 'having knowledge of disease,' and I think they would meet the case.

Mr. INGRAM. That section is certainly altogether too wide. As the hon. minister knows, a good many men who are engaged in veterinary work to-day are not experts, and have no knowledge of what diseases are. Many owners certainly have not that knowledge.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say, in the first place, that if a veterinary surgeon does not know the diseases, he certainly ought not to be practicing as such. But under the clause he is only required to report on ascertaining that the animal is labouring under disease.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose I consult a veterinary about some animals, and he tells me that they are not diseased, and on a later inspection I find that they are ; what then ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the interest of the public we must insist that owners, on perceiving the appearance of infectious disease amongst their animals, shall notify the department. Of course, if they do not recognize that it is an infectious disease, they would not be liable to the penalty. There is no doubt of that under the wording of the Act.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am quite in accord with the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram) in protecting an innocent veterinary surgeon. Take the case of anthrax. I know that it is a very difficult matter for good medical men to determine a case of anthrax in a human being. It is not at all unusual for them to take the blood or some part of the flesh and have it analyzed by such a man as Professor Ellis, of Toronto, to determine whether it is anthrax or not. It is not easy in many cases to determine whether a disease is infectious or not, and in a case of that kind it is rather hard for a man to be subject to a penalty of $200.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A penalty of that kind would be only imposed by the court upon a person who was found to be guilty. Such a case as the hon. gentleman mentions would afford a just reason for not imposing the penalty. It is not imposed on the arbitrary will of some autocrat ; it is imposed on evidence of the guilt of the party.

Mr. PRINGLE. It seems to me that the language of subsection 3 would be more effective if it were made to read, 'every owner of animals and every breeder of or dealer in animals, and every one bringing animals into Canada shall, on becoming aware of infectious or contagious disease,' &c. I think that would make it a little stronger and better.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I might state to the hon. gentleman that the the words he takes exception to are copied verbatim out of the old Act. We took the old Act and changed it as little as possible. I preferred to abide by the wording of the old Act, which has been in existence seventeen or eighteen years without any difficulty arising.

On section 9,

Every person who, without lawful authority or excuse, digs up or causes or allows to be dug up the buried carcass of an animal which has died or is suspected of having died from infectious or contagious disease, or which has been slaughtered as diseased or as suspected

of disease, shall, for every such offence, incur a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why make the penalty only one hundred under this clause when it is two hundred under the previous clause ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is that way in the old Act, and I have no objection to make it two hundred. I move that it be made $200.

Mr. HENDERSON. This clause should go further. It should be made punishable for a man even to bury the carcass of an animal which has died of an infectious disease. Take the case of anthrax. If you bury an animal which has died of anthrax, you plant the disease in the ground, and animals grazing there will be sure to contract it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Under our regulations, which have the force of law, animals which have died of anthrax must be burnt.

Mr. HENDERSON. Many people see the statutes who do not see the regulations.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The regulations are sent broadcast throughout the country, far more generally than are the statutes. Section 29 of this Act empowers the Governor in Council to make the necessary regulations.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will a penalty for breaking the regulation be imposed as for breaking the Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Exactly.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 10,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is to prevent the offering of infected animals for sale. The wording of the old Act is changed so as to enable an officer to seize and examine an animal suspected of being infected with contagious disease. Therefore, I move that the words 'Governor in Council,' in the third line and in the seventh line on page three, be struck out and the word 'minister' inserted.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Better say 'Minister of Agriculture.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is provided for in the interpretation clause. Wherever the word 'minister' is used it means the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think it is a little dangerous to pass this section just as it is. I do not know whether the minister has considered how this will work out in the actual enforcement of the Act. Of course we are here to make the law as practical as we can, and to make it easy of enforcement. I would suggest to him that it would be better if we should leave this enforcement to the 'mayor or reeve, or to any justice of the peace having jurisdiction in the place,' and not to the officials appointed by the government. The law is apt to be brought into disrepute, if you have an official appointed by the minister called upon not only to give information but to practically try the case he complains about——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. It may not say that in so many words, but the minister will see that it comes down to that. It provides that if any animal infected with infectious or contagious disease or suspected of being so is sold or exposed for sale in the market then 'any clerk or inspector, or other officer of the fair or market or any constable or policeman, or any other person authorized by the mayor or reeve, or by any justice of the peace—it is 'place' in the Bill, but I suppose it means the justice of the 'peace,' and I would suggest that that be corrected—'or any person authorized or appointed by the minister'—as it is proposed to be amended—'may seize the animal and report the seizure to the mayor or reeve or to any justice of the peace having jurisdiction in the place'—I suppose that means the municipality—'and such mayor, reeve, or justice or person authorized or appointed by the minister, may after examination and verification'—cause the animal to be destroyed. Thus, the person appointed by the minister who thinks that an offence has been committed, is practically the informant—properly so, I am not finding fault with that—but it will not help the enforcement of the law if this same officer is to try the case complained of, which his business calls upon him to lay. That will make the law unpopular, and, if it is unpopular it will lose its effect. If the people are not behind a law that law will not be properly enforced. Therefore, I think the minister will help his own case if he would alter the Bill in this respect. Any person arrested or summoned—or it may not be quite that, but called upon and made liable for a penalty as well as to have his property destroyed—would have his friends in the neighbourhood, who, would, perhaps say he was not guilty of any offence. I would suggest that this section be amended. Let it stand as it is that any clerk or inspector, or other officer of the fair or market or any constable or policeman, or any other person authorized by the mayor, reeve, or by any justice of the peace having jurisdiction in the place—I suppose that means any person specially appointed to enforce this particular law—or any person authorized or appointed by the minister may seize the animal and report the seizure to the mayor or reeve, or to any justice of the peace having jurisdiction in the place. But when it comes to 'and such mayor, reeve, or justice'—that is all right; but I think when it goes on 'or person authorized or appointed by the minister,' may try the case, that would mean that this officer may

enforce his own information. I think the case should be tried by a third person, some one standing between the inspector or the officer, and the person proceeded against, whether he is appointed by the minister or by the head of the municipality, or whether he is one of the ordinary officials of the place. He is one side of the case, he is the complainant or prosecutor, and I do not think it will make the law more acceptable to the people to put an officer in the position of enforcing his own opinion. He should lay his information before the mayor, reeve or other magistrate, and let that person try the case before the decision is carried out. Then, in the last three lines of this section it provides 'to be forthwith destroyed or otherwise disposed of, in such a manner as he deems proper or as is directed, as provided by this Act.' I do not think that we ought to delegate to the mayor, reeve or other official who is trying the case the power of deciding what we are better able to judge than he. The two hundred and fourteen members of this House are better able to say how this should be done than is the mayor, reeve or other officer. Let him be simply a judicial officer to carry out this Act, but let us say how it is to be carried out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) does not desire that the officer appointed by the minister should have the power that is given to the reeve, the mayor, or justice of the peace. The mayor, reeve, or justice, as well as the officer appointed by the minister, has the authority to proceed under the first part of the section, and also to judge of the case in the second part. I do not see any reason why the others should have the power of judging these cases and the inspector appointed by the minister should not have it.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. minister will allow me, I do not think he is correct there. I do not understand this to say that the mayor, reeve, justice and so on, may proceed in the first place, but that 'any clerk or inspector, or other officer of the fair or market, or any constable or policeman, or any other person authorized by the mayor or reeve, or by any justice of the peace having jurisdiction in the place,' may proceed. The mayor, reeve, or justice may authorize an officer to proceed, and they may try the cases he brings before them. But the officer appointed by the minister is both complainant and judge.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would point out that all through this Bill the matter of prompt and immediate action is the necessity that is recognized, as it was under the old Act. The inspector should be in a position to act promptly, and, so to speak, off-hand. If these officers were not able to seize an animal and deal with it at once, they would not be able to prevent the spread of the disease. The hon. gentleman will notice that it provides that the officers appointed to deal with these cases 'may after an examination and verification,' cause the animal and so on to be destroyed. The officer may not do this until it is clearly proven to be a case of infectious disease; and when that is proven, it is necessary that he should be able to act at once.

Mr. GILMOUR. What do the words 'examination and verification' mean? Does it mean a scientific examination of the animal or an examination of witnesses in the case? I would like to point out to the minister that a man might be a good judge of beef who would not at all be a judge of whether an animal was diseased or not. I think he should act upon the report of one or two veterinary surgeons, and if that report states that the animal is affected, then he should give an order for its destruction.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One of the principles underlying this whole Act is that the veterinaries appointed by the government may have power to act promptly on their own discretion. I think that is absolutely necessary. Of course if these officers were to act improperly and were to give a decision which was not justified by facts, then the government would be responsible. The provision which is here discussed is one which has been in existence under the old Act. We are not intensifying it in any way, except that we are asking that the minister may appoint these inspectors instead of the Governor in Council.

Mr. GILMOUR. Would the minister appoint these justices, or would he allow any other person than justices to act?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The minister only appoints the inspectors, he does not appoint the justices.

Mr. GILMOUR. I know that, but you give that power to justices of the peace to make this examination. Would you allow any justice to make that examination? Because it would be a dangerous thing to allow any justice to make such an examination as that, and to act on his own discretion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The examination contemplated is not made by a justice. This is an examination of a technical character, and has to be made by a veterinary who is properly qualified.

Mr. PRINGLE. I think that clause ought to be made a little clearer. It reads now:

> And such mayor, reeve or justice, or person authorized or appointed by the Governor in Council may, after examination and verification, cause the animal——

And so on. Now that certainly means that a justice of the peace may, after examination and verification, cause the animal affected to be destroyed. It seems to me that a justice of the peace is not the proper per-

son to cause the destruction of that animal, but he is the proper person to inquire and gather the necessary evidence to see whether that animal should be destroyed. It strikes me it would be much better if that clause were framed in this way :

And such mayor, reeve, or justice of the peace, or person authorized or appointed by the Governor in Council, may, after being satisfied by the evidence of a veterinary that such disease exists, cause the destruction of that animal.

Then the justice of the peace would not act on his own judgment, nor would he act on a simple inspection of the animal, but he would act upon the evidence of a man who was thoroughly competent to decide whether the animal was diseased or not. That clause should be amended so as to make it more effective, and to avoid any possibility of error.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the word 'verification' practically covers that point 'examination and verification.'

Mr. POPE. This Act is to be interpreted by farmers and people who are not perhaps so accustomed to the interpretation of an Act. I think that ought to be made very clear. It seems to me that the language here leaves that matter a little obscure, it may have been so in the old Act. 'Such mayor, reeve or justice, or person authorized may, after examination and verification.' That may mean the justice of the peace, the mayor or the reeve, all those people.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All the persons authorized.

Mr. POPE. So you leave the authority in the hands of the reeve rather than of the government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To meet the point raised I would suggest the words 'after the veterinary's examination and verification.' I would be willing to have that inserted.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman any means of knowing whether the veterinaries are capable men to perform the examination ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All veterinaries in this country are obliged to have a diploma from a veterinary college before they are allowed to practice, and only those who have such diplomas are entitled to be recognized as veterinaries. In addition to that, the appointees of the department are chosen as veterinaries of standing, knowledge and experience. We make ourselves no examination at the present time to test the qualities of the veterinaries.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman knows there are some sections where hog cholera may be prevalent, which is a disease of which some veterinaries have very little knowledge. I have in my hand a report of a veterinary whose name, however, I will not mention, in which he says :

Held post mortem examinations on five hogs slaughtered on January 14th, and in examinations could find no indications of bowel trouble, the intestines appearing in each case to be healthy.

That is the report of the veterinary, and in a few days afterwards the whole herd of hogs he mentions were slaughtered. He evidently was not acquainted with hog cholera. I think something should be done whereby veterinaries residing in certain localities where hog cholera is prevalent should be instructed by others who are better posted as to what constitutes hog cholera.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have tried to do that as much as possible. We have certain veterinaries who have been detailed to attend to hog cholera in sections of the country alluded to by the hon. gentleman, men who have had a great deal of experience, and they have been busily employed for some time back in instructing the local veterinaries. Wherever an outbreak of hog cholera is reported to us we send one of these experienced veterinaries, before accepting the judgment of the local veterinaries, unless we know that the latter are well acquainted with the disease.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. I think the clause might be simplified by adding these words, 'after verification and examination,' 'or after the magistrate, having been satisfied through evidence that the animal is diseased.' I think that would cover the whole point in a few simple words.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the suggestion made already will cover that point. The whole essence of this section and of the Bill is to enable prompt action to be taken to prevent the spread of disease. I would not like to see any machinery created which is going to be slow or dragging in its operation.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the hon. minister what he means by prompt action ? Whom does he empower to act promptly in the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The veterinary inspectors have power to do certain things.

Mr. COCHRANE. They have power to destroy the animal ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, why do you name magistrates, or reeves, or anybody else ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because there may be no authorized veterinary inspector present. The magistrate

would then call in a local veterinary of standing, get his opinion and verification as to the disease and order the destruction of the animal effected.

Mr. COCHRANE. If a veterinary surgeon was competent to give an opinion would he not be competent to destroy the animal ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but we do not give power to any veterinary in the country to do that. We only give that power to inspectors appointed by the Governor in Council and to reeves and magistrates.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where will the prompt action come in if the veterinary inspector does not happen to be there ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We cannot always obtain prompt action if there is no veterinary magistrate or reeve in the neighbourhood. I beg to move :—

That section 10 be amended by striking out the word 'place' in the second line from the top of the page and inserting the word 'peace'; also that the words 'Governor in Council' in the third line be struck out and the word 'minister' be inserted in lieu thereof ; also that in line seven the words 'Governor in Council' be struck out and that the word 'minister' be inserted in lieu thereof ; also that in the seventh line the word 'veterinary' be inserted between the words 'after' and 'examination.'

Mr. POPE. In regard to the disposition of the animal I would like to ask the hon. minister if it is to be under the regulations and under the care of the veterinary.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The law directs how it shall be disposed of.

Mr. POPE. The Bill says that the person authorized may cause the disposition of the animal together with hurdles, troughs, litter, &c., in such manner as he deems proper. We would not like this discretion to be left to the ordinary person.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think any ordinary person would undertake to deal with that matter, having before him the Act and regulations directing how this should be done.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 11,

The minister may, from time to time, cause to be slaughtered, animals suffering from infectious or contagious disease or suspected of being so affected, and animals which are or have been in contact with or close proximity to a diseased animal, or an animal suspected of being affected by infectious or contagious disease.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that not a pretty broad section ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is the same as in the former Act except that it substitutes 'minister' for 'Governor in Council.' In an action of this kind it is practically impossible to procure an Order in Council when it is necessary.

On section 12,

1. The Governor in Council may order a compensation to be paid to the owners of animals slaughtered under the provisions of this Act.

2. Whenever the animal slaughtered was affected by infectious or contagious disease, the compensation shall be one-third of the value of the animal before it became so affected, but shall not in any such case exceed twenty dollars ; in every other case the compensation shall be three-fourths of the value of the animal, but shall not in the case of grade animals exceed fifty dollars, and in the case of pure-bred animals two-thirds of the value of the animal, not to exceed one hundred and fifty dollars ; and in all such cases the value of the animal shall be determined by the minister or by some person appointed by him.

3. Such compensation may be withheld in whole or in part whenever the owner or the person having charge of the animal has, in the opinion of the minister been guilty, in relation to the animal, of an offence against this Act, or whenever the animal, being a foreign one, was, in his judgment, diseased at the time of entering Canada.

4. If in any case the sum received by the government, on the sale of a carcass of an animal slaughtered, under the provisions of this Act, exceeds the amount paid for compensation to the owner of the animal slaughtered, the excess, after deduction of reasonable expenses, shall be paid to the owner.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Would it not be better, so as to make it correspond with the other, to take out the words 'Governor in Council' and insert the word 'minister' ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think, in the matter of compensation which is a question of general policy, that it ought to be decided by the Governor in Council and not upon the minister's own responsibility.

Mr. POPE. Is this a new section ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. POPE. I have known instances where animals were slaughtered by authority of some one and they were not diseased at all and no compensation was possible. Can it be a fact that this section has been in operation for a series of years ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will read subsection 3 of this section he will see that it provides that :

Such compensation may be withheld in whole or in part whenever the owner or the person having charge of the animal, has, in the opinion of the minister been guilty, in relation to the animal, of an offence against this Act.

The whole clause is permissive and not compulsory. The question of compensation is a matter entirely within the control of the Governor in Council and is dealt with in regard to each individual case.

Mr. POPE. I must say that my experience is that the Act might as well not have been printed in so far as the farming community is concerned, because no man is going to complain about the presence of disease in his herds if he is not going to be compensated, and these animals will be disposed of in the future as in the past. There is not a day passing in which there are not diseased animals being disposed of on the market through butchers and by the farmers, and the experience of a man in our community, Mr. Bowen, whom the hon. minister will perhaps know, was not such as to encourage farmers to notify the authorities of the presence of disease because Mr. Bowen's cattle were slaughtered and he got no compensation for them. He lost some animals in which disease could not be traced. He appealed for compensation but did not get it. Under these circumstances no one in the community is going to tell if he has any diseased animals. I found fault with this Act many years ago in regard to this particular. I am sorry that the hon. minister has not seen his way clear to making an amendment to the Act by which compensation would be ensured to those who give information in regard to the presence of disease in their herds. We provide a fine of $200 for a person concealing the presence of disease in animals, but we should go further and provide that when a man having the health of the herds of the country and of human beings in view, volunteers this information, he should not find himself in the position in which men giving such information have found themselves in the past. Since this question was discussed several years ago in the House, the increase of tuberculous cattle throughout Canada has been very great. It could have been wiped out by the expenditure of $100,000 or $200,000 at the time, but to-day it would take much more money than that, and the longer it is postponed the greater will be the cost. The day will come when parliament will have to deal with this matter. The object of this Bill is to make a man suspicious of an animal, but if it costs him $50 to be suspicious it will be very hard to impress that suspicion on his mind. I would impress upon the minister that his policy on this matter should be changed. He has the assistance of an ex-member of this House whom we see sitting there to-night, and who is perhaps a better authority on this question than I am, but at the same time I submit that the practical working out of this Act will not tend to improve the health of animals in this country. I do not believe that a man should be compensated who imports animals and can have them properly inspected before he buys them, but the Canadian farmer who offers his animals for slaughter for the benefit of the community is certainly entitled to compensation. In our section of the country the law has not worked well in the past.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. While I would not like to go as far as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope), I fully appreciate the situation he has depicted. The difficulties are great in securing information about the existence of disease in animals. The idea of compensation to those who report disease among their animals has been discussed upon various occasions in this House. Some years ago, when I asked for a vote to deal with tuberculosis, I had to pledge myself that it would not be used for the purpose of compensation. The hon. gentleman stated that some years ago there was less tuberculosis in Canada than now. I think that statement is too broad. The tuberculin test has been the means of discovering a great many cases where the existence of the disease would not have been suspected prior to the introduction of the test, but on the whole I am well within the mark when I say that Canada is remarkably free from this disease in comparison with other countries. The question of compensation is a difficult one to deal with. No one would like better than I to give compensation to the public spirited man who offered his animals for slaughter. He ought to be compensated, but the difficulty is to distinguish between such a man and others who would demand compensation, and perhaps obtain it where the necessity for slaughter did not exist. Parliament clearly indicated, when the matter was under discussion before, that it would look favourably at the idea of granting compensation. Suppose we spent a large amount of money and stamped out the disease apparently, yet it is of such a nature that the chances are it would reappear constantly, and although we would not have such a large expenditure from year to year as at first, still the expenditure would go on indefinitely. In subsequent sections of the Bill I propose to ask for power to make regulations in regard to certain diseases, and which may help to bring about the state of affairs the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) refers to.

Mr. GILMOUR. If you suspect disease and have animals slaughtered, and if afterwards no disease was found to exist, would the owner be paid in full ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That would depend on whether the animals would have been in contact with disease or not.

Mr. GILMOUR. If they had been in contact, I think you would have the right to pay the three-fourths of their value, but if you merely suspect the herd and you order their slaughter, and it was found afterwards that no disease existed, I almost think the owner would be entitled to full compensation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to have an opportunity of looking into that matter.

Mr. GILMOUR. I do not suggest that the minister should come to any hurried decision on the question. I would advocate killing middling freely when animals are suspected, but if you find you are in error, I think the owner should be fully compensated.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On one or two occasions we have paid compensation when an error was committed by one of our officers.

Mr. GILMOUR. That is what I say you should do.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think provision should be made for that under the law. I think there is provision in some part of the law, but if not I will see that provision is made.

Mr. LANCASTER. With regard to subclause 3, does not the minister think that it would be better to have the matter therein referred to tried in some other way than to leave it to the opinion of the minister? If a man has been guilty of neglect, it is usually enough to prove it in the locality in which he lives, before some justice of the peace. The minister could not very well determine that down here at Ottawa. He is not going to the place where the man lives, and it will be equally difficult for the man to come to Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think the minister could form an opinion on the matter without looking into it very carefully and having the whole evidence before him. Of course, any action of that kind by the minister would be pretty sure to be brought before the House by some one on behalf of the individual if he were discriminated against or hurt. The machinery might be a little awkward in certain cases, but I think it would be safe enough to leave it as it is. It has been in the old Act exactly in this shape.

Mr. LANCASTER. Although the Governor in Council is to determine the compensation, the minister can withhold the payment of the compensation by deciding that it is not a proper case.

Mr. BRODER. The minister would depend on the report of his own officials who investigated the matter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not necessarily. The minister would probably have representations from the individual, and he would have to balance these against the report of his officials. The minister does not depend on his officials in every instance.

Mr. BRODER. But the person you would call criminal in the matter would be the person attempting to hide the prevalence of disease among his herd. My experience in localities where these things occur is that, without the incentive of compensation, it is impossible to bring the individual to notify the department of the existence of disease; the experience is all the other way. The tendency is to hide the fact. There have been cases where the herds have been slaughtered, and after the slaughter it has been found that the disease was not so great as the official has supposed it was. My idea is that it would be better to give a more liberal remuneration, and stamp the disease out as far as possible; it seems to me that is the cheaper way of dealing with the matter. Whether or not the different conditions under which animals are now kept, from the old hardy way, have anything to do with the greater prevalence of disease, I do not know. I think a great many cattle are put into close stables, and too many are put together, which is, no doubt, a cause of disease. You are never going to stamp out the disease unless you let the owner of the cattle understand that it is his interest as well as the community's interest to expose the fact. Take the case of a poor man whose all is represented by the few cows he milks on his farm. That man will hide the fact of disease as long as possible, because if he does not his all will be gone. It would be better for the government to pay him 75 per cent if the animals proved diseased, and 100 per cent if they proved to be not diseased. I do not think you can reach the difficulty in any other way.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think perhaps the hon. gentleman is labouring under a little misconception. We do not order the slaughter of animals in cases of tuberculosis, which the hon. gentleman evidently has in his mind. At the request of interested individuals, animals supposed to be affected with tuberculosis are inspected, and when found to be diseased, they are subject to the quarantine law, which prevents them being sold or moved about; but no inspector has ever demanded that such animals should be slaughtered.

Mr. BRODER. But the regulations amount to that. They have to be isolated. The owner cannot take them out of the premises. His only remedy is to kill them. Then he will have an officer of the government along, who will investigate the meat and see that it is not put on the market if it is diseased. It would be better to order the animals to be slaughtered. You would get at the difficulty sooner than you do now.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The health officers are required to deal with these animals in the interest of the public health. All we try to do is to find out what will benefit the public at large, whether the animal is diseased or not. Then the law steps in and says that if the animal is diseased, it must be treated in such and such a way. That is done in the interest of the public health and for the protec-

tion of the community. I do not think we can relax that law in any way.

Mr. BRODER. No, but if you take the right to slaughter and remunerate, you will obviate all the other difficulties.

Mr. CARGILL. I think the hon. member who has just taken his seat has made a very valuable suggestion. There is no doubt such a tendency as he points out on the part of the people who own cattle which are subject to inspection by a government official, to ascertain whether or not they are diseased if the owner of the cattle were to receive good compensation for the animal slaughtered, he would have no object in concealing the disease or in preventing the official from making a thorough investigation. I think that the suggestion is a very valuable one. If people owning cattle were led to believe that they would be paid in full the value of the slaughtered animals, they would court inspection rather than refuse it, and I believe that would be a very effective way of stamping out the disease. While the government may be very vigilant and have the interests of the farmers at heart, still the farmers do not like to suffer loss, and if they realized that they were going to be fully compensated for the cattle slaughtered, they would court inspection and would be willing to give the government official free access to their herds.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am afraid that if we were to pay the full value of every animal slaughtered, a farmer who might happen to have surplus stock might be tempted to try and get the value for his surplus animals in this way, and it would be a very dangerous policy to institute. The most that could be expected would be that a certain portion of the value might be paid. If an animal is diseased, the loss is bound to fall on the farmer, and if he be wise he will get rid of the animal. But of course there are some men who will run every risk rather than resort to slaughtering any portion of the herd. It seems to me that to pay the full value would be impracticable. I appreciate what the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) has said, and can realize that so long as we do not pay some compensation, there will be a great deal of difficulty in working out the Act without paying any compensation and the public educated up to the opinion that it is in their own interests not to evade the Act. If we are to inaugurate a system of general slaughter and compensation, I am afraid that we would have to face a very large expenditure, probably from $200,000 to $500,000 per year for several years.

Mr. COCHRANE. How can that be when the hon. gentleman told us this session that there was no disease in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend is mistaken. I never said that there was no disease in Canada. There is, on the contrary, a considerable amount of tuberculosis in the country. It is a contagious disease which affects animals and men, and I would not venture to say what value would have to be paid if all the animals affected by tuberculosis were to be slaughtered in a few years.

Mr. COCHRANE. How could a farmer who has a surplus stock impose upon the government when his herd is inspected by a proper official ? He could not get any of this stock slaughtered without first having the animals inspected by the government veterinary surgeon.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We would have to add largely to the number of our officials, and my experience indicates that we would have to watch with the utmost vigilance. Even now, in the case of hog cholera, when compensation is paid for the hog slaughtered, we have a great deal of difficulty indeed in order to avoid being imposed upon, and the difficulty would be much more serious with regard to cattle at large.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman can hardly be serious when he makes the charge against the farmers, that when they have surplus stock to dispose of they would take advantage of the law simply for the purpose of making a sale. That is not my estimate of the farmers of Canada. I think that they are a more honourable class of people, and the hon. minister himself, who is a practical farmer, is hardly fair to the farmers of this country when he makes such a wholesale charge.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope that my hon. friend will not misquote me. I did not make any wholesale charge, but he must admit that there are among farmers, as in every other section of the country, men who would take advantage of the government if they could.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister has not answered the point made by my friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) that the animals slaughtered would not be paid for unless an official of the government had ordered their slaughter. You do not pay for the animal unless you order it to be slaughtered. Then the only ground advanced by the hon. minister for not paying full compensation, is that the farmers are so absolutely unreliable that they would endeavour in the absence of a better market, to work off their surplus stock in this way.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Is the hon. minister aware that there is a good deal of tuberculosis in the country ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is well known to exist, not only in this but in other countries.

Mr. ROBINSON. But the hon. gentleman said in this country ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Do the British people know this ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. No wonder they keep up the embargo on our cattle.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is ten times as much tuberculosis over there as here. It has nothing to do with the embargo. The embargo is on account of pleuro-pneumonia.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman will find a report in his department by Dr. McEachren, a few years ago, in which he gave the cost of stamping out tuberculosis in this country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think he said $200,000 per year for several years.

Mr. POPE. For a very few years ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For several years.

Mr. POPE. If it could be accomplished with $200,000 a year for three or four years, it would be money well spent, indeed. I would say again—not that I wish to make a political or a stump speech—that I think the farming community are entitled to an expenditure, even if it reaches a million dollars in a term of years, as much as other portions of the community are entitled to the expenditures we make to assist them in the ways of trade and commerce. In the amount of taxation he bears and in his importance in relation to all other lines of trade, the farmer is the great element of strength in this country, and I believe that the rest of the community would not hesitate to bear their share of any taxation that might be necessary to bring about an improvement so desirable as the stamping out of this contagious disease. As the Minister of Agriculture suggested, this disease is a very stealthy one ; it creeps into a herd of cattle without arousing suspicion, it hangs about the herd for many years without the knowledge of the owner, until a weaker generation of animals come, and then suddenly he finds his whole herd infected with the disease. I would favour compensation for the killing of the animals, for the government has no right to ask that animals be killed, or isolated so that their owners have no use for them, without compensation. A plan should be properly prepared under the direction of medical skill and technical experience, and the House should be asked to vote such money as is necessary in the premises. As this is a government of commissions, it might not be out of place to suggest that we might have a commission with regard to this matter, and then two or three more friends of the government could be given employment for some time. And a scheme might be formed by which as good results could be obtained as from some other commissions that have been appointed and have caused expenditures certainly not directly beneficial to the farming community. It would also be quite in keeping with matters as we sometimes find them, if a lawyer could be engaged to preside over this commission to look after the interests of the farmers. But joking aside, I think that the importance of the cattle trade in the east and in the west of the Dominion and the importance of the dairy trade, is sufficient to warrant the expenditure, whether it is one hundred thousand, two hundred thousand or three hundred thousand dollars a year, and whether that expenditure is for one year or for the next twenty years.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall be happy to consider the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Pope) suggestion of a commission.

Mr. SHERRITT. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) or with the hon. minister that tuberculosis is prevalent in this country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not say that.

Mr. SHERRITT. I think, perhaps, more of the thoroughbred cattle are affected than of the ordinary cattle, but I do not think that there is any justification for such wild charges.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sherritt) is misquoting me. I did not say that tuberculosis is prevalent in this country, on the contrary I said that the herds in Canada were less affected than those of almost any other country. At the same time I said—and it is true—that there is a good deal of tuberculosis among the cattle in Canada.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I agree with the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) that it is desirable to spend even a large sum to stamp out all serious disease affecting our cattle. That is the object of this Bill, but it would appear that the Bill does not go far enough. It is evident from the admission of the minister that there are a great many people who have disease in their herds who do not complain. But the benefit will be small if only a small portion of the diseased cattle are slaughtered, the cattle of farmers who are generous enough to be willing to have them slaughtered and receive only 75 per cent of the value of them if they are not affected, and one-third of the value if they are affected. It is evident to me that if we wish to stamp out the disease, we must take such steps as will ensure the slaughter of all animals that are affected. And I believe, as has already been said, that, unless the farmer is to get the full value of his cattle, there are many cases in which the farmer will not complain. Why not, then, spend a sufficient sum of money to clear the country absolutely of this disease ? The

hon. minister knows the experience we had in reference to the San José scale in Ontario. The Act as first passed provided for partial payment for trees diseased—a very small payment for those diseased, and a larger payment for those in the neighbourhood of infected trees, but not themselves infected. The consequence was a little rebellion among the fruit-growers, because they did not get sufficient value and the Act became a dead letter. So, the disease spread and become uncontrollable until stronger remedies were applied. It seems to me that the same must be true of the cattle industry. Unless we face the matter and stand ready to pay a considerable sum if necessary, this disease will continue to spread. I fully concur with those who say we should be willing to spend even large sums to stamp out serious disease affecting our herds and flocks. This is the leading industry of the country and is bound to be so for some time to come. The largest export we have in Canada is the export of the products of our herds and flocks, and appearances indicate that these exports are bound to go on increasing. These are the most profitable products of the farm. It seems to me there is nothing we can do which we ought not to do in order to give these herds and flocks an absolutely clean bill of health.

Mr. BRODER. I think that the minister and the House as well, has not allowed for the effect that a clean bill of health for our cattle would have upon the market for our butter and cheese. If it were known that the herds in Canada were clean and free from disease, there is not the slightest doubt that our products would be more highly appreciated than they can be under any other condition. I think this is something that it is worth while for the country to consider.

Mr. COCHRANE. I take strong exception to the Minister of Agriculture telling us that he is afraid that the farmers would impose upon the government of their country by selling their surplus stock under pretense that the cattle were affected with contagious disease. When the minister thinks that over, I believe he will see that he made a statement that he should not have made. As a farmer, I object to a minister of the Crown telling the public that farmers are so mean and low that if they had a few surplus head of cattle they would take advantage of the minister and the government by disposing of them as diseased. Now, why will the minister say that, when he knows deep down in his heart that the cattle cannot be slaughtered without a certificate from the veterinary surgeon? How could any farmer impose upon the department with diseased cattle in the mean contemptible way he mentions, when he has officials all around the country to inspect the cattle? I am here to repudiate any such thing. That may be the prevalent idea with the farmers the Minister of Agriculture associates with, but I can tell him that is not the character of the farmers of Ontario. If it was their disposition, he has it in his power to prevent them dealing with the government in that way. He talks about a few thousand dollars. Who is paying most of the taxation of this country? Is it not the farming community? Are not the exports produced by the farming community worth more to this country than any other manufacturing industry in Canada? And if so, why should a few hundred thousand dollars be parsimoniously dealt out to defend the herds and stock that are bringing more money into this country than any other industry? You will fritter away two or three hundred thousand dollars in a harbour where there is no harbour, and never will be, and $75,000 to dredge a channel and build a wharf where the post office is not worth $100 a year. That is all right; but when you come to make a clean bill of health for the greatest industry in Canada, you talk about a little expense, and you are afraid the farmers are going to be mean enough to take advantage of the government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The question of money is not the only one involved here. I presume that hon. gentlemen have followed what is done in other countries in fighting cattle disease, and if so, they must be aware that everything cannot be done by money. If the reputation of our dairy products is high in England, it is not because we have no tuberculosis in this country, but because of the high quality of our product. My hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) has alluded to the experience in some counties in Ontario, to something that was attempted and it failed.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Because they did not pay enough.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Perhaps not; that shows that great difficulty arose in such an undertaking. I think one reason of not paying enough was the opposition of the farmers having their herds compulsorily destroyed. It is not because I am unwilling to pay a sufficient amount, because I think if we could stamp out tuberculosis entirely in this country, a very considerable expenditure would be justified. But we must be able to show parliament that such an expenditure would be successful. My experience leads me to the conclusion that we might go on spending money year after year without really accomplishing the destruction of the disease.

Mr. SHERRITT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there is less tuberculosis in this country than in England and the United States?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. SHERRITT. Then does not the hon. gentleman think it would be well to enter into some different arrangement with the United States, which would prevent their cattle coming in here and feeding in our yards where our own cattle are put afterwards before putting them back on to the farm ? Does not the hon. gentleman think there is something wrong in the present state of affairs when cattle are allowed to be shipped in here from a country where cattle are not as healthy as our cattle, shipped into our yards, fed in our yards, and our cattle afterwards fed in the same yards ? It seems to me the hon. gentleman has shown a weak point in his argument when he accused the farmers of this country of trying to outwit the officials of the government. It seems to me that the officials of the government ought to be more attentive to their duties, and they should not give certificates at all where there is at least disease.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We do not allow cattle to come in from the United States except for breeding purposes, and they are always tested for tuberculosis. If they are found to be diseased they are not allowed to come in. We do not import stockers and feeding cattle from the United States except to a certain extent into the North-west Territories.

Mr. GILMOUR. What care is taken with regard to cattle coming over from the other side to graze, and then taken back again ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are all inspected.

Mr. BELL. I would like to know if the minister has found the farmers inclined to take advantage of these Acts, and to dispose of animals that are diseased and to get some money return for them ? I do not think, as a rule, he would say that the farmers are apt to take such advantage. There has been a good deal of cattle disease in the county of Pictou, and the hon. gentleman has had something to do with controlling that so-called Pictou cattle disease, and compensating the farmers for animals killed. I do not think he is disposed to argue that generally speaking farmers are dishonest in the matter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly not. I never undertook to say that.

Mr. BELL. That construction has been derived from the language of the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Very improperly.

Mr. BELL. I think that a comparatively large amount of money might be expended in stamping out the disease altogether. It will be cheaper in the end to do that when you take into account the great benefit that will result from a knowledge of the fact that our herds and flocks are entirely free from disease. In the case of the Pictou cattle disease it has been under the care of the government for something like twenty years. I really believe that the government would have saved a great deal of money in connection with this disease, which is still in existence and for which the hon. gentleman is called upon to make payments every year and which has now spread to a distance of nearly sixty or seventy miles from its original starting point, by adopting the British system used in the case of the Rhinderpest outbreak and really stamping out the disease by destroying every animal that was either diseased or had come in contact with a diseased animal paying a fair compensation to the farmers for the animals so destroyed. The expenditure already made upon that subject in Nova Scotia I think must be in excess of what it would have cost if every diseased animal, or every animal in contact with diseased animals, had been destroyed and even if the buildings in which they had been housed had been destroyed. I believe the government has paid more than it would have expended if it had destroyed all the animals that have come in contact with diseased animals and replaced the buildings. While you leave the seeds of disease there in animals that are passing back and forward from one farm to another and pasturing together, there is a constant development and growth of the disease it must involve a continual expense. Really, I would imagine it might be in the case of tuberculosis perhaps better to pay the full value if by that means we would be free of the disease, but, I understand, that in reference to tuberculosis the hon. minister would not be prepared to recommend the destruction of the animals effected.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have never ordered destruction.

Mr. BELL. I would rather infer from the experiments conducted on the farm of Senator Edwards that it has been determined that by instructing the farmers sufficiently as to the methods of raising calves from diseased animals these animals continue to possess a certain value in the agricultural sense and that it would be a piece of foolishness to destroy them. But, that being the fact, it seems to me that there should be some system by which farmers would be very carefully instructed as to the means of raising healthy calves from diseased cows and sires, and that certain precautions would be taken to see that milk products from infected animals are not used in such a way as to affect the health of the population of the country. In respect to that I understand that there are experiments making now to determine whether or not the disease is actually communicable from ani-

mals to human beings. I believe there are some parties who do not admit that there is much danger of infection in that way. As long as there is no really demonstrated great danger and as long as there is no question at all as a result of the experiments made under the direction of the hon. minister that diseased animals are quite capable of rearing healthy progeny, I think the hon. gentleman would not be justified in advising the country to go to the heavy expenditure necessary to stamp out tuberculosis. But I think in the case of the so-called Pictou cattle disease, pleuro pneumonia and Rhinderpest, or any other disease that is infectious, the minister would no doubt be warranted in recommending that the animals affected should be slaughtered and that these diseases should be stamped out. I am very glad to hear that the hon. minister has not got an unfavourable opinion of my constituents in connection with the expenditure he has made in so far as the so-called Pictou cattle disease is concerned.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. Minister of Agriculture made a statement to-night that is rather a strange statement for him to make in respect to tuberculosis. I would like to know from the hon. minister if this disease has increased or decreased.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not like to say definitely whether it has increased or decreased. My impression is that it is constantly decreasing, because the knowledge of the treatment of the disease is becoming much more widespread amongst the farmers and I know they are dealing with the disease to-day in a way they never thought of doing a few years ago.

Mr. INGRAM. Tuberculosis being a contagious disease, the hon. gentleman has stated that there is a large amount of the disease in Canada, though it is not so prevalent as in the United States or other countries. That being true a statement of that character coming from the hon. minster, I should think would have a tendency to injure our Canadian cattle trade. For the purpose of getting the hon. minister to explain, I will read the statement he made in this House last year in respect to the embargo on Canadian cattle.

I have no hesitation in endorsing that statement——

Referring to the motion made by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa).

The evidence was so completely submitted to the Minister of Agriculture in England, the Hon. Mr. Hanbury, that he first, privately, to myself, when I was interviewing him, acknowledged that there was no disease amongst our animals in Canada against which the provisions of this Act ought to be enforced. When I suggested to him that it would be well to make that statement publicly he shortly afterwards, in an interview, which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has just been alluding to, made that statement publicly, saying in answer to the assembly of the associations in Edinburgh that he believed to-day that in Canada there was no contagious disease such as they feared the introduction of into England. We therefore say that the evidence has been supplied to Great Britain to show that there is no justification for the application of this Act as against Canadian cattle.

Again he said :

I believe that everybody in Canada who has given the slightest attention to this question of the embargo on our cattle is fully convinced, in the first place, that no disease exists in this country, and, in the second place, that it was not necessary for the protection of the herds in Great Britain. I feel that the parliament and government of Canada can approach the imperial authorities on this question with the greatest force and strength.

Tuberculosis is a contagious disease because the interpretation clause says so. We are exporting our cattle to Great Britain. Would it not injure our Canadian cattle trade if it goes abroad that there is a great deal of this contagious disease in Canada, and in view of the statement made by the hon. minister to-night would it not effect the cattle trade in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) has quoted is absolutely and entirely correct. The question of the embargo in England is a question as to an embargo on Canada against the introduction of foot and mouth disease and pleuro pneumonia only.

Mr. INGRAM. Only ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These are diseases referred to and my statement was qualified by words which the hon. gentleman will see that it was only these diseases that I had reference to. It is a well known fact that anybody who has anything to do with cattle knows that there is some tuberculosis in this country as in all countries that we know anything about. I do not know any civilized country in the world that has not tuberculous cattle any more than I know any country in the world that has not tuberculous human beings, and the statement that there is tuberculosis amongst our cattle is no more damaging to our trade than the statement that there are cattle in Canada. People in England know that we have tuberculosis amongst our cattle in Canada and as they have tuberculosis amongst cattle in all countries. It would not be necessary for any one to pretend that there is no tuberculosis amongst our cattle even if we could truthfully so contend.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister has overlooked the fact that the English Act under which this so-called embargo is levied on our cattle is in general terms. It refers to contagious diseases generally and not to pleuro-pneumonia particularly.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say positively, but every one knows it was enacted in connection with pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth diseases. There is mange in this country, in the United States and in England, and it is a contagious disease, but the Act does not refer to that.

Mr. POPE. There is nothing to prevent the English Act being enlarged at any time if the English government see fit to do so. They claim they have discovered pleuro-pneumonia in some of our cattle and consequently they simply apply the Act.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They claimed that years ago, but not now.

Mr. POPE. They can embargo our cattle for anything else as well as pleuro-pneumonia under the Act.

Mr. COCHRANE. We are allowing United States cattle in bond to be watered and fed in the Toronto stock yards, where our own cattle are brought in after the American cattle leave, and we make no provision for fumigating the stock yards but simply depend in blind faith on the certificate of a gentleman in the United States. It appears to me that there is great danger of disease being introduced in that way. We are making provision in this clause for the destruction of bedding and so on, but we are allowing the condition of affairs in Toronto to go without taking any precaution. It appears to me that it would be a very judicious expenditure to have separate and distinct sheds for American cattle, so that we may not run the risk of the untold damage that may be done if they communicate disease to our animals.

Mr. POPE. We do not permit cattle to enter Canada for the purpose of remaining here without submitting them to the tuberculin test, and therefore we ourselves consider the matter a very serious one, so therefore we ourselves consider the matter a very serious one so that we cannot blame the English people for thinking likewise.

I again put myself on record as saying that the expenditure of $200,000 to $300,000 a year if necessary for a term of years, would be a wise expenditure if it resulted in making the health of Canadian cattle better than it is to-day. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to assume the responsibility of voting for such an expenditure if it were made under proper regulations as no doubt it would be.

Mr. CARGILL. I am quite sure that it is the desire of the minister to do what he can in the direction of stamping out tuberculosis and all other contagious diseases of cattle. I think from what has been said on this side of the House that it would be worthy of the minister's consideration as to whether it would not be advisable to offer more compensation to the owners of diseased cattle that have been slaughtered. I always commend the economical administration of affairs by the government as well as by business men, but at the same time I believe that the only way the minister can succeed is by allowing a fair value for all animals which it is necessary to destroy. I am in hearty accord with members on this side of the House who have spoken on this subject, and they all seem to be of the opinion that it would be money well spent if we made a thorough investigation of the herds throughout the length and breadth of Canada and slaughtered diseased animals where we found them. All owners of cattle would assist the minister and his department in trying to eradicate the disease if they got fair compensation for the animals which it was found necessary to destroy. Some members on this side of the House have stated that the agricultural industry is the most important in this country, and I think, Sir, that the agricultural community are entitled to a liberal expenditure for the purpose of stamping out this disease. I do not agree with the member for Wellington (Mr. McGowan) who stated that tuberculosis was much more prevalent among the higher grade of cattle than among the ordinary herds. I know in my section of the country where men have pure bred cattle, they have ample provision for stabling them, for ventilating the stables, for taking care of the animals, and they do not allow them to be exposed to severe weather as ordinary herds of cattle are. I believe that to-day tuberculosis exists to a greater extent among the ordinary herds of cattle in the country than it does among the purer-bred cattle. In conclusion, I advise the minister, who I know is very desirous of doing all he can to lessen the prevalence of this disease, to consider the matter fully, and bring down some measure to aid the cattle growers of this country in every way possible to stamp out this disease. I am quite sure they would do all they could in that direction, if they were sure of getting a fair and reasonable compensation.

Section allowed to stand,

On section 14,—Governor in Council may prohibit importation of animals and certain articles,

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the minister if there is any Order in Council in existence at the present time prohibiting the importation of animals, or of flesh, hides, hoofs, horns, or other parts of the animal, or of hay, straw, fodder, &c.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, an Order in Council was passed prohibiting the importation of animals from the neighbouring states in which foot and mouth disease was found to exist, and prohibiting the entry of hides, horns, hoofs, and so on, which were affected.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the minister exercise a supervision over the importation

of hides, not the product of the United States, but coming from a foreign country, say a South American country, through the United States ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Those hides are allowed in, coming through in bond.

On section 16,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This gives the minister power to appoint officers on the spur of the moment, when he thinks it necessary. Under the old Act the Governor in Council had power to appoint, but very often could not appoint until long after the necessity ceased.

On section 17,

Mr. HENDERSON. Are the inspectors appointed under this clause and the preceding clause paid an annual salary, or only for their services when called upon ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That depends on the nature of their engagement. Some inspectors are appointed all the year round on annual salaries ; but this is for the purpose of appointing temporary inspectors for temporary work that arises from time to time, and they are only paid for the work they do.

On section 19—report to Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. LANCASTER. This does not seem to provide for the minister having any other information than what the inspector sends. What evidence would the minister have to show him whether the inspector's report was right or not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The declarations sent in by the inspectors sometimes have to be supplemented by bacteriological investigation ; and if under such circumstances it is found that the disease was not what the inspector thought it was, then the minister would declare that the place was not an affected place. Other cases of that kind might arise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that not a little awkward where you are dealing with portions of the country which are at a very great distance ? For example, suppose you were dealing with a supposedly infected place in a remote portion of British Columbia. It might take a week to communicate with the minister, and the event might show that without any justification it had been regarded as an infected place.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It would have to be so under the declaration of the local inspector until that was overriden by the report of the inspector-general or the minister. I was pointing out a few minutes ago that sometimes the disease appears to exist, but when the specimens are sent to the laboratory for bacteriological investigation, it is found that the animal is not infected and the minister would reverse the decision of the local inspector.

On section 21,

The area of an infected place may, in all cases of a declaration by the minister, include any common, field, stable, cowshed, or other premises in which infection or contagious disease has been found to exist, and such an area as to the minister seems requisite ; and the minister may, from time to time, by order, extend or curtail the limits of an infected place beyond the boundaries of the common, field, stable, cowshed, farm or premises where infectious or contagious disease is declared or found to exist.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is there to be no chance whatever given to the man who is interested on the other side of the question to be heard ? It seems to me that when we give power to enforce an embargo against a man and practically put him out of the cattle-raising business for the season, without giving any or very little compensation, there should be some opportunity given him to present his view of the case.

Mr. GILMOUR. It is possible that a veterinary might declare a contagious disease, as for instance, cholera, to be in a certain district for the purpose of getting the fees.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The inspector is paid a salary and not by fees.

Mr. GILMOUR. Still it may be in his interest that a district should be declared to be infected. I have an instance in my mind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They are not permanent salaried officers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That lets in the danger to which my hon. friend referred.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If we believed that these men were deliberately creating business for themselves, we would have to take steps to remedy that. But I do not think that is at all likely, and in any case it is necessary for health purposes that prompt action should be taken. We could not wait for the ordinary procedure of law, and the inspector must take responsibility. If we found him doing anything of the kind without justification, we would soon remove him. At present we are having this work done much more by officers paid by the year and have slightly enlarged our permanent staff, so as to be able to employ permanent instead of temporary officers.

On section 24,

Mr. LANCASTER. This provides that an order of the minister relative to an infected

place shall supersede any order of a local authority inconsistent with it. Is not that a little dangerous ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has been the rule ever since the Act has been in existence.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think it has ever been tested in the courts. It is a serious thing to put it so strongly as that, without any qualifications, because the question of the power of two parliaments might very easily arise.

Section agreed to.

On section 27,

Every company and every person carrying for hire animals to or in Canada, shall thoroughly cleanse and disinfect, in such manner as the Governor in Council, from time to time, directs, all steamships, steamers, vessels, boats, pens, carriages, trucks, horse-boxes and vehicles used by such company or person for the carrying of animals ; and the Governor in Council may cause any such steamship, steamer, vessel, boat, carriage, truck, horse-box or vehicle, to be detained at such place as to him seems meet, until it is so cleansed and disinfected.

Mr. POPE. Has there been any Order in Council passed in connection with this ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. POPE. Does the hon. gentleman remember the district ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not. It is one of the general regulations which require that, any time it is ordered, all railway carriages, trucks and cars for the carrying of stock must be cleansed.

Mr. POPE. Must cars passing from the United States through Canada into the United States again be cleansed before they return to Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. POPE. Is the system of keeping track of these cars such that the department knows that they have been thoroughly cleansed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have a general order with regard to all cars coming in from the United States. Under ordinary circumstances, there is merely a general inspector to keep track of them. The railway companies are responsible for it, and they are liable to be called to account at any time if they do not comply with the rules. The reports are that they do it very carefully and effectively. When the New England States were scheduled as having foot and mouth disease, we put special officers on and watched so that there should be no danger of cars coming in without being disinfected.

Mr. POPE. And how is it with regard to cars coming in from Chicago eastward ? Is the same trouble taken ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. POPE. It would not be possible for cars to go from the New England states to Chicago and then into Canada without being cleansed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The American authorities do not allow the cars to cross into other states from the New England states without being disinfected. They are watching that carefully.

Mr. POPE. Still, the hon. minister is trusting to their doing it, and is not making any regulation affecting the cars from Chicago ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have not made any special regulation on that point.

Mr. POPE. In the case of Texas cattle going into Alberta. I saw a number of Texas cattle being unloaded there—any one having seen Texas cattle once would have no difficulty in recognizing them again——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Are they not Mexican ?

Mr. POPE. I would not say they are not, as the two are very much alike.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think they must be Mexicans. There is a law in the United States appointing a line north of which cattle from the south are not allowed to come. Subject to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Pope) knowledge on that subject, which I would not dispute——

Mr. POPE. Does the hon. minister know how far north that line is ? Is it north of the Indian Territory, the pan handle of Texas ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is south of the Indian Territory, I think. I think the pan handle of Texas is not included.

Mr. POPE. Are not cattle coming from Southern Texas to the markets shipped——?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. None, by the regulations of the United States. Or, rather, I am informed that I should correct that as to time. There is a certain season of the year when the Texas cattle disease is not dangerous.

Mr. POPE. When I was acquainted with that section of the country, certain territory was marked out in which the cattle were permitted to be driven from southern Texas through the pan handle and shipped from Dodge city to Kansas city, Chicago and other places. I know that, later in the season, they are allowed to go anywhere. But during the period of the year when the Texas fever was infectious, the restriction was imposed. The hon. minister says, as I understand him, that the regulation allow-

ing them to pass through has been done away with.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That route cannot now be used.

Mr. POPE. The hon. minister thinks there is no danger of the importation of cattle disease into Alberta from that district ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe there is none.

Mr. POPE. Have we regulations prohibiting Texas cattle from coming into Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We do permit them, with certain certificates from the United States bureau of animal industry, which corresponds to our veterinary bureau—certificates of health and of individual inspection of the animals—to come into our North-west.

Mr. POPE. Could the hon. gentleman say whether these cattle are allowed to come from Texas to other parts of the United States under similar conditions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not tell.

Mr. POPE. There is danger in dealing with these cattle, and we cannot be too careful.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are trying to guard against danger and are watching the matter closely. I think we have been successful in keeping out disease.

Mr. GILMOUR. Will the minister please say which of these sections, from section 17 to section 28 are new ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Section 26 is new, and section 28 also.

On section 28,

All yards, stables, sheds or other premises used by railway or steamship companies or other persons for the accommodation of animals shall be maintained in a clean, comfortable and sanitary condition, and shall be subject at all times to inspection by inspectors acting under the authority of the minister, who, when they deem such action necessary, may order the cleansing and disinfection in a satisfactory manner of the said yards, stables, sheds or other premises.

2. In the event of any railway or steamship company or other corporation refusing or neglecting to carry out the orders of the inspector in regard to such cleansing or disinfection, or in the event of such company or corporation neglecting to maintain its yards, stables, sheds or other premises for the use of animals, in a clean, comfortable and sanitary condition, the inspector may condemn the said premises as unfit for use ; whereupon the said premises shall not be used for the accommodation of animals until such time as the orders of the inspector in regard thereto have been satisfactorily carried out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I move to substitute 'person' for 'corporation' in the second and fourth lines of subsection 2.

Mr. INGRAM. Has any railway or steamship company refused to comply with this rule ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They have not refused but they sometimes have not acted, and we wish to have the power to stimulate them.

Mr. GILMOUR. Have you ever asked them to act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, yes; and not only asked but ordered them to do so.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would it not be better to insert after 'corporation,' 'or person' ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am told that legally 'person' includes 'corporation.'

Mr. LANCASTER. Technically, I do not think that a railway or a company is a person.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am willing to make the change, and I move to amend by striking out the word 'corporation' and inserting the word 'person.'

Amendment agreed to, and section agreed to.

On section 46,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will reserve this section in order to give an opportunity for further discussion. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business shall we expect to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE We will take up first the Railway Bill, then later on go into Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A week ago I gave notice to the House that I proposed to move a certain motion, and I consented on Thursday last to let the motion stand until to-day. Although I did not make any stipulation about it, I was under the impression that the House would be moved into Committee of Supply to-day, as I extended my motion at the request of the government. If the House is to be moved into Committee of Supply to-morrow, it is desirable that the motion should be made at such time as would enable any debate that arose on the motion to be proceeded with and concluded.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the absence of the Minister of Finance to-night, I would not like to make any pronouncement. But whenever the House does go into Committee of Supply, we will try to meet my hon. friend's views. I do not understand that he desires particularly that that should occur to-morrow; but if the House goes into Committee of Supply to-morrow, we will try to meet the hon. gentleman's wish.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agreed to permit it to stand. I said that I would allow it to stand until Monday, which is to-day. Of course, there was no understanding about it other than what would be implied by what took place, which was just about in the words I have endeavoured to give my hon. friend just now.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will report the matter to the hon. Finance Minister, who will no doubt try to meet the hon. gentleman's views.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 9, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland) moved that the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company be permitted to lay before the House their petition for the passing of an Act to authorize them to issue bonds, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for the presenting of petitions for Private Bills.

The PRIME MINISTER. Explain.

Mr. LOGAN. The Bill is to get leave to issue guaranteed bonds for the purpose of liquidating the obligations of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company. The reason it was not presented before is because the company were not in a position to liquidate with their creditors, many of whom are workingmen and contractors, when the time for presenting petitions in the regular way had expired. They are now in this position. The company are assuming certain liabilities of the contractors for debts due to workingmen and for material furnished, but as the bonding power of the company is exhausted, it is necessary to get permission to issue new bonds.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 197) respecting the Rocky Mountains Railway and Coal Company.—Hon. Mr. Costigan.

JUDGES' RETIRING ALLOWANCES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved that the House go into committtee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :—

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Court Acts, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts, and to provide as follows :—

1. If any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any Superior Court in Canada, resigns his office, His Majesty may, by letters patent, under the great seal, reciting such judge's age and period of service, grant unto him an annuity equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his resignation ; to commence immediately after his resignation, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life, provided such judge has (a) attained the age of seventy-five years, and continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts, or as such judge, and as stipendiary magistrate of the North-west Territories, for twenty years or upwards ; or (b) attained the age of seventy years and continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts for twenty-five years or upwards ; or (c) continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts for thirty years or upwards.

2. Every County Court judge who has attained the age of seventy-five years shall be compulsorily retired ; and His Majesty may, by letters patent, under the great seal, reciting such judge's age and period of service, grant unto him an annuity, if he has continued in office as such judge for twenty-five years or upwards, equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his retirement ; or if he has continued in office as such judge for a less period, equal to two-thirds of such salary ; the said annuity to commence immediately after his retirement, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

The PRIME MINISTER. His Excellency the Governor General has taken cognizance of this resolution and recommends it to our approval.

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I move that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Thursday next, the 11th instant, on the following resolution, which His Excellency has considered and recommends to the consideration of the House :—

Resolved, that it be expedient to provide as follows :—

1. The Governor in Council may from time to time advance and pay to the corporation of the

Harbour Commissioners of Montreal (hereinafter called 'the corporation'), in addition to the moneys authorized to be advanced to the corporation by the Governor in Council by chapter 10 of the statutes of 1896 (first session), and by chapter 47 of the statutes of 1898, and by chapter 9 of the Statutes of 1901, such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of three million dollars, as are required to enable the corporation to construct such further terminal facilities as are necessary property to equip the port of Montreal.

2. No such advances shall be made unless the plans, specifications and estimates for the works to be performed by the corporation, and on which the money so to be advanced is to be expended, have first been submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council.

3. The corporation shall, upon any advance being made, deposit with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General debentures of the corporation equal to par value to the advance so made (which debentures the corporation are hereby authorized to issue), and such debentures so issued shall be of such amounts as the Minister of Finance and Receiver General determines, and shall bear date on the day when such advance is made, and shall be repayable within twenty-five years from the date of their issue, and in the meantime shall bear interest at the rate of three per cent per annum, such interest to be payable half yearly on the first day of July and the first day of January in each year.

4. The principal and interest of the sums advanced under the authority of this Act to the corporation shall be paid by the corporation out of its revenue mentioned in section 8 of chapter 10 of the statutes of 1896 (first session), and shall be a charge upon the said revenue in the same manner and to the same extent as if the sums so advanced had been borrowed by the corporation under the said chapter 10.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT TARIFF POLICY.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). I would like to inquire from the right hon. the leader of the House when it would be convenient for him that I should take up the motion of which I gave notice some time ago. Of course, I quite understand that the motion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition should take precedence, but after that motion has been disposed of, I would like very much that the right hon. gentleman would inform the House when it would be convenient for him to take up mine.

The PRIME MINISTER. If convenient to my hon. friend, we will be ready to take up his motion on Thursday next.

SUPPLY—IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Some days ago, Mr. Speaker, I gave notice to the House that when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would again move the House into Committee of Supply I would move an amendment, the terms of which I then stated. As some observations have been made in the public press with regard to the time at which that motion was introduced, I would like to say, in the first place, that it was introduced in pursuance of a policy decided on several weeks ago, and so decided upon, not with respect to a single resolution, but with respect to several resolutions which was proposed on this side to bring to the attention of the House and the country. There is no doubt whatever, I think, that the iron industry is a very important one to any country which possesses the proper resources and material for developing it. Every one of the foremost countries in the civilized world possessing resources for the manufacture of iron and iron products has, either first or last, given that industry such protection as has resulted in its development. It is quite true that, so far as the mother country is concerned, the policy of free trade has prevailed there since 1847 in relation to the iron industry. But we must remember that that industry had obtained a very firm footing in Great Britain under a protective tariff long before the era of free trade in that country.

The iron industry is important because it affords the materials useful and necessary to the development of every country in the world. It is an important industry also on account of the large number of men it employs, and because it lays the foundation for many other industries. For these reasons, therefore, Canada, it seems to me, possessing the resources and the raw material necessary for the development of this industry, ought to give it such protection as will enable us to utilize to the fullest possible extent those raw materials, those resources, with which Providence has blessed us and which it is our duty, as inheritors of this country to utilize. It may not be out of place to remind the House that Canada possesses, not in one place, but in many places, all the materials which are necessary for the manufacture of iron and steel. We possess the means of economically assembling these materials at the seaboard in the province of Nova Scotia, and also we possess the means of so assembling them on the shores of our great inland waters. And, although the iron industry in Canada has not always in times past been the success that we could desire it to have been, it seems to me, that there is no reason why it could not be made a success. And in that view, I think, I am supported by the language, to which I will call attention in a few minutes, of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) both in 1897 and in 1899, when certain legislation was enacted with regard to this industry.

A writer who paid great attention to this question, and who was interested in

the iron trade to some considerable extent in days gone by in Canada, has spoken of the resources of this country and of the possibility of building up our great iron industry. I will refer to the work of Mr. J. H. Bartlett, published in 1885, after a pretty thorough investigation by him of the practicability of carrying on the manufacture of iron successfully in this country. He says :—

Again, as respects the second of the Baconian conditions to national prosperity, the possession of 'busy workshops,' Canada, more especially since the development of the national policy, has, in a general sense, made great advances. There is, though, one special branch of industry, wherein she has, to a degree almost painfully surprising, failed to attain any appreciable rank among the nations, and wherein she has indeed long lagged, and still lags, far behind in the march of material progress. We refer, of course, to that great industry, so valued by other nations when endowed by nature with the means of cultivating it, the manufacture of iron. If, under the dispensation of Providence, the successful and profitable manufacture of iron in Canada was an impossibility or even a dangerous or difficult venture, we would be compelled philosophically to accept the position, just as we all of us, with repining, submit to the veto of nature against the cultivation, on our lands, of sago, tea or oranges. Nature, however, most assuredly, has not placed any such veto on the manufacture of iron in our Dominion, but, on the contrary, has, in certain portions of our domain, most bountifully endowed us with all the essentials to the successful operation of this great industry. It is we ourselves who, through our apathy, want of knowledge, or through defective legislation, have so long failed, and are still failing, to duly recognize the immense possibilities which lie within our easy reach, but which, in our blindness, we fail to grasp and develop as we should do.

The relation of the various attempts to make iron in this country presents a sad record of loss and disappointment, of blasted hopes and shattered fortunes. These enterprises appear generally to have been undertaken by men of energy and ability,—but, unable to make headway against the competition of older countries, they had, one after another, to succumb.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in speaking in 1897 upon the changes which were then made in the tariff, used the following language as appears in 'Hansard' of that year, page 1,130 :—

How far it was a wise policy to undertake the development of the iron industry in Canada in the way the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) attempted, in the face of many difficulties, and in the light of our experience how far that was a wise policy may well admit of argument. But, it is not worth our while to argue it to-day. We know that large sums have been invested in this industry. We know that large iron industries exist in the country, and while we may not approve of the policy under which they are established, we have no desire to see them snuffed out now. As in dealing with all other countries, we have shown a very large measure of consideration, so we desire to show fair consideration to the iron industry. Therefore, we say, if it is in the interests of the people of Canada that there shall be a reduction in the duty on iron we are prepared to accept the responsibility of advising that the bounties on iron should be increased for a term of years in order that this industry may have a fair chance for existence. . . . . Now we are willing to pay a bounty on iron manufactured in Canada for consumption in Canada, but we have no idea of paying the manufacturers of pig iron or other iron a bounty to enable them to supply the world with cheap iron. Therefore, we say that the bounty shall be applied to iron produced in Canada for consumption in the Dominion, and if this iron is shipped beyond the Dominion we have the right to impose an export duty upon it equal to the bounty paid by the government of Canada.

I may say in passing, that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance withdrew that portion of his resolution before it was adopted, so that, in the end, it passed this House as a bounty on iron, with no exclusion of iron which should be exported after having received the encouragement of that bounty. Now, as further indicating the importance of the industry in the eyes of the Finance Minister, let me quote the very apt language which he used with regard to it when he introduced the system of bounties in 1899. I lay stress upon this because it indicates that the government as well as the opposition are alive to the necessity of maintaining and continuously developing in Canada an industry possessing so great importance as that to which this motion of mine is directed. Speaking on the 13th June, 1899, the hon. Minister of Finance said, as reported in 'Hansard,' page 4,973 :—

Cape Breton possesses advantages of a very marked character for the iron and steel business. The great things required in this business are large bodies of ore, large bodies of coal, large bodies of limestone and large capital. It is only by having these in combination that you can make a successful iron industry. There is a very large deposit of iron in Cape Breton, but, apart from that, this gentleman has obtained an option upon and is now virtually in control of a very valuable iron property in the sister colony of Newfoundland, the ore from which is found to blend very well with the native ore, while the Nova Scotia coal is admirably adapted for the work of smelting. Consequently, with the iron ore of Cape Breton available and the ore of Newfoundland so near that it can be brought to the coal at a very small cost, with large capital and with limestone in profusion, all the elements required for the successful carrying on of the iron industry are combined in that locality, and I have no doubt that if that gentleman and his associates take hold of the matter, they will carry on the business on a large scale. Nor does it end there ; for we all know that the establishment of a successful iron business means the establishment of other businesses that grow out of it.

And in dealing with that question, my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, after referring to the great shipbuilding industry which years ago was developed in the province of Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces, went on to say :

Not having an iron industry, the business of shipbuilding has passed away from us with the passing of the wooden ship.

Then further on he remarks :

With the improvements that are going on, the deepening of our canals, the opening of the Rainy River railway, and other things that are being done to improve the transportation of the products of Canada, there will be a large development of the iron industry on the great lakes and also upon the coast ; and out of this, I strongly hope we shall see a revival of that shipbuilding industry which was so important in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island in by-gone years, the revival of which would have such great effect in promoting the prosperity of our country. This has been happily described in Canada's growing time. Such, I believe, it will prove to be with regard to this industry.

And again :

I believe that the time is more auspicious for the development of an iron and steel industry than for years past, and I hope that with the announcement of this policy—a policy of certainty, because we give certain encouragements for a few years to come—we shall see a large expansion of this important iron and steel industry and that through it much will be done for the advancement of the welfare of the people of Canada.

Such, Mr. Speaker, was the attitude of this government with regard to this industry in the year 1897, and again in 1899. I am quoting from the financial exponent of the government's policy for the purpose of showing that the government, then at least, was alive to the necessity of giving adequate protection to this important industry, and was also fully seized of the fact that Canada, for an industry of this kind, possessed advantages and resources such as are possessed by few other countries in the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us examine for a moment the progress of the iron and steel industry in other countries during the past few years. It is an industry, as I have already said, which was protected in Great Britain for a large number of years, and I want to point out to the House the growth of that industry in Great Britain as compared with its growth in Germany and the United States, both of which latter countries have protected it by a heavy tariff. I want to compare the growth of these three countries during the past twenty years, to show what has been done by those two latter countries under a protective tariff, to develop and increase an industry which is of such vital importance to every country in the world possessing the raw material and resources thereof :

GREAT BRITAIN.

	1883.	1901.
Pig iron, tons..	8,493,287	*7,761,830
Steel, tons	2,158,880	†5,000,000

*Decrease. †Increase over 100 per cent.

GERMANY AND LUXEMBURG.

	1883.	1901.
Pig iron, tons	3,397,588	*7,860,893
Steel, tons..	1,066,920	†6,645,869

*Increase more than 100 per cent.
†Increase more than 500 per cent.

The United States, however, shows the most marvellous development of all. I believe it is stated in text books of acknowledged authority that previously to 1861 the United States imported practically all the iron and steel that was used in that great country :

UNITED STATES.

	1883.	1901.
Pig iron, tons..	4,595,510	*15,878,354
Steel, tons..	1,673,534	†13,473,595

*Increase about 275 per cent.
†Increase over 700 per cent.

That has been done under a protective tariff, and that has been done in face of the iron and steel industry of Great Britain, which in 1883 led the world, and in which the British economists of that day thought Great Britain would still continue to lead the world for all time to come.

Now, I submit these figures, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of showing two things : in the first place, that you cannot find, so far as I am aware, any country in the world where the iron and steel industry has not required protection of some sort in the first instance to give it a firm ground and to show in the next place, by the example of the United States and of Germany, that if you have a country which does possess the raw material and resources which are required for building up an industry of this kind, you can, by giving the proper protection to that industry, develop it to an extent that would hardly be dreamed of unless you had the actual results before you which I have presented to the House.

Now in Canada at the present time, we possess, as I have said, every material in abundance that is required for the purpose of developing this industry. We use in Canada a very considerable amount of iron, and we shall use in Canada for years to come a great deal more, as our system of railways develops, and as our industrial development increases. We know that for the purpose of railways, iron and steel are used very largely, we know that for the purpose of building, for the purpose of manufacture, for the purpose of warehouses in cities, for all the purposes that are necessary in connection with the industrial life of our country, iron and steel are very important factors indeed, and we may well assume that the consumption of iron and steel in this country will increase more rapidly in the future, much more rapidly than our population itself is likely to increase.

Coming back for a moment to the United States of America, and referring to the

development of the industry there, let us bear in mind there are to-day employed in the iron and steel industry of that country more men than in any other single industry in the United States of America, that $122,-710,193 was paid out in wages in this industry alone; that the total value of the production in 1900 was $835,759,034; and that over one-third of this production was consumed in the construction of rails, cars, locomotives, bridges, buildings and electrical machinery.

I have prepared a table showing the imports into Canada of iron and steel for the year ending 30th June, 1902, and although I know it is a little wearisome to give these figures to the House, still, I will ask the House to bear with me while I give them, and after I have given them I will state the total result of the figures contained in the official returns. For the year ending the 30th June, 1902, Canada imported in tons of 2,000 pounds, the following:

Canada's imports of iron and steel (direct products of blast furnaces and rolling mills) for year ending 30th June, 1902:

	Tons of 2,000 lbs.	Value in Dollars.
Pig iron	40,014	585,803
Scrap cast	3,048	39,958
Scrap (wrought) billets and blooms	55,761	938,941
Rails	130,602	2,953,230
Wire rods and their products	92,919	3,533,851
Sheets of all kinds, tin plate, &c.	63,390	3,285,208
Bars, round, flat and small sections, &c.	62,441	2,549,669
Plates	30,301	905,183
Plates universal	3,593	101,682
Plates agricultural	2,336	178,704
Pipes, boiler tubes, &c., but not pipe 2½ in. dia., and over for mining	12,071	841,670
Structural shapes, &c.	28,011	789,644
Hoops, &c.	2,080	96,728
Ship's plates, angles, &c.	1,786	70,707
Skelp	16,195	496,130
Totals	544,548	$17,527,108

Note.—Total importation iron and steel and manufactures thereof during the years ending respectively on

June 30, 1902	$33,681,625
" 1896	10,203,052
Increase	$23,478,573

So that the total importation of these articles into Canada during the year ending 30th June, 1902, was 544,548 tons, valued at $17,527,108, and I believe that the total consumption in Canada of the articles I have mentioned is in the vicinity of 800,000 tons, so that you will see that the total importation by Canada of these articles was during the year ending June 30th, 1902, about two thirds of the total amount consumed. Comparing for a moment the total importation of iron and steel and the manufactures of iron and steel in 1896 and 1902, we find that, whereas, we imported in 1896, $10,-203,052 worth, we imported, in 1902, no less than $33,681,625 worth, or an increase in that period of six years in the importation of these articles of no less a sum than $23,-478,573.

Now, Mr. Speaker, considering that we have the resources in Canada that I have mentioned, considering that we have some measure of protection in Canada and considering that the government provided a system of bounties in 1899, why is it that we find at the present time that the iron and steel industry of Canada is not in a very flourishing condition. I am not going into the history of any individual industry, nor do I propose to make any references thereto beyond this, that, looking around us at the condition of Canada we will all agree that the iron industry is not in that flourishing condition in which hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, having at heart the best interests of this country, would desire to see it. What is the reason for this? Well, the reason I think, in the first place, is the fact that we are side by side with a country like the United States of America, which jealously protects its home markets, which has magnificent resources for the protection of iron and steel and which has utilized these resources to the utmost, which now leads the world in iron and steel production and which controls the price of iron and steel throughout the world, because, I am told on what I regard as very good authority, that the output of iron in Germany to-day is controlled not in Germany, but in the United States of America. Well, under these conditions, what have we been doing for the iron industry of Canada? In the first place, let me make a comparison; let me compare the protection which we accord to the iron industry in Canada with the protection which is accorded to the iron industry in the United States, and in the second place, let me compare the protection which is accorded to the iron industry in Canada to-day with the protection which was accorded to it under the Conservative tariff of 1894. You have the enormous country, the United States, to the south of us with all these resources I have referred to, you have that country with a home market of 75,000,000 or 80,000,000 of people and you have in that country the iron and steel industry protected by customs duties which are absurdly higher, I was going to say, than those with which we seek to protect the iron industry in Canada to-day. Let us have no misunderstanding on this point. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) claims to be a free trader and is glad, having begun his life as a protectionist, that he is now a free trader. I am not finding fault with that. The right hon. gentleman is, of course, at liberty to select his own policy but let us have an understanding upon this point. Are we to have a policy to protect and develop the iron industry or not? Now, that is the question, which presents itself to this government and in proposing the

resolution which I shall submit to the House in a moment, I am not going to propose a resolution which the government need necessarily take as a motion of want of confidence. I have carefully abstained from putting in the resolution one single word of censure or reflection upon the government, and in any comparisons I make in regard to duties, I want it to be distinctly understood that my sole object is to get protection for the iron industry of Canada, because I believe that protection is necessary in the interests of the people of Canada as a whole to-day.

In the first place, I want to make a comparison between the duties which are levied in the United States upon iron and steel products coming into that country and the duties which are levied upon similar products coming into this country and see how the comparison stands. Remember that the iron and steel industries of the United States have for their support a home market of 75,000,000 or 80,000,000 of people with greater industrial development than we can hope to have for years to come, and one would suppose if the iron and steel industry is to flourish at all in Canada that we must have protection approaching in some measure at least to that which has been found necessary in the United States for the purpose of building up that industry in that country. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) said years ago that if the iron industry could not succeed with the protection it had, it would be better to give up paying any attention to either iron or coal and devote our time to digging potatoes and other agricultural pursuits, but I do not think my hon. friend is of that opinion to-day. I have done him the credit of quoting his remarks in 1897 and in 1899, which are in somewhat marked contrast, with the utterance to which I have just referred and which was made by him in the year 1887, and I trust that the Finance Minister has not departed from the view which he took in 1899 as well as in 1897 of the importance of the iron industry in Canada. And having that in mind; and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister having that in mind—because the Minister of Finance spoke for the government with regard to this subject—let us see what measure of protection we have in this country as compared with that which has developed to so enormous an extent these great industries in the United States.

The United States' tariff, particularly the iron tariff is very complex, and is a very carefully thought out production, and it has not been easy in all cases to make an exact comparison between the Canadian tariff and the United States' tariff, but in some instances at least that comparison is possible, and I will point out to the House what the difference is between the duties which are thought necessary even to-day in the United States, and those which we grant as a measure of protection to this great Canadian industry.

COMPARISON OF RATES OF DUTY ON IRON AND STEEL.

(Direct Product of Blast Furnaces and Rolling Mills.)

——	Canadian.	American.
Pig iron and scrap cast	$2.50 per ton..	$3.75 per ton.
Billets and blooms....	$2.00 " ..	$6.00 "
Scrap (wrought).....	$1.00 " ..	$3.57
Rails (tramway, &c.),.	30 p.c. = $7.50 per ton.	$7.00
Rails	Free	$7.00
Wire rods.....	"	$8.00 and higher.
Barbed wire.....	"	1¼c. per lb. and higher.
Galvanized wire.....	"	1¼c. "
Wire, spring...	"	1¼c. "
Wire fencing.....	15 p.c. = $10.80 per ton.	1¼c. per lb. = $25 per ton.
Wire, covered.....	30 p. c	45 p.c.
Wire, N.O.P.....	20 p.c. = $10.80	1¼c. per lb. = $25 per ton.
Wire for ships..	Free	" "
Canada plate, Russia iron, galv. sheets, &c.	5 p. c. = $2.63 per ton.	$18 per ton and higher.
Sheets, 17 gauge and thinner.	5 p. c. = $2.55 per ton.	$14 "
Sheets, corrugated....	30 p. c. = $8.46 per ton.	$14 "
Tin plates (sheets)....	Free	$30 "
Billets and flat spring.	"	$6 & $10 per ton and higher.
Spiral spring.....	"	$10 per ton and higher.
Steel for windmills, &c.	"	$10 " "
Steel under ½ in. diam.	"	$12 " "
Steel bars.....	$7 per ton	$12 per ton.
Steel shafting and forging.	30 p.c	Shafting, 45 p. c.; forgings, 35 p.c.
Steel fish and tie plates	$8 per ton ...	$8 per ton.
Steel angles less than 35 lbs. per yard.	$7 "	$10 "
Plates.....	$7 "	$10 per ton and higher.
" not less than ¼ in. thick.	10 p.c. = $2.93 per ton.	$10 "
" universal or rolled edges.	10 p.c. = $2.83 per ton.	$10 "
" agricultural.	5 p. c. = $3.80 per ton.	$10 "
Skelp for pipe.....	5 p. c. = $1.50 per ton.	$10 "
Tubing for boilers....	5 p. c. = $3.75 per ton.	$40 "
Tubing under 2 in. diam	35 p.c. = $22.75 per ton.	$40 "
Tubing, N.O.P.. .	30 p. c.... ...	35 p.c.
Tubing (item 617).....	Free	$40 per ton.
Tubing over 2 in. diam.	15 p.c. = $9.60 per ton.	$40 "
Angles, tees, beams, &c., weighing over 35 lbs. per lin. yard.	10 p.c. = $2.85 per ton.	$10 "
Hoops, 18 gauge and thinner.	5 p. c. = $2.30 per ton.	$12 per ton and higher.

The House will see from this table, that in almost every item of the United States' tariff, certainly in every important item, the steel industry in the United States of America receives a measure of protection which is much larger than we give to that industry in Canada.

Now, I am aware that this government in the year 1899 brought down certain resolutions for the purpose of giving support to the iron industry and causing it to be developed in this country, and I have already referred to the language of the Minister of Finance on that occasion when he dwelt upon the importance of this industry. Encouragement by way of bounty was given to the production of certain forms of iron in Canada for the reason that the tariff had been materially reduced in 1897, and it was announced upon that occasion by the Minister of Finance that the reason for extending the time for the bounties was that it was desirable to give the iron industry a fair chance in Canada, and it could only receive that fair chance by obtaining some compensation for the reduction in duties which had been made in the tariff of 1897 as compared with that of 1894. But, I do not know whether the House is really impressed with the very great reduction which was made in the tariff of 1897, and therefore I shall take the liberty of reading to the House some items in that tariff which show the serious reduction in the protection of this industry which was then effected.

And I may say in passing, that while the system of bounties may for the time being give support to the iron and steel industry in this country or any other country; I, for my own part, do not believe that the iron and steel industry in Canada can ever be put upon a solid basis, upon a permanent footing, unless we have something more than these bounties can give; unless we have actual protection in Canada such as will secure for our own producers our own market.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know whether that is the view of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance after having undertaken that system of bounties. I observe that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce seems rather to smile at that idea, and I suppose that that is due to the fact that his old free trade ideas of years ago still dominate his mind to some extent. However, that may be, I think we are face to face with two alternatives. We are face to face with increased protection to the iron and steel industry in Canada, or with this fact, that, for a number of years at least, that industry cannot be maintained unless our producers can command our own market and our own market cannot be given to them except by a very much higher measure of protection than they enjoy at the present time. Let us compare the duties levied under the Conservative tariff of 1894 with the duties levied by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the tariff introduced by him in 1897:

	Tariff 1894.	Tariff 1897.	Decrease.
Pig iron	$4. per ton	$2.50 per ton	$1.50
Scrap (cast)	$4 "	$2.50 "	$1.50
Billets and blooms	$5 "	$2 "	$3.00
Scrap (wrought)	$4 "	$1 "	$3.00
Steel bars	$10 "	$7 "	$3.00
Steel fish and tie plates	$10 "	$8 "	$2.00
Steel bands	$10 "	$7 "	$3.00
Plates	$10 "	$7 "	$3.00
Steel shaftings and forgings	35 per cent, or not less than $15 per ton.	30 per cent, = to $10 per ton.	5 per cent, or $5 per ton.
Steel angles less than 35 pounds per yard	35 per cent, or not less than $10 per ton.	$7 per ton	$3.00
Plates not less than ¼-inch thick	12½ per cent.	10 per cent	2½ per cent.
Tubing for boilers	7½ "	5 "	2½ "
Angles, tees, beams, &c., weighing over 35 pounds per lineal yard.	12½ "	10 "	2½ "
Plates, rolled edges	12 "	10 "	2 "
Barbed wire	¾ "	Free	¾ "
Galvanized wire	20 "	Free	20 "

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that these differences are very large, indeed. In some cases three-fourths of the protection has been taken away; in many cases from twenty-five to fifty per cent of the protection has been taken away; and it was apparently expected by the hon. Minister of Finance that the system of bounties he introduced in 1899 would take the place of this protection, and that the iron industry in Canada would have the same opportunity of development which it had previously enjoyed. Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot think that this is the case. I cannot think that the bounties

provided by my hon. friend, which will come to an end in the year 1905, have afforded the same measure of encouragement as that which was afforded by the tariff of 1894; and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in announcing, as he did in the county of Yarmouth, N.S., during the past year, that the system of bounties would not be continued after the year 1905, gave to this industry a very severe blow indeed; because the bounties coming to an end in 1905, and the protection to the industry having been decreased by the very large reductions which I have mentioned, and being now very slight as compared with that afforded in the great country to the south of us, it is not much matter of wonder that the iron industry of Canada is not at the present moment in a very flourishing condition. Let us look once more at some of the items which we imported last year free of duty :

	Quantity.	Value.
Wire rods..	55,182 tons.	$1,523,792
Barbed wire	16,469 "	826,846
Galvanized wire...	14,854 "	548,185
Tin plates..	27,207 "	1,528,655
Billets and flat springs.	3,681 "	119,309
Steel for windmills, &c..	3,305 "	153,114

Is there any reason why we should not give in Canada adequate protection to the iron and steel industry ? If we give to it the protection which it should have, having regard to our raw materials, and the resources of our country, will it follow that there will be any permanent increase in prices in this country ? Well, Sir, let us look at the lessons of the past with regard to that. We have taken the duty from binder twine; we have to some extent taken the duty from coal oil; we have taken the duty altogether from barbed wire; and yet, every one of these articles commands a higher price in Canada to-day than it did at the time the Conservative tariff was in force. Let us look at the history of the United States. Thirty years ago in that country steel rails were quoted at $112 a ton ; in 1902 they were quoted at $28 ; No. 1 foundry pig iron was quoted at $48 a ton, now it is quoted at $22.19 ; bar iron, rolled, was $97.63 per ton, now it is $47.79; cut nails have come down in price from $4.92 to $2.29; and so on, through the whole list of products of iron and steel in the United States. Can we not trust, Mr. Speaker, to the competition, the enterprise and the ability of our own business men to keep prices down in Canada ? Let us look around Canada to-day and see the industries which have flourished. Can any hon. gentleman on either side of the House tell me that, in respect of those industries which have had a fair and adequate measure of protection in Canada, any undue price has been exacted from the consumer ? I have paid some attention to this question; I have looked around for evidence upon it, and I do not know of one single instance in Canada in which an industry has been developed by protection and the price to the consumer is not a fair price, brought down to a fair basis by the very competition which exists in the country among our own people. So I say I do not think we have anything to fear in Canada from giving an adequate measure of relief to this industry.

I see no reason therefore why the government should not restore to that iron and steel industry the protection at least which it formerly enjoyed, and I should be inclined to think that in giving that question all the consideration and the attention it deserves, they might well take into consideration whether or not the protection which existed under the Conservative tariff of 1894 should not, so far as some of the articles are concerned, at least, be very materially increased, with every advantage to the true interests of the people of Canada as a whole. In giving the Canadian duties upon certain articles on which the duties are low or which are free, I should have said that the duties I have mentioned are in some cases those imposed upon articles imported into Canada for the purposes of manufacturing. That is the case with regard to two or three of the articles I have mentioned, and I state this in order that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance or my right hon. friend who leads the House may not suppose that I am under any misapprehension with regard to the actual condition of the duties on the articles I have named.

I believe that it is the duty of this government to take this matter into consideration at once, if they have not already done so. I would have been glad, had the government so desired, to let this motion stand over until a later day for that purpose but as no request of that kind was made me, I feel it my duty to proceed with my amendment. It is not made with any idea of staying the hand of the government or hampering the government, but with the profound conviction that it is necessary, in the interests of Canada to-day, in the interests of the iron industry, upon which the homes and fortunes of so many of our people depend, that we should have some greater measure of protection to that industry. I recognize the fact that in dealing with the duties upon iron and steel, the government would be obliged to give consideration to other industries in this country, and probably to revise our tariff in respect of many articles into the manufacture of which iron and steel enter. So far as we on this side are concerned, we are not afraid of that position. We believe that there should be a revision of the tariff generally, and if the government, in deciding to give some measure of increased protection to the iron and steel industry, finds it necessary to make some revision of the tariff in connection with articles into the manufacture of which iron and

steel enter, we on this side will be glad to lend them a helping hand and support them in that measure of protection to those industries which we think the true interests of this country demand. So that considering the importance of this industry, even if it should prolong this session to a greater extent than anticipated, even if it should involve a more complete revision of the tariff than might occur to one at first blush, I say that, having a regard to the condition of affairs in this country at present, the parliament of Canada could do no better work than give attention to that revision at once. The homes of ten thousand or fifteen thousand people may depend on the action which the government will take. A very important industry in the province of Nova Scotia may come to a standstill, a very important industry in the west may have to cease operations. I question if hon. gentlemen in this House adequately realize what a blow it would be to the future of Canada, not only to the iron and steel industry, but to Canada as a whole, if these industries, in which so many millions of dollars have been invested in the past few years, should come to a standstill. No one can overestimate what it would mean to this country should that come to pass. No one can exaggerate what effect it might have upon general financial conditions, and I therefore say that if this amendment of mine, calling for increased protection to the iron and steel industry, should involve a somewhat general revision of the tariff, the parliament of Canada could not do better work this summer than devote its attention to that subject. I do not know that there is one hon. gentleman in this House who is not so seriously impressed with the present condition of affairs that he would be unwilling to sacrifice some of his time and comfort for the purpose of remaining here even longer than we anticipated, in order that a measure of protection, adequate to the needs of this industry and to the condition of the country, might be given. Therefore, not to detain the House at greater length, but in the sincere hope that the government may see fit to extend some measure of protection to this industry, and in the sincere hope that the government may be willing to accept this resolution as one urged from this side is in the best interests of the country, I beg to move :

That all the words after the word " That " in the proposed motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor :

This House is of opinion that the tariff of customs duties should give such protection to iron and steel industries as will not only secure to our own producers and manufacturers the Canadian market in articles now produced or manufactured in this country, but will also develop and sustain the manufacture in Canada of other iron and steel products which at present are imported in large quantities from other countries.

And that the present tariff of customs duties should be now readjusted on this principle.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). If I were disposed, Mr. Speaker, to enter into any protracted discussion with my hon. friend on this subject, I should perhaps be obliged to take exception to some of the statements and conclusions which he has advanced. Not, however, to all. There was much in the hon. gentleman's speech to command my respect and admiration, and in that class I would include the excellent quotations he gave us from the speech of the Minister of Finance. There is also another point made by my hon. friend which demands my recognition, my appreciation, and, shall I say, my thanks. When I remember that for seven years hon. gentlemen opposite, in this House and out of this House, have used the argument that the policy of the government to-day is the old national policy, when I remember that they have gone from ocean to ocean to proclaim that no material reductions have been made in this tariff, when I remember that for seven years that has been the declaration and the attitude of the hon. gentlemen, I note it with satisfaction when the hon. gentleman comes down now and, for fifteen minutes reads a long statistical statement to show that, in the great iron business of this country, the foundation of so many other industries, not only have we reduced the tariff, but we have made enormous reductions. I regard that, Sir, as of great importance; I regard that statement from my hon. friend as ample apology—if I may call it so—for the time he has occupied in what was otherwise, in my judgment, an inopportune speech. But in the presence of that speech, that recantation if not apology for seven years of misunderstanding—to use a mild word—I want to thank my hon. friend for having, at last, put the matter right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I challenge the hon. gentleman to point to a single word of mine inconsistent with what I have just said.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is in a better position than any other member of this House to raise a question as to consistency. However, I said that if I were disposed to enter upon a protracted discussion of this subject I should be obliged to take exception to some of the statements, opinions and conclusions of my hon. friend. But I do not propose to enter upon such a discussion, because I think it would be inopportune, and I am persuaded that no good purpose would be served by having that discussion at the present time. The hon. gentleman seems to have expected that we would ask him to withdraw the resolution. We have no desire that he should withdraw it. He has brought it forward and he accepts the responsibility of it. Whether it is timely or untimely is for him to decide. In our judgment it is not timely.

Among the many sins laid at the door of this government, I for the first time now hear the charge that we have been lacking in generosity and liberality to the iron industry. I have heard it said from time to time that we have dealt too liberally with that industry; I have heard comparisons to the effect: You have done thus for the iron industry, but you will not do it for some other. It is a new charge that we have been dealing ungenerously with the iron industry. When the matter came up a few days ago I reminded my hon. friend that the resolution brought forward on the subject of the tariff were still before the House, the final stages not having been taken. I suggested that when these resolutions came up that would be the most opportune time for the discussion of tariff questions. My hon. friend has preferred to take a different course. He has preferred not to bring this question up in the ordinary way of tariff discussion, but to bring it forward as an amendment to Supply. He has preferred to bring it up in that form which is always taken in the moving of a vote of want of confidence. I am satisfied that no one truly interested in the iron industry, or with a sincere desire to promote the interests of the country irrespective of party politics, can support the hon. gentleman in precipitating this discussion to-day. But since the hon. gentleman has taken the responsibility of bringing the matter forward in this way, since he has preferred not to take the usual method and discuss tariff questions at the proper time, I recognize his right—I do not question that—but as he has brought this forward at what we regard as an inopportune time, and has brought it forward in the way in which one must vote either for or against the motion, I have to ask the House to treat this as a vote of want of confidence and reject the motion.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has chosen to treat the motion made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in the manner in which he has treated it. I presume that the hon. gentleman has taken that course which he thinks will be the most convenient and comfortable for the government on this occasion. I should have thought that the hon. gentleman would not be disposed, nor would the government of which he is to-day the spokesman, be disposed, to insist too much on matters of etiquette in the presence of what is a most important question for Canada. However, the hon. gentleman having chosen to treat the matter in that way, the result simply follows that, instead of replying to the exceedingly temperate and well-reasoned address made by the leader of the opposition, he has resorted to the use very commonly made by governments of their majority, he avoids discussion of the question and simply relies upon the numerical strength of the governments' forces to set the question aside for the time-being. I should have imagined that, perhaps, the hon. minister would have taken the opportunity to deal a little more fully with what he chooses to regard as a recantation by the leader of the opposition with reference to the charge, which he says has been made from ocean to ocean, against the present government, that they have really adopted the old protective tariff of the Conservative government. While the hon. minister showed a certain amount of pleasure and satisfaction in making that statement, still, even that was not enough to induce him to take the House and the country into his confidence, but he has resorted to the policy usually resorted to by the right hon. leader of the House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when he meets a difficulty—he has simply effected a retirement within the lines of Torres Vedras. There can be no question about the importance of the question which the leader of the opposition has raised. There can be no question about the opinion held of it on this side of the House. I regret very much that on this occasion the Minister of Finance, speaking for the government, has invited his followers to close their ears to all reasoning addressed to the government, to leave out of sight altogether the considerations affecting the welfare of the iron and every other industry in Canada and simply keep in view the stability and comfort of the government at the present moment. That may be a very important matter to hon. gentlemen opposite, but I do not believe that in the opinion of the people of the Dominion of Canada it is by any means so important a question as the welfare, success, and progress of Canada in those great industries for which it is so well adapted.

I suppose that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has, practically in brief fashion, exhausted the statement of the case proposed to be made from this side of the House, that is, that it is absolutely essential if Canada is ever to have any great iron industry, that the government of the day should change the policy under which it has been living up to this time. The statement made by Conservative speakers either in this House or out of it, that the government of to-day is living practically under the old protective tariff, is not at all replied to by citing the fact that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding)) has chosen to dwell upon with satisfaction, the fact that the leader of the opposition has been able to point out numerous cases in which the amount of protection enjoyed by iron and its associated industries has been reduced by the present administration. The Minister of Finance passed very hurriedly over that subject, and for excellent reasons. He did not deal with the associated argument of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that the government did not

actually diminish the protection afforded by Canada to the iron industry, because if they had reduced the protection afforded by the tariff to that industry, they have made it good, and even more than made it good, by the bounties which they have given. Take the tariff as it stood, even under the figuring of the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs, it has always been impossible to show that, generally speaking, taking the tariff as a whole, as great a reduction has been made by the government now in power as was made in the customs duties by the preceding Conservative administration, which always called itself protectionist. There was a small reduction somewhere less than two per cent, in the neighbourhood of one per cent, but not as great as was made by the Minister of Finance of the preceding government, which always avowed itself a protectionist administration. So that the statement, if the leader of the opposition or any other member on this side of the House had really made it, stands uncontradicted and uncontroverted to this moment, in that in so far as the tariff of to-day may be regarded as a whole, it is practically, with some small modifications and readjustments, a national policy, the old national policy, a protective tariff.

Now we have never found fault with the government for that fact. We did point to the fact that there was a certain amount of inconsistency in their position; we did point to the fact that the tariff which they presented to the country in 1897 was not exactly that tariff which the honest free traders who put them into power in 1896 would have expected them to submit to parliament. But we never found fault with them for that. In fact I think the great subject of praise from this side of the House, in dealing with the conduct of the administration, has been the fact that they chose that course and followed it. I believe their highest title to a claim upon the good will and gratitude of the people of Canada rests entirely in the fact that on coming into power they decided to stand by the institutions of the country and not destroy them by a sudden reversion of the Conservatives policy, but practically to stand by that policy. But what is the position to-day? While we give commendation to the government for that course, and while we congratulate the country upon the fact that the government chose that policy, we say now that the world generally and the industries of Canada are in such a position that conditions have changed, and that it is absolutely essential that these gentlemen who are to-day governing Canada under what is virtually a system of protection, should not remain in a stationary position, but should watch the course of trade the world over, should consider any competition which Canadian industries are expected to meet, and should adjust from time to time their tariff so as to make good that protection which I maintain the tariff under which we are living is intended to give to the industries of Canada.

Now, it is a simple matter which any gentleman on the opposite side can verify for himself with half an hour's research, it is an absolutely bald statement of the truth to assert, and it is very easy to prove, that not one of the countries which to-day enjoys a leading position in connection with the great iron industry which is the object of the resolution moved by the leader of the opposition, has ever attained the position which it occupies without the government of the country in which it has grown up, affording it protection. Our friends opposite are constantly pointing to Great Britain as a free trade country, they are citing the example of the mother country. In 1896 they professed to quote it to the people of this country, offering to them a tariff such as was in force in Great Britain; because their policy as expounded by their speakers and their press was a policy of revenue tariff such as they have in England. Now, what is the history of the iron industry in Great Britain? It is to-day, and has been for the last fifty years, living under a free trade system. But is it thriving under a free trade system? There can be no question whatever that the figures quoted here to-day by the leader of the opposition, show that in that country which is the one great example of a country in the world endeavouring to live under free trade system, and at the same time aspiring to occupy a leading position in industrial life, that country is practically stationary to-day, and the greatest statesman in that country is appealing to the people to reconsider the course they have been following, and is pointing them to what he considers a better way, and is inviting them to adopt a tariff which will enable them to keep what they have gained when thrown into competition with the great nations of the world.

It is an easy matter to prove that the position which Great Britain has attained in the iron world has been attained under a system of high protection. Does the hon. gentleman require to be told that the time is not far past when in Great Britain a duty of £20 a ton was imposed upon iron imported from Sweden and other countries of Europe? Does he require to be told that so far back as 1660, under Charles II, the tariff was so complicated that it contained sixty or sixty-five different headings in the iron schedules, including hundreds of articles upon which duties were levied far exceeding 100 per cent? Does he require to be told that in many cases actually the government of Great Britain positively prohibited the importation of any articles of iron, and for a long time refused to permit the export of iron from their own country in order that the manufacturers of iron

might have no lack of raw material ? Do our friends opposite not know that the whole object of the government was not only to develop and promote the manufacture of iron, especially in the shape of raw iron or pig iron, but to develop its manufacture into every one of the more highly organized classes and the more profitable divisions into which it enters in almost every feature of our modern industrial life ? There can be no question about the fact that when Great Britain attained a commanding position, having become the leader of the world in iron production, having reached that point when she alone was producing more iron than all the rest of the world combined, when she attained that position, then other countries that saw the abounding prosperity in Great Britain under the operation of that policy, these outside countries, envying the position of that country, set themselves to work to secure for themselves a share of that amazing prosperity which they witnessed in Great Britain. In every case they resorted to the very same system by which Great Britain had achieved her wonderful position, in every case they resorted to protection. They took their own home markets for themselves, they raised their duties to such a point that their home markets were absolutely protected, and to-day Great Britain is shut out of the markets of all her great competitors. Under the operation of that system I believe to-day Germany and Belgium equal her in iron production, or nearly so, and on the other hand, we find the United States far in excess, almost doubling her, in the production of iron.

Now, in the United States we find a case much like our own. We have a country of enormous natural advantages in which is found in the utmost profusion all the sources out of which this great industry has grown. Did that country achieve great success as an iron producing country until they resorted to protection of the most extreme character ? It did not. Up till 1816 or 1817, although during the preceding years, and during the time in which the United States were a portion of the colonial empire of Great Britain, it was the policy of the mother country to foster and develop the production of raw iron in the colonies, her iron was admitted into Great Britain at a duty for a long time of £1 a ton, while £20 was imposed upon iron of the northern European countries, and at one time it was admitted free into the mother country. And in face of that fact did the iron industries of the United States, after the great rebellion, after they had become an independent nation, show any vitality, any growth, any strength, any prospect of ever rivalling the great iron industries of the mother country. They never did. Not until the embargo which came about in 1809, when Great Britain refused to send her goods into that country and suspended commercial intercourse, did that country show any small beginning of an iron industry. Then, under pressure, when they were compelled to undertake the production of their own iron, not being able to procure it elsewhere, they took their first steps, weak and feeble, making no progress whatever, towards the marvellous strides that they are making to-day. But from 1816 and thereabouts, it became the policy of the United States to encourage the manufacture of iron by a system of protection which is far in excess of any that has yet been undertaken by any government in Canada.

And the result was that from 1816 to 1840, or thereabouts, constant changes and advances and increases were made in the tariff upon iron and iron products until the manufacturers of the United States were in the enjoyment of protection ranging from 40 to 100 per cent, but still, their first steps were weak and slow and it was not until over half a century was consumed in encouragement of the character that I have just described, that the industry became fairly established upon its feet and in a position to compete with the mother country, Germany and other countries in which the iron industry was largely developed. Thus, that country, which, in the first instance and with this measure of protection, seemed to be following this course of manufacture with tottering steps holding out no promise of ever achieving greatness, suddenly, when the time came, when capital was placed at the disposal of the people, when people flooded into the country and a home market was assured, became the rival of the mother country and other iron producing countries, until, as my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) says, it now dominates the iron production of the whole world. It is not too much for us in Canada to hope to see such a state of affairs in this country as exists there. We have every condition in this country with one or two exceptions. We have not the large population in Canada, we have not the magnificent home market, and we have not the great protective tariff which the United States have, but leaving these advantages at one side, we have every one of the conditions to give success to the people who choose to embark in this industry. We have ores, we have coal, we have fluxes in abundance, we have a climate suited to the discharge of the work which is done in connection with the iron industry, and we have a people in Canada in whom, I am sure, the right hon. leader of the government and the other members of the government must have every confidence as possessing all the qualities, the strength of mind and body, the adaptability, the tactile skill and clearness of head to fit them to undertake the development of this great industry. We have every requirement save the population and save the protection which the government are in a position to give that industry. Now, this is a far more

important matter than is any matter of etiquette. If it be possible to charge fairly against my hon. friend that his resolution is inopportune, is ill-timed, even in that case I should think, when these vast interests are appealing to the members of the government, they might overlook such niceties, such questions of precedence and such questions of etiquette, and they might, in the face of the opportunity which lies at their hand, not only forgive my hon. friend any laches on his part, but they might welcome with gratitude the opportunity which he has offered them of checking the apparent halt in the progress of the iron industry of Canada and taking a forward step, which, being taken on the part of the government, is bound to ensure to the people of Canada a commanding position in this enormous, this marvellous, this world controlling industry of the production of iron. However, I presume it is hopeless, in view of the attitude of the government, to argue this question. If hon. members supporting the government opposite were prepared to get up and deny or controvert the arguments advanced by my hon. friend and which could be advanced in great profusion by other hon. gentlemen supporting him on this side of the House, we could hope to argue this question out, we could hope to come to a decision as to what the wisest course is, either as a matter to be pursued by the government, or as a matter in the interests of the business men of Canada, which the government ought to take. But, that is not the attitude of the government at all. Their attitude is that they will do nothing, that they will not be disturbed. We are slumbering, we have been slumbering for years ; do not disturb us. It is true we have this urgent demand coming to the government from every manufacturer in Canada, yet, that government refuse deliberately to do anything. They are in an attitude of expectancy, they are waiting for political advantage to come from this point or that point. They refuse to take that bold, patriotic and strong course that the government of Canada ought to take. It is not well that the government, when such matters as this are brought up, because this is not a question of theory, it having been exemplified in every country in the world, to insist upon the observance of a rule of etiquette as to the manner in which such a proposition should be made to the government. It is a time for action and it is the duty of the opposition, having exhausted every effort in the direction of general propositions and of general invitations to this government, to show their hand and to choose their course. It is the duty of this opposition not only upon the iron industry question, but upon every other question and in connection with every great industry in the country to state their views and to stake their political existence as they are doing upon the opinions which they have honestly held. It would be far more convenient for the opposition to follow the course which the government are following, to allow the government to go on their way, to give them all the rope they want, to wait for the moment when they are embarrassed by injudicious friends or by internal dissensions and then to participate themselves upon the government with the view of their downfall. That is not the course which has been followed by this opposition. This opposition are perfectly clear in stating the position which they believe the government ought to adopt to-day. They want the government to adopt that position. They believe that it is essentially necessary, in the interests of the country, that the government should adopt that position, and their attitude in every year in which they have sat in opposition has consistently shown that the action they have taken to-day is one of encouraging the government in supporting our industries, in maintaining the protective system. We have been sincere in our advice which we have tendered to the government not to stand still, satisfied with what they have done in the past, but to go forward, to go onward, to show themselves in front of the people, not to wait for the people to lead them. It is the duty of a strong government to learn from the signs of the times the course which the people ought to follow, and to lead the people in that course. If we are to witness the highest statesmanship in this world we can scarcely look too long to see how danger can lurk in a bold, active, energetic movement. It is their duty to signalize the fact that they are in charge of the affairs of the country, that they have a definite conviction in regard to fiscal matters and that the system based on that conviction is not one in the interests of the government only, but in the interests of the country.

There can be no question at all about the great interest that attaches to this question for myself, not only for the country from which I come, but from the province from which I come. There can be no question at all that while we have not great agricultural resources, although we have agricultural resources in Nova Scotia to a large extent, our hope, our desire, is for a great development in industrial activity in Canada. Our only hope, if we are to be able to hold our own besides those immense and rapidly growing commonwealths of the west, lies in a tremendous development of industrial activity in our own country, and we desire that this great foundation industry of iron shall be encouraged and protected and helped along and assisted during the first steps which it must take in its infancy, until it is placed in such a position that it can stand alone and make its way in competition and in rivalry with the iron industry of the world. I am surprised to see the hon. Minister of Finance so cavalier about this question. He knows how im-

portant it is to the people of the maritime provinces. He knows how important it is to the people of the Sydneys. He knows how the hopes of the people of Sydney and Halifax, which, I am sure is very near and dear to him, are built up, not only upon seeing the iron industry of Nova Scotia continue, but on seeing it attain to an enormous development. What are the plans and hopes for the establishment of iron ship building works in the lower provinces ? Where is that vista of development towards which the eyes of our people have been turned for years past with the utmost hope and longing ? And yet the Finance Minister tells the people of the maritime provinces to-day that he deliberately refuses to consider a matter that is of such deep importance to them. And why ? Because—if we are to believe the argument which the hon. gentleman has advanced in the House, and he has advanced only one—because his opponent who leads the opposition has chosen an inopportune time in which to bring this question to the notice of parliament. I do not imagine for a moment that the Minister of Finance will find it easy, by his argument of opportunism, to satisfy the people of the lower provinces who are anxious to see development and anxious to invest their labour and capital in these great enterprises. I do not think the people of the maritime provinces will listen with a great deal of patience to this excellent argument advanced to the House —excellent so far as it is addressed to the supporters of the hon. gentleman, but disappointing to the great majority of the people of Canada. The Finance Minister will find it exceedingly difficult to prove that this amendment is inopportune. The Finance Minister having, in his budget speech, exposed to the country and to the House of Commons the opinion of the government in reference to its policy on that tariff, every moment after that is an opportune time for members on this side of the House to specify wherein the policy of the government is not sound, and to endeavour to change the conclusion of the government on that policy, if they can change it. It is the privilege and the duty of members on this side of the House to endeavour on every occasion to induce the government to depart from a policy which they think is a bad policy for the country, and to enter upon a policy which they consider to be sound. There is little in the argument of the Finance Minister that the time is inopportune. There may be reasons known to the hon. gentleman of a semi-diplomatic or confidential character ; there may be relations between that hon. gentleman and other members of the government which render it inopportune ; there may be negotiations in other directions, but the House of Commons is not made acquainted with these transactions, and it is not to be assumed that the opposition should take cognizance of them and seek some moment for an amendment of this kind which the financial spokesman of the government may deem opportune. Are we to have such a discussion as this cut off simply because it suits the convenience of the Finance Minister or his leader, to state that the consideration of a matter of such supreme importance is inopportune ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL. We on this side of the House hope that there are gentlemen sitting on the government benches who may have some convictions upon which to base their objection to the course that is marked out by the leader of the opposition ; not matters of opportunism, but matters of conviction. There used to be gentlemen in the Liberal ranks who loudly proclaimed that they were free traders, but I never see them fail to vote for this government, which is not a very free trade government. It may be that there are those in the House to-day who are prepared to brush aside as unworthy of notice the facts which the leader of the opposition has cited as to the enormous progress made by Great Britain, by Germany, by Belgium, by the United States, in wrestling one from the other the pride of being the leading nation of the world in iron manufacture. There may be gentlemen willing to brush aside as absolutely irrelevant arguments advanced to show that the United States, instead of throwing open their markets to us, are excluding us, and are pursuing that course of high, adequate, efficient and sufficient protection, which is the only thing that in the past has given commercial supremacy to any of the countries which to-day occupy the front rank in manufactures and commerce.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. A. S. KENDALL (Cape Breton). I congratulate the leader of the opposition on the moderate way in which he has placed this very important matter before the House, but still I consider that his motion is inopportune. I have been in a position to learn what is going on, not for the last few days, but for the last few weeks. I know that this question is of vital importance to the iron industry, and I know that the interests of this business to-day are in such a state that certainly further consideration will be required. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) has referred to the building up of the iron industry in the United States from almost nothing to its present gigantic proportions. He told us that it was only when the United States adopted a very high tariff that the iron trade was developed. I admit that, but I also wish him to admit that the iron industries when first established were established by the Atlantic seaboard under unnatural conditions, the high tariff did not save them, and there is nothing left to-day to mark the sites of these establishments but a few spots

of rust. It was only when the iron industry of the United States moved west, where iron and coal and limestone were in close proximity, that this industry commenced to prosper, and Pittsburg and Alabama became the great centres of the United States iron industry of which such boast is made. This phase of the subject has not been considered by hon. gentleman in treating of this matter. The hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Bell) also told us that it was under protection that the iron industry of Great Britain developed. I must contradict that. Last year when I had the honour to speak in the budget debate I quoted from a number of authorities to show that that business did not develop under protection ; that in fact the direst distress in the history of the British workman existed for several decades under the highest protection, and that it was not until the raw material of her trade, which does not consist alone in iron, lime and coal, but which consists largely of food and other raw materials ; it was not until these were made free and until the shipping of Great Britain was made free, that the great iron trade of that country developed.

Let me deal for a few moments with the iron development in Canada. I think hon. gentlemen, irrespective of politics, will agree with me that the growth of the Canadian iron industry has been slow and unsatisfactory, and has not yielded the results that were anticipated by the protection afforded in former years. Let me point out to hon. gentlemen that so unpopular was the history of the iron industry in Canada that in 1899, when the Minister of Finance brought down his bounty measure, the Hon. George E. Foster, whom we all know, was opposed to that measure, rose from his seat and walked out of the House.

Mr. CLANCY. Does not the hon. gentleman know perfectly well that the Hon. Mr. Foster supported these resolutions in 1897 ?

Mr. KENDALL. If the hon. gentleman is correct, I will retract; but I wish to tell him that it was generally understood, in the House and out of it, that the Hon. Mr. Foster was opposed to that measure, and I myself sat in the gallery when the Finance Minister brought his measure down, and saw Mr. Foster leave his seat and go out of the House, and he did not vote on the resolution.

Mr. CLANCY. He supported the resolution; there was no vote on it.

Mr. KENDALL. Let me point out to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) the condition of the iron business in his own county.

Mr. BELL. Does the hon. gentleman say that there was a division on the resolutions moved by the Finance Minister ?

Mr. KENDALL. I understood that there was ; that is my impression. Now, will the hon. member for Pictou admit that under a high protective tariff in Canada, before the present Finance Minister reduced the duties, the iron business in the county of Pictou was established on a satisfactory basis ? Will he for a moment assert that the condition of that business was satisfactory ? Does he not know that in a report brought down by the managers of that business it was shown that the wages paid to the men engaged in it ranged from 80 cents to $1 a day for the great bulk of the employees ? Does he not know that that industry, I will not say almost ruined a bank, but for a happy accident would have crippled a bank ?

Mr. BELL. What industry does the hon. gentleman refer to ?

Mr. KENDALL. The Nova Scotia Steel Company.

Mr. BELL. I think that is a very prosperous industry.

Mr. KENDALL. Was it at that time ?

Mr. BELL. What is it now ?

Mr. KENDALL. I will come to that a little later. For a number of years the company paid no dividend.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For several years before the advent of the present government the iron industry in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bell) town was unable to pay its dividends.

Mr. BELL. Might I ask the hon. Finance Minister if that was his reason for reducing the duties in favour of that industry ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend admits the fact, the hon. members can all draw their own inferences as to the fate of the iron industry under the Liberal policy and the Conservative policy respectively.

Mr. KENDALL. I do not wish the hon. gentleman to misunderstand me, nor do I wish to cast any reproaches upon the management of that business. The Nova Scotia steel business was taken up by good practical men, who worked first in a small way, and developed their business; and all credit is due to them for the development which has taken place, not only in their own business, but in the business of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. It was their knowledge, acquired under these adverse conditions, which made those men trusted by the investors in the iron business of this country.

Now, I think I have made my point. There are one or two other iron businesses in Canada, one in Quebec and one in Ontario, neither of which was at all prosperous under the high tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. But my point is this : The development of the iron business in every country where it has been developed has been slow. Every iron business is a matter of slow growth,

and you cannot at all times ascribe the fact that an iron business does not succeed to any relationships of tariff to that business. We have seen iron businesses developed under a low tariff; we have seen iron businesses fail under a high tariff. In 1897, the gentlemen who established the Nova Scotia steel business, after having for several years tested in their own furnaces at New Glasgow, the possibility of manufacturing iron from Newfoundland ore and Cape Breton coal and limestone, came to the town of Sydney, and made a proposition to the town to grant them certain concessions. They came to the Nova Scotia legislature in the winter of 1898, and obtained a charter. They came to the Dominion House later in the same year, and asked for the imposition of iron bounties. It was inopportune at that time for the ministry of the day to comply with their request; but in the following year my hon. friend the Minister of Finance brought down his scheme for encouraging the business by a system of bounties.

Now, I want to point out this to the House, that the gentlemen who promoted that industry, and who, we may suppose, looked deeply and broadly into the matter, and also looked ahead, ought to have known, when they asked for those bounties, that they would be effective to place that iron business on a sound footing.

It is one of the misfortunes of the case that evidently the bounties, did not entirely meet the requirements; but I wish also to point out that when in 1897 the present tariff was brought down and the old tariff was revised, provision was made to assist or protect to some extent the established iron business of the country. The Dominion Iron and Steel Company, which is to-day the leading iron industry looking for assistance, was at that time unthought of. Protection was granted to the products of the Nova Scotia Steel Company; but provision was not made for such products as might be made by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. Of course, the Dominion Iron and Steel Company might make the same products as those now made by the Nova Scotia Steel Company; but the market in Canada to-day is only large enough to absorb such lines as the Nova Scotia Steel Company is now producing; and if the Dominion Iron and Steel Company undertook to produce similar articles, there is no doubt that the two industries would be crowding each other, and perhaps pressing each other to the wall. Long before the hon. leader of the opposition spoke, or some days before, representations had been made by my hon. colleague and myself, with several others from Nova Scotia, to the right hon. the Prime Minister, and the hon. Minister of Finance; and let me say that I have such confidence in these hon. gentlemen and in the soundness of the case which we presented, that I believe that at the right time and in the right way the hon. Minister of Finance, who has always done the right thing in Nova Scotia, will do the right thing in this instance.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has been endeavouring to prove that they do not need any protection.

Mr. KENDALL. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. From my point of view, I do not object to the government raising the tariff on manufactured articles of iron—there is a very good reason, perhaps, why I should not; but I wish to point out to the House and the country that if the duty on iron is raised to any extent, for a number of years it will hardly be a protective duty, but largely a revenue duty; that is, if it is put on all around, because, as I have said, the development of the iron industry is always slow, and it will take many years before any industry that we are likely to establish in Canada can be built up to meet the requirements of the many details of the iron trade. I think myself it would be a better policy for the country to deal with this matter, not in a wholesale way, but piecemeal. It is far better, when the country requires iron products, if they cannot be produced in the country, and when our revenue is overflowing, to get them as cheaply as we can; but in the meantime, while we are establishing the industry, if any particular iron business undertakes to manufacture a number of the articles which we use, I for one, would think it good policy on the part of the government to assist them, particularly as some of the manufacturers in the United States have shown a strong disposition to slaughter their products as soon as a young industry in Canada ventures into new fields of manufacture. For those reasons I would not object to see the tariff raised. In fact I would urge on the government, in the case of several items that have been placed before us——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. KENDALL. To raise the duties on certain articles, but not to do so, in a wholesale way, on the goods required by the people throughout the length and breadth of Canada until it can be shown that the manufacturers of Canada are prepared to furnish them. If duties should be put on all around, the effect would be, not that the increase would go into the hands of the manufacturers, but that a larger amount would go into the revenue than at present. I wish to point out to the hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Pictou the particular reason why I, representing Cape Breton, can scarcely follow them. Let me remind them that at the time the hon Minister of Finance was laying the foundations of the present prosperity of that country, these hon. gentlemen were united with the Halifax 'Herald' in endeavouring to convince the people of that

province in 1894 that the measure introduced by the Minister of Finance was fraught with dire consequences to the interests of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On what does the hon. gentleman base that statement with regard to myself ?

Mr. KENDALL. It is an assumption on my part, because I am not aware that the hon. gentleman took any active part on the hustings, but I take it for granted that in the election of 1894 he was in accord with the gentlemen in Halifax city who were then running their election mainly on a campaign against the Finance Minister, who, by his coal legislation and iron and steel legislation had done so much for the province.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not remember that that matter was at issue in the election of 1894.

Mr. KENDALL. In at least one county it was the only issue, and the Halifax 'Herald' and the hon. leader of the opposition succeeded so well that down in that county, where the measure was of the greatest importance locally, the candidates of my hon. friend who, a few years before had been returned by a large majority, were defeated by a large majority. Having said what I have said and knowing what I know, it would be scarcely wise on my part to follow the hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Pictou. I would rather follow the hon. gentleman of whose policy I have had some experience, who has done something for the province from which I come, who has made every man in that province better off, than follow the leader of the opposition whose party, no doubt with his approval, followed that suicidal course in 1894. Knowing what I know and with the experience I have, I think that I will be justified in voting against the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition and in following the lead of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, who has done everything for the province of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, rather than that of the leader of the opposition who will scarcely venture to assert that up to this time he has done very much, being assured, as I am, that when the right time comes the hon. Finance Minister will do again the right thing for the country which is proud to acknowledge its obligations to his genius.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). We are afforded to-day, Mr. Speaker, the pitiable spectacle of a weak man, or a stubborn man —for both are in certain circumstances very much alike—when brought face to face with a position which he desires to avoid. Both act, in such a case, very much alike. How they squirm, how they hedge this way and the other, how they take a zig-zag course, like a dog beating through a field, and then how they resort to every shift in order to postpone the evil moment when they will have to face the inevitable and do what they have always declined to perform. We have that spectacle to-day of the weak and the stubborn man, who knows in his own mind that the moment is fast approaching when he can no longer refrain from doing that against which he has protested for years. We are to-day face to face with a great question : Is our policy to be free trade or protection ? For my part I have no hesitation in saying on which side I am ranged, and which side I believe the country favours and on which its prosperity is to be found. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was summarily dismissed from the cabinet because he advocated protection ; but if the cable despatches of to-day are correct, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) has just declared at a public meeting in England that the policy of Canada is moderate protection. Well, the last occasion, on which I heard the hon. Minister of the Interior express his views, he was an out and out absolute free trader ; and to my mind, the skip from absolute free trade to moderate protection is greater than the skip from moderate protection to adequate protection. If, therefore, the same measure of justice is to be dealt to the Minister of the Interior as was meted out to the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), he should be summarily dismissed from the present cabinet. The hon. Minister of Finance says that this resolution is inopportune. But surely when this House opened, surely when the hon. gentleman delivered his budget speech, he should have declared what material alterations, if any, he proposed to make in the tariff customs of this country. He failed to do so, but apparently since then new light has dawned upon his mind ; and if we are to judge by the statements of the hon. minister and those of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Kendall), there is a very strong possibility that the tariff on iron will be changed. If that be the case, then how is this amendment inopportune ? On this side we have for years contended that adequate protection was absolutely required for the successful carrying out of the industries of this country. In that policy we have been opposed by the government, and it is only now, when disaster is apparently threatening some of the industries in the native province of the hon. Minister of Finance, that he finds himself compelled to give way to the irresistible logic of facts. Early in this year or at all events shortly after this House met, a wild speculation took place in the security of certain companies down in Nova Scotia. That speculation was based upon what the young men who went into it believed was absolutely reliable authority, that the members of the government had promised the directors of those companies that they would largely increase the protection to the steel and iron industry.

I know not the truth of that; but I say that the members of the government ought not to be so uncertain as to their policy that they would allow speculators to bank upon the change of their policy. And, if that is their position, I say they are not looking after the interests of this country. Now, the fad of free trade is practically being thrown to one side. We hear very little about it. We hear it said even by free traders in England that the faddish free trade that is presented and upheld by the free trade school in England would not be acknowledged by Cobden and Bright if they were here to-day. It is the uncertainty of the government policy that is threatening us here with serious difficulties. My own belief is—strengthened by what I gather from the utterances of the hon. Finance Minister and the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall)—that the government are still disputing and squabbling as to what their policy is to be. I do not believe that the government or the members of the government are united. I do not believe that they have made up their minds as to their policy. Had they done so, it would be their duty to announce it at once, not to lose a day or an hour. If they are going to alter the duties on iron and steel it is their duty to announce that policy at once. The alteration and re-adjustment of the duties on steel and iron, will, of necessity, mean the re-adjustment of the duties upon many, if not most, of the manufactured articles. And I was astonished beyond measure to hear the hon. gentleman who has just sat down proposing the theory that the tariff should be taken up and industries treated piecemeal. Could you imagine a more vicious state of affairs than the government taking one industry after another and saying: If you will support us at the polls we will deal with your industry and yours alone. No more vicious plan could be adopted. It would be absolutely impossible to have honest government if the fiscal policy of the government were carried on in that way, and I am astonished that any hon. member of this House should propose that any government should have power to deal with the tariff piecemeal.

Mr. KENDALL. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) a question?

Mr. OSLER. Certainly.

Mr. KENDALL. Will he say that his party, when in power, did not revise the tariff again and again piecemeal?

Mr. OSLER. Now, I think I have made it plain often enough in this House that I am not going to father the sins of the old Conservative party. They were many. But, as I said before, they stand up white against the sins of the present government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is ghost-like.

Mr. OSLER.

Mr. OSLER. If the sins of the present government were ghosts, we could stand them. They are not ghosts, but living realities. The government must face the question, and face it very shortly, whether they are going to swallow their whole policy. I would advise them to swallow it at once, because if they do not, they will bring disaster upon themselves—(I would not regret that so much)—and upon the whole country. Now, to show that we are getting into a condition that should make us a little anxious, let me refer to some articles in the 'New York Evening Post,' which I think, has the reputation of being one of the fairest papers in the United States. I have read it for many years, and I think that reputation is well deserved. In last Saturday's edition are to be found articles on the iron trade. One leading iron man, in reviewing the situation expresses very great uncertainty as to the reason why there should be a steady and continued fall in iron. This is what he says:—

> The iron market is strong statistically and weak sentimentally. Statistics show that consumption is at a high point, and yet demand from buyers is very light. Prices have declined because buyers thought they would get lower prices—and they have. Whether prices will go still lower or not is a question difficult to answer. They have at least reached a point where foreign importation is shut out, a factor which should tend materially to lessen supplies.

And another article, closes with this quotation—

> On the other hand, the possibilities of the steel and iron export trade, in case of a further restriction in home demand or fall in prices, is the most interesting problem of our industrial future. In the ten months ending April 30, our export of such manufactures was $19,393,000 less than in a similar period ending with April, 1901. An iron manufacturer was asked not long ago how he could afford to export any of his goods with home demand what it was——

Now, here is the key of the whole situation——

> We are clinging on to the foreign market like grim death; it is the spar which will float us when the boom collapses.

The foreign trade which he refers to is the export of iron into Canada to an enormous extent. That iron manufacture represents the iron manufactures of the United States, and he does not at all attempt to deny that they are looking to holding our market as one of the things that is going to save the iron industry of the United States from disaster. I believe it is quite possible that the Finance Minister is either wrestling with his colleagues or is being wrestled with, and the result may be at any time that we shall have an increase in our iron duties. It will come with very ill grace and, I believe it will come very unwillingly from the Finance Minister, because I believe he has some sort of idea that there was a principle in free trade which he thinks

he ought to stick to. I think he does not regard it as good business, but, I believe he is a stubborn man and insists upon going a round about way to swallow himself or his principles. I would make this suggestion—that if he makes too long a circle to arrive at the point, he may arrive at it too late. I do not think there is any doubt about it that we have passed the supreme point in the period of our prosperity. It is so in the United States; it is so here, except for that one great outlet we have, the Northwest. If we have good crops there, it will carry the country through another year or two of prosperity despite the substantial blunders of the present ministers. But, if by any chance, we should have a failure of crops there we are face to face with a disaster in Canada that will appall most of us; for the manufacturing industries of the United States have attained such proportion that, with a fall of prices in iron of ten, twenty, or it might under certain conditions, of even twenty-five per cent in three months, we shall have, before we can remedy it, a flood of manufactured articles thrown into Canada that will practically ruin every Canadian manufacturer who is not, backed by large reserves of capital. Our manufacturers, during the last three or four years of great prosperity, have, I think, been very conservative, but they have still to expand, and the profits they have made have in most instances had to go into extended premises and new and modern machinery. If they should have a set back, they will not have, in most instances, the accumulated profits of the last few years to go on with; instead of that, they will have on their hands enlarged buildings, and they will have no use for the increased machinery, which will lie idle.

Now, I was greatly impressed when on my holidays during the winter time, to find what a change had come over Italy. That country, that we look upon as old and effete, is now one of the most thriving and industrious on the face of the earth. In Rome they are manufacturing in the most extensive manner. Ten or twelve years ago when the Grand Hotel was built in Rome, all its furniture, carpets and so forth were imported; to-day Rome is manufacturing its furniture for Canada, and you can buy it at Kay's, Toronto. The same with silks, the result altogether of very high protection, not imposed by the government, but imposed by individual cities to protect their own manufactures. That is an object lesson that we should take strongly to heart. I believe sincerely that unless the government face this question at once, during this session of parliament, we are going to have disaster in Canada that it will take ten years or more to get over.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It was not my intention to say a word in this debate, and I would not have risen but for some observations that have just fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler). He desires to know what is the policy of the government upon this question and upon the tariff generally. I have to say to my hon. friend that his question is one which, at this time of day, it is rather late to ask, because the policy of the government was announced by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance a few weeks ago, when he declared that our policy was the tariff of 1897. That tariff is a moderate tariff, which carries with it a good deal of incidental protection. That it is a tariff made for all time, nobody ever imagined. The conditions of the country change and vary. What may have been suited to our conditions in 1897, may not be suited to our conditions in 1904. I will not particularize, I will take only the question which has been brought up this afternoon, brought up, as I repeat with my hon. friend, at a very inopportune moment. The history of the iron and steel industry in this country has been a very checkered one. The hon, gentleman opened his remarks by quoting an article written as far back as 1885, to the effect that Canada is admirably situated to have and to develop an iron and steel industry. Everybody agrees with that. I remember that this same article was quoted, if not verbatim, it was quoted in substance, by Sir Charles Tupper when he introduced the iron duties in 1886 or in 1888. Everybody who was in the House at that time will remember a certain celebrated and famous speech which Sir Charles Tupper delivered when he introduced a new tariff policy with regard to the iron and steel duties. His policy provided for still greater protection than had been supposed possible up to that moment. He built great expectations upon it, expectations which unfortunately have not been realized. He expected that under the tariff which he was then promulgating we would develop a very large industry in iron and steel. But everybody is aware that the expectations of Sir Charles Tupper fell to the ground, that though the consumers of iron in Canada were saddled with heavy duties, the industry which he expected did not rise from the ground, as he led us to suppose. The gentlemen engaged in this industry struggled on, the tariff was amended from time to time, until at last it was taken up by my hon. friend in 1897. Then he reduced it considerably, and adopted a more moderate tariff. Now, I call upon the hon. gentleman who has introduced this resolution, I call upon the hon. member for Pictou (Mr Bell) also, to admit that the iron business never prospered, never developed and increased so rapidly as it has under the present tariff. The building industries using iron and steel, at no previous period in the history of Canada, have advanced so rapidly as since the year 1897. It is true that at this moment one of the great companies is in trouble. But while that is so, every-

body must admit on the other hand that most every other industry in Canada is to-day doing a satisfactory business. We do not hear any complaints from them, we do not hear any complaints except from that one industry. I appeal to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to admit that not only in the province of Nova Scotia but throughout Quebec and Ontario, all the industries using iron and steel are to-day more prosperous than they have ever been before. I do not think my statement can be successfully challenged.

But, Sir, let us come at once to the question before the House. There has been a good deal of excitement about it during the last few days. A great company which had been started with a great flourish, and which was supposed to be doing a good business, has, I am sorry to say, been the object of a good deal of stock speculation, and that great company has practically admitted that it was not in good financial condition. And if the whole truth must be told—and this is the secret of the speech of my hon. friend from Cape Breton, a secret however which is well known—that company has come to us recently asking for an increase in the tariff. Well, Sir, whilst for my part I have never hesitated to say that I am a free trader by conviction, and whilst at the same time I have favoured a tariff policy such as we have at the present time, that is to say a tariff for revenue purposes, carrying with it a good deal of incidental protection, at the same time I am not dogmatic, I am not a doctrinaire, and the government is not a government of doctrinaires. We are always ready to listen to complaints when they are made to us. When an industry, no matter what it may be, comes to us to make representations, we are bound to listen to them; we are bound to hear their complaints, we are bound to give a sympathetic ear to all who come to us with grievances, if grievances they are. But when a company comes to us in this way we have a right to expect that it will show a statement of its affairs, and not only so, but to show wherein the conditions under which they are working are unfavourable, to show why it is that they have come to grief, and why the expectations they entertained have not been realized.

When this industry was before parliament in 1899, and when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) introduced the bounty system which was accepted on both sides of the House unanimously as far as voting went, and with very little exception as far as speaking went, it was expected that that industry would be able to produce iron at $6 a ton. Instead of producing iron at $6 a ton they produced it at a very much increased figure. We have a right to know from them how it is that their expectations have not been fulfilled, and how it is that the prospects which they gave out to the public came not to be realized. We have the right to know also how their position can be remedied by a change in the tariff. We have a right to know whether or not the cause of their disasters, the cause which has brought them to the position in which they are now is really the tariff or some other cause. Therefore, under such circumstances, is it not the part of statesmanship, is it not the part which the government should take before we accept any other policy to see where we are and whether we can improve this condition of things or not or whether it can be remedied at all? Within four days we have had these representations made to us, and if I do not betray any secrets I would not surprise any body by saying that we asked the gentleman who came to us to give us a statement in black and white which we could look into and study before we made up our minds whether or not we are to make any changes in our fiscal policy or allow it to remain as it is. That is the condition in which we are at the present time; yet, we are asked by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to rush into a change in the tariff and come down with a different policy. I say that before we can come to any such conclusion we must look into the question. It is a time not for action, as stated by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), but for consideration, reflection and study. That is the position we take. That is the duty which is imposed upon us, and it is the duty to which at the present time we are devoting ourselves. That is the reason why my hon. friend the Minister of Finance a moment ago said this motion comes at an inopportune time. You had better wait. It shall be the duty of the government by and by to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and when we go into Committee of Ways and Means it will be for us to state the position which we take before parliament and the country. In the meantime, as hon. gentlemen pretend not to be actuated by any desire to make political capital out of the question, it seems to me that the best thing they can do is to withdraw the motion so that we can look into the matter and come to a conclusion.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the right hon. leader of the government has relieved the tension to some extent in his finally deciding to take the country into his confidence and tell the reasons why this delay is taking place. The right hon. gentleman usually pays great attention to the speeches that are delivered in this House, and especially to those coming from his supporters. He has forgotten that just a moment ago the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) told the House that this was not a question of to-day, but that it had been urged for months, yet, the right hon. gentleman now tells the House that they do not want to precipitate matters, but that they want to inquire into

the statement. The right hon. gentleman has had months to inquire into that statement. That statement was not brought down this week or last week. It was brought down before the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) brought down his tariff, two months ago. It was considered then. Why was that statement not asked for before the tariff was brought down? Was not that statement inquired into by the government before the hon. Minister of Finance came down and declared that with the exception of binder twine and steel rails, the latter contingent on the manufacturers being able to supply the home market, there would be absolutely no changes in the tariff this year. Now, we have the right hon. gentleman telling the House that the iron industry has prospered more under the present tariff than it ever did in the history of Canada, and he called upon the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to assent to what he stated. Well now, if that be true, if the right hon. gentleman is convinced of that, he will surely not assent to any tariff changes. He believes that is the best that can be done. If the right hon. gentleman is like the hon. gentleman beside him, and is willing to follow the hon. Minister of Finance, right or wrong, rather than follow the hon. leader of the opposition, he will no doubt agree with the statement of that hon. gentleman, that a protective tariff has never up to this period had anything to do in affecting the iron industry one way or the other in Canada. I can scarcely refer to a speech made by the right hon. gentleman during his tour through Canada in 1895, in which he did not call public attention to the iron duties in Canada and in which he did not state that these duties should be lowered if iron were not made altogether free. The right hon. gentleman pointed out that iron entered into nearly every industry in Canada, and he estimated that the burden placed on nearly every other industry was about 60 per cent. When these hon. gentlemen came in, to satisfy the false sentiment which they had been teaching throughout the country, they made a reduction in the iron duties. What has followed? I shall not repeat the unanswerable statement made to the House this afternoon by the hon. leader of the opposition. He pointed out in the clearest possible terms, not in a general sense, but in the most specialized sense, the injury that has been done to the iron industry and the vast increase that has taken place in the importation of iron goods that might be manufactured in Canada in consequence of the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the government and the hon. Minister of Finance if, after careful consideration when that statement is brought down, the government will be prepared to say that they made a blunder in 1897, and that they will reverse their whole policy in making a reduction in the iron duties. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they are prepared to be convinced by any statement that will be submitted by the iron industry that they made a mistake in 1897? I think this whole country is thoroughly convinced that it was a mistake. It is only a question now whether hon. gentlemen are agreed that they should retrace their steps and admit that they did make a very great mistake. Let us take the position of the right hon. gentleman's followers in this House. Let us take the time when these iron duties were reduced, and when the hon. Minister of Finance introduced his budget. Where do you hear the thunders of applause and the speeches that were made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House on that occasion? I do not want to be offensive, but I say that hon. gentlemen were absolutely insolent in what they believed to be their strength at that time. They pounded upon their desks at every sentence that was uttered by the hon. Minister of Finance in connection with the reduction of duties at that time and now these hon. gentlemen are pleading for time. Never in the history of the House of Commons of Canada was there witnessed such a spectacle as to-day. The leader of the opposition, with great strength, with great courtesy, with great patriotism, with that clearness and effectiveness which belongs to him more than to any other member in this House, stated his case and gave ample evidence that his was not a motion of want of confidence, and the hon. Minister of Finance got up in a peevish mood and declared that the rules of courtesy had not been observed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not. I did not charge any discourtesy on the leader of the opposition.

Mr. CLANCY. Then I retract any words that might misrepresent the attitude of the Finance Minister, but he said it was an inopportune motion and he sat down not telling the House why it was inopportune. If the Finance Minister had acknowledged frankly that the government had the matter under consideration, and that they intended to make such changes as the interests of the country demanded, that would be a reasonable excuse to give. But no such thing was done. The Finance Minister was not taken by surprise. He has had notice for many days. He has no reason to complain. If he was big enough as Finance Minister of Canada to acknowledge that he had made a mistake and that he would rectify it, that would be a reason for not pressing the motion, but he simply took refuge in making a general statement without giving any valid reason to the House. Has the Finance Minister forgotten that he has emphatically declared that the tariff was fixed, and that the government had made

up their mind that they would not make any changes. Why is this motion ill-timed ?

Mr. OSLER. Because it is embarrassing.

Mr. CLANCY. And is the country to remain in suspense because the government is embarrassed ? Are the speculators to be allowed to take advantage of the Finance Minister's reticence ? Will he refuse hope to the struggling industries and give encouragement to those who are seeking for their own profit, to bring about the down fall of these industries ? Did the Finance Minister think that this matter was to be waived aside, I was going to say by a subterfuge, but I will not. Surely the business interests of the country demand an emphatic declaration from the Finance Minister, either that he sticks to his avowed declaration that any tariff that was not based on a revenue footing was a bad tariff, or, that he will acknowledge that he has made a mistake and save these industries from disaster by protecting them. In 1897, the Finance Minister read the Liberal platform of 1893, and he said that was the basis upon which the tariff would be revised. Will he adhere to that platform now ? The Prime Minister told us in 1897 that he was not a doctrinaire and that he was willing to be convinced and to change with the times. Let me ask him if there is one feature in the iron industry that has changed since 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. What is it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I gave it to my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell). I told him that the industry which under the Conservative policy was not paying any dividends has been prospering ever since.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. Then we have the answer of the Finance Minister, that these industries could not pay dividends under the Conservative tariff of 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In some years.

Mr. CLANCY. Then if the iron industry is prospering under the present tariff the government does not need to change its policy, but if the iron industry is not prospering the government will be forced to change its policy. The leader of the opposition quoted to the House a long list of iron manufactures and he showed that under the Conservative government in 1896, they were imported into Canada to the extent of $1,174,000, while in 1902, the imports of these articles amounted to $4,458,000, or over 400 per cent more. Perhaps that will explain the serious condition of the iron industry to-day. We are living alongside a country that is hostile to us commercially and the overflow of whose market would be sufficient to supply us and to wipe out our own manufactures. There is no changed condition in the iron trade between 1896 and 1903. We were at the mercy of the United States then, and we are at the mercy of the United States now, but we protected ourselves then. That is the difference. I venture to submit, Sir, that the Liberal government will recede one by one from the mistakes they made in their tariff of 1897. I defy them to point to any Canadian industry of any magnitude with reference to which they made a change that has not been injured by their mistakes. The iron industry, the barb wire industry, the binder twine industry, the coal oil industry, they lessened or removed the protection on each of these industries, and in each case they made a mistake. I state without fear of successful contradiction that they did not make one change of any importance in the tariff in 1897, that has not proven to be a grievous blunder.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was pointing out that the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite on the revision of the tariff has resulted in a succession of blunders. The first thing the Finance Minister thought it his duty to do was to shift the burden of taxation from foreigners to our own people. The iron industry, from its very inception in Canada, was protected by customs duties —duties which were very high from the year 1878, and which were never lowered until the hon. gentlemen took power. Up to 1897 the bounty on pig iron and on steel manufactured from pig iron was $2 a ton, and in that year it was increased to $3 a ton ; but, as was pointed out by the hon. leader of the opposition this afternoon, the Minister of Finance, in tones of considerable apology, and the Minister of Customs on the same occasion, declared to the House that the iron and steel bounties were given to compensate the manufacturers for the loss of the protection which had been taken away.

Both sides of the House in 1897 were committed to giving the increased bounties. The Conservative party of Canada had offered what was thought to be a fair measure of protection. They recognized then, as they recognize now, that if that great industry is to be put on its feet in Canada, it must undergo the same process, encounter the same difficulties and have the same assistance, that it has had in all other countries where it has been put on a sound footing. For that reason the Conservative party did assent to the additional bounties given on

that occasion. But, speaking for myself, I entirely dissent from the proposition to decrease the import duties on iron and correspondingly pay bounties out of the pockets of the people. As an illustration of the effect of this policy, I may state that during the six years, from 1891 to 1896, when the Conservative party were in power, $436,876 were paid out in bounties, whereas during the six years from 1897 to 1902, we have paid out in bounties $1,800,000.

Now, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance what he thinks is to become of the iron industry in Canada after the bounties cease in 1905 ? The hon. gentleman was very distinct in his declaration that the bounties given in 1897, and continued for five years longer on the sliding scale adopted in 1898, were for the purpose of repairing the losses the manufacturers would sustain by reason of the reduction of the duties. I ask him now, not in an offensive sense, how does he expect the iron industry to live after these iron bounties have ceased, and it has no longer the protection which the hon. gentleman took away in 1897 ? His only answer will be to restore the bounties again, as he prefers to adopt a policy under which these bounties will be paid out of the pockets of the people, instead of one under which the foreign manufacturer would pay the import duties in order to get into the markets of Canada. There can be absolutely no doubt as to who pays the bounties ; there can be no doubt that the cost of iron to the people of Canada has been increased to the extent of the bounties. But the weight of opinion is entirely on the side of the position that the foreign manufacturer, in order to get into Canada to compete with the Canadian manufacturer, must pay the duties. The hon. gentleman told us, in his very able speech on the budget a few weeks ago, that when we imposed additional duties we increased, if not proportionately, to a large extent, the cost of the goods to the Canadian consumers. That is his doctrine ; but the hon. leader of the opposition this afternoon challenged the hon. gentleman to point out one single case of any magnitude or importance in which the protective policy had been the means of permanently, or to a notable extent, increasing the price of an article to the consumer. The hon. gentleman was content to sit down, after that long speech of his of two or three minutes, declaring to the House and the country that this was an inopportune time to introduce a resolution of this kind, and without attempting in the slightest degree to gainsay what had been stated by the hon. leader of the opposition on so important a question. We will take for granted that the hon. gentleman has changed his mind, and now finds himself face to face, not only with the public sentiment of the country, but with a policy that is threatening one of the greatest industries we have in Canada.

Now, the House must have been much amused at what the hon. gentleman's friends had to say. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall), who was put up to defend an industry in his own province, said that the success of the iron industry was not in any degree due to protection, and that he himself did not consider protection necessary for it ; but, after all, he concluded his speech by declaring that he wanted protection for iron, but intimated that there should not be protection for anything else. He thought there should be a sort of piecemeal protection, as he called it, given to iron ; it should be given to one section and not to another, and he urged the government to adopt that policy. Well, I do not know whether the country will take it that the hon. member for Cape Breton speaks for the government, or whether the government is too weak to speak for itself. The country certainly expected some declaration from the Finance Minister to-day as to what the government intended to do ; but he sat down without giving the House any information whatever. The right hon. First Minister declared that they were going to inquire ; that they were waiting until they had statements from those who were asking for increased protection ; but he also sat down without declaring his policy. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance, since he has had his dinner, what the policy of the government now is on that question ? I would like to ask him, in the event of the government being satisfied that their policy of 1897, of making a slashing reduction in the duties on iron goods, has been the means of affecting the iron industry of Canada, if it is the policy of the government to remedy the wrong they then did ? I am not asking that in an offensive sense ; but the hon. gentleman will see that it is a reasonable question to ask.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will answer the hon. gentleman, if that is any comfort to him. I will tell him that some of those who have approached us with reference to the particular company whose affairs are now engaging attention, have stated to us that they do not complain that the result is in any way due to the policy of the government.

Mr. CLANCY. You will observe that the hon. gentleman was very cautious, and said that 'some of those who have approached us declared that the policy of the Liberal party had not injured them.' Let me ask him if they all said so ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know. There are thousands interested in the steel industry. But I can say that those high in authority, in approaching the government on this question, have stated that they do not complain of the attitude of the

government. They have said that certain things have arisen recently to which they invite our attention, but they do not complain of the attitude of the government.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that no tariff revision was asked. I understand that no demand is made on the government for a revision of the tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. CLANCY. How is the hon. gentleman going to reconcile the two positions? He declares that those who have approached the government have no complaint against the tariff of 1897?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that. I said that with regard to the representations made to us recently as to a particular company, and it is only one company whose affairs are in controversy——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is debateable, and I do not want to enter upon that now. I want to say that the particular grievance which has recently been brought to the notice of the government has been put before us in terms which do not reflect upon the policy of the government at all. Certain changes are sought and we are asked to do certain things because of conditions which have very recently been created and for which they do not blame the government at all.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In other words, they have not gone for you with a club.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, deputations have not the habit of going for us in that way. They used to do that with our predecessors.

Mr. CLANCY. The intelligent newspaper readers will have some difficulty in finding out just what the hon. gentleman means. He has told the House that parties who waited on the government had no fault to find with its policy. If that be the case the policy of the government must remain as it was in 1897. What are the business men of this country going to understand by the hon. gentleman's admission that the government have been approached for certain changes. What are these changes? They must be changes in the tariff. If so, these changes must be asked because the tariff of 1897 was a faulty tariff, for I defy that hon. gentleman to point out one condition now that did not exist in 1897. What was the condition in 1897? It was that we were largely at the mercy of foreign manufacturers. That is the condition to-day. Yet the hon. gentleman repeats again and again that those who are asking for tariff changes say that they have no fault to find with the tariff policy of the government. This is surely trifling with the intelligence of the people. It is time that the country should be relieved from suspense. The country is entitled to know what tariff changes are asked and what are contemplated, and what are the conditions which, according to the Finance Minister, induced those parties to approach the government. This is not a private matter which should be kept secret. It is a matter affecting public interest and concerning which the public should be given the fullest information. We were told by the Rt. Hon. First Minister that these parties who came to the government for changes in the tariff were the sole cause of their own difficulties, and that the government would require from them a reliable statement in order to verify whether the complaints they had made had any foundation or fact before the government would take any action. Well, Mr. Speaker, what we on this side contend—and we care not what the men who went to the Finance Minister for relief may have said regarding the policy of the government—is that the policy of the government is bad. We say that it is a mistaken policy, and we have that fact demonstrated to-day. Take the position of the two parties on this question. Do hon. gentlemen opposite believe that the iron industry has any future in this country? If they do, they must change their policy. Is the hon. Minister of Finance going to come down with a proposition to give bounties instead of protection. If he is, I am afraid that the people will not at all agree with him. Are the facilities wanting to make the iron industry a success in Canada? I do not think they are. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition pointed out clearly that we have every facility for producing iron in competition with the most enlightened methods in the world. All we require is the chance. All we require is a tariff which will give us our home market. If the government want to have the iron industry succeed, as we believe it will, if properly fostered, they must not face this question with a faint heart. The whole question must be grappled with. Contrast the positions of the two parties. The one party is shuffling in uncertainty, its leaders are afraid to proclaim its policy, although they have a majority of some fifty at their back. They declare that their policy of 1897 and their tariff of 1897 are sound, yet we have them to-day in the humiliating position of being afraid to proclaim that policy to the country. Compare the attitude of the hon. Finance Minister and the right hon. the First Minister with that taken by the hon. the leader of the opposition. The leader of the opposition boldly declares his policy and takes the consequences. He does not wait to follow public opinion but takes the lead and creates a healthy, sound public opinion. A comprehensive, broad and courageous policy has been enunciated this afternoon by the leader of the opposition. He is not afraid to take the responsibility of his doctrines in this House and before this country. But the Minister of Finance

this afternoon proclaimed the cabinet to be a collection of weaklings and its supporters a lot of mutes. There never was a more humiliating spectacle in the House of Commons in all its history than we witnessed this afternoon on the government benches. This iron industry is too important, there is too much money involved in it, there is too much of the future of Canada dependent on it, for it to be treated in this shuffling, uncertain, faint-hearted manner. We must have a defensive policy in Canada. Who would put his money into the iron industry with its present prospects ? with the tariff reduced nearly one-half, and in some cases three-fourths what it formerly was, and with this uncertain and unsound policy of giving bounties. Bounties can only be justified when high protection ceases to give the encouragement to manufacturing industries to which they are entitled. What does the hon. gentleman offer the country if our iron industries are embarrassed in any sense ? Has he invited men of capital to come to the country and put their money into it ? They will never put a dollar into the industry until the hon. gentleman changes his policy. No payments of bounty, paid out in dribbles and drabbles, and taken out of the pockets of the people, will give a home market to our farmers. Our people have to compete with foreign goods—I do not say in prices, for we are always able to compete in prices. But what the manufacturers and the farmers and all classes of producers in this country desire is that we shall have the home market which is the best market. What they want is the field, not the prices. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that we live in an age when a business must depend upon the amount of trade done rather than upon the margin of profit on each transaction. Now, I do not wish to detain the House any longer. I have only to say that, of all the resolutions proposed in this House in the short time during which I have had the honour of a seat here, I know of none more far-reaching, more comprehensive or clearer in its statement of the case than this. Not only does it state the case with clearness, but it shows that the Conservative party are prepared to face the people with a policy that grapples with this whole question from the raising of the ore from the mines to the manufacture of the smallest article required by the people. That is what it means, and I know of no resolution proposed in this House that I support with greater pleasure or greater confidence than I do the one now in our hands.

Mr. ROBERT A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont). Mr. Speaker, this is a great question, a question affecting great Canadian industries, and I hope in the few remarks I shall make, to speak upon broad Canadian principles. The hon. Minister of Finance, in opening his remarks, referred to the resolution brought down by the leader of the opposition, and said that this was a most inopportune time to bring down such a resolution. But has not the hon. gentleman had ample opportunity to consider the advisability of protecting this and other great Canadian industries ? We find that, on the 10th of March, the government met a committee of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association for the purpose of discussing with them the advisability of a general revision of the tariff. We find, Sir, that that committee reported to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and that, subsequently, on the 19th of March, they presented a tariff memorial. I am sure the House will pardon me if I refer to some of the things contained in this memorial. They say :

> In pursuance of the interview granted on the 10th instant to a special committee appointed by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, when they had the honour to consult with you relating to a general revision of the Canadian tariff, we beg to place before you a brief review of the circumstances from the standpoint of our association.

And they go on :

> For some time past we have urged that, in the interests of Canada, her tariff question should be removed entirely from politics, and be viewed as a national business problem. As time passes and the tariff wars of nations multiply, we are more than ever convinced that in this we are correct; and we believe it to be the duty of the government of the day, irrespective of any party watchwords or traditions, to immediately adopt that policy which will best defend the interests of our citizens and not only secure for Canada the development of her vast resources, but reserve and foster within our borders those great industries which provide industrial opportunities for her people. In recommending immediate and general revision of the tariff this is our sole purpose, and we believe we need no other.

Then, in this memorial, they go on to point out the great increase in the importation of the manufactured goods from the United States of America and the great increase in importation under the British preference. They also show the reasons why it was necessary for the government to take into immediate consideration the general revision of the tariff. They say :

> Many of our industries have been comparatively prosperous during recent years. This has been due largely to the abnormal prosperity which the world at large has enjoyed, the partial protection afforded by the present tariff, the growing excellence of the products of Canadian factories, and specially to the fact that the demands of the United States market, where industries are encouraged have taxed the output of the United States manufacturers to its fullest capacity. This home demand has been so great that recognizing the importance of their own market they have sacrificed their export trade, and speaking generally, have confined their attention largely to their own country. But even in spite of this, it is quite clear that any ground gained by the manufacturers of Canada has been only by persistent struggle

and in face of the keenest competition with the United States, Great Britain, Germany and other countries. If such has been our experience during a period of prosperity, what may we expect when depression comes and our manufacturers are forced to compete against those gigantic aggregations of capital which control the specialized industries of the United States, and which, as our imports prove, have already changed the trend of business in many lines of manufacture.

And they wind up that memorial by saying :

We then humbly pray that your honourable government will give us your worthy assurance that this most important question will receive your valued attention.

Now, Sir, that memorial was presented on the 17th of March. The government evidently considered very carefully and very fully the request made by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. Then, on the 16th of April, we had the budget speech of the Minister of Finance. We were entitled then to know just what consideration the government had given to that memorial and just what changes they were prepared to make. But this is what the Minister of Finance said :

I have two clauses to propose which will affect the tariff in certain directions and I shall ask for some amendments to the terms. Of these I shall speak presently. With these exceptions—and they are important exceptions as respects the clause referred to—we do not propose any change in the schedule rates of dutiable goods. We are not unmindful of the fact that there has been some agitation for a general revision of the tariff, but we think there is nothing in the present circumstances of the country which calls for this, and there are some strong reasons why any extensive changes in the tariff schedules would be inopportune. . . . . The country is prosperous, our manufacturing industries have, on the whole, enjoyed, and are enjoying, great prosperity.

Further on he says :

Indeed sir, the manufacturers themselves who have communicated with us have rather based their claim for changes, not so much upon the present condition of affairs, as upon the probability, as they think, that we shall soon have less prosperous times. I think, sir, that most of the manufacturers to-day are suffering, not from want of orders, but for lack of sufficient hands and factory space to enable them to supply the demands.

Now, Sir, what I say is this, that having this tariff memorial before them, having come down with a budget speech, having stated in that speech that there were only two changes of any importance to be made in the tariff, the leader of the opposition would have been recreant to his duty if he had not, knowing that a great industry of this country was imperilled, brought up the motion which is before us on this occasion. We, Sir, have always recognized that the Minister of Finance has been hostile to the great iron industries of this country. If we look back at the speeches of the Minister of Finance we will find that he has always taken that stand. Let me refer you to a speech he made in the Nova Scotia legislature on the 14th day of April, 1887. Referring to the iron industry, he spoke as follows :

The iron industry of this country has certainly had a liberal share of stimulus. If it cannot stand with the aid it has received it should come down. It has a heavy duty to keep out the foreign article, and a heavy duty to encourage production at home, and if, with all this, it cannot stand, I thing we might as well let it fall ; let us cease our efforts to produce iron and devote our energies to catching fish and digging potatoes.

Those are the utterances of the Minister of Finance on the 14th day of April, 1887. Now the opposition are not content, if by any means we can prevent it, to let the great iron industries of this country fall, notwithstanding the opinion of the Minister of Finance. Now, Sir, we had last year an election in the lower provinces, on which occasion we had utterances from the Minister of Finance and the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). In that contest, which took place in October, we had the hon. the Minister of Finance pronouncing an end to the iron bounty, saying that the Liberal party were heading for a lower tariff. During the same campaign the hon. member for Guysborough, who was campaigning with the Minister of Finance, said that :

The iron bounties would cease, and that Mr. Tarte had left the cabinet because the government was against higher duties.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce said:

He did not think the government were able to do anything to promote the iron industry in Canada.

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said :

That he objected to the iron duties on the ground that, as in the United States, they gave an undue stimulus to the iron business of that country.

Now, Sir, I take the position that we in this country, having the destinies of a great country in our hands, should do all that is possible to foster our great industries, and to foster especially that industry which is, I may say, the most important industry, if it is successful, that could be established in any country, the iron industry. Now the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) has referred to the industry in the United States. I do not think it is necessary for me to go over the history of the iron industry in the United States of America. I think that the history of that industry is very familiar to this House. We all know that the iron industry of the United States never prospered until they got a strong measure of protection. I do not like to weary the House, but I would ask permission to read a few extracts from a very able writer on the question of the iron industry in the United States of America.

Sir Lothian Bell, president of the Iron Trade Association of Great Britain, speaking before the Royal Commission, said among other things :

The monopoly of the British iron masters is broken. The monopoly of the iron trade held by English masters at this time enabled them to take advantage of conditions, fix prices to suit themselves and reap enormous profits. To be sure an unusual demand arose at this time from extensive railroad building and other causes, yet no increase in the cost of production occurred excepting a slight advance in wages, yet the profits were very large.

Then he goes on to say :

As competition arose, prices declined. Had other countries neglected to build up their industries under protection, England would have continued to 'suck in gold, gold, gold.' Notwithstanding the constant harping about protection raising prices, though rival industries would have been reared under its influence, the consumers of the world are undoubtedly getting cheaper iron than they could have ever hoped for under free trade monopoly.

Then the editor of this work says :

The iron industry of the United Kingdom has not only received a set-back in the development of the industry in other countries by the loss of foreign trade, but by maintaining open ports the consumers of England are making large purchases abroad. The increase of imports for home consumption of some of the leading metal manufacturers from 1860 to 1890, were as follows :—

Arms and ammunition in 1860, $423,565 ; in 1890, $1,372,375 ; in iron and steel, wrought or manufactured, in 1860, $220,335 ; in 1890, $13,843,200.

While the imports have been increasing as disclosed by the foregoing figures since 1874, the exports of domestic productions have declined. In 1872-73-74, the total exports of iron and steel manufactures were $143,520,242. During the following twenty years of marvellous development in other countries, as competition increased the exports declined to $118,908,362 ; in 1880-1-2, a decrease of 17:1 per cent. It has already been pointed out that from the beginning of railroad building in 1850 to 1874, the British iron masters supplied the world with the larger portion of the materials for their construction. The export of railroad iron of all sorts from the United Kingdom in 1872, 1873, 1874, was $50,470,966 ; by 1890-91-92, it had declined to $20,136,125. It will be remembered that the first steel rails were made in the United States about 1867, when protective duties were first imposed for the purpose of giving employment to American labour in making them for American railways.

Now, I quote this to show that Great Britain's production of iron has been decreasing as the production of iron in the United States has been increasing under a protective tariff. Then he goes on to say :—

The advantage of iron and coal, without protective tariffs, would not have enabled us to develop the vast iron and steel industry which has now become one of the great sources of our industrial prosperity.

Now let me quote from the evidence of Mr. James Willis Dixon, President of the Chamber of Commerce of Sheffield, who was examined in regard to the depression which was then existing in England in the iron industry, and see to what he attributes the cause. After giving a number of causes he says :

Then, there are the American duties. I had a fine trade with America about twenty-five years ago, a magnificent trade. I had an agent there who was paid £400 a year to keep stock there, and he did a big business. It is all gone and I do not send 6d. worth to the United States to-day.

Now, I would like to quote from a recent publication, being the Statistics of the American and Foreign Iron Trades for 1900. There is a review of the iron and steel trade of the nineteenth century by a man who is supposed to be one of the best authorities in the work on that industry, that is James M. Swank. In this article he states :

While great progress has been made in the last quarter of the nineteenth century in the development of the world's iron and steel industries, the most notable progress has been made in the United States. This country to-day leads all other countries in the production of iron and steel. This prominence in the manufacture of these articles is only in part due to the bounty of nature in providing liberal supplies of the raw materials needed ; it is largely the result of friendly legislation by the general government, first, in more firmly establishing in 1861 the protective tariff policy, which has since been effectively maintained with but brief interruptions, and, second, in adopting at about the same time the policy of liberal grants of land to railroad companies. Through the operation of the protective policy the home market has been preserved for the home producers of iron and steel and of all articles made from them, and through the operation of the land-grant system, supplemented by the homestead policy, thousands of miles of railroad have been built in the western states and territories that would not otherwise have been constructed.

Then he goes on to say :

But many of these railways could not have been built if our protective tariff policy had not built up our iron-rail industry in the third quarter of the century and our steel-rail industry in the fourth quarter. Until we began to make our own iron rails and afterwards our own steel rails, foreign manufacturers charged us excessive prices for such rails as we could afford to import. Both the industries mentioned had at the first to struggle for their very existence against foreign competition, the early duties on foreign iron rails and afterwards on foreign steel rails not being sufficiently protective, but in the end the control of the home market was gained, the production of rails increased enormously, and the prices were steadily reduced.

That is just the position that we want to bring about in this country. We want to give that measure of protection which will give to our people the home market and I believe the same result will follow in this country that has followed in the United States, that we will control the market,

and that the price of the product will be steadily reduced. Now, he says further :

The courage of our iron and steel manufacturers in entering upon new enterprises of the greatest magnitude and the skill displayed by our engineers and mechanics in attaining important and valuable metallurgical results must be a constant marvel to every student of our industrial history.

The people who have gone into this great enterprise in this country have had a good deal of pluck. They have had a good deal of nerve to invest their money in such a large and important industry, and I say that having done this it is the duty of this government to assist them in every legitimate way to bring that industry to a success. I would like to refer for a moment to the great progress that has been made in other countries in this industry under a protective tariff. I do not intend to take up much time in that respect, but I would like to refer to Russia. We all know the experience that Russia has had under a low tariff, and we know the prosperity she is now enjoying under a protective tariff.

In Russia, in 1861, pig iron was imported free of duty and the free import of all kinds of machinery and implements was granted, which, of course, operated against the Russian machinery building industry. It was not until 1880, however, that the privileges of free importation was abolished. In that year duties were levied upon all machines and tools made of wrought and cast iron and steel. In 1882 the duty was made still higher. Under this influence machine construction and the manufacture of rails developed rapidly. The railways now in operation began to bring ore and coal nearer to the mills, and, when the Ekaterininsk railway in the south of Russia was finished, it opened up mines with inexhaustible veins of fuel. In 1884 the government raised the duty on cast iron and still protected coal mining. Almost yearly since that time to the tariff of 1891 duties have been levied to meet particular needs of the iron and steel industries.

The position we should take in this country should be identically the same as that which has been taken by Germany, France, Russia and the United States, and that is that duty should be levied to meet the particular needs of the iron and steel industry just as well as to meet the particular needs of all the other great industries of this country. When we consider the enormous importance of an industry of that kind to this country I say that it should receive every consideration. We know that in the manufacture of pig iron there is about ninety per cent of the cost which is labour. Is there anything better for us than that the labour of this country should be employed in the manufacture of iron and steel ? I do not think that I am stating it at all excessively when I say that the labour cost of one ton of iron is somewhere about ninety per cent. Some experts put it a little higher. The authority that I have referred to says that the cost of a ton of 2,240 pounds of pig iron, based upon a certain cost of material, is 90·8 per cent. In the same way it can be shown that over ninety per cent of the cost of a ton of steel rails, or any product of iron and steel, is labour. I have also the opinion of good authority, the Hon. Abraham S. Hewitt, based upon his experience as a miner and manufacturer of iron. He said :

The value of every manufacture is made up entirely of the wages paid to produce it. Coal and iron in the mines cost nothing. They are the free gifts of God. But they are excavated by the pick and shovel of the workmen ; by him they are wheeled, carted, boarded to market ; by the workmen they are caried to mill ; by the workmen the furnace is heated and charged ; by him the iron is puddled, rolled, put up for the market, carried thither and sold. It is labour, labour, labour that constitutes every addition to the value of the article, and it is the man who bestows that labour who should enjoy the fruits thereof.

I say, Sir, that the policy of this government ought to be to protect the labour of this country which so largely enters into the manufacture of iron and steel.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PRINGLE. Let me point out that prior to a very high protective tariff being brought into force in the United States they had nothing but failures in that country. Men invested their capital and made brave attempts to develop the industry, but time and again they were crushed out by foreign manufactures. Up to the time they got very high protection, there was a constant series of failures amongst the very large iron industries. Mr. B. F. French in his history of the iron industry of the United States accounts for it in this way :

It is an established fact that in many departments of English industry, those who are interested will carry them on at a loss for years, to aid in retaining markets from which they are in danger of being excluded by commercial restrictions or industrial competition; and scarcely a branch of industry has sprung up in the United States which has not, at first, had to encounter a severe struggle in consequence of the foreign article being reduced in price below that with which it had been expected to compete.

But in spite of this handicap, the iron and steel industry in the United States has made remarkable progress since 1860. In every branch, as soon as an adequate duty was levied, the manufacture began and increased greatly while imports and prices decreased in an almost constant ratio. I have a list here of the failures prior to 1860, but it is sufficient for me to say that during that period there were a large number of failures in the United States. After they got an adequate protective tariff we heard of few failures of any moment. It was not until 1870, that the iron industry of the United States received adequate protection and really began to show what it could do. The production of iron in the

United States in 1867 amounted to 2,277 gross tons and in 1894 it amounted to 1,017,096 tons which as you will see is an enormous increase. But I need refer more particularly to the increase from 1870, for the reason that in 1870 a very high protective tariff was placed on the iron industry of the United States. In 1870 the gross tons produced were 30,357, but in 1880 under a heavy protective tariff that production had increased to 864,353 and from that time down to the present day there has been a constant increase, except during the short period that the United States adopted a lower tariff when their productions diminished and when they were not as prosperous as when they re-adopted the high protective tariff. Let us see what protection did for the steel rail industry of the United States. In 1867 the importation of rails of all kinds into the United States amounted to 145,580 tons, and in 1878 it dropped down to nine tons.

An hon. MEMBER. What is that?

Mr. PRINGLE. Nine tons was the total importation of rails in 1878 into the United States. I will admit that some years subsequently the importation increased because there was an era of marvellous railroad construction, and the industry in the United States was not able to cope with the demand, so that in 1882, for instance, the importation ran up to 200,113 tons. But just so soon as railway construction slackened the importation of rails slackened also and in 1885 it only amounted to 2,189 tons, while in 1892 there were only imported into the United States 347 tons. The United States have been able to manufacture steel rails cheaper than any other country under the sun. They cut down the cost of steel rails some few years ago to $22 a ton, and they were able to underbid the manufacturers of Great Britain and Europe in that industry. That result was obtained under their system of high protection. We are familiar with the tariff history of the United States and we know that the Republican party in 1861 after a long period of low tariffs, inaugurated a high protective tariff and there has been an unbroken line of prosperity in that country ever since with the exception of the years between 1894 and 1897 when a low tariff was in force. Since 1860 the population of the United States has grown from 31,443,321 to 76,303,387 in 1890, an increase of 143 per cent. That was an enormous increase in a country which, if the argument of gentlemen opposite were true, should have retrograded under a system of high protection. In 1860, the national wealth of the United States was $16,159,616,000, or $514 for each individual, and in 1890, it was $94,300,000,000, or $1,235 for each individual. It is no wonder, Sir, that Gladstone made the remark that the United States of America, under her protective tariff, was passing Great Britain, with her free trade policy, in a canter.

In the great manufacturing industries, the activity of the manufacturer and the earnings of the workmen show equally striking improvement. The cotton manufacturers have increased their consumption of domestic cotton from two and a half million bales in 1896, to over three and a half million bales in 1901; the number of iron furnaces in blast has increased from 159 in 1896, to 266 in 1901; and the manufacture of tin plates has grown from less than 40,000,000 pounds in 1894, to 678,000,000 in 1901. While I am on that subject, let me say a word in regard to that tin plate industry. We are all familiar with the attitude that was taken by the late President McKinley in regard to protecting the tin plate industry. The duties on tin plates and turned plates provided by the tariff of 1890 went into effect on July 1st, 1891. From that date until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, the statistics of tin plates and turned plates were regularly collected for the Treasury Department. Let us see the increase under the protective tariff in that country. In 1892 the gross tons produced were 18,803; in 1901 the gross tons were 399,201, showing that under the protective tariff there was an enormous impetus to that industry.

Let us see what was done in the great industry of building locomotives in the United States. We know that it was not many years ago when it was impossible for the United States to construct an American locomotive in competition with a foreign manufacturer. The foreign manufacturer chose to put his price down to the point where he could prevent the American manufacturer from making locomotives at a profit. But under that system of protection we find that American locomotives are running on American rails in every part of the world. You find them to-day passing the pyramids of Egypt; you will find that the railroad now being built in the Orient, the Manchurian Railway, is being supplied entirely with American rails and American locomotives; and, strangest of all, you find in free trade Great Britain that there is not an important railway on which there are not American locomotives used. That shows the progress which the United States has made in that industry.

But, Sir, I do not wish to be understood as saying that the only industries that prosper under a protective tariff are the great manufacturing industries. I recognize just as well as any one that the great agricultural interest is the important interest of this country; and I could show by evidence that the great agricultural interests of the United States have prospered under protection just to the same extent that the great manufacturing industries have done. The Agriculture Department reports an increase of more than $350,000,000 in farm values,

and an enormous increase in all the products of the agriculturists of that country.

I have quoted from some of the speeches made by the hon. Minister of Finance. That hon. gentleman, like others on that side of the House, always leaves an open door. In a speech of his, made at a banquet in Halifax on December 12, 1902, the hon. gentleman was evidently looking forward to leaving an open door for some changes in the tariff. This is taken from the Toronto 'Globe's' report:

> If there is an inequality which needs to be remedied, we are prepared to consider it and remedy it. If there is a new condition created by the establishment of some new industry; if there are conditions abroad which are interfering with our trade; in short, if anything has happened, we do not propose to shut our eyes to established facts, but we do say that where the country has prospered under this tariff there is no reason for getting up an excitement for purposes of having us return to high duties.

Now, Sir, I say that something has happened. The manufacturers of this country, on the 10th of March and on the 19th of March, and persistently from that day to this, have informed the hon. gentleman that something was happening, and that the industries of this country desired that there should be a revision of the tariff. If the hon. the Minister of Finance meant what he said in the speech delivered on the 14th of December, 1902, he should, when he brought down the budget, have taken into consideration the revision of the tariff. I am not going into the figures of the importations of iron products into this country. These have been brought out very fully and ably by the speakers who preceded me on this side. Suffice it to say that, according to the figures given here to-day, there are over $33,000,000 worth of iron products brought into this country, some of which are free, some subject to a very small duty, but the larger portion dutiable. Our aim should be not to encourage the foreigner, not to bring in foreign products, but to encourage our own people and our own manufacturers. No industry, such as our iron industry, with free imports or a very low protective tariff, can stand up against the huge corporation now doing business in the United States, and known as the United States Steel Corporation. That company is bound to control this market and will control it, to the ruin of our iron industry, unless the government comes down with an adequate measure of protection. We have had enough in this country of this 'let alone' policy. We want a government which will act and act in the interests of the Canadian people. The policy which hon. gentlemen opposite advocate is not the policy of the great statesmen of the neighbouring republic. It is not the policy of our late chieftain of the Conservative party, Sir John Macdonald, it is not the policy of the present opposition in this House. This is a matter which we should consider on broad Canadian lines. Are we to be told, as our manufacturers were told prior to 1878, that under no circumstances or conditions would the government raise a finger to protect or encourage the industries of this country, that if anybody went into any manufacturing enterprise, he did it at his peril and must take the consequences, and that it was not the intention of the government to interfere in any way to protect industry, under any circumstance. We have had the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), when speaking of the woollen industry, stating that if that industry could not survive under the tariff then in existence, it had better go down. I perhaps speak a little feelingly when I refer to the woollen industry, because I have the honour to represent a constituency in which there is a manufacturing town. In that town we had a prosperous, thriving, woollen industry, giving employment to from 150 to 200 men, but its doors had to close, and these men, who had no desire to leave Canada, had to go to the United States to find employment in the woollen industry there. But if the government had acted as it should, that industry, instead of being in crippled, would be to-day in a prosperous condition. We say that it is within the power and it is the duty of the government to give proper protection to the energies of the country, and to encourage and relieve distressed industries. That it can do by making such changes in the fiscal policy as may be necessary. Situated as we are, owners of the best half of the North American continent, possessing a territory stretching from ocean to ocean, with varied resources and capabilities, it is our mission to do everything that is necessary to make the Canadian people a great and powerful nation, and we should neglect no opportunity to lay the foundations broad and deep of future greatness. It is possible to do much by legislation. We are likely to have another great transcontinental line. I do not know whether it will be the policy of this government to subsidize that line or not, but if it should be the policy of this government to vote millions of dollars of the people's money toward the construction of that line, then it should be the policy of the government to see that these millions of dollars are expended in this country in so far as possible. As I said a moment ago, in my opinion the right hon. the Prime Minister should have gone further than he did. There are great interests to-day waiting the decision of the government. I think he should have announced to the people whether the government deemed it necessary to assist along proper lines the enterprise which is appealing to it for assistance to-day. I have no doubt that there are other industries which will make a similar appeal before the session is over. I would like to see these hon. gentlemen in favour of their own country. I would like to see them frame their policy

for the benefit of our own farmers, our own mechanics, our own miners, our own labouring men. Let them protect our own people. It is within their power to do so, but their policy seems to be to favour the foreigner and not the Canadian. I know that it is very hard for us, on questions of this kind, to separate ourselves from politics, but it seems to me that on a great Canadian question such as this we should be able to do so and consider it free from party prejudice. It seems to me that we should be able to come to its consideration in a true Canadian spirit, it is a question that soars far above and beyond party interest and consideration, and we should discuss it on broad Canadian principles. I have probably taken up a little more time than I had intended in speaking on the question of protecting this great Canadian industry. Ninety per cent of the cost of all iron products consists of labour, and there is no capital so important in this country as labour. I say that productive labour is the greatest thing we have in Canada. Its importance is incalculable. Just suppose that we have in this country 500,000 working men, whose wages averaged $400 a year. That is equal to the interest of $8,000 at five per cent, so that each labourer's capital is equal to $8,000 at interest. Multiply this by 500,000, the number of labourers, and it gives you capital to the enormous sum of $4,000,000,000, producing, at five per cent, $200,000,000 a year. That is the interest that we ought to protect in this country—the labour interest. This labour capital the Conservative party have always striven to uphold and maintain. It is, after all, the great national interest of the country, and it is this that we wish to defend against the ruinous effect of unrestricted competition. We on this side of the House have always been for cherishing Canadian labour, for giving it high wages, for surrounding it with substantial comforts of life; and I say it should be the object of the legislatures of this country to protect in every way the labour interest of Canada. I know that my hon. friends on the government benches have many difficulties to contend with. They have these very clever and brainy gentlemen from the west who have settled upon a free trade policy in so far as they can. Let me say to these hon. gentlemen that they should take no narrow view of a matter of this kind, but that they should approach it upon broad national grounds. Let me say to them that if they take protection from the old provinces of the Dominion, they rob us of that which not enriches them and leaves us poor indeed. Destroy protection in this country and you destroy the older provinces of the Dominion, and with the older provinces of the Dominion the great west would also suffer.

Sir, I hope the present let-alone policy of hon. gentlemen opposite will be abandoned and upon its ruin will arise a Canadian policy protecting and cherishing Canadian industries, a policy which alone, I believe, will save this country. If hon. gentlemen will adopt that policy, I am satisfied that there will be no question about the prosperity and progress of the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. J. ISRAEL TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Mr. Speaker, I am aware that a motion in amendment to the motion to go into Supply is usually considered as a motion of want of confidence. Under ordinary circumstances, the government are justified in calling upon their followers to reject and vote down such a motion. Has the government been justified, or are they justified in resorting to that procedure in this debate ? The leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has very clearly and distinctly stated that he did not present his motion as a motion of want of confidence. It was rather, if I rightly interpret his words, an invitation to the government to relieve the present situation by making declarations proper to restore public confidence. My hon. friends on the treasury benches cannot ignore, cannot possibly ignore the fact that we are passing through an industrial crisis—it is out of the question. I do not believe that I am exaggerating the figures in stating that, during the last three or four months, there have been $100,000,000 of Canadian money lost. That is indeed a very large amount of money. I do not mean to convey the idea that the policy of the government is responsible for all that loss. All the same, the losses are there. And the last phase of the losses and of the crisis have come from the very industry that is under discussion to-day. For a time, the iron and steel industry was a very popular one. In my hearing, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said, a year or two ago, that he expected, before he was very much older, to see the Sydney iron industries rival the Pittsburg industries. My hon. friend must know to-day that he was then very far from the mark. The doors of the Sydney works are closed to-night, and my right hon. friend knows it better than I do, because he has information that is not available to ordinary members of parliament. Yet, I happen to know that I am not exaggerating, that I am not going beyond the mark, when I say that the doors of the Sydney works are more than half closed. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) whose good intentions I do not question, whose honesty of purpose I do not question in any way whatever, has said that he has one consolation after all, and that is that the opposition gave him the credit that the duties on iron have been lowered since 1896. That is indeed a poor consolation. What the opposition may think, what any of us may have said or thought years ago, is a poor consolation in place of

the loss by the disasters which face us to-day. And why are these losses so heavy? Let me tell my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that it is because we have reduced the duties on iron. I am responsible for that reduction as much as my hon. friend is; politically I am responsible, although I am free to say that I have never had much confidence in the bounty system. My former colleagues will do me the justice to say that I have never had much faith in that system. The bounty system is not a policy, it is an expedient; and expedients have never led to any good results in the world. Capital cannot possibly have any confidence in a bounty system. If this country had gone firmly, energetically, into a protective policy on iron and other things, I make bold to say, we should not have had the crisis that we have had during the last month. And so much is this the case that to-day the men who are at the head of these large industries, are applying to the government to remedy the evil. If there was no remedy, they would not be here now. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has told us, in his very short speech, that this amendment is inopportune. Why is it inopportune? We have not been told. I would like to know what my hon. friends on the treasury benches have in their minds when they say the amendment is inopportune. Is it so because they believe that the opposition and men in politics who hold protectionist views have no right to place their views before the country in the way we are doing now. I know that governments do not like to see their hands forced; we must admit that governments are in office to rule. But governments are in office to listen also; and when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said distinctly, that he meant simply to offer to the government the help of hon. gentlemen on his side of the House, it seems to me there is nothing inopportune in the motion.

Now, Sir, the words of the Minister of Finance have been re-echoed by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House. He has told us that this is a time for reflection, for consideration, for study. My hon. friend has had a lot of time for reflection, for consideration and for study. For the last two or three years this question has been brought to his notice, the difficulties of the industrial situation have been made known to him as they have been made known to us. He knows that representations after representations have been made to the government. He knows that the iron men have come to us over and over again. He knows that his strongest political friends have warned him. Let me quote only a few words from the Hon. Mr. Cox, who is a friend of the government. I am sure he will not be accused of being a traitor because he shares the views that other men hold, other men who are no more traitors than he is. In his speech at the annual meeting of the Bank of Commerce, in November, 1902, the Hon. Mr. Cox spoke these words:

> Apparently thus far we are able to view with some satisfaction our position. But the tendency is clearly towards a condition demanding caution.

I shall not weary the House by reading the whole utterance of the Hon. Mr. Cox, who was then warning the country that we were in a difficult position. Mr. Cox knew then, what has been made very clear since. He is a financier who is at the head of several great banking and financial institutions, and he saw signs of trouble, he saw the signs of the times that we are face to face with now.

My hon. friends have been warned. During the last session of parliament, the Minister of Finance made a statement which is much like the one we have heard during this session. He inviited the country to wait. Not this session, said he, not now. The country waited, the manufacturing interest waited, the big institutions waited one year. That year passed away. At the opening of parliament this year the hon. the Minister of Finance invited us once more to wait. Last year the London conference was to be held. It was a reasonable pretext. This year we were informed that the high commission might perhaps meet again. That was also, to a certain extent, a reasonable pretext, but after all these are only pretexts. These arguments cannot inspire capital with confidence, they do not save us from the great crisis that hon. gentlemen have to take now into their consideration. We have waited two years, and we are invited to wait again. I know that it is rather late. The hundred millions that are lost may not be reimbursed, may not be made up again, they are lost. Why should we wait any longer? Sir, I do not wish to be a prophet of evil, but let my hon. friends on the Treasury benches permit me to say to them that unless they pause, unless they reflect a little more rapidly than they have done in the past, before we are much older we will have greater losses than the losses we are lamenting to-day. I make this statement to the right hon. gentleman and to his colleagues. They should know just what we know ourselves. They should know that great banking institutions are afraid of the present situation. I happen to live in a city where there are large institutions, I happen to meet business men, and I know what they think of the situation, and I know that my hon. friends on the Treasury benches have been made aware of the danger of the situation. Let me say that party politics should not interfere at a moment of crisis to vast interests. It should be no humiliation for the Minister of Finance and for his colleagues to come before parliament and to say: Circumstances have

changed. The ministers are not infallible. If they would come before the House and say : Circumstances have changed, we are passing through a great crisis, let us change the tariff—they would be supported, not only by their own friends, but by their opponents. I know that there are in the rank and file of the Liberal party, not only in this House but outside of it, thousands of men who think as I am speaking to-night. I know they would cheer my hon. friends on the Treasury benches, they would be glad if they would come before the House, before this session is over and say : Well, let us save the industries that are most in danger. I know it is late, the session is advanced. But my hon. friends, as I said before, have had time to reflect. I would not blame them one moment for what they have not done, if they would do to-day what they should do.

Now, Sir, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister said, and I believe there is a great deal of truth in it, that perhaps the management of the Sydney mines has not been what it should have been. Let that be so, that does not change the situation by any means. The fact that there may have been mismanagement does not prove that the policy of the government is right. My hon. friends know it, and they know it so well that at the beginning of the session they tried to improve it a little by announcing that they would put up the duty on rails. What is true about rails is still more true about dozens and dozens of articles of iron. I say it again, if there has been some mismanagement in the Sydney mines, that is no evidence that the policy of the government is right. Getting a statement from the gentlemen who are interested in the Sydney mines will not improve matters in any way. The proposal is an evidence of the unwilling spirit with which the government is grappling with the situation—let me say it without meaning to give any offence.

The government should make up their minds that new conditions have arisen, that even in England, free trade England to which we are referred so often, there is a political revolution going on to-day. England was the only country in the world which professed free trade, and now the greatest English statesmen have made up their minds that long enough they have allowed other countries to slaughter their market, and they are right. Let me say it openly, I recognize the broad and statesmanlike spirit of the Hon. Mr. Chamberlain. We may not always agree with him in everything that he has done, but he has at least a pride in the great empire of which he is one of the servants. He knows, not only as a statesman but as a practical business man, that the industries of England are being destroyed. He knows that the agriculture of England is being injured, and as a business man as well as a statesman he is not ashamed to say : Let bygones be by-gones. I have been a free trader, I have made free trade speeches ; now I want to protect and defend the industries of England against the unfair competition of foreign countries. That is a statesmanlike position. Why should my hon. friends be more proud than the hon. gentleman who is one of the first statesmen of the empire to-day ? We may all have made mistakes. I am very much afraid we have all made mistakes, but I would not call it a mistake to have said ten or fifteen years ago that it was better to have a low tariff. I do not say that those who spoke in that way then are obliged to admit that they have made a mistake, but they must admit that circumstances have changed.

Sir, the iron industry needs no defence. It is one of the most important industries that the country can see grow and prosper. That industry is intimately bound up with the shipbuilding industry. If the government allows, by false shame, that industry to go to the wall, it will be many years before it could recover. I would not hesitate one single minute if I were in the position in which the right hon. gentleman is, to take up that iron question and solve it. It would be solved very easily indeed. I do not mean to say that we could impose duties on every detail of the iron industry. There is a way of doing it. We know what we can manufacture. In 1897 we had scarcely any iron manufacturing industries. We were then only beginning. Our industry has been developing since, not very much, but it has been developing. We have erected great buildings for the manufacture of iron. We have plants to do that. Let us examine carefully and ascertain what these plants can make. Let us protect immediately all that these plants can manufacture. I would suggest to my hon. friends on the treasury benches, if they are good enough to accept a suggestion at my hands in the spirit in which I am offering it, to raise the duties on a certain schedule of iron articles against all foreign nations, giving a preference to England. We would then import from England articles that we are not prepared to produce here. It would be a national policy, it would be a sound policy, and it would lead to a trade between this great colony and the mother country, and largely encourage our merchant marine while at the same time protecting our own industry. There is no difficulty in adopting this policy. The shares of the iron industires are very low to-day. Would my hon. friends permit me to say that if they would adopt the policy I am suggesting this evening the shares would go up immediately. Confidence would be restored. I see smiling faces. I am not surprised, because I know a good many of my hon. friends in this parliament have lost a lot. But, outside of this Chamber men in perfect good faith have also lost money by leaps and

bounds. Let us not forget, as I said at the beginning of these remarks, that about one hundred millions of money have been lost.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) if that one hundred millions went into the industry ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, I do not mean anything of that kind, but a very large amount of money has been lost as my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) knows, in the iron industry as a result of the slump which has taken place in the iron industry as in many other stocks. Disaster invites disaster, and unless my hon. friends on the treasury benches make up their minds that they must grapple with the present situation, they will have to face more disasters than we have had to face yet. The great trouble to-day is lack of confidence. There is no confidence in banking institutions or in the industrial world, and I may very frankly tell my hon. friends on the treasury benches why this is so. Telling the country and telling parliament to wait until next year, to wait and see is not a policy. It is the lack of a policy. It is the absence of a policy. Capital cannot have confidence in such a state of affairs, and let me assure my hon. friends on the treasury benches that in what I say now I do not mean to impute any undue blame or give any offence to them. I mean to convey to them with all the earnestness that I can put into my words the conviction that I am speaking the truth, that I am making out the position as I know it is to be, that we are face to face with grave dangers and that in their own political interest they had better take up the question now than later on.

References have been made to the progress of the iron industry in the United States. The industry in that country encountered a great deal of trouble before it could take root. Why was it ? It was because England was then a strongly protectionist country. Our English friends went very far. Parliament went so far as to pass an Act to prevent the emigration of mechanics or skilled workers to the United States. There was an Act of parliament passed in 1785 to prevent the emigration of mechanics or skilled workers in iron or steel or the exportation of any tool, engine or machine beyond the sea. Lord Brougham, in the House of Commons in England denounced the efforts that the young American nation was making to build up its industries. He suggested to the iron masters of England to undersell the infant American industries. In his speech, Lord Brougham said :

> It was even worth while to incur loss upon the first exportation in order by the glut to stifle in the cradle these rising manufactures in the United States.

The PRIME MINISTER. What year was that in ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Act of parliament I referred to, was passed in 1785. Of course, it was going far. As my hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) who has just spoken, said, the iron industry took a foothold only after it was protected as highly as it has been for years and years. Now, it is easy to give more figures. Last year the United States produced 16,250,000 tons of iron, and over 11,000,000 tons of steel. Germany had also an immense production ; England is no longer in it. Mr. Chamberlain wants England to be in it, and it is for that reason he wants to protect England. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not much more to say.

An hon. MEMBER. Thanks.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. An hon. friend behind me says 'thanks.' It is the gentleman from the North-west that we hear so often speaking in such dignified language. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) has urged the government to come to the rescue of the Sydney works. But he is a free trader. He has informed us that he is very sorry to have to come to that conclusion, but he came to it. Let me tell him that the Sydney works are not the only ones involved. The whole iron industry of Canada is involved, and all the iron men have asked the government for relief. We had a pretty big disaster at Sault Ste. Marie a few months ago. The crisis began there, it travelled down by the sea, and it is everywhere now. I believe that if my hon. friend (Mr. Kendall) and others who have influence with the government would combine with the independent members and with the opposition, we would carry the day. If we assure the government that it is the wish of parliament that those industries should be relieved, the government would come out all right. Let us tell the government that we do not mean to imply any want of confidence, and that is my intention in the speech I am making now. One last word. The Prime Minister has asked : Why is it that the Sydney works have not produced iron as cheaply as the promoters of the industry thought they would That is a very pertinent question, and I think I can answer it. My humble opinion is that unless you give to an industry enough to produce, it is out of the question to expect cheap production. Quantity is essential in the cost of production. That is an elementary law. How can we expect that our infant industry at Sydney and elsewhere can compete successfully with the giants on the other side of the line, the giants of Germany, of England, and of France ? Let us start by doing the right thing. As the Minister of Finance said, the granting of bounties was a liberal thing to do. Yes; but it was not the right thing to do. A good many of us thought that bounties would help but that they would not be sufficient, because bounties will not secure the home market. A bounty means taking the

money out of the pockets of the people and paying it to the manufacturers, while protection, adequate duties, mean cheap production; it means the securing of the home market and it is because that cheap production has not been secured by sufficient duties and that enough protection has not been assured, that the cheapness that the Prime Minister expected has not been achieved.

In conclusion, let me say, that in my opinion the government would not only be justified but would be doing its duty towards this country by raising the duty on iron. I know very well that other industries will apply, but it seems to be that fifteen days of consideration to a revision of the tariff could make it right. The government have a lot of material in their hands. When I left office they had it, and I have a very large amount of it myself. They have time still to consider it, and to come before this House with, if not a complete policy, at least a policy sufficient to relieve the present situation.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). I feel quite at ease in expressing my opinion on this question, because I am not a convert to the idea of protection. Even when the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was a member of the cabinet, and before he had decided to take his free course upon this question, I expressed clearly my opinion in this House that I was in favour of a bold policy of protection to the industries of Canada against undue competition from the United States. But because I am a protectionist, and for the very reason that I am a protectionist, I would not like to see this government or any government use what I have always considered to be the true national policy of Canada, as a means for helping stock gambling. Not that I say that stock gambling is the only question involved here, but I do say that it is deeply involved, and unfortunately it has not been treated of so far in this debate. Considering first the protection needed by the iron industry so far as it is covered by the motion, I wish to give the reason why I approve entirely of the position that has been taken this afternoon by the Prime Minister, when he said that it was impossible that the government could accept immediately the motion of the leader of the opposition. It is not my habit to attribute base motives to any member of this House, whether he sits on this side or on that. I am convinced that the motives of the leader of the opposition are sincere and are patriotic, but we must consider the consequences of such a course as he invites us to take. The hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has properly said that the policy of bounties was a policy of expediency, that it had not the permanency of a policy of protection. And just because a policy of protection is of a permanent character, it would be foolish on the part of this government or this parliament to accede right away to the demands of the iron producers without considering what would be the effect of such protection on many other industries that are entitled to the care of this parliament just as much as is the industry at Sydney. Before the government grants any further protection to the iron and steel manufacturers, it is its duty to ascertain what would be the result of such protection to the farm implement manufacturer, to the manufacturer of carpenters' tools, to the nail and screw manufacturers, and in fact to every other industry in this country whose raw material is the product of the industry which we are asked to protect. If protection is to be given to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company—and I do not say that it should not be given—the government should be prepared at the same time to give an equally fair measure of protection to all those industries which have to buy their materials from that company or import them from abroad.

But, Sir, there are other industries than the iron and steel industries, and those which use iron and steel, that are entitled to the same care and attention of parliament; and it would not be proper for this parliament and this government to come out now and say that because there has been a disaster in the stock gambling of this country, and certain industries are affected by stock gambling, other industries which are being conducted on a legitimate basis, and which offer to capital a prospect of a fair and honest profit, are not entitled to the same consideration at the hands of the government.

Therefore, the question that is raised to-night, with reference to only one industry, is in reality the whole question of the tariff. The hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) gave notice in the debate on the budget that he was going to bring into this House a resolution on the general tariff policy of the government. I could understand the hon. gentleman, on such an occasion, giving out the views he has expressed to-night—and I do not say that I do not partake somewhat of the views of the hon. gentleman; I do not say that I shall not be prepared at some future time to consider the whole question of a tariff revision; but whatever may be our different opinions of what the real interests of this country require, whatever may be the policy of the Liberal party, or the policy of the Conservative party, to-night is not the time, just because a few men who have lost money through stock gambling are coming here to ask for more protection, to raise the whole tariff question by a motion affecting the iron and steel industry alone.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I want to tell my hon. friend that this motion was prepared weeks before I ever had the slightest idea that the iron and steel men were coming to the government at all. To my

knowledge they never came to see the government except during the latter part of last week. I had given notice of my motion on the previous Monday, and it had been prepared for two weeks before that, and I was waiting for the return of the hon. Finance Minister to afford me an opportunity of moving it. When my hon. friend makes the statement that the difficulties of a certain company which he named have been caused by stock gambling, I think he ought to give some explanation as to how this company has been brought into business difficulties by gambling, or how its financial position could be affected by the fact that people throughout the country have been buying or selling its stock.

Mr. BOURASSA. As far as the first part of the hon. gentleman's statement is concerned, I am quite prepared to accept his explanation. But what I say is that the position put before us in the motion to-night is the position that has been raised by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. It is the position taken by most of the newspapers, including the organ of the hon. member for St. Mary's. I do not blame the hon. member for St. Mary's, nor do I blame the hon. leader of the opposition, for the views these hon. gentlemen entertain. But I say that the government are justified in refusing to adopt such a resolution to-night. I say that they would not be entitled to the confidence of this parliament and this country if they would not withstand such a demand in a moment of excitement, because there are some men who, in good faith, and some who in bad faith, are now in a position to accept a motion which would mean an entire revolution in the fiscal policy of this country.

I will come later on to the question of stock gambling; but when the hon. leader of the opposition interrupted me, I was just going to say that we are told to-night that the only remedy required by this large industry in order to prosper is an increase in the duties. We have been told of the great development of the iron and steel industry in the United States on account of a high tariff; but I would like, before this debate is over, to have an explanation of the statement that was made this afternoon by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) that one of the dangers that threaten our industry was the state of depression of the iron and steel industry in the United States —the industry which, according to other members of the opposition has been so greatly flourishing under a high protective policy. Is the tariff in the United States lower to-day than it was five years ago? If the tariff does not protect the iron and steel industry in that country, born and brought up and kept under the most favourable circumstances with which any industry was ever favoured, with a huge monopoly extending not only over the entire territory of the American republic, but invading the neutral markets of this world, going to England and competing there with old iron industries, going to Egypt and supplying the railways there with American rails, going to China and superseding the English products there—I say that if such an industry is not prospering to-day, how can the logical conclusion be drawn from the motion of the hon. leader of the opposition, from the speech of the hon. member for St. Mary's, or from the speeches of the other supporters of this motion, that, by adopting the same policy, we shall avoid the disasters which the iron and steel industry of the United States has suffered? I say that the conclusion is not logical that by adopting that same policy we would revive our industries.

Now, I am not going to enter into any technical details regarding this industry; I am not competent to do so. The hon. member for St. Mary's said that one of the reasons why iron cannot be produced at Sydney cheaply enough in the present situation is because the iron industry cannot expect a large enough market to develop and to prosper. But, Sir, the statement was given out some days ago by some of the directors of that company that it was not the iron part of the business that was suffering, but the steel production, and that if they were given some special protection on some of the articles of steel, the production would be revived. But the fact remains that under the present tariff, knowing exactly where they were, knowing what property they had, knowing what the population of Canada was, knowing the purchasing power of Canada, that company started some four years ago with a huge prospectus asking the people to subscribe millions and promising them large returns and profits, without conveying the slightest hint that the tariff was an impediment. Therefore, I say that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister was right when he said that the public of this country were asking for some explanation regarding the management of the Dominion Steel Company. The hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has asked the government to declare immediately in favour of a high tariff upon most of the productions on iron and steel with a preference in favour of the British producer. I must say that I was astounded at this declaration, and it was mainly this declaration which brought me to my feet. It is well known that when the government decided to increase the preference to the British producer, I spoke of that policy with great caution. While I had supported that policy in 1897, I expressed my fear that we were going too far in that line.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Perhaps I did not make myself clear. What I said is this. There are certain articles we could not produce now, and which we are buying from the United States and elsewhere, and I was

suggesting that we should give a preference to England on these articles but not on everything.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am glad my hon. friend has given that explanation. I go further on that point, and that is one part of the motion of the hon. gentleman to which I wanted to refer, and I might as well do it now. I was just going to tell the hon. leader of the opposition that there is a part of his motion which needs some explanation. It is when he says that we should give—

Such protection to the iron and steel industry as will not only secure to our own producers and manufacturers the Canadian market in articles now produced or manufactured in this country, but will also develop and sustain the manufacture in Canada of other iron and steel products which at present are imported in large quantities from other countries.

This is a broad statement. Does it mean that he would like the government to now impose a duty on all iron and steel articles that come into this country, even those which are not manufactured and cannot be manufactured here with profit, because the market is not large enough, and thus impose on the other industries which have to use these articles a further amount of taxation without compensating them by other protection? The hon. member for St. Mary's had evidently that position in view, when he spoke of the preference which we might give to British goods. But if we acknowledge that certain goods cannot be produced in this country, by what right should we prevent the manufacturers of Canada, who need those goods, from buying them where they can get them best and cheapest? Why should we compel them to go and buy them in England? In my view, Mr. Speaker, on these articles which we cannot produce, we should have absolute free trade. If by a certain amount of protection and without imposing too heavy a burden on other industries we can force the production of these articles in Canada, I am in favour of our doing so, because I am a protectionist; but since we cannot do that, we have no right to impose on those manufacturers the obligation to buy those goods in England. We should leave them free to buy them where they can get them of best quality or of best producing capacity, if machinery, and at the cheapest price.

I am just now coming to the point that I touched at the beginning of my remarks. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) said this afternoon that the country wants more protection on iron and steel. The hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said that $100,000,000 had been lost to this country in the last three months by the policy of the government. The hon. leader of the opposition said that an increase of duty was imperatively necessary to save the parties interested in the manufacture of steel and iron. Well, as regards the loss of $100,000,000 within the last three months, at least nine-tenths of that loss is due to the fact that many people of the country lost their heads. If capital has become difficult, if bankers have become close-fisted, it is not because of the tariff policy, but because capital was forced into improper channels. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the opinion of the bankers. I know, as a matter of fact, that in December last, there was a consultation between the managers and directors of the most important banks of Canada, and what did they decide? They decided, not that the tariff policy was wrong, but that an immense amount of capital was invested in stock gambling—for which they were in a large degree responsible—and they decided there and then to restrict supplies to stock gamblers. Certainly the decision was a wise one in itself, but perhaps it was hardly a wise decision, after they had enabled those people during nine and ten years to get money on a margin of 10 per cent, to close immediately their doors and bring about this slump in the markets.

The hon. member for St. Mary's has said that the bounty system is a policy of expediency in tariff matters. Let me say also on the part of many people who have money invested in the industries of this country, that black-mailing is also, for too many people, a good policy to be used in finance and tariff matters. The hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says that for three years the government has been made aware of the situation of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. Well, Mr. Speaker, the investing public was not made aware of it. On the contrary, the directors of that institution repeated time and again that the industry could not fail to be most prosperous; and if these directors were going to the government for the last three years and asking for more protection, while at the same time they were enticing money from the people on the pretense that the company had a glowing future, I say that a thorough investigation should be held; and if the people have been robbed by the directors of the Dominion Steel Company, these directors should be held accountable before that industry is given any more protection.

What was the prime occupation of the company? They issued bonds to the amount of nearly $8,000,000, at the rate of $85 for every bond of $100, and every purchase of a bond received in addition a paid up share of $100 common stock. So that the company gave a par value in bonds and shares of $200 for $85. They issued preferred stock to the amount of $5,000,000, they issued common stock to the amount of $20,000,000, they gave shares all over the country, and they made returns of the common shares to the amount of 80 per cent, because it was a tremendous industry and was going to be the best investment the people of Canada

could make. And during all this time, I am told by an ex-minister, they were going to the government and begging for more protection because otherwise they could not live. I say, if that is the case, first and before all, what the public of this country will demand is not so much protection for Mr. Cox and Mr. Ross, but that they should be made accountable for the declarations they have made to the people of Canada.

Now, Sir, I quite admit with the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that the mismanagement of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, and the way in which the people of this country have been led to take stock in that concern, is no reason for not having a bold policy on the industry itself. I quite admit that, and I am prepared to say now to the government that, after they have carefully considered the question, after they have taken into consideration the consequences that will arrive as affecting every other industry that is dependent upon this mother industry, if they are prepared to recommend an increase of duty, I do not say I will not support it, but I say——

Mr. POPE. Oh, you will support anything.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, Sir. Before now I have asked the government for more protection than they were willing to give. My views on the tariff question are well known. I ran as a protectionist in 1896 and again in 1900 in a purely rural constituency where there could be no political advantage to me in advocating that policy. But I am convinced that, as the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) has said, the tariff policy of the country should not be made a tool either in the hands of financial speculators or in the hands of political speculators. I am in favour of a solid policy of protection for this country. That should be our national policy. But, because we make it our national policy, every part of it should be wisely considered, and it should not be changed on the spur of the moment because of some financial distress existing which arises from causes entirely foreign to the tariff. Let me add—I cannot give it as a piece of information, but as a rumour which has been current on the streets of Montreal for some weeks—that a high official in the Dominion Iron and Steel Company has thrown lately on the markets over one thousand shares of his own company's securities Perhaps that has had something to do with the fall in value of the shares of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company—perhaps nearly as much as the competition of the American industry. Therefore, I say, and I insist upon it, that, while public opinion in this country, or at least a certain part of it, may require that more protection should be given to that industry, what this country requires and immediately demands is that a thorough examination be made not only of the way the stock of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company was managed and put on the market and used by stock gamblers, but that the whole question of stock gambling should be considered by this parliament. Sir, if we wish to have confidence established for the capital of our country, if we wish to bring in foreign capital to support our industries, if we wish British and American and German capitalists to invest in Canada, we must make it known that no board of directors is allowed to speak one way in secret when they want favours from the government and another way to the public when they want the money of the public. We must make it known that when the public has been allured by false promises to invest in any industry, the government's hand is strong enough to force those who have made those promises to give an account of their deeds. We must make it known to foreign capitalists that when money is placed in an industry in Canada it is placed in safe hands, and will not be subject to stock gambling on any change of opinion on the part of this director or that. We must make it known that no particular director has the right to give three times the value received without knowing that some day he will be obliged to pay back that capital and in the meantime to pay interest on it. I say that the hon. member for St. Mary's may be right when he says there should be a tariff revision. That is a question which should be studied. But I contend that I am right in saying that the time has come when this parliament should deal with the whole question of the stock exchange and the way in which strong industries in this country are placed at the mercy of speculators, of men who have no responsibility, who do not care for the future of the country or even for the general character or permanent stability of their industries, but simply care to raise money for the time being, whatever the consequence to the people of the country.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). In following this debate it has become difficult for me to understand whether the motion was intended to deal with a general principle or to apply to a specific case, whether it is intended for the purpose of bringing about a change in the conditions connected with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company or whether it was intended to deal with the iron industry as affecting the Dominion as a whole. I would like to deal with the question from the standpoint of its effect on the general industries of the Dominion. Canada, situated as it is, and constituted as it is, needs iron as England needs bread. Cheap iron is as necessary to the development of this country as cheap bread is to the support of the industries of England. I believe in protection, but I do not understand the idea which seems to prevail with some of our friends that a mere increase of duty is protec-

tion, and that such an increase is a cure for every evil that can possibly affect the nation. We have had, in times past, a policy of protection to the iron industry. It was not a part of the National Policy. It was an addition which proved the unreasonableness of the high tariff policy and actually broke its back; it was the high protective duties in favour of the production of iron which caused our other manufacturing industries throughout Canada to languish in the latter years of the so called National Policy.

There is no part of the present tariff policy of the government which has been so effective in improving the condition of our manufacturing industries and improving the general conditions of this country as the reduction in iron duties which is part of the tariff of 1897. The iron duties were reduced in 1897, and the country benefited thereby. But it would seem as if our friends wished to create the impression that the iron duties were abolished at that time. I find on looking at the Tariff Act of 1897 that there are duties attached to the importation of iron and steel which seem to me to give a very substantial measure of protection, quite as much as any industry is entitled to under a revenue tariff. I find on looking at this list that pig iron has a protective duty of $2.50 a ton; that rolled iron or steel has a duty of $7 a ton; bar iron and steel $7 a ton; rolled iron and steel, in sheets or plates, $7 a ton; iron and steel rails, 30 per cent; fish plates, $8 a ton; cast iron pipes, $8 a ton, and so on through the list. Does any person suppose that the manufacturing and agricultural industries of this country can afford a higher rate of protection to the iron industry than is now accorded ? For my part I do not believe they can. Under any circumstances, and according to the knowledge which has come within my range, I am prepared to vote against any increase in the iron duties, beyond a mere readjustment thereof. I believe that in doing so I am acting in the best interest of the country as a whole. I find that not only is the iron industry protected to the extent I have mentioned, but that it is also bonused to the extent of $3 a ton on iron and steel ingots, puddled bars and pig iron. Now, I say an industry that is protected to this extent, and is further bonused to this extent, has certainly no right to come to this parliament and make a plea that it does not now enjoy a very considerable measure of protection and advantage at the hands of the country at large.

Now, a word in regard to the bonus policy and the difference between a bonus and a tariff. It has been said that the bonus is a policy of mere expediency. No doubt it is a policy of expediency or experiment, and why not ? Why should the country be committed without experiment to a policy the result of which no man can foresee, or if he can foresee, it would be in the light of experience, and that would be that a policy of high tariff in favour of the production of iron would mean disaster to the country. I think it is right and proper that if you desire to encourage iron production in this country—and who does not so desire?—the encouragement should be given by way of a bonus rather than by way of a tariff. Let me point out the difference between the cost to the country in the two cases. Supposing we produce 100,000 tons of iron in a year, we bonus that to the extent of $3 a ton, we pay a specific amount of $300,000. Supposing we put a protective duty of $3 a ton on iron and we import a million tons. It costs the consumers of that iron $3 a ton on a million tons, or $3,000,000 ; whereas the bonus only cost $3 a ton on 100,000 tons, and the iron industry of the country had just the same advantage on every ton actually produced. The policy of bounties is only a policy of expediency or experiment. But as one who desires to see the iron industry encouraged, and does not want to see the country itself or the industries therein wrecked, I have supported the policy of iron bounties, and am prepared to continue to do so to a moderate and reasonable extent in preference to an increase of duties.

In regard to the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that if the iron duties were raised to-night, to-morrow the millions which have been lost, as the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) said, in stock gambling, would be recovered. I ask this House if that is a proper reason to present to us. Does this parliament exist for the purpose of rigging the stock market ? Surely we have other duties to perform, other interests to guard than the interests of those who have invested their money under such circumstances. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in the construction of railways necessary for the development of this country, in the expenditures on manufacturing industries necessary to keep pace with our agricultural development, we require cheap iron more than we do anything else. If Canada can produce that iron, and if any legislation can be brought forward or any assistance be given that will really induce the production of that iron by Canada as cheaply as it can otherwise be procured, then I am in favour of such legislation. But legislation which shall cause iron to be dear throughout the country, which shall cause an increase of its price one-third, or one-half, or possibly double—I say such a policy is not a policy of national protection, it is a policy of industrial and commercial suicide.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). I had not the pleasure of hearing what has been said on this question, yet it is of sufficient importance to excuse me for occupying a small portion of time. With the spirit of

the resolution I am in hearty sympathy. I believe it is in the interest of this country to protect the development of all its natural products. But the question arises whether the resolution itself, at this stage, is not of an academic nature, incapable of doing any good, or of being made applicable in the slightest degree. If the resolution was propounded at the proper time, I would be glad to give it my sympathy and support. I believe in cultivating the iron and steel industry of this country, because I believe they are indigenous to it. I do not think that if this resolution was carried to-night the government are in a position to make it effective. It would involve a readjustment of the tariff from top to bottom. It would require an investigation into the manufacturing conditions of every industrial concern in this country that uses iron. It is a task that, at this late stage of the session, it would be impossible for the government to overtake, and it is not in the present instance an absolute necessity. Therefore, while I sympathize with the resolution, I do not sympathize with it under the present circumstances, because it is incapable of doing any good.

Now, it has been urged that a bounty differs from a duty. So it does to a certain extent, but in so far as any manufacturer is concerned it is exactly the same thing. It does not matter whether he is protected against the foreign producer by $6 a ton duty or whether he receives a present from the government of $6 a ton. It does not matter if he is able to put his wares upon the market at $6 a ton less than the people who are competing against him. I take exception to some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who sits in front of me (Hon. Mr. Tarte) when he undertook to asperse the government and to hold it responsible for the loss of a large sum of money. The government is not to blame in the slightest degree, because of the disaster which has overtaken some of the industries that may be affected by it. These people knew when they went into this business exactly what the tariff was. They thought they would be able to bring about a successful condition of affairs but they have not been able to bring about that condition. This disaster has not been brought about by the neglect of the government because it has taken no new attitude since the present tariff was inaugurated. My hon. friend who sits in front of me, says that over a hundred million of dollars have been lost by the people of this country. I think he is incorrect in that. I think the ownership of that hundred million of dollars has shifted. The people who had that hundred million of dollars a short time ago have not got it to-day, but somebody else has and in so far as the country is concerned, I do not think that any very serious loss has taken place. If we were to compare, as has been done here, the value of the stocks to-day with what it was in 1896, we would see that there has been an actual increase of several hundreds of millions, not of a hundred million, in value. The crisis that has been brought about and which has precipitated this discussion in the House is the result of an attempt to float upon an unsuspecting public manufacturing estimates that are not truthfully represented. Take the very industry whose condition has precipitated this discussion. We know that at the time it was floated the promises that were made. We know that the vice-president and manager made a speech in Toronto before the board of trade and we know what he said. I will read from his speech :

> As to the Cape Breton district, situated on the seaboard, the whole wide world is her market, all of it, and in our modesty we do not ask for more.

At this point we must again revert to our cost comparison. Then he goes on to say in his speech that they can produce iron and steel at Sydney at $6 per ton at tide water cheaper than they can at Pittsburg.

> I will be pardoned for a few more words on the great promise of the Cape Breton district. So great is this promise that it has ceased to be local. It has ceased to be sectional. It has become international in its influence. To-day, Sydney is a familiar name to every steelmaker in England, and before another year rolls around the leaders in this industry will have been with us to see for themselves the new centre. At this moment Sydney is debated with doubt and misgiving by the large German syndicates, and in the United States the strength of her position is conceded by every expert. Canada alone at this moment does not realize how splendid an opportunity is within her control.

That speech was made only two years ago before the Board of Trade of Toronto by the vice-president and manager of this very institution and yet we are told that the government is responsible for this loss. These men have induced an unsuspecting public to pay three times as much for the stock as it was worth, they floated for about $28,000,000 a concern that never had more than one-third of that money invested in it. What can you expect ? There is not one manufacturing establishment to-day in Canada from one end of the country to the other, except, perhaps, those that are affected by the preferential tariff, for instance, the woollen mills, which are not successful and whose stock is not above par. I am willing to admit that the preferential tariff has affected some of our industries, but I believe the surtax will do them good. I believe that in not more than a year from now better conditions amongst the woollen and cotton mills will prevail. The iron industry was started a few years ago knowing the conditions which existed. The same conditions exist to-day as those which existed in 1897 and 1900. The government has done nothing to precipitate the disaster

which has overtaken this concern, and these establishments that have been over capitalized, and then floated upon an unsuspecting public must come to disaster. You cannot float a company and declare dividends on a capital of $30,000,000 when there is only $10,000,000 in the concern. You cannot declare dividends on water and keep it up for ever. To hold the government responsible for what has taken place is to make a foundationless charge. I sympathise with the resolution. I believe higher duties should be put upon iron and steel, but before passing a resolution like that to-night we must consider what it involves. It is simply an academic expression of opinion that it would be a good thing, but would it restore confidence ? Not at all. It would demoralize all subsidiary trades and other great industrial institutions. If the industries which are engaged in buying iron were told that there would be an increase in the value of iron and there was a feeling of insecurity and uncertainty created in every large establishment that uses iron unless the government promised that it would make a corresponding increase in the duties which these establishments now enjoy. That would involve a re-arrangement of the tariff from beginning to end, months of labour and a great deal of study. We know that when the old government existed and when the new government took office nearly a year was consumed in ascertaining exactly the conditions as they existed. It is as necessary to-day as it was seven years ago to make careful inquiry and when this revision of the tariff takes place it must be the result of careful investigation and consideration and after the opinion of experts has been had in every department of trade. But, because disaster has overtaken men who have engaged in stock speculation, and men who have floated fictitious enterprises on the public it is no reason why the government should go to the rescue and disarrange the financial and industrial affairs of the country.

Mr. RUFUS POPE (Compton). Mr. Speaker, this discussion was brought about by the introduction of a resolution by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) asking that further consideration in the way of increased duties be given to the steel industries of Canada. It was met, first, by the reply from the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that it was not an opportune moment at which to bring forward this resolution intimating that it was unfair that my hon. friend should have brought this resolution forward at this particular time. He did not give us any reason for making this statement, but thought that this House should be satisfied with the fact that he simply made the bald assertion that it was untimely. At the beginning of this session, or nearly at the beginning of this session, when the budget speech was delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance, a resolution was proposed by my hon. friend in which he declared, and in which those supporting him declared, that the hour for the revision of the tariff had arrived in this country. It was voted down and there has never been any moment since that time when we were going into Committee of Supply that it was not the legitimate right of the hon. leader of the opposition, or of any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, to move such a resolution as that which was moved to-day. So, Sir, I say that it does not become the hon. Minister of Finance to put forth that as the basis of his argument against the introduction of his resolution. It indicates fear, it indicates cowardice on the part of the hon. gentleman when he attempts to ward off the pressure that is brought to bear on him from all sorts of financial institutions throughout Canada ; it ill becomes him to say in a whining manner to the leader of the opposition that this motion is inopportune. But we have a franker statement from the Prime Minister who told us that it could not be expected that the government would revise the iron tariff without first having a statement from the Sydney Company. Well, to a protectionist like myself, a protectionist in season and out of season, who believes in the application of principles rather than dodging between two theories, it does seem peculiar that the leader of the government should have to wait to apply his sound principles until he inspects the private books of a company. The right hon. gentleman told us that the growth of this industry had been brought about by the tariff inaugurated by his government, which is lower than the tariff of the Conservative government. If that is true, then for heaven's sake do not let the hon. gentleman return to a higher tariff and ruin the industry. But the Prime Minister, in the next breath, told us that he was going to look over the books of that concern, and that if he finds good reason for returning to higher protection he will do so. That is the kind of shifting policy we have had for six years of Liberal rule in Canada, and it is a sort of policy that has never built up industrial life in any country. The Liberals have been lucky. Since they came to power they have had the benefit of prosperous times and wonderful crops, but, notwithstanding that, they are now beginning to learn that they made a mistake when they did not revise the tariff this year. It is quite true that if they once open the door they will have many other industries knocking ; they will find the silver lead men of British Columbia and others demanding protection, and I can well understand how they are in fear and trembling. But, Sir, no government, whether free trade or revenue tariff, or protectionist, can sit supinely there and permit such a

great industry as that at Sydney to go to the wall. If the prayers of the men interested in that industry have any foundation, the government will be bound to increase the iron duties and to declare to all Canada within thirty days that the leader of the opposition is really the leader of the House. They may dislike to do so. They may get their supporters to bob up here and there, one after another to declare that they are in sympathy with the motion, but will vote against it, but all their hedging won't do. The only man who is in sympathy with the motion is the man who has the moral courage to vote for the motion when it embodies the principle he believes in. And now as to stock gambling. We are not concerned about that on this side of the House. Perhaps we do not deal in stocks as extensively as hon. gentlemen opposite do. I noticed that when the hon. member for Labelle suggested an investigation, many gentlemen opposite applauded, and I thought at once that these gentlemen had dropped their money, and even though an investigation could not find out where it went to, it would give them some consolation. They want consolation instead of cash, and if the iron industry is not protected that is all the people of Canada will get. I have listened to the Finance Minister, I have listened to the Prime Minister, I have listened to the Minister of Customs, the thunderer of the administration, quoting stock prices in this country and in this House as an evidence of prosperity. Why are they ashamed to quote those stock lists to-night? For several years we have heard the Liberals glory that they established the works at Sydney. Where is their glorification to-night? I do not care whether the management of these works has been extravagant or not. I never knew of a new industry of such an extensive nature that did not commit mistakes. It is not enough to have markets for their products and to have their raw material, but you must have practiced and experienced men to mould the iron from its raw state into its perfect manufactured condition. That man has to grow up in the institution, and that is one of the great reasons why protection must be had in a new country with infant industries. Now, Sir, what sympathy are hon. gentlemen opposite showing to these men who are said to be in difficulty—saying that there should be a committee to investigate the heads of the company—Mr. Cox, Mr. Ross and others who but a year ago they were lauding to the skies? As Liberals, they were at that time gloating over the fact that they were establishing a great industry down by the sea. To-day they are characterizing these men as great stock gamblers who should not receive any protection. Great is the change that has come over hon. gentlemen opposite and over this great industry down by the sea.

Mr. Speaker, the difficulties with which the Prime Minister finds himself surrounded in this particular instance are only going to be magnified as time rolls along. I was reading a year ago of the period of the Liberal administration from 1873 to 1878. I was reading about the promises made year after year to the people as their only consolation. The administration at that time said, wait until next year, wait until a future time; next year we will deal with this, and we will deal with that; until the hour came when it was too late. Hon. gentlemen sitting on the treasury benches to-day are following the same policy. One year we had to wait for the jubilee, last year we had to wait for the colonial conference. That was supposed to be a reason for Canada standing still. Mr. Speaker, I admit of no reason for Canada standing still. I admit of no reason why the government of the day, every hour of the day and every hour of the night, should not have an adequate policy of protection for the development of the industries of this country. Sir, as a protectionist, believing in the development of the great industries of Canada, I know of no application of the principle that should give greater satisfaction to any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has the slightest idea of protection, as so many of these hon. gentlemen profess, than its application as proposed in the present instance. We have not only the application of the principle of protection to the iron, steel, silver, copper, lead and other great mineral resources of this country, but we have the splendid results of manufacture. It is an opportunity to exemplify to the world the greatest possible advantages to be obtained under a protective policy. We give protection to many industries whose raw materials are brought from foreign countries to be manufactured here. In this instance we lend our protection to the development of the raw materials within the bounds of Canada, and to the conversion of those raw materials into the manufactured goods to be utilized in Canada and to be exported abroad. With such an application of the principles of protection, no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House needs to haggle and apologize and say that he stands behind the mere shams and screens of protection.

It has been stated by some hon. gentlemen, I think the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall), that the early growth of the iron industry in all countries has been slow. Consequently the right hon. Prime Minister must not blame us too severely if during the hard times that preceded the year 1896 the growth of the iron industry of this country was not very rapid; because he has sitting behind him gentlemen who are versed in this matter, who have lived in the midst of that development down by the sea, and who have given him his lesson in

this very debate, by saying that the early stages of that development are always slow. I admit that the early stages of heavy mining are bound to be slow; a tremendous amount of capital has to be got together. I want to put it on a business basis to any man in this House, and ask him : if you go to England to-morrow to obtain capital to develop the mining resources of this country or to establish any industry, and you state in your prospectus the quantity of goods likely to be consumed in Canada, and the quality of the raw materials from which the goods are to be manufactured, would that be a perfect prospectus ? Could you get a dollar on it ? You could not get a dollar until you showed the people of England and the world that you had the right to your own market under the stamp of protection. That is the strongest argument you can put in any prospectus in floating any scheme in England; and if it is good for the flotation of business projects or the acquirement of money on our property in England, it is a good, sound principle for us to follow at home. What is the result of manufacturing a ton of iron in Canada ? Suppose it should cost us $40. We manufacture it in Cape Breton; we buy it with Canadian money. What have we got as the result of that trade inside of Canada ? We have the $40 and we have the ton of iron. But suppose we bought that ton of iron in a foreign country for $30. We would practically lose the $30 and have only the ton of iron. That is the application of the principle of protection all through. If we buy a mowing machine in the United States for $100, we have only the machine, and the American has the money to feed the American people, build American cities, and help to maintain that wonderful population of the United States which has grown up from home consumption. You may confine the policy to a small centre or extend it as broadly as you like. The nation which has the courage to stand by its own iron and steel industry will accomplish more in the way of nation-building than the nation which has not the courage to stand by its own people and its own markets.

This is a mighty period in the world's history in which we are living. We are witnessing great events as indicated by the speeches made by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain. We are seeing the opening of a new era of agitation throughout the length and breadth of this empire, and the government of this country should not hesitate to build up Canada as rapidly as the legislation of this parliament can do it. Let us go forward in that development of all our natural resources and industrial life, let us accomplish all we can in the space of time left to us before we are asked to consider the new order of things, so that when we enter into that greater and more magnificent federation of all the empires and colonies, nations and states over which the British flag floats, we shall enter it with our industries established and our minds developed, and take a position in that glorious imperial federation that will be worthy of the gentlemen who have charge of the legislation of this country.

House divided on amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Avery,	Hughes (Victoria),
Barker,	Kaulbach,
Bennett,	Kidd,
Birkett,	Lancaster,
Blain,	LaRivière,
Borden (Halifax),	Lavell,
Boyd,	Lefurgey,
Brock,	Lennox,
Broder,	Leonard,
Bruce,	MacLaren (Perth),
Cargill,	McIntosh,
Carscallen,	Morin,
Casgrain,	Osler,
Clancy,	Pope,
Clare,	Pringle,
Clarke,	Rosamond,
Cochrane,	Smith (Wentworth),
Culbert,	Tarte,
Earle,	Taylor,
Hackett,	Tolton,
Haggart,	Vrooman,
Hale,	Wilmot,
Halliday,	Wilson.—47.
Henderson,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Loy,
Béland,	Macdonald,
Belcourt,	Mackie,
Bernier,	MacKinnon,
Bickerdike,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Blair,	Macpherson,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McCool,
Bourassa,	McCreary,
Brown,	McGowan,
Bruneau,	McIsaac,
Calvert,	McLennan,
Calvin,	Madore,
Carbonneau,	Malouin,
Champagne,	Marcil (Bagot),
Christie,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Costigan,	Matheson,
Cowan,	Mayrand,
Davis,	Meigs,
Delisle,	Mignault,
Demers (Lévis),	Monet,
Demers (St. John).	Morrison,
Desjardins,	Oliver,
Douglas,	Parmelee,
Dugas,	Power,
Erb,	Préfontaine,
Ethier,	Proulx,
Fielding,	Puttee,
Fisher,	Riley,
Fitzpatrick,	Robinson (Elgin),
Fortier,	Ross (Ontario),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Rimouski),
Geoffrion,	Russell,
Gibson,	Schell,
Girard,	Scott,
Harty,	Stephens,
Harwood,	Stewart,
Heyd,	

Holmes,
Johnston (Cape Breton),
Kendall,
Lang,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Logan,
Lovell,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Talbot,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Turgeon,
Wade,
Wallace,
Wright.—91.

PAIRS.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Thompson (Haldimand and Monck),	Ingram,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Ross (Victoria),	Ganong,
Hyman,	Gilmour,
McColl,	Ward,
Mulock,	Maclean,
Lavergne,	Ball,
Beith,	Kemp,
Ross (Yukon),	Thomson (Grey),
McCarthy,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Laurier (L'Assumption),	Gourley,
Gould,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Hughes (P.E.I),	Sproule,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Fraser,	Bell,
Guthrie,	Porter,
McEwen,	Sheritt,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Sifton,	Roche (Marquette),
Paterson,	Alcorn,
Carroll,	Monk,
Campbell,	Kendry,
German,	Roddick,
Grant,	Reid (Grenville),
McGugan,	Richardson,
Copp.	Seagram.

Amendment negatived.

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). We will take up the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to the fact that the statements we get as to the business that we may expect to be called upon to deal with are not very accurate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In what respect ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For example, we are told that certain business will come up next day, and when next day comes, the order is entirely reversed or the nature of the business is changed. We were told that to-day the Railway Commission Bill would come up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understood that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) had expressed a desire that the motion for Supply should be made in order that he might move the amendment of which he had given notice. We thought we were accommodating him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Quite so, but the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), who made the announcement, was not able to give me any satisfaction on the subject. He said, as I understood him, that he would consult the Minister of Finance, and I never heard a word afterwards until I came into the House. The motion was made to go into Supply at the very first stage, very much to my astonishment. I was not prepared at the moment not even having my papers at hand. I had not the courtesy of a line from my hon. friend to state that the arrangement had been changed. I am only drawing this matter to the attention of my hon. friend with the idea to suggest that he might be a little more particular in these matters. I would not mention it if this were the first time it has occurred, but it is more than the sixth or seventh time. On other occasions when attention has been called to it, I am bound to say, hon. gentlemen opposite have been courteous enough to say that they would not presume to go into matters concerning which we had no notice. I am only suggesting that with a little care we might have a better idea as to the work we are to be called upon to take up.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I am very much surprised at the attitude of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) with regard to this matter. I happened to be the senior minister here last evening when the House was about to adjourn. In answer to the question of the leader of the opposition, I stated that the intention was to take up the Railway Bill and after that to go into Supply. The leader of the opposition requested me to present to the leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the fact that he had a motion to present on going into Supply, which he had not had an opportunity to present yesterday, and that he hoped that if the motion for Supply was to be made, it would be made early so as to enable him to reach a conclusion on the motion if he moved it. I laid the matter before the Prime Minister and he said that certainly he would take up Supply early so as to give the leader of the opposition every opportunity to reach a conclusion upon his motion. Practically the whole day has been required to reach a conclusion. It is fair to infer that had we not done what we did this afternoon and presented the motion for Supply early, a conclusion could not have been reached. The course followed was entirely for the purpose of meeting the views of the leader of the opposition, which I informed him we would try to do.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not finding fault with the course pursued to-day, but suggesting that it would be more convenient if the course to be followed were more accurately made known to us. In this case, I was not made acquainted with the fact that the government were willing to meet my request. When the hon. Minister of Agriculture told me that the Railway Commission Bill would come on and later Supply, I made the suggestion I did, and he said he would report the matter to the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And said that no doubt we could meet your views.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I complain of—and I think I have the right to complain of—is that I have not had the courtesy of a note or telephone message or any intimation from the government, so that I could know what they intended to do. It is no very serious matter, but I would say to my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or the Minister of Finance or any other minister charged with informing us of the course of next day's business, that, if any change is made it might be intimated to us in the course of the morning what the business of the day will be. My right hon. friend will understand that it makes the business of the House much easier to carry on. I am only asking that the same principle should be followed that is followed on this side in giving notice of any matter which we intend to bring up and which is likely to disturb the course of business set out for the day.

The PRIME MINISTER. The request of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is not unreasonable, on the contrary, I agree with him wholly. If, in this case, there is any blame, I must take it all upon myself. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) notified me early this morning of the request that had been made by the leader of the opposition, and I said that to meet the hon. gentleman's views we would present the motion of Supply the first thing. Now that my attention is brought to the matter, I admit that I should have sent the hon. gentleman a note. But, as I knew he was anxious to move the resolution and thought that he had had his speech prepared for some time, I assumed that he would be ready. I hope that the relations will continue always courteous between the hon. gentleman and myself, and that in this case he will acquit me of any intention to incommode him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Absolutely. In matters of this kind as in others, the right hon. gentleman has shown me the most perfect courtesy.

Department of Agriculture—salaries, $66,152.50; contingencies, including payment up to $800 each per annum to three assistant patent examiners, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $17,750, $83,902.50.

Mr. INGRAM. We want to know who these chief clerks are ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. George Johnston, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jarvis, Mr. Lynch. There is a vacancy caused by the death of the late Mr. Brymner. No appointment has yet been made, but probably there will be one within a short time.

Mr. INGRAM. Can the hon. gentleman give us his name ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Can the hon. gentleman tell us how many clerks each one of these chief clerks has under his charge ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Johnston has four, Mr. Jackson three, Mr. Jarvis has a technical department, with no particular clerk under him ; Mr. Lynch has practically all the clerks in the patent branch, some twenty-two or twenty-three. Mr. Johnston's salary is $2,400, Mr. Jackson's $2,400, Mr. Jarvis' $2,312, and Mr. Lynch's $2,200. These are the figures for the ensuing year.

Mr. INGRAM. I see the salaries of these gentlemen bear no relation to the number of clerks they have under their charge. Are we to understand that those who have charge of the largest number of clerks perform more important services, or have more responsible duties to discharge ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think that would be a fair measure of the duties or of the work of the chief clerks. For instance, Mr. Lynch is the chief clerk in charge of the patent branch, and has a large number of employees under him. Mr. George Johnson is the chief clerk and statistician, and also has charge of the statistical year-book and other work of that kind. These salaries are regulated by the seniority or status of the clerks in the civil service, that is to say, they grow by years of service and by statutory increases. The actual figures are not decided by the amount of work they do.

Mr. INGRAM. Speaking of the patent branch, I am bound to say that having had some business to do with it I was impressed with the courtesy and with the expert skill which I observed in there on the part of the employees. It is highly important they should be treated well. I think that branch needs a little more assistance. I noticed that some parties applying for patents had some time to wait, owing, I fancy, to the large amount of work in that branch. The hon. gentleman might well engage a few more experts to deal with these matters.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The minister will remember that last session I drew his attention to this branch of his department, and he promised that certain appointments

should be made to facilitate the examining of claims and applications.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have added two.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). With reference to the statistical branch, has the Minister any record of the freight rates between Canada and the old country, or between the interior cities of Canada and the seaboard? The collection of these rates would be a very useful function for the statistical department to undertake. I think the United States Department of Agriculture issues a statement showing the freight rates from every important centre of the United States to the chief seaboard cities. It also shows the freight rates over every important line of steamships from every American port to European ports, English, French and German. This is most interesting information. If we had this in Canada, I am satisfied that the people in the interior points would have just ground for interference with the railway rates, and would strengthen the appointment of a railway commission. The minister is well aware that the rates between many inland cities of Canada are higher than through rates to the seaboard. I trust the minister will give this his attention, and that next year we will have all this information furnished to us month by month.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the minister give the reason for this increase of $3,540 in salaries?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are all statutory increases, there is no increase contrary to the Civil Service Act. There is an increase for two second-class clerks and one junior second-class clerk. The junior is a new appointment.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have before me the estimates of 1895-96 and 1896-97, brought down by the late Conservative government, and I see that the amount asked for the Department of Agriculture, which was as important then as it is now, was $49,782. Now the hon. gentleman is asking for $83,902, an increase of $34,120. How can he possibly justify so large an increase in the last six or seven years, while the work of the department is practically the same?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the first place the work of the department is not at all the same. The increase in the patent work is responsible for practically all this increase of salaries in the civil government estimates. The increase in the patent work has been something like 30 per cent. The increase in the patent work is very considerable, an increase of something like 30 odd per cent in the number of patents that have to be examined and issued each year. The staff of examiners has been increased to the extent of three times the number formerly employed and the system of examination is much more complete than it was, and therefore calls for more time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why, the patent branch was just as efficient in 1895-6 as it is today.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Totally different.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yet, there has been $34,000 of an increase in the expenditure since 1895-6 according to the main estimates brought down.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot see where the increased expenditure that the hon. gentleman speaks of comes in. There is no such increase as that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have the estimates here.

Mr. INGRAM. As to the expenditure that the hon. gentleman is pointing to, they are students from our colleges?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They must be university graduates in science.

Mr. INGRAM. Their appointments are not of a political character?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, they have been appointed solely on account of their expert knowledge. I have the estimates here for 1895-6 for the Department of Agriculture and I find they amount to $49,782. This year they are $66,000 which is a difference of $16,000 instead of $34,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the minister has a lot of contingencies to add which were not in the main estimates before.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are no contingencies here, which were not in before.

Mr. TAYLOR. Point them out in the main estimates.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that contingencies are not a separate item. They were in the estimates then and they are still.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In regard to contingencies, I may say that it was the practice in former years to have separate votes. We found that we were discussing the estimates of the same department at different times, and it was found to be more convenient to put the two items together and to have salaries and contingencies under review at the same time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Civil government and contingencies in 1895-6 amounted to $14,500 and this year the estimate is $17,750.

Mr. TAYLOR. Which leaves an increased expenditure on the two items of $20,000

since the hon. gentleman took charge of the office and the work is practically the same.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The work is not the same.

Mr. BARKER. In the Auditor General's Report for 1901-2 the contingencies under this heading were $9,711.22, which appears in the first volume at D—11, while last year and this year contingencies are put down in the estimates at $17,750. What is the explanation of that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The item covers clerical and other assistance the vote for which is $10,000 and in addition to that the hon. gentleman will find two other items, printing and stationery and sundries. They are not included in the $9,711.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I want to ask the hon. minister whether or not he has taken into consideration the matter I brought before him last year in reference to the dismissal of Captain D. C. Stuart, of Halifax, as well as the refusal of the department to pay back to that gentleman a considerable sum of money which he had paid into the superannuation fund. He was dismissed without any investigation and without any opportunity to make his defence, although, I think, some explanation was received from him in writing. I promised my hon. friend last year that I would disclose to him conduct on the part of at least one official in Nova Scotia which was infinitely worse that anything that had been charged against Captain Stuart. That, however, was by the way. I did insist with a good deal of earnestness that these moneys which had been taken from him should not be detained from him any longer, and that the same rule which had been applied in similar cases before should be applied to him and that the money should be paid back with four per cent interest. I think the hon. Minister of Finance raised the point that the terms of the statute which was passed did not technically include this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not exactly the statute but our explanation of the objects of the statute.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If there is no technical difficulty it is so much the better. The alleged misconduct, although I do not think there was any real misconduct, for which he was dismissed was of the most trifling character. The hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross), under whom Captain Stuart acted for many years, stated very freely in this House that he had not the slightest doubt that the only reason why Captain Stuart was dismissed was on account of the feeling that existed between him and one of his superior officers. Under these circumstances I do not think there is any reason why the government of Canada should take from Captain Stuart the money which he has paid into the superannuation fund, and at the same time dismiss him without any proper investigation into his alleged misconduct. I hope the hon. minister to whose attention I drew this matter somewhat late in the session of last year will look into it because I have not the slightest doubt that if he becomes really seized of the facts as they are and as I believe they are supposed to be by the public in Halifax to-day, he will have no hesitation in paying back this money.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I confess the matter has escaped my attention, but I shall be glad to see if there is any justification in my mind and the minds of my colleagues for action such as the hon. gentleman speaks of.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The general question of repayment of superannuation contributions is not a matter we can saddle on the Minister of Agriculture. The statute does not expressly forbid it, but it was expressly declared in this House when the statute was passed, that its object was to make provision for the return of superannuation money to men who were dismissed for political offences. The ground we took was that while these men have been punished by losing their office, they should not be further penalized by the loss of their superannuation money. Once we depart from that there are numerous cases many of which appeal to our sympathies, and so far we have adhered to the purpose for which that Act was passed as stated in parliament. I do not want that the Minister of Agriculture should bear the responsibility for the non-payment of the superannuation money. That is a matter of general policy, and the Treasury Board and the government are responsible for it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Any policy that withholds this money from Captain Stuart is a policy the government of this country should not indulge in. The charge against him was a slight dereliction of duty which did not amount to anything, and because of which the public interest did not suffer. The usual practice is that ordinary corporations pay back money received into the pension fund where officers are dismissed for reasons ten times as serious as that for which Captain Stuart was dismissed. I do not think that the government is justified in retaining from Captain Stuart the sum of $200 or thereabouts which was received from him first and last for the superannuation fund, and which ought to be paid back to him with interest.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not wish to discuss Captain Stuart's case, because I do not recall the circumstances. If private corporations pay back money under such conditions it is likely one of the conditions attached to their superannuation fund, but that has not been so in the Do-

minion service and under all governments men have passed out of the public service after contributing to the fund for years, and have not received a penny. A man who has been a quarter of a century in the service dies and under the old system his family would not get a penny of his contributions to the fund back; but such cases of hardship have arisen for many years under the Superannuation Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Exactly the same thing occurs with regard to the pension funds of private corporations. An officer dies and he does not get the benefit of his contribution to the fund, but I know of my own knowledge that where corporations have had the most absolute power to retain the money they did not think it was fair to do so. I do not see why the government of this country should adopt a smaller policy than that adopted by private corporations. I will leave the matter with the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Finance, but I will bring it up again when they will have had time to consider it. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will consider this matter impartially, and I have no doubt that he will come to the conclusion that it is not just to retain this money from Captain Stuart.

Mr. BARKER. I notice from the Auditor General's Report that $1,115.16 is charged for postage stamps. I thought the minister was able to frank his mail matter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The great bulk of that postage is in regard to the correspondence about patents with foreign countries and the post office charges for that.

Mr. BARKER. I thought the minister's frank would be honoured in all countries in the postal union.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the post office arranges that, but it charges us.

Mr. BARKER. I notice that the minister purchased a book called the 'Nemesis of mis-Government.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He must have been studying the history of the late government.

Mr. BARKER. Oh, no, this was many years after the late government went out of power.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not read the book, but it must have been required by some branch of the department.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not had the pleasure of meeting the deputy Minister of Agriculture, but I notice that the gentleman sitting in the Chamber to-night is not the same gentleman who met us on former occasions. I would like to ask the minister who the gentleman is, what his former occupation was and what are the special qualifications he has to fill the duties of deputy Minister of Agriculture. I think it is a proper thing that the new deputy should be introduced.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) of course must be constitutionally blind to the appearance of anybody having a seat on the floor who is not a member of this House. I can tell the hon. member that the deputy Minister of Agriculture now is Mr. George F. O'Halloran, and that he was appointed within the last year to succeed the late deputy, Mr. W. B. Scarth. Mr. O'Halloran is a lawyer by profession and has been practicing for many years, first of all in the eastern townships where he was born and brought up, and afterwards in the city of Montreal. He is a lawyer of repute and standing, and is specially competent, I believe, and my colleagues believe with me to deal with these matters connected with the Department of Agriculture which are not entirely agricultural in their nature. There are not only the agricultural branches but a number of other branches such as patents, trade marks, designs, copyrights, statistics and various other things. The mainly agricultural matters in the department are chiefly in the hands of experts. Dr. Saunders, the director of the Experimental Farm, Prof. Robertson, in the dairying and agricultural branch, Dr. Rutherford, in the veterinary branch and Dr. Montizambert, in the quarantine branch, deal with the matters affecting these branches. The deputy minister has the supervision as deputy minister of these branches, but has nothing to do with what I might call the technical or expert carrying on of the branches. The other branches I have alluded to do require the superintendance of the deputy minister directly and personally, and therefore this gentleman was chosen particularly to look after these branches.

Mr. HENDERSON. The explanation seems to be very satisfactory to the hon. gentleman hon. (Mr. Fisher). I must confess that when the minister takes long trips to Japan and the old country and is absent from his office a large portion of the year, I think that the chief executive in the department should at least have some practical knowledge of agriculture. We think it an extraordinary proceeding to choose the head of the executive Department of Agriculture from the legal profession. I do not think that is what the country expects or what the country was promised. It has been the boast of the right hon. Prime Minister in going through the country that he selected an hon. gentleman to place at the head of the Department of Agriculture who was a practical farmer. It was only a year or two ago that we found the very important position of chief in-

spector of fruit was given to a lawyer. The minister seems to have the idea that only men learned in the law are able to administer the Department of Agriculture. Now, I think the farmers of this country have a little claim upon the government; and surely, amongst the intelligent agriculturists of this country men could be found qualified to discharge the duties of Deputy Minister of Agriculture. If the minister wants legal assistance, he has at his command at all times his friend the Minister of Justice, who I am sure is well qualified to advise him on legal questions. I do think it is a slight upon the great agricultural community of this country that the Department of Agriculture here at Ottawa should be filled up with professional men who know nothing about practical agriculture. I know nothing of the gentleman who occupies the position in question. It may be that he is reading the book which the hon. member for Hamilton referred to for the purpose of acquiring a knowledge of agriculture. If so, I think it is a slow way of qualifying a man to discharge that duty, especially as I understand the deputy is really the man who administers the department. The minister himself is travelling all over the country taking his pleasure, and relying almost entirely on the deputy minister to administer the affairs of the department. I think that in future either the minister should give some reasonable attention to his department or he should select a practical farmer to administer it.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that the Minister of Agriculture has cast a sad reflection upon the Department of Justice, because this is the first time that an intimation has been given to the House by the hon. minister that he needed a lawyer for his deputy. It is the first department, so far as I know, that has lost confidence in the Department of Justice. It does not often fall to the lot of the opposition to defend members of the government against each other; but I must say that it is a sad reflection on the Justice Department for the hon. Minister of Agriculture gravely to tell the House that there are questions of a technical character in the Department of Agriculture which make it desirable that he should have a lawyer, and he adds what he calls a good lawyer to his department. Now, there was a pamphlet, written I believe by the Minister of Agriculture himself, in which he pronounced a eulogium upon himself.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is it printed ?

Mr. CLANCY. I do not know whether it was printed by union labour or not; it has not the union label on it. The Minister of Labour is not in his place, and if my hon. friend will defer that question until he comes back, though it may be some time, he will no doubt get an answer. On page five of the pamphlet of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, written I believe both for by-elections and for general elections——

Mr. INGRAM. Before or after ?

Mr. CLANCY. Well, this is to be taken both before and after, but this is how it looks after. On page five it says :

> The Laurier government and agriculture. What Hon. Mr. Fisher has acomplished for the improvement of the agricultural class. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his party promised the electors during the election of 1896 that he would work for the improvement of the condition of the agricultural class. The first act of the Prime Minister, on assuming the administration of the country, was to call to the Department of Agriculture a practical farmer. Under the last administration, there were at the head of the Department of Agriculture lawyers, doctors, brewers or other persons having neither technical nor practical knowledge of agriculture. * *

The hon. gentleman has told the House that he selected a lawyer to have technical knowledge, and yet in this pamphlet he named the lawyers and the doctors and others as being unfit to take that department. I ask him now if he is willing to retract that. Will he be able to reconcile his statement now with his pamphlet, circulating in the province of Quebec and elsewhere, declaring it a crime on the part of the Conservative party to select such men ? I will await the hon. gentleman's explanation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Very simple.

Mr. CLANCY. If it is very simple, it will not take the hon. gentleman long to explain it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not long.

Mr. BARKER. The explanation possibly is that the minister was anxious that he should know a little more about agriculture than his deputy, and therefore he appointed a lawyer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend from Bothwell may take that explanation.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman accepts the explanation of the hon. member from Hamilton, I need not complain, but it would be well perhaps for me to go a little further :—

> Mr. Laurier,——
>
> That was before the right hon. gentleman received his knighthood——
>
> —deemed that under his administration it should be otherwise, and called to the Department of Agriculture, Hon. Sydney Fisher, a farmer of more than twenty years experience, and one knowing full well the needs of those who, like himself, were engaged in the development of the soil of Canada. The results of this wise policy——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who wrote that?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman who declares this to be a wise policy wrote it, I believe.

The result of this wise policy——

What was it ? To select the hon. gentleman who presides over the department now? These hon. gentlemen do not usually have a policy, but there was a policy involved in selecting the hon. gentleman who so ably presides over that department.

Mr. CLARKE. They must have a policy, for they never give it away.

Mr. CLANCY (reading) :

The results of this wise policy are being felt that throughout the whole country, Mr. Fisher, while practicing in the internal administration of his department at Ottawa the strictest economy, while reducing the number of employees of his department and the total amount paid to them in salaries, has succeeded in rendering the administrative work more effective and more useful to the agricultural class.

The hon. gentleman is now asking for additional assistance. He has more clerks now than he had then. He has constantly told us in the past, with regard to the Patent Department, that he took in young men of ability and training to do precisely the work which he now declares he must employ a lawyer to do. These were the reasons he urged in the past for overriding the Civil Service Act and paying high salaries to certain men employed to do technical work. If he employed those men to do technical work, why does he select a lawyer as deputy minister of Agriculture for the same purpose ? Is there any question affecting patents of any seriousness that would not be referred to the Department of Justice ? There is not one. What particular reason can be given why a lawyer should be selected as deputy minister of Agriculture, which might not be urged in every other department ? I quite agree with the hon. member for Halton that public confidence is not apt to be increased by the appointment of a lawyer as deputy minister of Agriculture, notwithstanding his legal ability. If he has succeeded in becoming a good lawyer, he has done about as much as any one man can succeed in doing. If a man can make a success in one line, that is about all he can, on an average, accomplish in this world, and Mr. O'Halloran has succeeded in becoming a good lawyer he could not have had much time to devote to agriculture. If the hon. minister had selected the deputy minister of Agriculture purely for his knowledge of law, it is well the country should understand it. The committee is entitled to some explanation of this item, and particularly to some explanation why the hon. minister selected a lawyer to be his deputy ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know that I can add much to the explanation I have already given. I do not think that I said that I chose Mr. O'Halloran because he was a lawyer. I selected him because I considered him to be eminently fitted for the position and also because as deputy minister of Agriculture he is commissioner of patents as well, in which position his legal training would be of great advantage. The agricultural portion of the work does not come specially under his particular supervision, but is under the supervision of the well known agricultural experts who have always given such satisfaction, even before I came to the department.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I ask the hon. minister what the business for to-morrow will be ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Railway Bill will be taken up in the afternoon, and supply later.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 10, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What is the commercial agency of the government of Canada ?
2. When and how was it inaugurated ?
3. Who are its officers ?
4. What are their duties ; and what remuneration do they receive ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). The phraseology may be open to question—'What is the commercial agency of the government of Canada ?' Assuming, however, that I understand what the hon. gentleman means, the answer to his questions are as follows :

1. Commercial agencies were established by Order in Council of the 21st November, 1891.

2. The Order in Council of the 16th March, 1892. Various appointments throughout the West Indies were made at that time to date from the 1st April, 1892. Since then others have been appointed.

3. The present officers are :

J. S. Larke, Sydney, Australia.
D. H. Ross, Melbourne, Australia.

J. G. Jardine, Cape Town, South Africa.
Peter B. Ball, Birmingham, England.
A. E. Poindron, Paris, France.
G. E. Burke, Kingston, Jamaica.
R. Bryson, St. John, Antigua.
S. L. Horsford, St. Kitts, British West Indies.
Edgar Tripp, Port of Spain, Trinidad.
C. E. Sontum, Christiania, Norway.

4. Their duties are to promote trade between Canada and the countries in which they are located. Their remuneration depends upon the duties performed, and runs from $250 to $3,000 per annum. The minor officers are paid at the rate of $250; those in Australia and South Africa, who devote their whole time, at the rate of $3,000 per annum.

STATION AGENTS, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. HACKETT asked:

What are the names of the agents, or caretakers, at the following small stations on the Prince Edward Island Railway, viz.: St. Louis, Elmsdale, Coleman, and Conway? And the amount of wages, or salary, per month, or year, paid each respectively?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The names and amount paid the caretakers of the following small stations on the Prince Edward Island Railway are:

Stations.	Names of Caretakers.	Amount paid each. per month.
St. Louis.. ..	John Perry..	$10 50
Elmsdale.. ..	James Forsythe.. .. .	8 33
Coleman.. ..	.N. McKay..	12 50
Conway.. .. .	A. M. Palmer..	8 33

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CARS AND LOCOMOTIVES PURCHASED.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. How many cars of the various classes, which had been contracted for, or purchased for the Intercolonial Railway previous to the 1st July, 1902, have been received into stock since that date?

2. How many cars of the various classes, contracted for, or purchased for the Intercolonial Railway on or after 1st July, 1902, have been received into stock since that date?

3. How many additional locomotives have been received into stock for the Intercolonial Railway since 1st July, 1902, inclusive, and what is the total number now in service?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. No cars have been received on capital account since July 1st, 1902.

2. Two hundred platform cars, twenty-one stock cars and two snowploughs have been received since July 1st, 1902, on revenue account.

3. Eight locomotives have been received since July 1st, 1902, on capital account, and two locomotives on revenue account, making the total number now in service 287.

VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) to what I consider a poor arrangement with reference to this Chamber. I think we are suffering more here this year than ever before, when we had the windows on both sides and at the west end open. I understand that the engineer says that if the windows are open it will interfere with the fans now running, which fans make such a noise that hon. members on the back benches can hardly hear themselves speak when they address the Chair. These fans may be good for ventilation, but it would be better to have them running when the House was not sitting. I see by the thermometer that the temperature here is 74. It was about the same yesterday, though I venture to say it was nothing like that outside in the shade. It appears to me that we are in a sweat box here.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The other side are.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think members on both sides are. In other years when the windows at the sides and end of the Chamber were open, we had a better atmosphere than we have this session, and I would recommend the Minister of Public Works to have that plan tried. It would be no trouble to open the windows; we could try it for a day and stop the fans while the House is sitting.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). At least, my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) cannot complain, as many others are doing, that he is being frozen out. I have noticed the noise of the fans, and have given instructions that they should be stopped during the sittings of the House. As to opening the windows, I spoke to the architect about it, and he says that if this were done, the fresh air would escape through the windows instead of circulating through the building. I will try to have the difficulty remedied. It is a difficulty that has existed, apparently ever since the Chamber was built. A great deal of money has been spent to remedy it, but, I am sorry to say, without as good an effect as we could desire.

UNITED STATES DUTY ON PULP WOOD.

Mr. R. H. POPE (Compton). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to bring to the attention of the government the recent imposition of a duty by the United States on pulp wood imported from Canada into the United States. The regulations of the duty have been changed, and we find now imposed upon peeled wood,

that is, wood that has been peeled either by hand or by machinery, a duty amounting to something like $1.25 to $1.50 per cord. I would like to know if the government have been notified about that, and what action the government propose to take in the matter.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not aware that this matter has been brought officially to the notice of the government, but I will make inquiry and let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I would like to draw the attention of the acting Minister of the Interior to a return that I moved for on May 4th, in reference to the acquisition by the Saskatchewan Land Company of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Company's land grant. The hon. the acting minister said it would only take a few days to prepare this return. I also moved for another return on March 30th, in reference to the disposal of the school lands. I would like to have the acting minister bring these returns down very soon.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY—GUARANTEE OF SECURITIES.

House went in committee on the following proposed resolutions :

1. Resolved, that the government may aid the extension of the line of the Canadian Northern Railway Company from Grandview, the point where what is known as the Gilbert Plains branch of the said railway ends, to a point at or near Edmonton, a distance of about 620 miles, and also of the Prince Albert branch of the said railway from a point 100 miles east of Prince Albert to Prince Albert, a distance of about 100 miles, by guaranteeing the principal and interest of the first mortgage bonds, debentures or other securities of the company to the extent of $13,000 per mile of the line, interest on the said bonds to be at the rate of three per cent per annum payable half-yearly, and the principal to be payable in 50 years.

2. Resolved, that the said bonds, debentures or other securities shall be secured by mortgage forming a first charge upon the lines of railway so aided, and all property and franchises in connection therewith, and all revenues derived therefrom by the company ; provided that with respect to that portion of the said line from the end of the Gilbert Plains branch to the westerly boundary of Manitoba, a distance not exceeding sixty-five miles, the said mortgage shall be a first charge to the extent of only $10,000 per mile, but shall also rank on the said portion next after the charges heretofore created ; provided also that the said mortgage shall be a charge next after a first charge of $13,000 per mile (to be created by the company) on that part of said Prince Albert branch.

3. Resolved, that the said mortgage shall also form a charge next after the charges existing thereon upon all the lines and branch lines of railway of the company now in operation, and all property and franchises connected therewith, and all revenues derived therefrom by the company.

4. Resolved, that the kind of securities to be guaranteed as aforesaid, and the forms thereof, and the form and terms of the mortgage securing them, and the form and manner of guarantee, shall be such as the Governor in Council approves of.

5. Resolved, that upon the said guarantee being signed on behalf of the government, the government shall become liable for the payment of the principal and interest of the securities guaranteed, and the said payment shall be a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

6. Resolved, that the rates and tolls to be charged for the transfer and carriage of freight and passengers upon the lines of railway so aided and upon the lines owned by the Canadian Northern Railway shall be under the control of the Governor in Council or of such authority, commission or tribunal as is designated or constituted under any Act of the parliament of Canada for the regulation or control of the business of railways.

7. Resolved, that the Governor in Council or any authority created by parliament for the purpose may also grant running powers over any portion of the lines hereby aided to any other line of railway upon terms considered equitable.

8. Resolved, that it shall be unlawful for the Canadian Northern Railway to lease or sell any of its lines or any portion thereof to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or to amalgamate with the said company or enter into any agreement with the said company whereby rates upon freight or passengers shall be pooled ; but this provision shall not extend to traffic or running arrangements made with the assent of the Governor in Council.

9. Resolved, that any money paid by the government of Canada under the guarantee herein provided for shall be held to be paid in discharge of the liability of the government, but not in discharge of the liability of the mortgage securing them ; and the money so paid shall be held to be still secured by the said securities and mortgage, and the government shall be subrogated in all the rights of the holders of the securities, the interest upon or the principal of which has been paid by the government, and the government shall in respect of all the moneys so paid be in all respects in the position of security holders in respect of whose securities default has been made in payment to the extent of the moneys paid by the government.—(The Minister of Railways).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). These resolutions, it will be observed, contain the proposals of the government in the way of granting aid towards the construction of certain portions of the line of the Canadian Northern Railway. I apprehend that there is no railway which could be projected in Canada to-day which would have stronger claims upon the favourable consideration of the government and of parliament for assistance to any necessary extent than the line of railway which is mentioned in these resolutions. The main portion of the line of this road, that is to say, that portion extending from Grandview, in the province of Manitoba, to Edmonton, has not only been

located, but its location has been approved as required by law. Therefore, we know whereof we speak when we say that the country through which this railway passes is one of exceptional fertility, and one which will, without any reasonable doubt, afford, in a very short time, not only a substantial amount of traffic, but a paying traffic, to the railway. It will be noted that the mileage for which aid is to be authorized in these resolutions aggregates about 720 miles.

One portion of the line has not yet been finally located, or at all events, the location has not been approved of. That is the portion east of Prince Albert not exceeding 100 miles. The main line, as I may describe it, because it will be the main line of the Canadian Northern which extends from Grandview to Edmonton, passing through Battleford, will not exceed 620 miles. As to the quality of land in this district, we are informed by the officers of the Interior Department, that the railway is tributary to a fertile soil and a country 80 per cent of which is capable of yielding the best quality of wheat the North-west Territories can produce.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You are speaking of the 100 miles ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am speaking of the 620 miles from Grandview to Edmonton. The same may be said in refrence to the other section as well, as I am advised. Perhaps, not quite the same percentage, but very nearly so, and the section of the country through which the 100 mile branch of the railway passes east of Prince Albert, is pretty well filled up by settlers. People have been settled there for very many years, they have flocked in within the last few years in increasing numbers and they have been expecting that a railway would be constructed through the district for many years past, until, as I am advised, they have become almost hopeless in regard to it and the disposition is believed to exist in many of them to throw up their hands and abandon the country altogether if railway construction does not take place at an early day. Taking into account the class of country through which the 620 mile section from Grandview to Edmonton, runs, it will be fair to assume that no reasonable amount of obligation, no reasonable amount in the way of bonded indebtedness which may be placed upon that undertaking in order to ensure its construction will not in the course of time be fully paid, not only the interest paid, but the principal amount returned. There is, I think, no doubt in the mind of any person who has made himself acquainted with the result of the operation of the lines of the Canadian Northern Railway in portions of the province of Manitoba and the west, that the business which will be created upon that line of railway will not only suffice to pay the working expenses almost at the outset, but will suffice to pay at a very early day the interest charges upon its bonded indebtedness as well. No one, I think, will question but that in view of the magnificent country through which that railway passes, and in view of the rapidity with which people from other lands as well as from some portions of our own country are flocking into the North-west Territories and settling in the district, that the obligation rests upon the government to see to it that no time is lost in ensuring the early construction of a railway through that territory. I think there is no more imperative obligation resting upon the parliament of this country than to bring railway conveniences and railway accommodation at the earliest possible moment to the settlers who have gone in there with the expectation of making their homes there and in the further expectation of finding these facilities afforded them. If that be a fact, and I think it will not be disputed by this committee, the question which rested upon the government was this : Was it reasonable to suppose that the company which has been chartered to construct this line would be able to as speedily as the necessities of the country required lay out and construct and put that line into operation of its own means and relying upon its own financial strength and relying in addition to that only upon the character of the credit which would attach to the undertaking among financiers abroad ? I think it would be a disappointment to the country, I think it would be expecting too much of the company, and that we would be likely to retard and injuriously affect the interests of the people who have settled in that territory if we were to wait until conditions exist which would enable the company to carry that work through itself without assistance. Time would be lost and it appears to me and to the government time is the very essence of the whole question in connection with the construction of this railway. Well, having decided in our minds that the obligation rests upon the government to give all the assistance to this company that was possible, and that we could not afford to wait until the company of its own means and with the resources which it had in its own hands should be able to build the railway, and having come to the conclusion that the duty rests upon the government to assist this company in carrying out its undertaking, the question then arose as to what form assistance would take. It is well known to this committee that for years past there has been a general and uniform policy on the part of both the present and preceding governments to make grants by way of bonus to such companies as the government felt were entitled to be assisted, giving out of the public exchequer for ever very substantial sums of money for the purpose of enabling these enterprises to be carried through. But, it appeared to us

that in a work of this magnitude, in an undertaking which would involve such a very large amount of money if we were to pursue the policy which has hitherto obtained and having regard to the fact that we could make the necessary advances, or afford the necessary assistance without any question or doubt in such a manner as would not involve in the carrying out of the scheme one dollar of charge ultimately upon the treasury of the country, we felt that it was a venture, that the proper policy to pursue was to give assistance seasonably necessary to carry the enterprise through without any loss to the Exchequer of the country. We have come to the conclusion, upon negotiation with the gentlemen who are promoting the carrying out of the Canadian Northern schemes that this sum of $13,000 per mile, which is named in the resolutions, would be ample for the purpose, not an excessive sum by any means, but that it would be reasonably ample for the purpose. And we come to the further conclusion, that it would be a wise course for us to take and less burdensome upon the country; a course which would ensure the return of every dollar that might be directly or indirectly secured by the government assistance; relieve the government ultimately of all obligation in respect to it; if we were to incumber it to the amount of $13,000 per mile. It will be of course for the committee to say whether or not our conclusions in this regard have been wisely arrived at, or whether any more favourabe plan could have been devised by which the aim which I think we all desire to attain should be attained, and attained within the shortest possible period. We propose therefore to ask parliament by these resolutions to authorize us to endorse as it were, the obligations of this company to the extent of $13,000 per mile. We guarantee the interest upon these bonds at the rate of 3 per centum per annum. The company are able to make their loan upon these securities at a low rate of interest. They avail themselves of the credit of the government; they profit by the fact that with our endorsation—particularly as the credit of Canada stands to-day in the great financial centres—they will be able at a very much less annual charge than could possibly be achieved in any other way to secure the money which is required from government to complete the undertaking at the smallest possible cost and to afford every possible reasonable guarantee that the results would be the best which it would be possible to obtain. In my remarks I propose to pass over the minor details of the resolution——

Mr. BELL. Is it expected that the company will be able to sell their three per cent bonds at par, with the government endorsation ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are very hopeful about it.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR.

The committee will observe that the resolutions provide for a first charge of the $13,000 per mile bond issue upon all the lines which we are here aiding, with a single exception. I will state what that exception is. There are about sixty-three miles between Grandview in Manitoba and the western boundary of that province which are not subject to a first lien to the extent of the $13,000 per mile. With the exception of that sixty-three miles about, the balance of all the mileage bears from the outset a mortgage to secure these bonds, a first charge upon the railway for the $13,000 per mile. As to the sixty-three miles the committee will observe that the mortgages will only get a mortgage endorsed by the government as a second charge upon these sixty-three miles, because in the arrangements which were made by the Canadian Northern Railway with the government of Manitoba there was a clause under which they were entitled to encumber all their railways within the limits of the province of Manitoba to the extent of a first charge of $10,000 per mile. And there were some miles of their railway in that province, among others this sixty-three miles, upon which that charge had not been executed.

Mr. CLARKE. Did they not get the aid of the province of Manitoba to build that sixty-three miles ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that they did; I think not. They gave the province of Manitoba a general mortgage, the particulars of which I will briefly state to the committee, so that they will see just what the character of our securities are. The first lien for the $13,000 per mile, with the exception of the whole of the line built under these arrangements, in the province of Manitoba and in the province of Ontario, and throughout the whole system of the Canadian Northern Railway we take and obtain a mortgage of a second charge on top of the existing mortgage which has been given to the Manitoba government, or if not given to them, given under the arrangement they have made.

Mr. LENNOX. Are we right in understanding that on the whole of the Canadian Northern system including Ontario we will have a second mortgage ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. We have a blanket mortgage over their whole enterprise from Port Arthur through to the west.

Mr. BARKER. Then I misread the second clause. I understand you that on sixty-three miles we have a second mortgage for $10,000 a mile, but as I read this you have a first mortgage of $10,000 per mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A first mortgage.

Mr. BARKER. You said a second mortgage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I failed to make myself clear to the hon. gentleman. We get a $13,000 per mile mortgage upon all except the mileage between Grandview and the Manitoba western boundary. On that we only get a $10,000 mortgage. The clause that I refer to in the contract with the Manitoba government reserved to the company the right to encumber any of their lines in that province which they had not previously encumbered, to the extent of $10,000 per mile before the mortgage to the Manitoba government could take effect and become a charge.

Mr. BELL. In that case, how can this government secure a first mortgage to the extent of $10,000 a mile upon that section ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because this company have never issued the mortgage.

Mr. BELL. They have not used it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have not used their power to encumber it and they are using it now. We fall short there to the extent of $3,000 per mile in getting a security by a first mortgage in respect to this sixty odd miles.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Does the security include rolling stock and equipment ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. The mortgage will be given upon the property of the Canadian Northern Railway, will cover its whole line, its branches, its undertaking, and property of every kind and description without exception of any kind or nature whatsoever.

The position of the encumbrances now existing on the Canadian Northern Railway line, is, as I am advised, as follows : On the main line from Port Arthur to the Rainy river there is a first charge of $20,000 per mile.

Mr. MACLEAN. Who owns that mortgage—the public ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume the public; yes. On all lines in Manitoba there is a first charge of $10,000 per mile. This first charge of $10,000 consists of two charges, one of $8,000 and one of $2,000, aggregating $10,000. That is the position as between Port Arthur and the Rainy river, and all the lines in Manitoba. The $20,000 per mile from Port Arthur to Rainy river is collaterally secured by a charge on the lines in Manitoba next after the $10,000 per mile above mentioned. So that in point of fact, our position as guarantor of these bonds, so far as the lines from Port Arthur to Rainy river and the lines in the Manitoba district as well are concerned, would be this : We would have before us encumbrances to the extent of $20,000, which we would have to retire or answer for, with the single exception of the $10,000 mortgage on the sixty odd miles between Grandview and the western boundary of Manitoba.

Mr. BELL. There is a first mortgage for $10,000, and a second collateral for $20,000. Would it not be correct to say that there is $30,000 of prior charges ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Undoubtedly the $20,000 which was given in respect to the Ontario lines and collaterally charged on the Manitoba lines would add $20,000 to the existing $10,000 charges; but, stating the matter broadly, there would not be obligations for $30,000 over the whole line.

Mr. BELL. Oh, no; just on the Manitoba lines.

Mr. MACLEAN. Might I ask the hon. minister what is the obligation of the road to the government of Manitoba on the Manitoba section at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The obligations of the company, whether to the government or the bondholders, are all included. I am not speaking with absolute confidence when I say that I think the bonds they have issued are held by the public and have the government guarantee.

Mr. MACLEAN. To what extent per mile ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $10,000 per mile. The first was for $8,000 and the next for $2,000, both guaranteed by the government. So that they stood subject to $10,000 per mile before this other arrangement was made.

Mr. MACLEAN. Could the minister tell us the total amount approximately guaranteed by the government of Manitoba on that road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not furnished to me here; but I take it that it is very easily ascertained, because if you add up the present obligations, the mortgage of $20,000 in the Ontario district and the $10,000 in the other district, you will have the total.

Mr. CLARKE. What information has the government obtained as to the cost of construction of this road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Our information is that the road will cost to build and equip more than the $13,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. A standard railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, a first class standard railway.

Mr. CLARKE. How much ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have had varying estimates from $16,000 to $17,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. minister lay on the Table the information he has obtained from competent persons as to the cost, so that we shall have an opportunity of examining it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will send and get the information, and will bring it down at one of the later stages.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the government were willing to guarantee the bonds to that extent after having received information as to the cost of construction. The hon. gentleman has not given us as full information as we would like to have in regard to the cost of construction and equipment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I procured through my chief engineer a statement of the estimated cost of construction, and equipment. Then we had estimates from the company's engineers showing what they were basing their calculations upon.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be reasonable to lay all the information on the Table?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there would be no difficulty in doing that.

Mr. MACLEAN. In the district through which this railway passes, west of the Manitoba boundary, how much of the country on each side of the railway, say forty miles wide, is still owned by the Dominion? Have we a large interest in the land?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We must have a considerable interest; but to what extent I do not know.

Mr. DAVIS. I may inform the hon. gentleman that we have an interest in nearly all the homestead lands. The odd numbered sections mostly belong to different railway corporations; but all the even numbered sections which have not been taken up are the property of the government.

Mr. MACLEAN. The other sections belong to railway corporations?

Mr. DAVIS. Some of them belong to the government, I fancy, but a good many of them to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With a good deal of what the hon. minister says in regard to this matter I am sure we all agree. There is no doubt about the urgent need of railway extension in the western part of Canada, and particularly in the vicinity of Edmonton, which I am sure merits all the encomiums which the hon. minister has bestowed upon it. In visiting that part of the country during the past year, I was particularly struck with the possibilities of the town of Edmonton and the country around it, and I am sure there is not a man in this House who would be disposed to hamper in any way the development of railways in that country. At the same time, this is a project which involves on the part of this government a guarantee to the extent of $9,360,000, which, during a period of fifty years after the date of the subsidy, will be considered, I suppose, for certain financial purposes at least, as part of the public debt of this country, because we shall be under obligation for that amount in certain contingencies. Therefore it seems to me that we ought to consider in the first place, whether or not this project is part of any comprehensive scheme which the government have in hand for the development of transportation facilities in this country. It seems to me that we ought to know from the government whether or not it is part of a scheme for railway extension to the Pacific coast; whether or not it is part of a scheme which looks to the development and the utilization of our great national ports and harbours and the development of our ports on the great lakes; and generally part of a scheme for transporting the products of the west, not only to the Atlantic coast, but to the markets of Europe. This matter was brought to the attention of the House last year, and the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, in the closing days of the session, stated that the conclusion of the government with regard to aid to a line in the west, would be arrived at very shortly. Apparently the decision of the government was somewhat delayed, and putting aside other considerations for the moment, I regret that delay, because I think that the development of railway communication in the west would probably have been advanced much more rapidly if the government had come sooner to a conclusion. We have had in the western part of this country a very inconvenient state of affairs with regard to a large colony from the mother country and we have had the people from this district complaining, not only during years past, as the hon. gentleman has mentioned, but during the past year of the lack of railway communication.

On previous occasions in this House, I have pressed the view that there should be some definite scheme decided on by the government with regard to transportation. I do not believe that any government is justified, at this stage of the history of transportation in Canada, in dealing with that question from the standpoint of 300 400 or 500 miles of railway, but that it should map out some definite scheme and include in it the navigation of our great lakes and the equipment, as national ports, of those ports in Canada which the government may think best deserving of consideration. I do not believe that

any other scheme of aid to transportation will produce as good results as a comprehensive and carefully thought out scheme, such as I have suggested. I do not know whether or not the government have considered the question in that light. We know that the gentlemen who are at the back of this undertaking are very enterprising and have done much for railway communication in Canada up to the present, and we believe that any legitimate efforts on their part to aid transportation should receive reasonable assistance. But what does this scheme look to in the end? Does it look to a transcontinental railway? Does it look to any line from the great lakes to the seaboard, by means of which the company operating this railway as far as Edmonton, or it may be in the future to the Pacific coast, will have a through line of communication to the Atlantic coast, and thus give the people of this country advantages in the way of transportation which they would not perhaps otherwise enjoy? Has the government any of these matters under consideration? It has had all the time necessary for reflection and consideration and study, which my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister asked for last night in respect of another matter. This matter has been before the government for more than a year, and it seems to me that the House might reasonably have expected that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, in announcing this scheme to-day, would have been able to give the House some definite policy, which would cover, not only the 600 miles west to Edmonton, but from Edmonton to the eastern seaboard and possibly to the Pacific coast. I do not know whether the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is to be regarded as a renunciation by him of the scheme which he propounded in the west some few months ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had only a dream.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It has been suggested that it might be called a nightmare. I do not think that my hon. friend put it to the western people as a dream.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I used the language any way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That it was a dream?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that my hon. friend, in his persuasive manner, might have used the expression 'dream' and yet made the people of the west regard it as a possible reality in the near future, if the hon. gentleman had the power to carry out that policy which he thought best in the interest of the country. That is what I have to say with regard to the general features of this scheme. With regard to what might be called the details, hon. gentlemen have asked my hon. friend for information as to the cost of the line, and I think that that is a very pertinent inquiry. I think that he ought to furnish the House all the information with regard to the cost of the line, because we are embarking on a pretty large undertaking; and while we are disposed to do everything necessary and reasonable for the purpose of furnishing railway facilities to that part of the country, still in the public interest we must be careful that we do not do anything more than is reasonable and necessary in that behalf. I am under the impression that lines have been built in the province of Manitoba—indeed I think that the hon. gentleman has so announced—I am under the impression that enterprises of a somewhat similar character have been successfully floated, upon which the guaranteed bonds amounted, in the first instance, to no more than $8,000 per mile. The hon. minister informed me of what I knew, but what had escaped my memory at the moment, that there was a subsequent guarantee given by the Manitoba government of a further sum of $2,000 per mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Some of those lines got assistance from the provincial government and municipalities. This line gets no more assistance than we are giving it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman should place before the House all the information of that kind in order that the House may form the conclusion whether or not the sum of $13,000 is no more than a reasonable sum for the purpose of furnishing these railway facilities to which people of the west are no doubt entitled. There is another subject on which we should have a little information and possibly some discussion, and that is the question of capitalization. I do not know what the capitalization of this company in respect of this line will amount to, but I think the majority of members will agree that we cannot be too careful in seeing that it is not put at so high an amount that it may be used afterwards as an argument against the control of rates by the government, which is so essential and especially so important to the people of the west. I think therefore that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals should give us a little more information. I have already adverted to the comparison between the subsidy to this line and other similar lines in Manitoba. The hon. minister forestalled another question which I was about to ask by stating that this is the only assistance which this company is receiving from any government or municipality. I think that I am correct in this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a further question I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. gentleman before going into the details of the measure, and that is whether or not the government are to have any supervision over the construction of this railway, not only as regards the mode but the cost as well? Is that provided for in this resolution? If not, does not my hon. friend think that there should be at least such government supervision over the construction of that line, as is usually to be found in the subsidy agreements entered into by the government during the past fifteen or twenty years. I do not know that any further suggestions occur to me at this moment, except that I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that while we may go on and, with profit, discuss this afternoon some of the details of this matter, I would like the final discussion of it to be postponed until we get a little more information on the questions involved, and also until the return of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart), who is out of town to-day. I presume there will be no objection to the delay of a day for this latter reason. The announcement made at the close of the sitting last evening did not include, so far as 'Hansard' shows, the announcement that this matter would be brought up to-day. Otherwise I am sure my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) would have allowed his other engagement to stand and would have remained for the purpose of dealing with this subject to-day. As it is, he has gone away without any knowledge that this matter would be brought up. I do not know that he has anything to remark upon it, but still, as he is very conversant with matters concerning transportation, I should like to have him present before the matter is finally passed in committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite sure the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) has no intention of conveying a wrong impression, but I think that the rather urgent and pressing way in which he spoke of the production of these papers after what I had said to my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) would tend to convey the impresison that there was some hesitation on my part in acceding——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not at all. I beg my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) to acquit me at once of any suggestion of the kind. I assure him that I had not that in mind, because I knew that he has accepted the suggestion at once. I merely mentioned it by way of reiteration.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall be very glad indeed to produce the information the hon. gentleman desires, and will do so, if possible, on the next occasion when the resolutions are taken up. And I see no objection at all to the final passing of these resolutions being deferred until these papers are forthcoming. The hon. member has passed some criticism, not upon the resolutions themselves, but upon what he considers the unsatisfactory attitude of the government with respect to the general question of transportation. And the hon. gentleman seems to be under the impression that it would have been very proper for the government, on the occasion of introducing these resolutions, to have stated to the House just what the general idea of the government was as to the proper methods of thoroughly and adequately dealing with the question of transportation as a whole. While I can understand my hon. friend's impatience and anxiety to know at what conclusions the government have arrived, or may arrive, upon this question, still, I cannot for myself, perceive that it was at all necessary that we should make the introduction of these resolutions the occasion for any such declaration of general policy. This railway enterprise stands by itself. We know that it has been in the public mind for some time and that the railway has been progressing by degrees, adding to its general plan, reaching out and extending year by year. As it has made progress under the charters it has received, it has been asking for further charter power. I do not know whether, when the Canadian Northern was started in the Rainy River District, it was in the minds of the promoters of that undertaking to continue westward until they reached the Pacific coast. But, if it was not in their minds, their ideas became enlarged, for they have obtained from parliament power to construct all the way to the Pacific. We are not now offering any proposals to parliament beyond Edmonton; we do not ask that asistance be rendered to this railway beyond that point. And we are perfectly safe in asking parliament to assist the undertaking to that point, because, unquestionably, whatever is done in any other direction will not conflict in the remotest degree with this undertaking. If this undertaking stood alone, it would justify the asistance which we are asking parliament to give it, and it is not such a project as might be altered, changed or varied in its character in any degree by any general scheme which the government might find itself able, later on, to suggest to parliament. The government has not yet matured its views with regard to the question of railway policy concerning a transcontinental line. We may be able, before the close of the present session, to give parliament some knowledge on that point, or we may not. But, what I wish to impress upon the committee is that, whether we do or not, it would not affect in the slightest degree the measure which we are now submitting to parliament for assist-

ance to the Canadian Northern between these points mentioned in the resolution. I note what the hon. gentleman has said on the subject of capitalization of this railway and——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not speaking of this railway in particular, but of all railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, what applies to all railways, would, of course, apply to this. I am speaking within the knowledge of many of the members of the committee when I say that my views on this subject have been expressed upon previous occasions, and generally they are quite in accord with what the hon. member has stated. I think we ought to keep a very watchful eye on the question of capitalization ; and I think that in the Railway Committee, where these powers are conferred, we do the best we can. When, before this project of the Canadian Northern had fully assumed its present shape, but when it was apparent that they were going to extend their lines over a very considerable portion of our northwestern territory, I called the attention of the Railway Committee, which was very largely constituted at the time—many hon. members now in my eye must have been present on that occasion—to the capitalization, and said : This railway is asking for powers to capitalize at a very large sum, and I think it would be proper for us to have in our minds the absolute certainty that, in some form or other, this company is likely to be aided, directly or indirectly, from the treasury of the country. A result of what took place was that the amount of total capitalization which the company asked authority to issue was very much reduced.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was about cut in two.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend reminds me it was about cut in two. I think it was in the neighbourhood of $46,000,000 or $50,000,000. Speaking from memory, we cut it down to $24,000,000 ; so we made a very substantial reduction, and entirely in view of the thought which the hon. member has expressed to-day. Now, as to supervision during the construction of this work, I may say to my hon. friend that many provisions will be found in the contract when it is entered into which it would not be necessary to include in the resolutions now before the committee. The government will feel it to be its duty to see that it is abundantly satisfied as to the character of the road which is to be constructed, as to the quality of the work done, as to the standard, as to the expenditure, so that the bonds which are issued may be well within, certainly not in excess of, the amount which they would be earning during the progress of the work. I omitted to say that the road will be a first class road in its character generally, its alignment, its grades, its curves, &c. It is possible to lay down a railway along the route—we have seen the plans and profiles, it has nearly all been surveyed instrumentally—and we know that a road from Edmonton to Port Arthur will not exceed at any point a higher grade than one-half of one per cent, or twenty-six feet to the mile. Imagine such a length of railway as this constructed through that country, and only showing a grade of one-half of one per cent per mile. Certainly this is an element of immense value, because they will be able to earn a dollar where another road, with one and a half or two per cent grades to combat, could not earn half a dollar.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that that is the grade on the Rainy River section ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Twenty-six feet to the mile.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Going east ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not stated so by these gentlemen to me. The statement is a general one, as it was handed to me. I suppose, perhaps, it was an oversight. The quality of the line, we will see, is very superior. In connection with the question of cost, I may make this remark : This railway will bridge across the Saskatchewan river twice.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Four times—once across the South Saskatchewan and three times across the North Saskatchewan.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, then, the cost of bridge construction will be larger than I imagined.

Mr. CLARKE. That shows the necessity of having the fullest possible information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Speaking of the estimate of $13,000, I think it will occur to anybody who has had any experience in railroad construction that $13,000 is a very low estimate indeed for a first class railway properly equipped.

Mr. OSLER. What amount of equipment is covered by the government guarantee ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We stipulate for an ordinary equipment when the line is first built, to be included in the first cost. It would not be reasonable to require such an amount of rolling stock as they would require when the business grew and became very heavy. We treat them upon the same basis as we treat all other railways in their initial stages.

Mr. FOWLER. Does this mortgage cover simply the roadbed or the roadbed and equipment ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It covers all, the terminals and all the property of the railway company. When it was suggested a moment ago that in the province of Manitoba the company was able to construct its line with a smaller subsidy, with guaranteed bonds of $8,000 per mile at first, and then increased to $10,000, it must be borne in mind that that was very far from covering all the assistance which the railway company received. In the first place, over a good many miles of their system they had 6,400 acres per mile; then from Port Arthur through to the Rainy River district and a portion of the Rainy River district, covering 120 miles, they had from this parliament double the usual subsidy, viz. 6,400 dollars per mile. So the amount of assistance which was given by the Manitoba government was largely supplemented in these various ways.

Mr. MACLEAN. I must take issue with the proposition as laid down by the Minister of Railways to-day. He says this is for a local branch, for a small portion of the road, that it is not a part of any general plan. I say we should have a statement here to-day giving us a general plan, showing how the government propose to deal with the transcontinental railway proposition. He has opened wide the door for assistance, and every railroad running through a new country where there are settlers desiring railroad facilities, is bound to be assisted by the government. His statement went that far. He said: Here is a new country, available for settlement, there are settlers in it, and the government feel bound to assist this road. Well, if they say that in this case, they must say it in all cases; and they should have been prepared to say to-day whether this proposition to aid a transcontinental road is to be followed next week by another proposition to aid the Grand Trunk Pacific road. We have no statement whatever in that respect. Now, when the government came down to the House with this proposition, they were bound to come prepared to state their general policy on the transcontinental railway question. They have not done it. I cannot vote for a proposition of this kind. For what has happened? This railway running from Port Arthur to Winnipeg in the west heretofore has been very largely bonused by the people of this country. When the first portion of this railway was considered in this House, I took the position then that if public money was to be put into a road, it should be a government owned railway, for the only way to solve the railway problem is for the government to own a road from one ocean to the other, a road controlled by the people, and its rates regulated by the people in such a way that every other road will have to live up to that standard. They should have done that long ago, they should have done that with the Rainy River road, and the minister said he had some idea of it in his mind, but he said at the time: This is only a small section, let this go through. Now comes along another section, and he says: We must take this as part of a proposition, let it go through. The country expects something very different from the government. They expect that the government should outline its policy in regard to transcontinetal railways. The only thing to do if they are putting in public money is to build a government road. Hon. gentlemen have heard a good deal in this House about a government owned railway, and they have heard a great deal from their supporters. Some years ago only a few of us took that view, but now there is a growing demand in the country for a government owned railway. This is one of the signs of the times. There are hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who said that free trade was bound to live for ever, and that the protectionist proposition was not a policy which would last. To-day——

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am only mentioning the point in illustration—England is in a ferment over the trade question, and the bulk of the leading English statesmen in England are beginning to see that the time has come for revision of their policy and are becoming protectionists.

Mr. COWAN. You have not read this morning's papers.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, I have. The same thing is happening in connection with the railway question. The people are coming rapidly to the opinion that if the national credit is to be given towards the building of a trans-continental railway the government should build a road which should be owned and controlled by the people. Instead of that, we are giving our money for a railway controlled by private parties. This is not good policy, and it is not in line with what the people expect. What follows? It follows as sure as night follows day that next week or the week after, another proposition will be introduced into the House providing for an immense bonus, probably a land grant, or an immense guarantee to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Where is all this to end? The door is open wide and the policy has been set forth as the policy of the government that if there is a new country with settlers in it and a railway is desired the country must build that railway. I cannot vote for a proposition based upon that principle. The hon. minister says: We are committing ourselves to nothing. We are committing ourselves to a great deal. In the first place we are guaranteeing over $9,000,000 of money. It is a commitment which will affect the credit of the country more or less, and if there is to be a commitment to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway of the same kind that will affect the

credit of the country also. We are rapidly dissipating the credit of the country in building railways for private corporations. I do not think the feeling of this country to-day is in favour of any such policy. The feeling of the country to-day, and hon. gentlemen will find it out when the voice of the people is heard, is against this system of bonusing railways owned by private individuals. I have not the slightest objection to that country having a railway. I believe the men who are seeking aid under this proposition are enterprising men and that they are opening up the country, but they are opening up the country for their own benefit rather than for the benefit of the country. The hon. minister says that we are practically giving nothing away. Do you know what backing this note of the Canadian Northern Railway Company is worth ? We are told that it will enable them to borrow money for 3 per cent. If they had to go upon the open market and borrow it they would probably have to pay 6 per cent, so that it is worth $30,000 a year on each million, or $270,000 a year. It is practically a perpetual bonus to this enterprise. We are giving this road a quarter of a million annually and there is no prospect of getting anything in return. The hon. minister says that we are going to control the rates. How far have we controlled rates up to the present time ? It is true something has been secured by the bargain which the province of Manitoba made with this railway company. They have reduced the rates in a measure, but not in such a way as they should have been reduced. For one thing there should have been a maximum freight rate provided for in this agreement, and most of all a maximum passenger rate should have been put in. That is where you get control of railways. We have to deal with the Canadian Pacific Railway, we may have to deal with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and other roads may grow up. The Canadian Northern is one of them. Every one of these roads could be absolutely controlled by the competition of a government railway or by stipulating with these roads the passenger and freight rates which should be charged upon them. Is anything of that kind proposed in these resolutions ? Nothing of the kind. We have had no great results from what was promised in the past in the way of taking control of these railways and their rates. We have had no satisfactory results from the amount of money we have expended and we are going on and spending millions and millions on our terminals, on improving lake and river navigation, on improving the seaports, because they say the nation must do this work. What is the good of spending all that money on lake navigation, on the canals, and on ocean terminals if we have no control over railways ? The only way to have complete control is by having at least one government owned railway. We are spending enough money on all of these different propositions to build a government road from one ocean to the other. Why should we not have it ? Why should not the Intercolonial Railway be extended to the Pacific ocean ? Why should not all this money that the people are putting up be put into a proposition in support of a railway owned and controlled by the people ? The money is being frittered away. The problem is not being solved, but it is being complicated by such a proposition as the one which we have before us now. It makes it harder to control these railways and eventually to settle the transportation problem. I stand in my place in this House and I tell the government that the people of this country are opposed to this system of bonusing railways. This bonusing proposition which is presented here to-day is very much milder than similar propositions in the past, as there is no land grant, there is no grant of money, and there is some regulation in regard to freight rates, but I submit that though the proposition is presented in a modified form to-day, the sentiment of the people is against the bonusing of private owned railways in this country and hon. gentlemen will find it out. I am willing to take my risk, whatever it may be, in standing by that policy and of saying that any money that we put into a trans-continental line ought to be put into a railway owned and controlled by the government and made the complement of the lake and river navigation system that we are supposed to be building up. What is the use of paying immense sums in improving our seaports, in lighting the St. Lawrence, in the canals, in improving river navigation and lake navigation and in providing terminals on the lakes, if we cannot substantially control the railways that feed these ports ? I will allow the hon. members from the North-west Territories to deal with that question. They have their constituents to face, and the wish of the people of the North-west Territories agrees altogether with what the people of eastern Canada think, that the time has come to stop the bonusing of railways and to put all this money into a government railway. I do not wish to go into the details of this measure. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) pointed out, here, to-day, that the greatest care ought to be taken as to the standard of the road and as to the way in which it is built. The road can be overcapitalized. It might be constructed in a way that would interfere with its working afterwards. These minor details and everything of that character should be closely looked into, but I shall not speak of that now so much as in regard to the fact that the government are building a railway which they are not going to control, and they are doing it in such a way that they are not working out a trans-continental

system, in such a way that it does not justify the national expenditure on lake terminals, sea terminals and lake and river navigation, and they are doing it in spite of the well expressed opinion of the people that the day has come to end this subsidizing of private owned railways.

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to enter into a general discussion of this measure, but I wish to say that when the final discussion takes place on the Bill I hope that the government will be prepared to make a clear explanation as to their policy in regard to a trans-continental line. There is no doubt that public opinion, in the province of Quebec at least, and indeed in the whole of Canada—until the moment that notice of these resolutions was given—lay in the direction, that if the money of the people of Canada was required to aid any large railway enterprise in the west, it was to include a through transcontinental railway which would not only develop the grain traffic of the west, but would connect the east and the west and develop the general traffic of Canada. I fear that the passage of these resolutions and the Bill which will be based upon them, will tend to prevent the adoption of a general scheme for a transcontinental line.

Mr. MACLEAN. A government line.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not say a government line. I fear, though I hope it will not, that it will render more difficult the early construction of any transcontinental line such as the Grand Trunk Pacific or any other scheme that may be favoured by parliament. The moment this line is being operated it will cover the more profitable trade of the country for the present, because there is no doubt that the transportation of grain from the North-west to Lake Superior is the most profitable part of the business now, and therefore when a new line comes and finds itself deprived of a good share of that traffic it will be less disposed to build a line from Lake Superior to Quebec and the maritime provinces. I trust that the government have studied the situation in this light, and that when this Bill is brought before the House they will make a declaration of their policy and assure us of the eastern provinces, that the building of the road from Winnipeg to Quebec and the maritime provinces through the northern portions of Ontario and Quebec will not be jeopardized by this scheme.

On the general question of our railway policy, although I do not go so far as my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) there is no doubt there is a growing feeling in Canada that it is time to put an end to our railway policy of the past. No country in the world is so greatly in need of railways as Canada. There is no country in the world where railways mean so much for the future of the country both from a commercial and from a political point of view, and at the same time there is no country in the world where railways have been built with so little care as to their future consequences to the people. We have spent more money on our railways, in proportion to our population, than the people of any other nation, and there is less probability that we shall have a return from them, than is the case with any other nation. I had hoped from the declaration made by the Minister of Finance last session, when I brought the subject before the House in the debate on the address, that the government would be able to advise us this session, and give us some hope that there would be a change in our railway policy. I admit that in these resolutions there is a change, and a change for the better. This way of dealing with the Canadian Northern Railway is far better than the system of the past under which we simply squandered the money of the people without any expectation of a return from it. But at the same time this change is not sufficient. We should go more fully into the matter and we should study the railway policy of other nations which have better solved the problem than we have, or that the people in England and the United States have. In continental Europe they are greatly in advance of England and the United States and Canada so far as their railway policy is concerned. With the exception of Germany they do not go so far as ownership and operation by the government, and I think that is wise because where they have tried it they have found it a failure. But they have adopted a mixed system by which the state retains the ownership of the railway, the right of property in the railway, but gives the operation of it for a certain number of years to private companies under the control of the state. The title which is given to the company is only a lease of power for the operation of the road under the supervision of the government, and the aid given to the railway is only a guarantee of interest.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With what result has that been worked out ?

Mr. BOURASSA. With splendid results so far as France, Belgium and Holland are concerned.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My information is quite the other way.

Mr. BOURASSA. In France and Holland especially they have tried different systems, and if the minister studies the question he will find that the mixed system which they have adopted of late has largely succeeded.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) must have observed that the French government had a very large deficit last year,

and that the greater part of that was due to the loss on the operation of their railways under the system that he refers to.

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. Minister of Railways is strengthening my contention because the deficit was on the state owned and state operated railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under the system the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. BOURASSA. I may tell the minister that there are two systems; in fact there are three systems going on together in France. At first they gave charters to companies with permanent powers such as we are doing, and there are only a few small lines which remain under that system. Under the second system they went to the other extreme as they generally do there, and they had state owned and state controlled railways, and a certain number of railways remain in that condition at the present day.

Mr. CLARKE. You mean state operated.

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes. Then they constituted the six great companies with which they entered into an agreement in 1857. Of course political events in France had some effect on the railway policy and created some disturbance. For example, after the revolution of 1848 some of the smaller companies having failed, the government extended their state operated system. They took the Charente and Vendée systems and after that, during the empire, they more or less balanced the three systems together. After the war of 1870, there was, of course, a great disturbance in the operation of their railways, primarily because of the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine, which deprived some of the railway companies of a part of their system. After more or less disturbance, in 1879, the French government under Mr. de Freycinet, tried to extend the state operated system and they changed their agreements with the six great companies. They took over a part of their system and it is upon that state owned and operated system that the deficits have occurred every year. But upon the system belonging to the six great companies which are operated under the dual system there has been no deficit.

Mr. RUSSELL. May it not be, that the reason the state operated railways do not pay is that the best railways were taken by the companies, and the worst left to the state ? It has been stated by some writers on the subject in the magazines, that where there is a mixed system of state owned and company owned railways, the state always get the heavy end of the plank.

Mr. BOURASSA. In theory that is right, but the state owned system of France was born before the agreement with the six companies Under the arrangement of 1879, made by Mr. De Freycinet, part of the system of these great companies was annexed to the state system, but that went on for only four years, and in the general revision of 1883, the state deprived itself of these lines which it had annexed in 1879, and concluded an arrangement with the six great companies by which they handed back these parts that they had taken in 1879.

Now, I am ready to admit with the Minister of Railways and Canals that over some parts of the railway system of France the arrangement has not worked so well as over other parts. But if you go into a careful analysis of the system you will find: That wherever there is a large deficit it is due to the fact that the government forced the companies to build certain lines that were entirely unprofitable. That was done through political pressure, and the deficit is due to causes entirely apart from the system itself. They also adopted a very peculiar policy—and it is not a policy I would recommend—but at that time they had reason to do it. They classified the railways into two systems, the old system and the new system. They guaranteed the interest on the new system, and, in order to make it up, they forced a part of the profits of the old system to be applied on the new system. This caused some disturbance, and they have now done away with that part of the system, because it is no more needed. If the hon. minister would go into a study of the French state operated railways, he would find that everywhere there is a deficit upon them. That system is not a success, and the people of France know that it is not, though they probably continue it for the same reason that we continue the Intercolonial Railway. But leaving aside the state-operated railways, which consist of only about 2,500 kilometers, while the systems of the great companies consist of 26,000 kilometres, the hon. gentleman will find that the general system, as it was adopted in 1857, and renewed by the last agreement of 1883, is not only successful, but is the one feature of French politics which is the most hopeful, so far as finance is concerned. The prospects of the railways, after an experience of forty-three years, are such that when the leases expire in 1956, instead of being a burden on the French people and increasing their debt, they will probably be the means of reducing the debt of the French people by an immense figure. In fact, independent of the state operated railways, and independent of those parts of the lines which have been built and operated under special circumstances, the amount of interest paid by the French government on what we may call the ideal system is diminishing every year ; and, after ninety-nine years, that is in 1956, the whole system will go back to the French government. But their intention is not to operate the railways at the end of the leases, but to lease them over again on such conditions as they will be able to impose,

which at that time will probably be more favourable than the present conditions, because of the increase of population and trade and the better management of the system.

There is no general railway law in France. The railways are operated under a kind of agreement, a model schedule, which is modified according to special circumstances. There are dispositions of the schedule giving the same powers of control to the government as we have here, and power to revise the rates at different periods. There are other powers also. For example, the government would have the right to take possession of the railways at any time during the lease, and put an end to the lease.

On the state-owned and state-operated railways of Germany, there were at first decreases of the rates, and that is one of the dangers of state operated railways. These decreases were too great. At first they were pleasing to the people, but the government came to the conclusion that they were going to bankrupt the system, and they had to impose higher rates, which, of course, caused a great deal of discussion. Holland formerly operated its own railways, but finally adopted the French system, and now has state owned railways operated by chartered companies under special agreement. Germany has kept state owned and state operated railways to a large extent, in spite of the inconvenience of the system, for purely military reasons, which do not exist here. I did not intend to go so fully into this question ; but I have given these explanations because I think the time has come when we should study seriously our railway policy. We shall not effect any improvement by putting off the question from year to year. Every charter and every aid we grant to a railway company to-day is so much of the national wealth of the country being given away to private individuals without any hope of return ; and the time has certainly come when we should have a more intelligent and conservative policy for the people of Canada in railway matters.

Mr. SCOTT. On the general question of providing for an extension of railway accommodation in the particular parts of the country through which these proposed lines are to run, I think there can be, and there is actually and practically, no contrary opinion. Upon that general question I do not intend at the present time to add anything to what I have said to this House on previous occasions. I think, too, with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that the present proposition is very far in advance of any other railway proposition ever presented to this House, and upon this fact I sincerely congratulate the hon. gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches. I do not know, however, whether these resolutions are as good as they possibly might be made. I think this parliament is in duty bound at the present time to make for the people the very best possible bargain with these railway promoters and contractors, the Canadian Northern Railway Company. A number of very good suggestions have been made to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals by the hon. leader of the opposition and other members of the House this afternoon. There is one, however, which has not been made, and which I am going to make. Personally I favour the principle so consistently and enthusiastically championed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean)—the principle of government ownership and operation of railways. Still, I do not feel that at present I can go with him the full length of demanding that the government shall at once commence to apply that principle in this country. I know, and I think he knows and recognizes, that to-day there is not in this House a majority of members in favour of the immediate application of that principle ; and I very much question whether there will be found throughout the country a majority of the people in favour of its immediate application. At the same time, I agree with him that the feeling in favour of the principle is growing, and growing with considerable rapidity, and I think it would be well to have in the proposed contract a clause which would enable the government at some future time, when the majority of the people of the country believe in the application of that principle, and when they will elect to this House a majority of members in favour of its immediate application, to take over on fair and reasonable terms the lines which we are at present proposing to aid and have constructed. There was another suggestion, which I consider a very good and very essential one, made by the hon. member for East York ; that is, that there should be put in this contract a provision for maximum rates, so that the people along the lines to be constructed shall know definitely and distinctly what advantage they are to receive in return for what the public is doing for this company. For these reasons, to allow of time to frame some further provisions, and to further perfect the bargain which has been already agreed upon to some extent between the government and the railway company, I would concur in the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition, that the question should not be pressed to a conclusion at the present time, but that further time be given for consideration.

Mr. McCREARY. I understand that it is not the intention of the hon. minister to conclude the discussion on this subject to-day, but that in probably a week or ten days the matter will be again before the House. I think that the hon. minister should then bring down at least a rough draught of the actual contract to be entered into with this company and also a copy of the mortgage to be given by it to the gov-

ernment. In the transaction which took place between this company and the Manitoba government, I think that the mortgage was actually brought before the House and discussed. However, these are matters which can be discussed later on as well as the rates of freight and the question of government ownership. I may say, however, that the majority of the people of the west are rather sorry that the dream of the hon. minister did not come true, and that when he woke up, he did not go on and carry that beautiful dream into practical effect.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think he is awake yet.

Mr. McCREARY. But the giving of assistance to this road need not prevent the government from constructing at any time a road of its own. I do not believe that there is one mile of the road aided by this Bill which will not pay from the start. From Lake Superior to Edmonton, it will be a paying road every day it runs. But there are some things we ought to carefully see to, judging by our experience in the past. In my opinion the government should employ an engineer and some assistants, whose duty it would be to keep continually going over the road and look after the manner of construction. The Canadian Pacific Railway, although it has been built over twenty years, was so imperfectly constructed that this year, as is pointed out in the Winnipeg papers, in addition to the ordinary section men employed by the company, Messrs. Foley-Larson Company have three thousand men actually at work putting that line into shape between Winnipeg and Port Arthur. It is a well-known fact also that the Crow's Nest road, which was assisted by this government, will practically have to be rebuilt from Lethbridge into the Mountains. The cuts through the mud hills are in such a shape that it will cost as much to build a new road as to repair the old one. Therefore, I would urge on the government and the hon. minister that competent men should be employed to supervise the construction of the road and see that the grading and bridges and terminals are properly constructed. This company say that they will only have 5 per cent of a grade, but how they can cross the Saskatchewan river five times, how they can lay five bridges across the Saskatchewan and go up and down the hills leading to and from those bridges, without a steeper gradient than .5 per cent, is an engineering problem I would not like to have to solve. There is another phase of the question to which I would call attention. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was built—its main line as well as its branches—and when the Crow's Nest road was built, the treatment of the men was such as to bring disgrace on the Dominion. Every one must recollect that when in 1897 the Crow's Nest road was under construction, telegrams were sent abroad of such a nature as forced the right hon. the First Minister to take action. Government officers should be put on the road to see that the men are paid proper wages and fairly treated. Of course if there should be such a crop in Manitoba and the west as we had last year, there will be no difficulty on the point of wages paid, except this: In the case of the Crow's Nest road, the men were not given proper food, the camps were not properly constructed, the bedding was not what it should be, there was not sufficient accommodation for the men, but worse than that, the men who were hired at Winnipeg to go to the work, were charged a high rate of transport to get there and another high rate to get back, and were charged besides other excessive charges, so that all a man could earn was about $13 per month net. I sent out myself on this very road a large number of Doukhobors, Galicians and others, who had worked full time, and the poor men, when they had paid the charges for transport, and the fees of a doctor, whom they never saw, at the rate of $1 per month, and $3 per sack for flour, had their pay reduced down to the minimum. Thirteen dollars or thirteen fifty per month was about all they could make.

The construction of this road should be made the means of colonizing the prairie. By the construction of the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern railways, the states of Minnesota and Dakota were settled, but unfortunately the manner in which the Canadian Pacific Railway was built and its branches, the Manitoba and South-western and the Deloraine, so disgusted the men employed that they left the country. It is the duty of the government to see that the men employed are properly fed and housed, and not overcharged for their supplies or transport; and if that were done, I believe that we would get many good, hardy settlers in there to earn a few dollars, who would afterwards settle along the prairie. But the company should not be allowed to go to Minneapolis, Duluth and Chicago and hire a lot of Italians under the Padrone system, at perhaps ninety cents per day, for this would do the country harm instead of good. Now is the time, when we are putting the company under certain obligations, to insist on fixing the conditions.

With regard to the equipment of the road, the hon. minister should state exactly what equipment it shall have per mile—what box cars, passenger and flat cars and engines, and the style of engines. It is well known that notwithstanding the fact that there are less engines per mile on the American roads to-day, they haul more than was hauled five or six years ago, because the engines are larger. We should have a statement as to what the equipment will be at the end of two, three or five years. The hon. minister says that it is not customary to have a road up to proper equipment during construction, but from the time the first

hundred miles on this road are built and in operation, there will be enough freight to yield a handsome profit. You cannot compare it to a new road constructed over new territory, because the country will be settled just as quickly as the road is constructed. In fact, there are settlers in there now.

Another question is whether or not this is to be a great national highway. I do not think that it is necessary to decide that question just now. If the government should undertake to construct a great national highway, this road will not stand in the way, and they may use this road or not as they choose. They are given running power over it in one of the clauses. Any road may have running powers over it, but unfortunately I do not think that the terms on which running powers may be given to other roads are sufficiently well stated. The clause says they shall be given running powers on an equitable basis, but I believe that basis should be defined. If the Grand Trunk Railway or any other road wants to run over this road, the terms should be stated. I will not discuss that Manitoba bargain, nor another question which I think the minister probably overlooked, and that is the condition of that part of the Canadian Northern system which is merely leased, as I may say, from the Northern Pacific Railway. Three hundred and fifty-seven miles in the province of Manitoba were taken over from the Northern Pacific Railway Company at $7,000,000, which calls for $210,000 to be paid annually. I do not know whether the minister had a copy of that deed before him in framing this mortgage. It is as well that he should have. They have not the fee of the road; it is merely a leasehold, and it can be closed out in sixty days or ninety days, I am not sure which. I got the exact particulars from the president of the road. I think that this is a matter which should be looked into. As I said, I shall defer any further discussion of the matter until the contract itself is brought before the House.

Mr. OLIVER. As this seems to be an occasion for giving advice to the government, I propose to offer such suggestions as occur to my mind. I would ask for some indulgence from the House in the matter, as I happen to represent a part of the country served by the railway proposed to be constructed. I would like to rather emphasize the importance of the proposition now before the House. There seems to me a tendency to belittle it as not being of the importance of a great transcontinental scheme. It is true, this is not as important as if it were part of a transcontinental scheme; but allow me to say that it is of stupendous importance, not merely to the handful of people who are now in the country proposed to be served, nor merely to the thousands or hundreds of thousands who are shortly to occupy that country, but to the whole Dominion of Canada. The road is for the development of the Saskatchewan valley, and the Saskatchewan valley is the coming grainary of Canada, of North America and, possibly, of the world.

Mr. McCREARY. What about the Red River valley?

Mr. OLIVER. The Red River valley is part of the great country of which the Saskatchewan valley is very much the larger part. The part of that great wheat growing area of the North-west which, long ago, was called the fertile belt, and which includes the valleys of the Red River and the Saskatchewan, is the part of the country to which Canada must look for its future development in wealth and population. There, and there only, have we the area of fertility suitable for the growth of population and the production of wealth that will ever constitute this Canada a great country. So, I say, it is of the very highest importance, looked at from a national standpoint, first that such a road as this should be constructed, and, second that it should be constructed under proper conditions. I shall say nothing with regard to the amount of aid to be given, the manner in which that aid is to be given nor the security to be taken. I do not think we need quarrel about any or all of these three particulars. It does not matter so much to this country whether we guarantee the bonds to the amount of $10,000 a mile or $13,000 a mile; it does not matter so much even if we have to pay the interest on these bonds. What does matter to us is the amount we shall have to pay for the service we get from the road. I have troubled the House and some of the committees on some other occasions on this subject, and I propose to trespass again and to emphasize the point that the rates to be charged on this railway for the service of the country through which it runs, and, even more, for the service of the whole country, is the important question in this connection. There seems to be an idea that the transportation question of Canada begins at Fort William and extends to Quebec. Allow me to say that Canada has no serious transportation question over that distance. Nature and what we have done in the past has, in very large measure, solved the transportation question over that distance, so that when grain comes east, once it reaches Fort William, there is then no question as to the transportation or the rates from that point to its ultimate market. Neither is there any serious question as to the transportation of manufactured articles going westward until Fort William is reached. The lake navigation and the railroads fulfil in great part the requirements. I do not say that improvement cannot still be made; of course we admit that it can. We do not say that it is not

desirable ; of course it is. But what I say is that it is not of the stupendous importance of the transportation question over the distance from Fort William westward. I do not think I need dwell on the importance to the wheat producers of the west of the lowest possible rate for the hauling of their grain to the ultimate market which, as I said before, means the lowest possible rate for their grain from the wheat fields to Fort William—Beyond that point we need not concern ourselves very seriously. But, from the wheat fields to Fort William is where the toll is taken that keeps the Northwest settler poor and keeps this country back, and, in the legislation which this parliament passes and in the aid it chooses to give, that is the point we need to emphasize and keep in mind. Just let me say, for the purpose of emphasis that a difference of a cent a bushel on the grain rate from the wheat fields to Fort William makes a difference of half a million dollars on every 50,000,000 bushels of wheat exported.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you expect to have many crops of fifty millions of bushels for export?

Mr. OLIVER. We do, certainly. I am thankful to have my attention called to that point. We expect many times fifty million bushels, and we need, and we expect, a number of reductions in freight rates to the amount of one cent per bushel each. The fifty millions of bushels which we speak of as the export product last year was produced very largely—in fact it was altogether produced—in what we still call the Red-River-Valley-Section of the North-west, that is the drainage area of the Red, Assiniboine and Q'Appelle rivers. That is the area which produce the 50,000,000 bushels. When you consider the sparse settlement throughout the greater part of that area, and take the total area from Grandview to Edmonton and beyond, I think you will agree that our present production is not a quarter, is not a fifth of the production that necessarily will occur when the country is settled all the way to Edmonton and beyond through the Saskatchewan valley.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The export quantity——

Mr. BOYD. I wish to protest against the manner in which questions are being asked by members on the other side of the House. Questions have been asked by the Minister of Railways and Canals and by other members, but not a man on this side of the House knows what is being said. I think a little respect should be shown to the gentlemen on this side of the House, and when a question is asked it should be asked in such a manner that we can hear it and know what the answer is.

Mr. OLIVER. I was speaking——

Mr. BOYD. Tell us what the minister asked you, and what your answer is.

Mr. OLIVER. I was speaking of the prospective increase in exports, and suggested that, taking the comparative areas and the prospects, our exports would certainly be increased five fold when the Saskatchewan valley was settled up as the Red river valley is now. The minister suggested that our exports would not increase proportionately. I would be very glad to believe that the population of Canada would increase to such an extent that our exports would not increase proportionately. But I for one do not see that there is anything in our present prospects to indicate that our exports will not be in proportion to our production. At any rate the question of transportation from the wheat fields to Fort William would remain the same, because our great increase of consuming population, aside from our producing population, would be naturally in eastern Canada. So the question of rates on grain would be just the same then as now, except that we would be paying out at both ends, that is, the eastern consumer would be paying as well as the western producer; whereas now it is the western producer and the consumer in the old country. But I do not want to dwell on that point, everybody understands that feature of the case.

The point I want to emphasize is that this is not a question which concerns alone the producers of wheat in the North-west, but that the eastern manufacturer, the eastern commercial man, is just as deeply interested in a low freight rate to the wheat fields of the west as the producer of wheat in the west is interested in a low freight rate to reach the markets of the world. The ultimate market for the manufacturers and commerce of eastern Canada is necessarily these wheat fields. It is there or it is nowhere. Either you are going to have increased manufactures because of your increased market there, or you are not going to have increased manufactures. Now, it is of just as much importance to you that you should have the lowest possible rate to place your manufactures in these wheat fields as it is that the western farmer should get his grain out at a low rate. The difference between a high rate and a low rate to the western farmer means a difference in his profits; but if you cannot get a rate that will enable you to get your manufactures into the west, you cannot manufacture at all, your throat is cut, you cannot do business.

Now, let me point out just how and where your throat is cut. It is a matter of notoriety that in western Canada the importations of United States machinery for agricultural purposes has increased in recent years far beyond the increase of our population. Your manufacturers of eastern Canada are not keeping pace with the increased

population of the west in their sales. Now, why is this ? There is no difference in the protective duty, and there is no difference in the freight rate over our eastern lines. The difference is because the manufacturing centres of the United States which supply those articles are situated so close to the Canadian boundary enjoy the lowest possible freight rates from the Atlantic coast ; they are therefore able to put their products into our wheat fields at a rate that you in this end of the country cannot compete with under present circumstances. Not only is that so in heavy manufactures, but it is also so in heavy groceries. I have visited the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, and it must be borne in upon any Canadian who visits those cities that the trade of the Canadian North-west is one of the principal reasons for the great prosperity of those cities. This is recognized by the people there, they look upon the North-west of Canada as their meat. They are growing with its growth, they are prospering with its prosperity, and they expect to continue to do so. And unless you can improve the freight rates which at present keep you out of the North-west market, they are going to continue to prosper and grow, and you are going to continue to stand still, as you have done to a very large extent in the past.

What is true of St. Paul and Minneapolis in regard to our North-west is just as true in regard to Spokane in connection with the Kootenay mining district in British Columbia. Spokane papers are published with that in view, the commercial houses are run with that end in view, for the reason that Spokane gets a low freight rate by reason of railway competition. It is close to the Canadian border, and the Canadian Pacific Railway charges a high freight rate from the east. No matter how high you put your duty it is calculated into the freight rates, and you get no benefit from it. I say the cities of Spokane and St. Paul have grown within the past few years as no cities in Canada have done, and their growth has been principally, within very recent years, because of the growth and development of the adjoining North-west of Canada. The reason of that is because they have had the benefit of freight rates which our eastern manufacturers have not got, and when this parliament and this government propose to do anything in the way of increasing railway facilities in that country, it is their first duty to meet that case and see that railroad rates are cut, and cut to the bone. And why not ? If we are guaranteeing the bonds of a railroad company to the amount that will be required to build and equip that railroad, as I understand we are doing on this occasion—and very properly I believe—then there is every reason why we should take into consideration the necessities of our trade in the development of our country, and place the rates on such a basis as will ensure our own markets for our own people.

It has been suggested, when I have mentioned this matter before, that provision is made in these resolutions for a control of rates over this proposed railway. I read :

6. Resolved, That the rates and tolls to be charged for the transfer and carriage of freight and passengers upon the lines of railway so aided and upon the lines owned by the Canadian Northern Railway shall be under the control of the Governor in Council or of such authority, commission or tribunal as is designated or constituted under any Act of the parliament of Canada for the regulation or control of the business of railways.

We are referred to the Railway Commission Bill which is now before the House as the authority which shall control the rates over the Canadian Northern Railway. I have every confidence that it would be possible to provide a Bill that would control these rates, but I have looked at the provision contained in section 260 which, I presume, is the provision relating to the control of tariffs, and I do not find that, in my estimation, it meets the case or that it is intended to meet the case. If I understand the general purposes of the Railway Commission Bill it is that it shall prevent discrimination in rates, that it shall tend to the equalization of rates, that it shall provide against the conditions which prevail throughout Canada where one town is discriminated against in favour of another, or where certain differences are made by one railway from another. It is not the equalization of rates that we want. It is not equalization that we need. As I said a few moments ago, we need that the rates shall be cut to the bone, that we shall get the lowest rate which it is possible to get in order to transact our trade. The Railway Commission Bill does not contemplate any such action and under its provisions as they stand, it would be impossible to take such action because it would be distinctly contrary to the spirit, and even to the letter of the Bill. Therefore, I say the Railway Commission Bill does not meet the case as we understand it. Our claim is that in consideration of special aid given, a special arrangement should be made in regard to rates. Such a condition is not contemplated in the railway commission. The position which I take is that at the time we are making this bargain with this company is the time when we shall agree upon the maximum rates which that company shall charge upon freight going out and coming in. That is the time to make the bargain and it is the only time to make it. We are giving them a definite amount of assistance for a definite purpose. It appears that we can hedge them around with conditions in regard to this, that and the other thing of minor importance, and now is the time to impose the conditions which are of the importance of life and death to the

country served and to this whole country. It is not enough to say that the government even would control the rates. The government has control of rates over many railways in Canada, but I have never heard yet that the government exercised that control with regard to the amount of aid which was given to the railway in order to ensure its construction. I do not know that it would be justified in doing so under the conditions under which aid was given. The only effective reduction of rates which we have had in the North-west Territories has been the reduction that was brought about by the Crow's Nest bargain when, in consideration of a sum of money paid, a specific reduction of rates was given. That was a plain business proposition, and it was satisfactory as far as it went. I believe, still, that the railway company got a good deal the best of the bargain, but this country got something that it never would have got otherwise, and that is the only thing it has ever got out of the aid that it has given to railways. I do not wish to be unpleasant, but I will just draw the attention of the committee to a little incident in connection with the Crow's Nest Railway which would indicate why some of us have not the fullest confidence in the mere general control of rates by the government. Under the Crow's Nest bargain the government has the right to regulate the rates from point to point upon that piece of railway. After that road was put in operation a schedule of rates was put in force which was most unsatisfactory to the towns and villages along the railway. The people complained against that schedule. The complaint was voiced here in this House. I am looking at the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) now, and he will remember that he told us that he had examined that schedule of rates and was satisfied that it was a fair schedule of rates. Not very many months after that the railway company reduced the rates so as to make them fairly satisfactory to the points served? We looked to the government on that occasion to compel the railway company to reduce its rates and we were put in the position of having agreed to a bargain which as far as the public could see meant nothing as to the control of rates on an occasion when that control should most certainly have been exercised. The fact that the company afterwards did reduce the rates shows that the rates were unreasonable. I do not wish to press the matter further at the present time, but as the representative of a part of the North-west Territories, and as the representative of a part of the country to be served by this proposed railway, I must say to the government and to this House that as far as the people there are concerned they will look with very great dissatisfaction upon the fact of large government assistance being given even to this railway unless satisfactory conditions are made as to definite maximum rates along its line, so that it shall be apparent to the country at large that value in rates is being secured at the time the aid is being given.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to say anything in reference to this Bill at present, but the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has made a statement with which I do not coincide in saying that Spokane was built up at the expense of British Columbia on account of high freight rates. I am going to ask him the distance between Spokane and the Kootenay, and the coast cities and the Kootenay. I may say that Spokane is fifty miles from the Kootenay country whereas the coast cities are 425 miles from it. Hon. gentlemen can easily see that it could not be on account of the difference in freight rates that Spokane has been built up at the expense of our country for the simple reason that there is no comparison to be made in that regard. It is rather because the people on the American side were more progressive and took possession of the land.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson) if he admits that Spokane has been built up largely by the trade of the Kootenay?

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, I do not admit that at all. I say that Spokane has been built up largely on account of the gold and copper mines of the Kootenay. The people from the American side came over possessed themselves of the land which was there and built up Spokane from the profits of the mines. It was entirely because of the gold they took out of the country.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to say in regard to freight rates that Spokane is not an originator of traffic. It is not a manufacturing city nor a city built on commerce. Its supplies have to be brought by rail from ocean ports and from manufacturing centres. It is within, I believe, 150 miles of Nelson, which is the commercial centre of the Kootenay country. Nelson is just as close to the manufacturing centres from which Spokane draws its supplies as Spokane is, and if Spokane draws the trade rather than Nelson, it is because Spokane has better freight rates than Nelson, and we are here to see that Nelson gets as good freight rates as Spokane when the opportunity arises.

On the second resolution,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the scheme of the second clause of the resolution? Is it intended that there shall be a mortgage to a trustee which shall be security to the debenture holders as well as the guarantee of the government, or is it intended that there shall be a mortgage to the government, securing the govern-

ment against any loss consequent upon its guarantee of the bonds ? The resolution is rather indefinite as to that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The proposal was that bonds should issue with a mortgage to a trustee, the bonds being endorsed by the government. Also there should be an additional mortgage upon the other portion of the company's system which are already encumbered to some extent, that would be a separate and independent instrument.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are two distinct things. One is a series of bonds guaranteed by the Crown. In passing, I may say that there should be some definition of the word 'government' which is not a word known to the law, and in the Manitoba Act the word 'government,' although used in the statute, was defined in the first instance as meaning the Crown represented by the executive government in Manitoba, and I suppose that course will be pursued in this case. Now, you may have bonds guaranteed by the government and also secured by a mortgage to the trustee. That is one proposition. I would not suppose that very much additional value would be given to the bonds by mortgage over the line of railway, provided they are secured by a guarantee of the government, because in that way the credit of the whole country, including the railway and everything else, is pledged to the holders of the bonds for the time being. If we are to give the guarantee of the government, one would suppose the best course would be a mortgage to the government securing the government against any loss consequent upon the guarantee which it had given for the purpose of securing these bonds. There are two distinct methods of procedure, and I cannot quite understand from the second clause of the resolution which of those modes is proposed, though I would supppose, looking on it from a practical standpoint, that the latter one would be preferred by the government. What is really intended by the second clause ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I stated that what was in the mind of the drafter of the resolution was that bonds should issue in the ordinary way, bearing the government guarantee, and that a mortgage should issue to the trustee or trustees, which should cover all the assets and property of the railway company as mentioned to secure these bonds.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I realize that a mortgage of that kind could be drawn in such a way as to be a security to the Crown, but it would require to contain provisions very different from those which are usually contained in a mortgage given to a trustee for the purpose of securing bonds on a railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course it would.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It must not only be for the benefit of the bondholders, but there must be elaborate provisions in it for the purpose of enabling the government to take advantage of any provisions of the mortgage upon default being made by the company, and upon the government paying any sums the company would otherwise be obliged to pay. May I ask the minister, whether or not the mortgage proposed to be taken has been drafted ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not yet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would have, perhaps, been more satisfactory to us if that had been before the House, so that we might understand the remedies which the government would have in such a case. The result of a default might be that the government might acquire the right to enter into possession of this railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what we would contemplate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, the ordinary form of mortgage would not at all cover that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me it might make some difference in the consideration of this proposition if the House knew exactly what the terms of the proposal were in that regard. The mortgage is one of the all important features in this connection. For example, to what extent must the company be in default in the payment of interest before the government can enter and take possession and operate the road as its own ? What remedies will the government have in that regard ? What right would the company have in such a case to come in and redeem its property from the possession of the government. There are a great many interesting questions which would arise upon the consideration of the terms of the proposed mortgage, and if the Minister does not present to the House a draft of the mortgage, he ought to be in a position to give us some outline of the provisions in that respect which the mortgage will contain when this transaction is carried through to a conclusion. Suppose the company should be in default of its interest for a number of years, during which the government is paying interest upon these bonds, when would the time come at which the government could take some proceedings for the purpose of enforcing against the railway repayment of the money which it has been obliged to advance on behalf of the company ; when do you reach the stage at which the govern-

ment shall have the power to enter into possession of the road and to operate it in such a way as to relieve itself from any such burden in the future ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All these are matters of detail and they will have, of course, to be covered by any documents that are executed between the parties. We have fully in our minds that all these points and others must necessarily arise, when we are proceeding to draft the security which is to be given and held by the government, and which it would be perhaps unnecessary to anticipate at this stage. The resolutions are clear, we are providing that aid shall be given in such a way, and shall be carried out by such instruments as will fully secure the government. At the same time, if the government should make any advances in respect of the interest defaulted by the company, or make any payment on account of the principal, we would necessarily step into the position of the original creditors or bondholders for the full amount we had paid. All these things have to be thought out very carefully, and I think it would not be wise for us hastily to draft the document in order to lay them before parliament. There need be no great hurry in framing the instrument. We will take all the time necessary in order that the public interests shall be fully safeguarded. I can quite understand that my hon. friend would wish it to be very carefully prepared ; but in order to this careful preparation, it is not essential that it should be done now. In fact, it would be difficult to have it prepared now with the care and deliberation with which a transaction of this kind ought to be managed. It must rest on the responsibility of the government entirely to see that the conditions under which parliament has granted the aid shall be observed. I think this a reasonable view to present to the committee, and I certainly would be very loath to think that the committee or the House would desire to have all these minute details laid on the Table, and action with respect to the matter precipitated.

Mr. SCHELL. The hon. minister made some interesting remarks when viewed in connection with the remarks of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who said that no doubt this $13,000 a mile would cover the entire cost of this road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not expressed that opinion.

Mr. SCHELL. The hon. member for Alberta did so. The minister said that the government must take precautions to have a thorough security. I do not know that a security on your own property would be a good security ; I do not know that any money-lender would consider that good security for the money he was lending. This clause reads :

> The said mortgage shall also form a charge next after the charges existing thereon.

You take a mortgage for part of the money only, and a second mortgage at that. We do not know how many preferred bonds may be on the property under the $10,000 agreement. Before we go any further, I think the contract and the map should be in the hands of the members of this House, if a proper contract is to be made. One reason for the strong feeling which is abroad in the country to-day against subsidies being given to railroads is that for a number of years past the subsidies given, with the small amount of bonded indebtedness added, have been sufficient to build all the roads that have been built, and the railway promoters have put in little or nothing. It is very easy for people to become millionaires if the money is put into their hands. I hope the minister will take the House into his confidence and let us have this contract before the matter is further gone into.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that his supposition that we were without knowledge of either the character or the amount of the prior securities on the other portion of the Northern system, is not well founded. Perhaps the hon. member was not present when I stated to the committee the facts in regard to that. If not, he will see them in 'Hansard' to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister says that these are matters of detail. They are in one sense ; but they are matters of detail that depend on principle. For example, all that this clause provides is that the government shall have a first charge. The method of enforcing that charge, the time at which it shall be enforced, the consequences of enforcing it, are not dealt with. The provisions in that regard are not as definite as they were in the case of the Drummond Counties Railway, where the document itself was brought down, or in the case of the agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We were purchasing a property, and we had come to an agreement, and we submitted to this House the agreement which had been arrived at.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the case of the Grand Trunk you were acquiring terminals, and were providing for some aid for the Victoria bridge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We did not provide the aid in that document, but by a separate vote, as a separate proposition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there not an agreement submitted to the House in regard to that as well?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, that was not part of the agreement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know that it was not part of the agreement as to the terminals; but was it not in an agreement by itself?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty is that one seems hardly to be able fully to grasp the proposition when the clause is couched in such general terms as this. How is the House to judge accurately as to the future relations between the government and the company? You have a clause which simply provides that there shall be a first charge, and the committee have nothing before it to show the conditions under which that charge can be enforced, or under which the government might be obliged at some future time to operate the railway. If the minister cannot place the mortgage before the House, can he not give us an outline of the policy or the scope of the proposed mortgage? If any clause of the agreement is to stand, I would suggest that it should be this one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection to that if the hon. gentleman desires it; but I do not accede to the suggestion with any intention of conveying the impression to the mind of my hon. friend that I think it would be desirable that precise statements should be made in respect to the matters he alludes to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am speaking of an outline.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If I attempted to give an outline, it would be necessary for me to indicate with some definiteness what the proposals are to be. We think parliament ought to be willing to leave the working out of these proposals in our hands, on our responsibility. Of course, the question of responsibility arises anyway. We bring the proposals here on our responsibility, and the responsibility remains. Parliament has said, you may do so and so, you may make such and such arrangements with this company, safeguarding the public interests. After parliament has settled on this, we shall proceed to examine the question in all its bearings. It then becomes a matter of negotiation and discussion as to how and with what particular restrictions and regulations this arrangement is to be worked out. Take the question, which I have not been able to think about very much yet, as to when the government would be justified in exercising its power of retaking this property on default in the payment of interest, it is a very proper thing to consider in all its bearings as to whether a reasonable time might not be allowed to elapse before taking over the road, and it would not be wise to say that such time shall be one, two or three years or more. Conditions might arise that would make it contrary to public interest to enforce this power and take possession. It must be for the government, with a knowledge of all the facts, to say, when a default takes place, whether it should enforce its power or not—whether it should or not allow the interest to accumulate and the company to operate the road. All these things are matters concerning which it would not be wise to make any definite statement because our future course must be guided by the circumstances.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 190) respecting Queen's College, Kingston.—Mr. Harty.

Bill (No. 195) for the relief of James Reid Steele.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 196) for the relief of William Allen.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 197) respecting the Rocky Mountains Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Costigan.

SUPPLY—CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House, and particularly of the government, to a matter of long standing, which seems to me has been now put off long enough, and should be settled for the sake of the good name of Canada. With the indulgence of the House, I shall speak for a few moments upon a matter which I can only class as a debt of honour. I can quite understand that the matter of the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway has become rather hackneyed in the last ten or fifteen years. But, while it may be hackneyed, so long as it is not settled, it remains a stain upon the honour of this country and an impediment in the way of those who desire to secure the investment of capital, particularly of British capital in this Dominion. The promoters of the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway have abandoned the construction of that railway. Therefore, I am not here to-night urging upon the government that they should vote a subsidy to this company, or that they should allow this company to proceed and complete the works, but I am

here to appeal to the government to settle with these people and so—to repeat the expression I have already used—wipe off a debt of honour of the Dominion of Canada. I do not propose to take up more time than is absolutely necessary in explaining this matter. In the first place, I wish to contend that the connecting of the waters of the Bay of Fundy and Northumberland straits was a matter decided not by one government alone, but by two governments at least. Away back as early as 1825—to trace the history of this matter for a few moments—a survey of the Baie Verte canal to connect the waters of the St. Lawrence at Baie Verte with the Bay of Fundy by cutting across the isthmus uniting Nova Scotia with New Brunswick was made by Mr. F. Hall. At a later date, about 1840, Mr. Thomas Telford, a civil engineer, revised the report of Mr. Hall upon the subject, and afterwards another report upon the same project was prepared by a royal engineer, Captain Crawley. I will not go into all the surveys and reports made upon this subject, but will come to the year 1870, when an Order in Council was passed by the government of that day, the government of Sir John Macdonald, appointing certain eminent engineers and others as a committee to investigate and report upon the proposed transportation facilities of the Dominion of Canada. That commission consisted of Mr. C. S. Gzowski, of Toronto; Mr. D. D. Calvin, of Kingston; Mr. George Laidlaw, of Toronto; Sir Hugh Allan, of Montreal; Mr. Pierre Garneau, of Quebec; Hon. William Stairs, of Halifax, and Mr. Alexander Jardine, of St. John. In the Order in Council, they were instructed to institute a thorough inquiry into the whole subject with all its bearings both in a commercial and engineering point of view, with the object of obtaining such reliable information as might furnish the necessary data on which to base a plan for the improvement of the canal system of the Dominion of a comprehensive character, and such as would enable Canada to compete with success for the transit trade of the great west; and further to inquire with regard to a number of works and improvements, and among those works enumerated was the construction of the Baie Verte canal across the isthmus dividing the Bay of Fundy from the gulf of St. Lawrence. And the commissioners were further instructed by this Order in Council to report as to the works and improvements which ought to, in their judgment, be constructed. On the 24th February, 1871, the commission submitted their report, which stated the following with reference to the Baie Verte canal:

> Inseparably connected with the growth of the intercolonial trade is the construction of the Bay Verte canal, across the isthmus connecting the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The advantages that must accrue, not merely to the Dominion as a whole, but to the commerce of the maritime provinces, are so clearly pointed out by the Boards of Trade of all the leading cities of Canada and by men interested in the development of our commercial interests, not simply the merchants of St. John and other places in the locality of the proposed canal, but merchants of Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa and Quebec, that it is superfluous for the commissioners to do more than briefly refer to a few salient features of the scheme.
>
> A steamer laden with flour for St. John, N.B., now goes down the gulf as far as Shediac where the cargo is transported by rail to its destination. The total distance by water from Shediac through the gut of Canso and around the coast of Nova Scotia to the Bay of Fundy as far as the commercial capital of New Brunswick is about 600 miles, and the consequence is that there is little or no direct communication between the Bay of Fundy ports and those of the River St. Lawrence. By a canal through the isthmus the distance from Shediac to St. John will not be much more than 100 miles.
>
> This fact will show the insuperable obstacle that now exists to anything like extensive commerce between Montreal and the Bay of Fundy ports of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the great impulse which must be necessarily given to trade by the opening up of a route which will shorten distance so considerably, furnish an inland navigation from the lakes to Boston, and consequently lessen freight between these points at least 25 per cent.

The report then goes on to show all the interests of the maritime provinces that would be benefited, particularly in the matter of the coal trade. The freight to Boston, they say, would be reduced at least $1 per ton. The lumber and fishery interests of the gulf of St. Lawrence, both of Prince Edward Island and what is generally known as the north shore of New Brunswick, will also be benefited equally with the coal trade of Pictou, by their being afforded a safer and shorter route, not only to the ports of the Bay of Fundy, but also to those of the north-western coast of the United States.

These distinguished men discussed the benefits of the construction of the Bay of Fundy canal. They referred to the great importance it would be, not only to the provinces down by the sea, but to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. They then conclude by referring to the great impulse it will give to the ship-building and carrying trade of the Dominion generally. In their report they classify the relative importance of the several public works which are under their eye, and the proposed improvements to which their attention has been directed, and they recommended these works in the order in which they should be proceeded with. In this plan they divided the works into four separate classes, and in the first class they placed the construction of the Bay Verte canal. In the report on the engineering aspects, I find the following:

> The evidence submitted points out with remarkable force and unanimity the necessity of opening a highway for commerce between the gulf of the St. Lawrence and the head waters of the Bay of Fundy through the Isthmus of Chignecto, dividing them.

And submitting a report of Mr. Keefer, C. E., endorsed by Mr. Gzowski, they said :

We think this will remove all doubt as to the practicability of the proposed undertaking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after that report had been submitted, the then government of the day voted certain sums of money for the construction of this work, as they classed it, of first class importance. The Mackenzie government coming into power, took this up and voted in one year the sum of $1,000,000 to connect the waters of Northumberland Straits with the Bay of Fundy. They had an engineer make more exhaustive reports. Mr. Mackenzie stated in the House that if that canal could be built for $5,000,000 he was quite willing to expend that amount of money, and towards that purpose he voted $1,000,000. It was found afterwards by a more careful examination by engineers that the work would cost, not $5,000,000, but probably between $9,000,000 and $10,000,000, and that amount rather staggered the project. They said they could not afford to spend so large a sum of money even upon so important a work.

Now I want to point out that the government of Canada at that time was quite willing to expend $5,000,000 to connect the waters of the Northumberland Straits and those of the Bay of Fundy. The matter then lay quiescent until a Canadian engineer named Ketchum, eminent in his profession, came forward and said to the government of Canada : You want to connect these waters, you are willing to pay $5,000,000, you say, but you cannot afford to pay $10,000,000. I will build a ship railway across this Isthmus connecting these two waters, and it will cost you very much less than to construct a canal. Mr. Ketchum's scheme was submitted to the government, it was endorsed and approved by the chief engineer of Railways and Canals in his report dated February 4, 1882. A company of Canadians was incorporated; and I am going to try to show that this scheme was concocted by Canadians, that Canadians went to London with the charter granted by the parliament of Canada, and secured the money which was spent upon this undertaking, and that money was lost by the British investors through what I consider the fault of the government and parliament of Canada. This company of Canadians, then, was incorporated. They did not have any money to spend upon the ship railway, and it was never supposed they would spend money upon a ship railway, they were simply a legal entity. They approached the parliament of Canada for certain legislation. Now, Sir, in 1882 the parliament of Canada passed two Acts, one incorporating this Canadian company and another granting a subsidy of $150,000 per year for twenty-five years. I want to call your attention to the words in the subsidy Act :

In consideration of the great advantages which would accrue to the maritime provinces and the intercolonial trade of Canada generally from the construction of a ship railway across the Isthmus of Chignecto——

Etc. In the Act incorporating the company it is stated that this was done because the construction of the railway would be especially conducive to the development of the commercial interests and the coasting trade of the maritime provinces. The next year, 1883, the Canadian parliament passed another Act fixing the capital of the company at £400,000 in shares, and £700,000 in debenture bonds on the estimated cost of the railway. Meanwhile the representatives of the company named in the Incorporation Act went to London and consulted leading engineers, at the same time endeavouring to arrange for capital. But they found this could not be obtained on the terms offered by the government, and they returned to Canada and made a report. In 1886, the Canadian parliament therefor passed another Act, changing the subsidy from $150,000 per annum for twenty-five years, to the actuarial equivalent, namely, $170,602 for twenty years, as a further inducement to enable them to secure British capital. At the time a report was made upon the project by Sir Benjamin Baker, probably the leading canal engineer of the world, who reported favourably. In obtaining this Act this Canadian company made a contract with the government to construct a railway. Mark you, the government was to pay them $170,602 per year for twenty years, but had not however to pay a cent until the railway was completed. Had they been an ordinary railway company they would have been paid on progress estimates. But in this case they were not to receive one cent until the road had been constructed and in operation. On the above terms the capital was promised in London provided that the engineers' surveys, plans and specification were approved by the Canadian government. This was done on May 23, 1888. It was then obviously impossible to finish the work on July 1, 1889, which was the date named. As the object was to obtain capital in London, the Canadian parliament were prevailed upon to pass another Act making the date for completing the railway July 1, 1892. That then was the date upon which the railway was to be completed. I desire to call attention to this fact, because the Canadian government has said that this extension of time to complete the railway was granted to the investors. But it could not be said that it was a grant to the British investors except in a technical sense, as the railway had not then been commenced, and the British investors had no connection with it until 1889 when they were induced to find the capital and to undertake the work. I wish to refer at this point to some remarks made in the Canadian parliament in reference to the effect of the legislation which was then going through. The Hon. Alex-

ander Mackenzie, the then leader of the Liberal opposition, said :

He (Mr. Ketchum) will no doubt obtain the money in the English market with the guarantee of the Canadian government.

The same language was held from the passing of the first Act in 1882 to the passing of the last Act in 1888, on which occasion Sir Charles Tupper, who was then Finance Minister, said :

The government is not asked to pay any money but simply to enable English capitalists to furnish all the money required to give us the work at half the cost we could obtain these advantages in any other way.

Therefore, between 1882 and 1888 the Canadian parliament passed two original Acts and amended them by subsequent Acts passed in 1882, 1886 and 1889. The proforma Canadian Company was composed of twenty-one incorporators with the sole object of making the enterprise sufficiently attractive to investors to induce them to find the capital. The prospectus was ready in the beginning of 1889, when it was found that in the meantime parliament had amended the General Railway Act of the country. Section 93 of the Railway Act which deals with the issue of bonds had the following subsection added thereto :

No bonds or debentures shall be issued until 20 per cent of the cost has been actually expended on the work.

The company, therefore, could not issue their debentures and could only offer the £300,000 of preference shares. These were issued on March 20th, and were subscribed for. I desire to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that had it not been for this amendment to the Railway Act, had it not been for this subsection, the company which at that time stood in a first-class financial position in London could have raised every dollar to complete the work by the sale of their debentures if they had been allowed an opportunity to issue them, but they were not by the addition of this subsection. The work commenced. The construction proceeded and £220,000, or over $1,000,000 was expended upon it, before, according to that subsection, the company could legally issue any debentures. This amount was expended, as rapidly as they could expend it by the advice of their engineers, until November, 1889. In the meantime, after they had spent this amount, a financial crash came. There was trouble in the Argentine republic, Baring Bros. suspended payment in London, and the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company found themselves in such a position that only £250,000 of the £700,000 of debentures authorized, could be sold, and the financial troubles of the company have continued from that day down to the present. In 1892 this very subsection which had created the trouble, and which had been passed by the Dominion parliament, was repealed as it was found that it was not wise Canadian legislation. Let me recapitulate these statements. First, the law was changed in 1888——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the subsection ?

Mr. LOGAN. The original section of the Railway Act which deals with the issue of bonds and debentures was amended by the addition of the following subsection :

No bonds or debentures shall be issued until 20 per cent of the cost has been actually expended on the work.

Second, for this reason the company could not legally issue any bonds until £220,000 had been expended on the railway. But for this the company could have got all the money they required. Thirdly, as soon as the company got into a position to issue bonds, in November, 1889, the financial panic was on, and fourthly, this subsection was repealed in 1892. The financial depression became a little less severe afterwards, and the directors of the company succeeded in making a provisional contract to complete the railway with Messrs. Pearson & Sons, of London, and also in obtaining the necessary capital. In 1892 the company applied to the government of the day for an extension of time, and the government issued an Order in Council, dated July 9, 1892, promising, that provided the works were actually in progress and the capital secured to complete the railway by July 1, 1894, the government would recommend to parliament an extension of the time for the charter. Mr. Provand, one of the directors of the company and a member of the Imperial House of Commons, cabled to the Rt. Hon. Sir John Thompson, the Prime Minister at that time, as follows :

To the Right Hon. Sir John Thompson,
Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

We have now secured the capital to complete the Chignecto railway, and have settled with first-class firm of contractors to commence the work immediately that we receive an extension of time sufficient to complete them, say two years, for which I now apply on behalf of company.

(Signed) A. D. PROVAND.

Sir John Thompson replied by cable that it was then too late in the session to consider the question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What year was that in ?

Mr. LOGAN. That was in 1894. In October, 1894, Mr. George E. Foster went to London. A deputation of the Chignecto people waited on him and he made the following statement to them :

The government, however, in this matter is bound to take in other considerations than those of strict and absolute legality, and I can assure you—and that is as far as I can go in an assurance as a responsible member of the government—that the government will take this matter up as was promised Mr. Provand, and we will

give it our best consideration on the grounds of what might be called moral obligations—of how it may affect credit, and also as we are primarily bound to do, in respect to the best interests of our own people, for whom we are trustees, and for whom we are bound to act with great care and prudence.

I think you are perfectly right in asking that you should have a decision upon this question as soon as possible. It has been impossible, and I may say it is impossible, to have a question of this gravity considered without what we call a full meeting of Council, and circumstances during the holidays have rendered it impossible for the government to be assembled in force. As you know, Sir John Thompson is coming to London for a few weeks, and as soon as he returns I have no doubt at all that the government will take the matter up and dispose of it so that you may, I think, confidently look for an answer to this question some where about the middle of December.

That was in 1894, nine years ago. Shortly after that Sir John Thompson died at Windsor. In May, 1895, Mr. Provand was summoned to Ottawa by cable from one of the ministers. He received a letter from Mr. Foster, then Minister of Finance at Ottawa, as follows :

Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Canada,
May 29, 1895.

Dear Mr. Provand,—In pursuance of your conversation this morning in reference to the application made by you for an extension of time for the completion of the Chignecto Marine Railway, I beg to write you as follows :—The government has listened carefully to the presentation of the case of the company made by you, and, while disposed to attach all responsible weight to the reasons adduced for an extension of time, find it difficult under the present circumstances when every effort is being made to strengthen the financial position of Canada by cutting off appropriations and refusing to enter into further obligations, to give a conclusive answer at present. The government will, however, take up your case for final disposition next year, and you may consider that the consequent delay does not in any way imply an unfavourable view of the company's claims, and is entirely without prejudice to their further consideration.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) GEORGE E. FOSTER.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What year was that in ?

Mr. LOGAN. That was in 1895. Early in 1896 the government of the day agreed, as I understand it, to pass an Act during the approaching session revoting the subsidy. A private Bill was introduced into this House in 1896 to extend the time of the charter. This private Bill was defeated by a snap vote, so-called by one majority, but it was replaced on the order paper by a majority of seventeen. On account of the celebrated debate upon the school question that session, that parliament closed without the question again being taken up, and since that time, Mr. Speaker, to make a long story short, the company have been knocking at the doors of the parliament of Canada asking for some redress for the condition of affairs in which they have found themselves. They claim that they were led into it to a very large extent by the Dominion government, by the high commissioner of Canada in England, and by the cabinet ministers of the day. I contend that the Canadian government were largely responsible for the promotion of this railway. It was first decided that it was necessary to connect the waters ; secondly, it was decided that it was too expensive to build a canal ; thirdly, Mr. Ketchum came forward with his Canadian company and asked the government of Canada to give them a charter. That charter was given to them and they went to England, and British investors put their capital into this scheme. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the people of this country know that there has been sunk in that railway, British capital to the extent of over $4,000,000. Sir Richard Cartwright now the Minister of Trade and Commerce, made the following statement in parliament :

The fact of parliament granting a subsdy of $170,000 a year for twenty years to this railway will imply to the minds of English capitalists, from whose pockets I take it that this money is expected, that the Canadian government have looked into the work, that they believe it to be a valuable work, and that it may fairly be implied that the government believe it to be reasonably profitable to those people whose money we are practically securing in consequence of our having granted a subsidy.

Sir Charles Tupper, Bart, then High Commissioner, when a deputation waited on him in London said :

In the light of all that has occurred, in the light of my thorough knowledge and familiarity with the sections of the country through which this railway is to run, and with my knowledge of the commercial business and shipping trade of Canada, I have no hesitation in saying I believe to-day that all that is required is the capital to be forthcoming to complete this undertaking to make it not only a thorough engineering but an equally great financial success, and that the return the parties supplying the capital may confidently look forward to is placed as much, in my judgment, beyond doubt, in connection with the subsidy which is provided by the government of Canada, as any financial undertaking or business enterprise that was ever presented to the public.

That is what the High Commissioner for Canada, speaking to these investors said; and after they had put $4,000,000 of their money into this enterprise, these people approaching him as the representative of Canada, were told that it was as good an investment as any financial undertaking or business enterprise that was ever presented to the public. And upon the statements formerly made by the High Commissioner of Canada, representing Canada as he did, the English investors poured their money into this enterprise, and yet, Sir, when they afterwards were caught by the amendment to the Railway Act; when they were not able to issue their debentures at a time

when the money market was in good condition; when they found themselves caught by financial depression and the suspension of Baring Bros.; then, when they came to the government of Canada and asked them to extend the time, simply to extend the time for the completion of this work, the government of Canada put them off and told them to wait until next year. And, Sir, they have waited until next year; they have waited from 1893 to 1903, a period of ten long years. Why should these people have been treated in that way? Why should they not have that extension of time? You may say that it was a wild-cat scheme if you like; you may say that it was condemned by every shipping man in Canada; you may say that every captain that sails the seas says it was a waste of money; but that makes it all the worse, because if it is a wild-cat scheme, then what becomes of the splendid future for the company that was held out to the investors by the government of Canada through its representative in England, and what becomes of the responsibility of Canada on account of such representations. Do you imagine for a moment, Sir, that if Canadian investors had sunk $4,000,000 in a concern and had asked for an extension of time that they would not have been able to pull enough strings to get that extension of time? Are we to treat the British investor who sunk his money in a Canadian enterprise in a different manner from that in which we would treat a Canadian investor? Take the case of the Interprovincial Bridge Company which is within a stones throw of this House of Commons. A charter was granted in 1882, the time was extended in 1890, the time was extended again in 1892; the time was extended again in 1896; the time was extended again in 1898. I might give other instances of a similar character, but I do not want to take up unnecessarily the time of the House. Let me quote again from Sir Charles Tupper:

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give me the year that Sir Richard Cartwright made that speech which has been quoted?

Mr. LOGAN. I cannot give the exact date, but I quoted it from 'Hansard.' These investors in the ship railway had another interview with Sir Charles Tupper and replying to them on the 20th of March, 1893, he said:

> There is no doubt whatever that the parties who have invested their money in this enterprise are in a position to claim from the government of Canada, in my opinion, the fullest and fairest consideration. They have entered upon this measure upon no imperfect calculations. Every means that were possible that could be taken to warrant the enterprise being presented to capitalists as a sound enterprise were taken.

And as to the extension of time to complete the railway he said:

Now, it is not necessary to dwell more upon that unfortunate and untoward event that has brought this work to a standstill; but I am afraid you cannot expect the government of Canada to do more than they have set forth in the Order in Council—that is to say, that when, as you have rightly said, it is not usual for governments or anybody else to expect contractors—especially in connection with very great undertakings—to complete them at the time—and I know of no instance in which any government or any respectable concern of any kind have ever taken advantage of the stoppage of the work, from circumstances altogether beyond the control of the parties, for the purpose of relieving themselves of any responsibility. I do not believe the government of Canada will do so. I do not believe it. I believe not only their sense of right and of justice to the promoters and capitalists connected with the great enterprise, but their regard for the financial standing and character of the country itself, will ensure to you that, if at an early period you are in a position to comply with the terms of the Order in Council, you will find a fair and reasonable extension of the time necessary to complete the work. I have great pleasure in saying that to you, because I feel you are entitled to that consideration, and I am sure it will not be withheld by the government of Canada.

I could quote at considerable length, Mr. Speaker, the opinions of Canadian newspapers on this Chignecto Marine Transport Railway matter, but I shall select only a few. Take the following from the Toronto 'Globe,' which said:

> The question more immediately concerning the Canadian people is to what extent the Dominion government is liable. It is true that the promise of a twenty years' subsidy was conditional on the completion of the work, but it is equally obvious that the action of parliament was the bait which caught the British investor, who would not have bitten at a naked hook. The original subsidy promised in 1882 was for $150,000 a year for twenty-five years, but in 1886 this was changed to a subsidy of $170,000 a year for twenty years. If we repudiate all responsibility, as technically we should be warranted in doing, the credit of the Dominion would suffer, for there can be no doubt that we have incurred a considerable degree of moral responsibility in connection with the undertaking.

The following is from the Ottawa Daily 'Free Press,' which says:

> But there is an aspect of the case which is almost painful, as it practically amounts to a national disgrace. On the strength of the endorsation given it by governmental and parliamentary procedure, many people in Britain have been induced to sink money in the project which must now be regarded as lost.

Mr. Provand addressed a meeting of senators in Ottawa, and the proceedings were reported in the Ottawa 'Evening Journal' of the following day, from which I quote. When he had finished his address, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who was Prime Minister in the last administration, said:

> Mr. Provand did not claim he had any legal right, but put his claim on moral and equitable grounds, and on the ground that all other subsidized enterprises, except this one, had been

given renewals when they failed to carry out their work in the first instance. He knew of no other company than the Ship Railway Company but had been treated otherwise. Mr. Provand's position was 'treat us as you have treated others, otherwise give us compensation.' He claimed the investors had looked at the Acts of parliament, and seeing that they were ensured so much, had therefore put their money into the project.

I will quote what was said by the Hon. Sir John Abbott, then Prime Minister, in the debate which took place on the application for the renewal of this charter :

It seems to me that we are to a great degree bound in good faith to give these contractors the opportunity of completing this work. I do not see very well how we could refuse them. I think a refusal to allow men who have spent three millions of dollars to spend $1,500,000 more would work very unfortunately on our enterprises, when we apply to England to borrow money to finish them with, and I think it would be an extremely hard measure to mete out to these contractors to say that, not having completed their work within the precise time mentioned in the contract, they should be mulct of so large a sum as they have invested in it.

I will not quote any more from newspapers or from the speeches of public men of Canada. The company are asking, as they have been for the last ten years, for compensation. They claim that they are not being fairly treated. They claim that other companies have been given instructions to build certain works in Canada in a semi-partnership with the Dominion government, and that these companies have been compensated when they had not an opportunity of completing their contract. This company claim that they were partners of the Dominion government in connecting the waters of the Bay of Fundy with those of the Northumberland straits, and thus carrying out the project of the commission which I had quoted in the first part of my remarks. They come and ask that, as they were led into this undertaking by the action of parliament and its agent, they be compensated to some extent for the loss they have sustained.

Apart from that phase of the subject altogether, the Chignecto Ship Railway bonds and other securities are to-day spread among the whole investing public of Great Britain. I have a list here of about thirty banking institutions which hold Chignecto Ship Railway bonds and shares, including the London and Westminster Bank; Balli and Sons (Greek bankers); Capital and Counties Bank; Martins Bank, Limited; Prescotts Bank; Union Bank; Union Bank of Scotland; Cocks, Biddulph and Company; Manchester and County Bank; Coutts and Company; Lacond, Youall and Company; National Bank, Limited; and so on. Nearly every great financial institution in London hold the bonds and shares of this unfortunate company. Do you not think, Sir, that it is against the best interests of Canada that this matter should remain unsettled ? If the government of Canada can see its way clear to come to a reasonable settlement with these people, it will certainly do us good in the financial markets of Great Britain. Those who have visited London know that you meet this matter whenever you talk to financial men over there. They refer to the bad treatment that was meted out to the Chignecto Ship Railway people; and when you place before them a Canadian proposition for the investment of their money, they point you to the history of that company, and say : That is the way you treated one British company; you got our money by representations, and then you refused to extend the time, and afterwards refused to compensate us for the money we expended. Apart from other phases of the subject, do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that it would pay the Dominion of Canada in the long run to settle this matter once and for all, and remove it as a stain from the financial credit of the country ?

The company have spent, as I said, about $4,000,000. They do not ask for the return of all that money, by any means. I am told by the representative of the company that they have paid in freights and in customs duties into the treasury of Canada about $500,000. Are we going to keep that money which these people have given us to bring in the machinery for the construction of their railway ? They ask first for reasonable compensation for the large expenditure they have made. They did not default in the payment of their men. The work happens to be in the county of Cumberland, which I represent. It does not make any difference to me politically what is done with this company; but I am here to plead with the government to treat these people in such a way as will remove the difficulties which exist between the company and the government and in the financial markets of England.

There is one other consideration in this matter. In settling with this company, the government will also be settling a debt of honour to the county of Cumberland. That county, of course, anxious to secure the operation of this railway within its borders, granted the company a free right of way, for which the people bought the land and borrowed the money, taxing themselves to do so. They ask that if any settlement is made between the government and the company, it be arranged that this right of way, which was given for a specific purpose that has not been carried out, and which is not of any value to the railway people, they having abandoned the project, shall be returned to the county of Cumberland. Let me repeat that the company are not asking for any extension of time, as they have abandoned the project altogether; but they are throwing themselves on the mercy of Canada, and are asking the government of Canada to wipe out what we must all regard as a national debt of honour.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Some years ago, when I was in London I was asked to meet two gentlemen. I did so, and I found that they were trustees for the Chignecto Ship Railway bondholders. I knew very little about that project further than what I had seen occasionally in the newspapers; but they explained the position of affairs to me, gave me the history of the company, told me how they had been induced to invest money in it, and asked me if I did not think they had a just and fair claim on the government for a return of their money or for substantial compensation. The case as they put it before me interested me, and on my return to Canada, and after I became a member of this House, a year afterwards, I looked into the origin of this scheme, and I found that, as far as I could judge, there was a practically unanimous approval of the scheme by the parliament of Canada, not only when the Conservatives were in power, but when the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was at the head of the government. There was a curious unanimity in favour of the scheme by eminent engineers, and it was endorsed apparently by the business men of the country. At all events it was endorsed very strongly by the business men of the lower provinces, who ought to have known what its value was commercially. The result was that a company was formed, and parties went to England from this side and pressed on English investors the soundness of the scheme and the substantial aid which the Dominion government were giving to it; and a large amount of capital was raised. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has gone into the details very fully, giving the dates, and stating the various stages through which the company passed, so that I need not refer to these.

The company spent altogether about $4,000,000. Through a notorious misadventure on their part, they overlooked a clause in the Government Act which provided that they should spend 25 per cent of the capital subscribed before borrowing on the market. This prevented their raising the money. The money, however, required to complete the scheme was practically raised, and but for the financial crash of the Barings and those associated with that large firm, this scheme would have been completed and this government would have been bound to pay $170,000 per year for twenty or twenty-five years. I told the trustees that in my judgment the scheme was a wild and visionary one, and that I would not advise the government, in any shape or way, to grant a furtherance of that subsidy on their completing the work, but it is clear that the government and these gentlemen who put their money into this scheme were practically in partnership, because these gentlemen were to obtain no return until the work was completed, and the government were under no obligation until the work was done. Therefore, it was a question of mutual good faith. These men went on in good faith, but because of a financial panic they were unable to complete their scheme when practically three-fourths of the work was done. Had the government extended their charter —and I suppose that no extension is ever refused where substantial work is done— they would have been entitled to the subsidy, and I think that it is clearly a breech of faith on the part of the country to refuse to recognize the obligation the country is under to pay back, to some extent, at all events, to these men the money they have put into this enterprise. Looking at it as business men, we all wonder how it was possible such a scheme could have been inaugurated and backed up by our leading engineers, politicians and business men, still they apparently thought it would be a paying transaction and a substantial advantage to that particular section of the country. The scheme, I believe, would have been a failure, had it been completed.

At this point the electric lights went out, and the hon. member was unable, for a few minutes, to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. OSLER. Mr. Speaker, if I were personally interested in this matter, and of a superstitious nature, I might take the sudden going out of these lights as rather an ill-augury of the cause which I am now arguing. But I rather take it as an indication that this House, recognizing that the transaction all round has been a bad job for the government and for the people of Canada, and for the men who put their money into it, will return to these bondholders a fair proportion of the money they have spent, will close out the transaction and have no more to do with it, and will try to avoid such transactions in the future. I do really appeal earnestly to the government to consider this matter. I believe the country is morally bound to meet these bondholders, and, at all events, return them some proportion of the money that they have, in good faith, put into this scheme. This scheme was presented to the British public asking for their money with the practical endorsation of the Dominion of Canada, the endorsation of the engineers of the government, with the endorsation of leading men on both sides of the House, with the assurance of business men that the transaction would be a profitable and paying one. I do not know of any scheme that has been so thoroughly backed up in this manner and has been so thoroughly forced upon the English people as a scheme in which they could invest their money safely. And, I think this government will only be doing their duty and I believe the country will approve too of their action if they deal liberally with these bondholders and give them some compensation for the money they have lost.

Hon. J. ISRAEL TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). I happen to have had the opportunity to study the question now before us when I had the honour of being a member of the government. Mr. Provand has come to Ottawa every year, I think, for the last five or six years. I was a member of the sub-committee to which the question was referred. The facts of the case are very simple. A company was organized to build the Chignecto Marine Railway. They were business men, and they undertook to carry out the work for a subsidy, agreeing that the subsidy should be payable when the work was completed. That is the basis of the whole agreement. I do not know whether my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has given attention to that part of the question.

Mr. OSLER. I have ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The company entered upon the work, but they were not very successful. They applied for an extension of time. Extensions were given to them twice. The last time when the government took up the matter was in 1896. I was then a member of the House. Sir Charles Tupper, who was Prime Minister, was favourable to the undertaking. A private Bill was introduced. However, he did not make it a government measure. I do not remember exactly by whom the Bill was introduced into the House, but Sir Charles Tupper approved of it. However, there was such a strong opposition on the government benches that the Bill had to be given up and the charter was not renewed. Although no subsidy was then asked the opposition I say again, was so strong, that the charter, which was asked to be renewed on a private Bill was not then renewed. When we came into office the question was presented to us as to what should be done. Well, nothing was done, and the matter stands as it stood when Sir Charles Tupper left office. My hon. friend (Mr. Osler) said that these gentlemen from London were entitled to compensation. If the government make up their minds that it is in the interest of the country to pay these bondholders a sum of money, the government, of course, will be held responsible for the position they take. There is no legal ground for the claim. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has quoted from the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I feel sure that if my hon. friend had read a little further down or a little further up in the speech, he would have found that his quotation does not at all render or do justice to the views of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. There was a strong debate in the House in 1896. There were several debates before that. I remember them very well, because I was then a member of the press. On every occasion, the Liberal party, which was then in opposition opposed and denounced the scheme. As to that, there can be no doubt; 'Hansard' is there to be appealed to. There was not a member of the Liberal party in the House that stood for the renewal of the charter. And, in 1896, the opposition on the government benches was so strong that the charter was not renewed. Why was it not renewed ? Because the scheme that, for a time, had been looked upon as a feasible scheme, was in those years looked upon as a fake, an impossible thing. The position in 1896 was exactly what I stated. The government considered that the scheme was not feasible, and that it would be a dangerous thing to renew the charter, as it would encourage men in the attempt to carrying out of a hopeless undertaking. These gentlemen failed in their undertaking. I am very sorry for them. But they were business men. It seems to me that the extension of their charter on two occasions was quite a sufficient measure at the hands of parliament to justify us, at any rate, to have some doubts as to the morality of their claims. They have failed as many other business men have failed in their undertaking. Now, if my hon. friend the Minister of Finance believes it necessary for Canadian credit to compensate these men, why, he is the Minister of Finance and it is for them to decide. But, on the ground of right, I do not think these gentlemen have any claim upon us. Whether the credit of this country can be impaired by our refusal to satisfy the claims presented to us, is another question.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). I have listened very carefully to the remarks made on both sides on this question. I know none of the parties, have never heard the names even of the bondholders in this matter. Two years ago I had the papers relating to it placed in my hands and I read them very carefully to form an opinion for myself of what was due from this country, if anything, to the people who had invested money in this unfortunate undertaking. The facts, as I understand them are briefly these :—About thirty years ago many prominent gentlemen in this Dominion conceived the idea that a canal or a ship railway at Chignecto would be a most valuable improvement, of the utmost importance to the provinces down by the sea. It was not a question of one political party or the other taking up that venture. Prominent men on both sides of politics, gentlemen who are in the ministry to-day and gentlemen who were in the ministry that preceded it, all seemed to take a most favourable view of the propriety and necessity of proceeding with this work. For some reason or other, for several years nothing was done. It appeared that there were doubts about the estimates of the cost of the work. But, ultimately, a charter was obtained and

the work was undertaken. The Dominion parliament subsidized that work, agreeing to grant a very substantial aid to the undertaking. The work proceeded; the directors of the company, assisted by expressions of opinion from the highest men in the land, both in parliament and out of parliament, succeeded in obtaining a large amount of capital in England. There had been delay, the bonds that the company expected to issue were rendered impossible of issue owing to what I think everybody subsequently agreed was a stupid provision put into a clause of the Railway Act with regard to the issuing of bonds. This impeded the financial end of the undertaking for some time but ultimately the money was raised in England, a large sum of several million dollars.

Now there is one material feature in this matter I would like to call attention to. These bonds were not placed in England in the ordinary way, at a discount. I believe that every bond was placed there at par or above par. It was looked upon as a thoroughly legitimate undertaking, fostered and endorsed by the highest men of this Dominion and by parliament. Well, after that the work went on, and as we all know now, the undertaking proved a failure, a most disastrous one for every body connected with it. It was a huge blunder from beginning to end. The people in England who placed several millions of money in it were led to do so by assurances from people on this side, and every dollar that they expended in that way, might as well, and perhaps better have been thrown into the sea. Now as to the subsidy. After we agreed to give aid it was found that this undertaking was going to be a failure, that it would be better for all concerned if it had never been begun, and it was no use to expend another dollar upon it. The people connected with it wished to get an opportunity to go on with the work. The parliament of Canada, very rightly, I think, determined they would not extend the time for its completion. The result of that was that this Dominion saved the whole of the subsidy that we had agreed to give to these people. I do not mean to say that the parliament of Canada in those days refused to extend the time in order to get rid of paying that subsidy. But even if it had, I do not know that it would have been improper. I have only to say it was a reasonable thing for parliament to do. There was no use throwing away all this money. The undertaking had become absolutely hopeless, and, therefore, this Dominion was quite justified in refusing to give the company an extension of time to earn their subsidy.

But there arises another question. By refusing to extend the time for the construction of this work, we happily were able to save a very large sum of money that we otherwise would have lost, while these unfortunate people who had put up their money lost every dollar of it. Now we were all partners together, as I look upon it. They had been induced to spend their money, and we had agreed to spend ours. By a fortunate bit of luck, the facts became known in time for us to save our money, though too late for them to save theirs. That is the whole position. We are all in a sense partners together, and what is decent for us to do in these conditions ? As I look upon this question as a representative of the people, I would vote to do here to-day that which I, as an honourable man, would think I ought to do under similar circumstances in a personal transaction. I think it would be discreditable for us to take advantage of the people who were practically our partners in this undertaking. We led them into it. It was not an ordinary undertaking. Public men, ministers of the Crown, gave certificates, gave statements in this House and elsewhere, leading these people to put up their money. They put it up and they lost every dollar of it, not only the principal, but every dollar of interest, and we have not paid out a cent. Now I say under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of legal right, it is a question of what is honourable and decent for this Dominion to do. I say the Dominion should do just what any hon. man in this House would do with a fellow man he was dealing with under like conditions. I do not know how much these gentlemen spent, some $4,000,000 are said to have been spent. I do not know whether that is the amount they expended or not, but the government can easily ascertain. I say that in my humble judgment it would be a right and proper thing for the government of Canada to give some relief, to look at all these facts, all the circumstances, and to do what is right, to do what is generous, and to do what is even liberal, without extravagance. For my part, I should be very glad to endorse such a course on the part of a Liberal ministry.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). I think all the circumstances connected with this unfortunate transaction have been fully explained, so that the members of the House who were not members at the time this transaction was going through, are fully informed of the circumstances. I heartily endorse the proposition that some arrangement should be made with these gentlemen who have put their money into this undertaking and lost it. All those who were in the House and heard these matters discussed on the different occasions when they came up, will remember that it was not only one government, but two governments, the government of Mr. Mackenzie and the succeeding Conservative government, who endorsed this proposition. More than that. the government engineers at these different times also expressed, in writing, and re-

ports to the government, very strong representations that this would certainly be a successful and strong financial enterprise. I attach more importance to the reports of our own officials than to any other representations that were made. All parties in this House agreed in what was done. I attribute the failure of the undertaking more to the evolution in railways, and their improvement in capacity and in cheapness of rates, than to any other reason. It is evident that the engineers and business and public men of those days were mistaken in their expectations. I go strongly with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who has so well expressed the views I entertain. It was not because we did not wish to extend the time in the usual way, but because the House was so well satisfied that it was useless, that it would be a waste of money. If any hon. gentleman here will turn up the debates on that occasion when the extension of time was refused, he will find the speeches from the members of the lower provinces generally who were better informed, and better capable of judging than those of us from Ontario and Quebec.

The members, especially from the lower provinces generally, who were better informed and better capable of judging than those of us from Ontario and the west, satisfied me, at all events, that it was useless. While I felt that, still, I voted on the principle of the thing to extend it according to the ordinary usage. I did that for the purpose of keeping faith, while perfectly agreeing with the arguments that had been presented that it would be entirely useless. The members of this House were satisfied that it would be useless to put more money into that unfortunate scheme because the evolution of circumstances and of development satisfied the good sense of the House that what had been done was a mistake. Fortunately for those who were in favour of the government doing something for this company, both political parties were committed to that judgment as to the futility of the work and I think that ought to have a very strong influence in regard to the settlement of this affair. Even the promoters of the scheme themselves who put up their money are not appealing to us here to say that it would have been well for the country or for themselves if they had been given an opportunity of fully expending the subsidy. They would be better satisfied to make some fair arrangement now than if we had expended more money than we did in assisting them and obliging them to complete the work, and it would be more satisfactory to the country than if the government were obliged to ask parliament for this large subsidy which the people of this country have to pay. It is not a question of breach of faith on either side, but, under the circumstances, I think it is better, both for the people of this country and for the people who were so unfortunate as to invest their money in the enterprise and who had good reason to believe from the representations of the government and of the engineers of the government, that it would be a perfectly satisfactory security, that they were not permitted to complete the work and that the government was not called upon to pay the subsidy. I think the government could probably satisfy the claims of these people for less money than it would have cost if we had extended the time and been called upon to pay the subsidy. That being the case I think the government would do well to arrange with them. I can add my testimony to that of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) as to the impression that this transaction has created in England in connection with some matters that some friends of mine and myself have been endeavouring to negotiate in the old country. We commenced eight or ten years ago and the first influence we had to encounter was this Chignecto claim. I did not wonder at it when I heard of the list of banks that were interested in this unfortunate transaction. I am, therefore, as one of the representatives of the people of this country, prepared to take my share of the responsibility of asking the government to make some fair and satisfactory arrangement with these people in respect of the matter and get it out of the way.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I have just a few words to say in reference to this matter. I was in the House when the Bill was introduced for the building of this Chignecto Railway, and we must all remember that this undertaking had the imprimatur of the parliament of Canada, of the engineers connected with the Railway Department as to the feasibility of it, and of the Minister of Railways and Canals responsible to the people who was looked upon as speaking authoritatively and with knowledge by the financial men in England when, speaking as to the financial position of the undertaking, he stated in the best of good faith that there was every probability of the company being recouped for the money expended on it. We were first to give $150,000 a year, but the subsidy was afterwards increased to $170,000. By an oversight in amending the Railway Act, a provision was introduced which affected this Chignecto Railway when parliament had no intention of applying the amendment to that particular undertaking at all, which rendered it impossible for the parties who were interested in this scheme to raise the money for the purpose of building the work. This amendment required the expenditure of 20 per cent of the capital before the company could float their bonds. However, afterwards, when that was remedied by parliament, and when they were in a position to put bonds upon the market, the unfortunate financial crisis occurred which caused the failure of Baring Bros. and rendered

it impossible for any scheme, no matter how good it was, to obtain money on the English market. Now, are we to take advantage of the unfortunate position of the parties who invested their money in this undertaking in good faith ? It has been said that we have no legal obligation. We do not keep ourselves strictly in this House to legal obligation. Time and again we have eliminated the legal responsibility in submitting questions for damages to the court and we have left the court virtually to judge as to the moral obligations of the people of this country. I contend, first, that we have a moral obligation to these people who invested their money in the undertaking. They did it on the faith of parliament, on the statement of leading men of this country, they did it on the statement of the engineers attached to the Department of Railways and Canals, and in addition they submitted the question to the first engineers in Great Britain. The gentleman who was the architect of the bridge across the Frith of Forth, the foremost engineer in Great Britain, reported favourably as to the feasibility of the scheme. It is true we changed our minds afterwards. It is true, as stated by the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that the opposition at that time were to a man opposed to the scheme. They opposed the proposal to renew the charter in 1896. Sir Charles Tupper, if he had remained in the government of this country, would have brought down a measure for the purpose, to a certain extent, of indemnifying these people for the money they had put into the undertaking. Whether they are entitled to the whole of it or whether they are entitled to only a share of it I will not say, but the penalty we attach to them is far in excess of their default. Why should they, because they were unable to raise the money, forfeit the whole amount of the money which they expended on the undertaking. We have all agreed now that there is no necessity for the building of this work. We have all agreed on both sides of the House that the undertaking shall not be built.

Mr. CLANCY. When did we make that discovery ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The feeling in the country, as I judge from public opinion, is that an undertaking of that kind would not be a financial success and that the government would not be justified in the payment of the money necessary to carry it to a conclusion. What I am contending for is the moral obligation of the people to do something for the people who have invested their money on the imprimatur of this parliament, on the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals, on the statement of the department which was responsible for the introduction of the measure providing for an undertaking which they believed would be a financial success. Admitting that they have no legal claim, yet they come before the parliament of Canada in the same position as dozens of others who have been recouped for expenditures they made on the good faith of the support of the people of this country. I believe that the Minister of Finance would have almost the unanimous support of the people of Canada if he did something to compensate these people for the large sum of money they have expended on this undertaking. I believe that money so expended to show our good faith, would be worth more to us than the cash itself in establishing our good name before the world.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). I have listened to my hon friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) who gave a detailed history of this unfortunate enterprise. I have also listened to my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who diagnosed the matter very clearly, and I believe that we, as an honourable body, should look upon this matter as a party to the contract with the English investors who undertook the work. We wisely carried out our part of the contract and it was no fault of ours that the project failed, except that perhaps some may say that we deprived the company of the opportunity of continuing the work owing to a clause in the Railway Act passed subsequently. I hardly like to venture an opinion as to whether this was a proper enterprise or not, but I may say that I have visited the scene of the proposed ship-railway and I could not for the life of me understand how any engineer could ever have recommended such an undertaking. If I had a ship in the Northumberland Straits destined for Boston or New York, I would much prefer to have sent her by sea route rather than to take her over this ship-railway had it been built, even if I could have done so free of tolls. The tortuous waters of the Bay of Fundy would have been the greatest risk in the voyage, to say nothing of the dangers of the railway itself in putting a ship on a contrivance of that kind. However, that may be, it was an unfortunate enterprise, and under all the circumstances I feel satisfied that this parliament should in honour recoup those people for their losses, at least a part, more particularly as quite a number of the English investors were put to great sacrifices by the failure of the party to carry out this scheme. We may not be legally bound to recoup these people, but I certainly think we are morally bound. Even if we put it on the ground of it being a charitable act, but I want it to go to investors who put their money in it, not to stockbrokers, solicitors and adventurers. I, for one, would be prepared to advocate it. If the government does not consider that they should repay the whole of the money expended by them, then I would be in favour of letting them exercise their own discretion as to what they consider would be fair, or equitable, under the circumstances. This is not a party

question for both parties are involved. As I understand it, both the Mackenzie government and the Conservative government endorsed the project. When the company applied to have the charter extended, I felt as a member of this House, that it would be a charitable act to refuse the extension so that they might not be subject to further loss of money by this scheme. I felt that there was no use wasting more money in the continuation of that work. I fully endorse the position taken by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) and others, and I trust that the government will consider the matter and do what is honourable and just in the premises.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I am afraid that I cannot go so far as some hon. gentlemen have in supporting the claims of this company, nor do I think they are quite correct in all the statements that have been made as to the circumstances under which this scheme was promoted. I may be wrong, but I think my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is mistaken when he says that some members of the present administration supported the scheme. I do not remember whether there was a division on it in parliament.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There was in 1891.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I recollect that one member of the present administration took very strong ground against it, and Mr. Mackenzie also spoke in terms of hostility.

Mr. BARKER. I have a distinct recollection of reading something signed by Sir Richard Cartwright in the very strongest terms referring to this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In favour of the scheme ?

Mr. BARKER. I think so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, no ; my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) is entirely mistaken. Sir Richard Cartwright condemned the scheme in the very strongest terms.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) is not correct when he says that the scheme was supported by the Mackenzie government generally.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I think they endorsed it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is mistaken. This particular scheme was not projected during the reign of the Mackenzie government.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Perhaps not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was a project for the construction of a canal, and when it was found that the cost of this canal was likely to be very large the project was abandoned. However, I do not attach very much importance to that point. The government of Canada is a continuing body, and if any obligation in the name of Canada is incurred by one government the succeeding government is bound to carry out that obligation. I cannot think that there has been anything here to justify the charge of breach of faith. It is not contended that there is any legal obligation; if there were these gentlemen would have availed of the courts long since. Nor can I admit with the member for Cumberland that it is a debt of honour. If anything can be done for these unfortunate stock holders it must be done, not because they have a legal claim, not because they have even a moral claim, but as an act of grace and favour of this parliament irrespective of everything else.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been some negotiations of late—I suppose it would be right to say there has never been a moment for some years that there have not been negotiations on the subject. It is now some twenty years since this scheme was first promoted, and it is some ten or eleven years since the scheme practically failed. According to the statement of my hon. friend from Cumberland, in 1892 application was made to the government of that day to restore the company to its former position. The government of the day did not do so; and although that Conservative government remained in power down to 1896, they never asked parliament to restore the company to its former position, for the reason stated by the hon. member for South Norfolk, that they and others had made up their minds that the scheme was not a wise one, and that it would not be well to continue it. That was the position when the present government came into power in 1896. This government took the ground that whatever might be said in favour of the scheme in earlier days—and I do not wish to go into that—it was now pretty well admitted by business men that the scheme was not a sound one, and therefore we felt that we should not give it a new lease of existence in order that other people might be induced to put money into it, and throw good money after bad. That left the question of compensation, and from that day to this that question has been pressed on the attention of the government; but up to a recent date the sums mentioned by the promoters of what they considered proper compensation were so very large that they did not seem to come within reasonable limits, and we did not feel like presenting the matter to parliament. I suppose this session would not be a constitutional one, if we had not here our energetic friend who represents the company to press its claims. I do not know

that I can say more at present than that the matter is engaging the consideration of the government. Representations are being made to us by the agent of the English bondholders, and, in the light of the discussion that has taken place to-night, we will give the matter further consideration.

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

Archives, $9,000.

Mr. MONK. What is the reason of the increase ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This increase is largely in connection with the copying of French documents in Paris.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the nature of the increase ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is going on constantly in Paris an investigation into documents connected with early Canadian history. That work has been prosecuted very actively. This year a very large number of documents have been copied, and next year we expect that there will be more. A very long list of documents which have to be copied has been prepared for that purpose.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the increase owing entirely to that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Almost entirely.

Mr. MONK. Who is in charge of the work in Paris ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Edouard Richard.

Mr. MONK. What do we pay him ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. $1,600 a year, including expenses.

Collection and compilation of criminal statistics, $1,800.

Mr. MONK. Who is the officer in charge of this work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. George Johnson.

Statistical Year-book, $5,000.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the nature of the increase ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The amount asked for is $1,000 more than last year, to provide for the printing of a larger number of copies, which have been asked for.

General statistics, $3,200.

Mr. BELL. What is that expenditure for this year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Some of the officers under Mr. Johnson are paid out of this vote. It is sometimes used and sometimes not used, according to the exigencies of the work. The officers are sometimes engaged to work up particular statistics which are used in the compilation of the Year-book.

Mr. BELL. Is all this used in connection with the Year-book ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not always. I do not know of anything last year except in connection with the Year-book.

Mr. BELL. Has there been any special investigation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. None during this current year.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture if any part of this sum has been paid for an examination of land values ? The hon. gentleman has had a Mr. Washington engaged for some time in connection with what are called general statistics, what has become of Mr. Washington's work ? Has the country the benefit of that long and painful examination he made of land values in the provinces, or has it been cast to one side ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The report is laid on the Table. There is no other publication.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman consider Mr. Washington's report of any value ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. What does the hon. gentleman intend doing with it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It may be utilized when convenient.

Mr. CLANCY. It was shrewdly suspected that the hon. gentleman intended it for campaign literature, but after examination by himself and some other members of this House he became somewhat faint-hearted and doubted whether it would serve his purpose. Does he expect to be able to resurrect it in the future and turn it to account ? And what was the expenditure in connection with that report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The expenditure on the work was closed before the commencement of the current year, and there is no intention of renewing it in the ensuing year. I have not the details of that expenditure of two or three years ago available.

Mr. CLANCY. I presume that Mr. Washington is being provided for in some other way. Is that the case ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware of it.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister was not aware of his having been employed on

a former occasion. He seemed to be taken by surprise when Mr. Washington made the statement before one of the committees last year that the minister had employed him. Mr. Washington was able to remind the hon. gentleman of some circumstances where there had been a conversation, in consequence of which Mr. Washington went down to the maritime provinces. However, the House has the assurance that his report may be brought into effect some time or other, and that the country is not to experiment in the meantime any more.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think it is treating the committee or the country fairly for an hon. member of the government to give the reply in reference to a report which was given a while ago. That report is either of some value or it is not. The hon. Minister of Agriculture ought to know, and he ought also to know whether it is the intention of the government to have it printed or not. If that be the intention, the committee have a right to know it in answer to the questions of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). If it is not the intention of the department to have the report printed, the hon. minister should say so. For my part, I protest against this flippant manner of dealing with public questions just as if none but members of the government had any right to say anything in this House. There is too much of this flippancy and jocularity at the expense of the dignity of the ministers and the pockets of the people.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to call the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that in the Auditor General's Report for 1902, Mr. Hector Washington is entered for special statistical work from January 1st to April 7th, 1902, eighty-three days at $3 per day, amounting to $259. I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he was in error when he said that Mr. Washington has closed his services before the financial year with which we are dealing. We had paid the sum of $700 or $800 for the fiscal year of 1901, and it will now be in order for the Minister of Agriculture to explain what these payments were for, in view of his statement that Mr. Washington's work had ceased before the present financial year had begun.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The statement I made was absolutely correct. The financial year we are dealing with commenced the 1st of July, 1902, and the payment which the hon. gentleman has just read was previous to the 1st of July, 1902. That payment was made in the fiscal year of 1901-2, and it completed payment for the work Mr. Washington had been doing.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows that that is not an answer. He knows that in dealing with accounts of that kind it is the duty of ministers to explain the expenditure for the preceding year. He does not suppose that this House is dealing with accounts for the money which we are voting for this year. He told us very plainly that no work had been done by Mr. Washington in the financial year with which we are dealing. I am referring to the Auditor General's Report, and not to the estimates we are voting.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said that Mr. Washington had done no work in the present financial year, and that there is no arrangement for his doing any work in the coming financial year.

Mr. MONK. Is he at present in the employ of the government ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is not in my department, and I do not know that he is any where else.

Aid to agricultural societies, $7,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is paid to the Agricultural Societies of the North-west Territories, and it is paid through the local government. This amount has been in the estimates during many years. It is paid to the individual societies who make a return of their membership, and each society gets an amount based on its membership. The work of making that apportionment is left to the officers of the local government in the territories. The reason for this vote is that, in the provinces, the provincial governments deal with agricultural societies, but in view of the work to be done, this concession was made by the Dominion parliament.

Mr. CLANCY. I had occasion last year and on previous occasions to call attention to the very small sum expended for this purpose. The hon. gentleman states, that vote has been stationary for many years. Either agricultural societies must be unfairly dealt with or there is very little interest in matters of this kind in that country. In view of the large expenditure of the government, it seems to me that some explanation is due to the House as to why it is that, with such progress and development going on there, there is no greater increasing expenditure under this head.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Agricultural societies in the North-west Territories have not been increasing in number. The policy of the department there has been rather to centralize and amalgamate these societies. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) seems to think that enough money is not spent in the encouragement of agriculture in the North-west Territories. But when this vote was first introduced, this was the only agricultural work done in the Territories by the government. Since that time considerable other work has been undertaken, work in connection with the establishment of creamer-

ies, work in connection with live stock associations and the sending of speakers to farmers' institute meetings all over the Territories. In the opinion of the people there it was better to spend money in that kind of work rather than in agricultural societies. There has been no demand for the increase of this vote.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are speakers sent from here to the North-west Territories to lecture to farmers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speakers are arranged for to lecture before the institutes of the North-west Territories. Some are sent from here and some are arranged for in the territories.

Mr. COCHRANE. Who are the parties sent from here ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not a list of them at hand. That comes under another vote, and when that vote comes up, if the hon. gentleman wishes it, I will give the list. It will come up under vote for the branch commissioner of agriculture, &c., and also under experimental farms.

Classifying all Canadian patents and preparing drawings for same for classification, to be paid, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $2,500.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the meaning of the phrase here : 'Notwithstanding anythink in the Civil Service Act ?'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This has been characteristic of this vote ever since it was taken. We have to employ some people not under civil service rules, so that this provision is necessary. In explanation of the decrease, the vote this year being $2,500 against $7,000 last year, I may say that this work has been going on for some years and, as a large number of the patents in existence have been classified, it is felt that $2,500 will complete it during the next fiscal year, and also carry on the current work for the year.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the committee to understand that there are a number of persons engaged in the hon. gentleman's department, as there seems to be in other departments, who are not permanent clerks ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Partly from the reason the hon. gentleman speaks of and partly from another reason, that there is one payment out of the vote that is made as an extra payment to the patent examiner who had charge of the work and who was specially qualified and who was given charge of it when it commenced. He has a regular salary as a first class clerk in the department, but during this work he was given an extra payment which had to be given him contrary to the regulation of the Civil Service Act. That covers the point as well as the fact that some employees are not members of the civil service and not under civil service rules.

Fumigating stations, $3,500.

Mr. CLANCY. The country will look for some explanation as to the progress that is being made in that work and whether the hon. minister proposes to enlarge the operations.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There has been a slight enlargement of the operations. It was found that the station in British Columbia had to be kept open practically all winter, which involved extra expense. There was a larger number of passengers going through, and we have had to employ extra hands to do the work. Then, again, I found that this year we were not able to pay all the bills out of the vote of this year. There may be something like $150 in the vote asked for to cover the arrearage, and make the ensuing year's expenditure all right.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain to the committee what progress is being made for the purpose of arresting the ravages of the San José scale, and to prevent infected plants from coming into Canada, which I understand now undergo a process of fumigation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My department has not undertaken in any way to try to stamp out the scale in this country, except that my officers, at the various horticultural and agricultural meetings, have explained the best methods of treating it. In the province of Ontario the local government have taken steps to try to stamp out the pest where it is in existence. The purpose of our government has been to prevent the importation of the pest into the country ; and I venture to say positively that in no case has an instance been found in Canada, since the passage of the Act under which this vote is administered, of the introduction of the San José scale from foreign countries. I think, therefore, we may congratulate ourselves that the action of parliament in passing that Act and in arranging for fumigation at certain ports, has been successful. The work has been carried out in such a way as to accomplish the object parliament had in passing the Act.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. From what countries does fumigated stock come in ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. From the United States chiefly. The United States, Australia, Japan and the Hawaiian Islands are the places mentioned in the regulations and the Order in Council from which plants are prohibited without fumigation. Those are the countries which at present are known to be infested by this scale.

Mr. SMITH. Is not the stock taken out of the boxes at the fumigating stations ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, it is unpacked from the boxes, put into a tight chamber and fumigated, and then repacked and sent on.

Mr. SMITH. At what ports is it fumigated ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The ports are Vancouver, Winnipeg, Windsor, Niagara Falls, St. John's, Quebec and St. John, New Brunswick.

Mr. SMITH. Then stock coming into Nova Scotia has to come through St. John to be fumigated ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. There is only one port in the maritime provinces where they are fumigated. As a matter of fact our records show that nearly all the stock that comes into Nova Scotia comes from the United States. It has been suggested that a port should be established also in Nova Scotia, but on investigation into the actual facts of the trade, it did not seem to me that it would be justified by the amount of stock imported, which comes just as cheaply through the port of St. John.

For renewing and improving the Canadian exhibit at Imperial Institute, London, $3,000.

Mr. MONK. What is going to be done in the way of improving these exhibits ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Imperial Institute, I confess, at the present moment, is in rather an uncertain condition. Hon. gentlemen are no doubt aware that the Imperial Institute was organized at the time of Her Majesty's jubilee, under the leadership and patronage of the then Prince of Wales. The Imperial Institute of London is established for the purpose of affording an opportunity of exhibiting colonial products. At that time the Dominion of Canada was invited to subscribe towards establishing an exhibit. This was before the incumbency of the present government. At that time the government declined to take it up, and relegated the matter to the provincial governments. Most, if not all, the provincial governments in Canada have taken part in arrangements for the Imperial Institute. They have not, however, maintained their exhibits in that high state of efficiency which seems to be necessary. Over and over again Canadian visitors at London have complained of the condition of Canadian exhibits in that institute. The high commisisoner, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, who is one of the board of directors of that institute, and who was the representative on that board from Canada, has over and over again referred to the condition and the character of the Canadian exhibit as being not at all in consonance with the dignity and importance of this country, and with its material resources. When in England a few years ago I came to the same conclusion, and discussed the matter with Lord Strathcona. I took upon myself to recommend to my colleagues that this parliament should be asked to vote a sum to aid in the establishment of that institute. But just about the time that was done, and soon after the first vote was taken here, the Imperial Institute passed into what I might almost term a condition of crisis. It dragged along for a couple of years. We did, however, subscribe a certain amount, and we spent a sum of money in establishing some further exhibits there, and rehabilitating a good many that were already there and making them more attractive. The institute has now passed under the control of the board of trade of the imperial government. Quite recently I received an official intimation from Lord Strathcona of this fact, and was made acquainted with the methods and management of the institute to be adopted in the future. I have not yet had an opportunity of going into the new conditions and the new arrangements, but I understand that they will tend greatly to increase the usefulness of the Imperial Institute from a commercial and trade point of view. I think therefore that it is well that we should continue to try and make the Canadian exhibit a creditable one, and in consonance with the importance of this colony and the importance of representing our products in the centre of the empire. I cannot now give any details as to how this money will be spent.

Mr. CLANCY. I think that on two or three other occasions we have had promises from the hon. gentleman that looked quite as rosy as the one he has just made us. He has stated that for years our exhibit there has been anything but creditable to Canada and to those who are connected with it. I understand that the provinces generally have abandoned their support of the imperial institute. I understand that the building is in an out of the way place that its whole surroundings are of a forbidding character and the Canadians would not find it a matter of interest to go there at all. Now, after so long a time, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman ought to abandon this. When I say abandon it, I am not speaking of any grant of money that we are making because it is a very small sum, but I say abandon it because it is a perfectly useless institution. Will the hon. gentleman tell the committee how that $3,000 has been spent each year; under whose control and for what purpose it has been spent ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I quite agree that it has been a long time under consideration and under discussion, but this is due entirely to the fact that the transference of the institute from the

old board of management to the Board of Trade in England has been dragging along. Until new arrangements are accomplished and we can know what arrangements are to be made, we cannot formulate any plans as to what we shall do in reference to an exhibit. One of the things I adhered to when I was in England was the establishment of an office in the city. The institute itself is in South Kensington; removed from the city and partly at my instance and after discussion with Lord Strathcona the authorities of the institute undertook to rent part of the building in east Cheap St. right down in the city where exhibits should be made from time to time of special lines with somebody in charge to explain to those engaged in those particular lines the value of them and to give information in regard to them. I pledged myself on behalf of Canada to contribute £100 to the rent of the office, and we have paid that for a couple of years.

Mr. CLANCY. Out of this vote ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why not do this in connection with immigration work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has nothing to do with immigration work. The object of the Imperial Institute has been for furthering commercial projects.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the hon. minister removed the exhibit from the Imperial Institute ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is at the Imperial Institute ? I understand that all the Canadian exhibits have been taken away from the Imperial Institute. Nobody ever goes there.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is a little mistaken in that. There has been no removal of Canadian exhibits from the Imperial Institute that I am aware of.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Then what does the hon. minister say has been done ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Provision has been made in the city to make exhibits of a temporary character. For instance, for a couple of weeks, or three weeks, an exhibit of canned goods will be made and the canned goods trade will be invited to come That will be taken away and then there will be an exhibit of dressed poultry, then an exhibit of Canadian butter and cheese, then an exhibit of Canadian hams and bacon, or whatever there might happen to be available which could be effectively exhibited for the purpose of attracting attention to our Canadian products. That has never been done in the Imperial Institute at all. It would be ineffective and the institute would not be suitable for an exhibition of that kind. But, I am satisfied if arrangements can be made in the city such as we are talking of, that effective work of that kind can be done. In consequence of the transference of the Imperial Institute from the old board of management to the board of trade, delay has taken place. The discussion lasted for two years until recently when I received a communication from Lord Strathcona that the official transference had been made, but I do not know as yet what the new arrangements are which have been put in force. Until we know what they are we cannot formulate any plan in regard to making an exhibit.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman any report from Lord Strathcona of the plans adopted by the institute ? The hon. gentleman will see the perfect uselessness of voting money, not because we are indisposed to vote that money, but it does seem a waste of money and a waste of time to drag a matter of that kind along for the time during which it has been dragging. I would like the hon. gentleman to say what contributions have been made to the Imperial Institute, and from what quarter support has been given. We are paying now the small sum of $3,000. The sum, I may say again, is not worth discussing in that light, but it is important if we are to have an institute of that kind, that it shall perform good work.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We paid last year £100 sterling towards the rent of the office in the city. We are pledged, I think, to the same contribution this current year. In addition to that, after the Glasgow and Wolverhampton exhibitions, a large number of the exhibits which had been utilized there were turned over for the purpose of the Imperial Institute. They were cleaned up and worked over, and put into such a state as to be presentable and suitable for establishment in the Imperial Institute.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the nature of the articles of Canadian produce or manufacture ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The exhibits are chiefly in minerals and forestry. The agricultural exhibits were not in sufficiently good condition at the end of these exhibitions to be available, and we propose to prepare and send over specially during this season a number of agricultural exhibits for erection and establishment in the Imperial Institute. But, I do not feel that I can make any definite plans in regard to our exhibit there until I know what the arrangements are which the new management intend to carry out. I have received information from Lord Strathcona of the official transference and with that infor-

mation he gives me an outline of the management and organization under the board of trade, but no definite information as to any plans that may have been worked out in regard to the exhibits themselves. I will have to communicate with him and get information in regard to that before I can formulate any definite plans.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman say what contributions have been made other than those made by Canada towards the support of that institution ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The other colonies, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and some of the smaller dependencies have exhibits in the Imperial Institute and they contribute towards its support. Our own provinces have been contributing regularly every year out of which the maintenance of their exhibits is paid for and also the payment of the salary of the Canadian curator, Mr. Harrison Watson with a small contribution additionally which I made last year to his salary.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not what I asked the hon. gentleman. I was aware, of course, that the colonies have each undertaken that. It has been stated that there has been a gradual falling off in these contributions. We have been contributing a small sum for many years. Can the minister state what sums are being contributed from all the other sources ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The contribution from Canada has been rather smaller than from other colonies in proportion to our wealth and importance. Speaking from memory, the contribution of the provinces amounts to something like $2,500 a year.

Mr. MONK. Have we to pay this sum each year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are only pledged for this year, and that pledge is a conditional one.

Tracadie Lazaretto, $5,500.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this institution doing a useful work which warrants this vote every year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is a work of absolute necessity. It was established before confederation, and was taken over by the Dominion government from the province of New Brunswick. The patients are not confined to the province of New Brunswick, and there are at present twenty patients. It is a curious fact that the number has varied very little for many years.

Mr. CLANCY. It has been stated in the press that a great number of them were Chinamen.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think that there is a single Chinaman there, or that there has been. There are some in the Lazaretto in British Columbia, but that is not under my department. Most of the patients from Tracadie come from the lower provinces, but on one or two occasions lepers have been sent from the west.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it not the duty of the province to look after these lepers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think there is any obligation on the Dominion to take charge of lepers except those in the maritime provinces. I will not speak positively as to the legal aspect of the question.

Public works—Health Act, $4,000.

Mr. CLANCY. What is this ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Some years ago this parliament passed an Act for the purpose of protecting the health of employees on public works, by seeing that the employers provided proper sanitary arrangements for their employees, and especially in cases where there was no municipal organization. An inspector was appointed to see that the provisions of the Act were carried out, and his report appears in the annual report of my department.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that apply only to where there is no municipal or provincial organization ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking from memory, I think that the Act would cover places where there is a municipal organization, but where the employees are not living in the ordinary way, but are camping on the works.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman say how much was voted last year, how much was expended, and how it was expended ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that $2,150 was expended last year. During the current year, up to the 1st of June, $2,233 was expended.

Mr. CLANCY. For what purpose ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The expenditure was entirely the salary and travelling expenses of the inspector, Mr. Charles Fisher, of Montreal. He makes Montreal his headquarters.

Mr. CLANCY. Has he made a report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is in the annual report of the Department of Agriculture, which has been laid on the Table.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, June 11, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. C. S. HYMAN (London) moved that the Order for the House in Committee on Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway be discharged, and that the report be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for further consideration. He said: The reason of my making this motion is that the committee, when the Bill was before it, adopted the following amendment:—

Provided always that before the construction of the prairie section is commenced, the location thereof shall be approved by the Governor in Council, and no part of such location shall be nearer than thirty miles to any constructed or located main line of any railway unless for special reasons to be named by the Order in Council, unless the Governor in Council may otherwise order.

While that was carried by the committee, the wording of it and the principle were left to be settled by the Minister of Railways and myself. As we find ourselves unable to bring the contending parties together and to get them to agree upon it, we think it is only fair, under the circumstances, that the Bill should be sent back to the committee for the purpose of discussing that clause.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The motion will stand till to-morrow.

Motion withdrawn.

REVISION OF RULES.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville) moved: That a select committee be appointed to confer with a similar committee to be appointed by the Senate for the purpose of revising rule 51 of the House of Commons and rule 49 of the Senate, and making them agree, with power to report from time to time; the committee to be composed of the following members: Johnston (Cape Breton), Lancaster, Turgeon, Wilson and the mover.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the rules, and what is the difference which is proposed to be adjusted?

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) In answer to the hon. leader of the opposition, I may say that the regulations governing the notices required by parliament in connection with private Bills are no longer what they should be. The Committee on Standing Orders, on examining the notices given in the newspapers regarding private Bills, came to the conclusion that the rule in this regard should be amended. For instance, the committee are of opinion that it is unnecessary to have these notices given for such a long period of time. Moreover, they found out that a difficulty arose in the case of a railway or any company whose business extended over more than one district. In accordance with the regulation now in force, notices should appear in every county in each district, while the committee think it would be sufficient to issue such notices in one only. This same difficulty arose formerly, and a similar committee was appointed. It is for the purpose of definitely settling this matter that it is proposed to appoint the committee referred to in the motion.

INSPECTION AND SALE OF SEEDS.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 200) respecting inspection and sale of seeds.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fisher) be good enough to state briefly the purport of the Bill?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Bill is for the purpose of trying to remedy some defects, and I might almost say grievances, in connection with the sale of agricultural seeds. In consequence of complaints and facts that came to the knowledge of the department some two years ago the department has been carrying on a good deal of investigation into the business of the sale of agricultural seeds, especially in this country. A condition of affairs was found which showed that there is a great deal of seed sold which is not full value for what is paid for it, and the people who purchase it in many instances are—I will not say imposed upon, perhaps, because I do not think for a moment that there is any intention or desire to commit fraud—but from ignorance and carelessness are not getting what they think they are getting. I believe that the evil has reached a magnitude in this country that requires a certain amount of regulation, and it is the purpose of this Bill to provide for such regulation. When the Bill is printed and before hon. members, it will be, perhaps, more suitable and convenient for me to go into the details more fully than at the present time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—STATION AT CHARLOTTETOWN.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Hackett—asked:

1. Have any communications, or recommendations, been received by the government with re-

gard to the building of a new railway station at Charlottetown, P.E.I., and for the extending of the railway along the water front, to afford more facilities for shipping ?

2. What are the names of the parties sending such communications, or making recommendations ?

3. Has the government decided on a site for the new station ? And if so, where will it be situated ?

4. Is it the intention of the government to extend the railway along the water front ?

5. Has the government stipulated that the city of Charlottetown shall provide the right of way for said extension ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes.

2. Board of Trade, Charlottetown, Horace Haszard, D. A. MacKinnon. Petition signed by the Mayor, merchants and other residents of Charlottetown.

3. No.

4. The matter is under consideration.

5. It is thought that the railway should be provided with the right of way for the track extension along the water front free of charge.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—SEMAPHORE LIGHTS.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Has the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway forbidden the use of semaphore lights where heretofore used on said railway ?

2. If so, will not the discontinuance of the lights lead to the possibility of accidents occurring at crossings, &c.?

3. What is the practice with regard to such lights on the other government railways ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. At certain stations along the line of the Prince Edward Island Railway instructions have been given not to light the semaphore lights.

2. It is considered that accidents are not likely to arise by the non-use of semaphore lights at these stations.

3. Wherever it is considered necessary lights are maintained at stations on the government railways where the traffic seems to demand them.

OFFICERS OF PERMANENT CORPS.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth) asked :

Will those officers who qualified for appointment under general order 86, 1896, and for promotion under general order 75, 1899, and whose brevet rank of captain was withheld until they had passed the latter, be required to pass again, for substantive rank of captain, under general order 30, 1903 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). The following answer has been placed in my hands by the Adjutant General : All subaltern officers of the permanent corps who qualified under G. O. 86, of 1896, must pass for the substantive rank of captain under G. O. 30, 1903. Had any qualified under G. O. 75, of 1899, they would not be required to pass again, but none have done so.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Are compositors, or typesetting machine operators, who do not belong to the typographical union, permitted to work in the composing room of the Government Printing Bureau ; and if so, how many such men are now employed there ?

2. Were the demands recently made by the compositors in the Government Printing Bureau for an increase of wages submitted to the fair-wage officer of the Labour Bureau to report upon ? And if so, did he report favourably or unfavourably upon the demand ?

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

1. All the compositors and typesetting machine operators in the Bureau belong to the Typographical Union.

2. No ; the Typographical Union adopted a scale without any conference with the government and announced that it would be in operation on and after the first day of June. The government declined, under the circumstances, to recognize the scale and the subject matter was not referred to the fair-wage officer of the Department of Labour.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. Was the contract or agreement between the government of Canada and province of Prince Edward Island, with regard to the Hillsborough Bridge, prepared by the Department of Railways and Canals ?

2. Was the whole cost of preparing the said agreement paid by the province of Prince Edward Island ?

3. Is the province made liable for damages in cases of accidents at the approach to said bridge ?

4. Are vehicles allowed to cross the bridge when trains are crossing the same ?

5. If not, what time is allowed between crossing of trains and permitting vehicles on bridge?

6. Is the provincial government to provide and maintain the approaches to said bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. No, but in consultation with the law clerk of this department.

2. Cannot say. The Dominion government, however, paid nothing.

3. No.

4. No.

6. No.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EARNINGS, WORKING EXPENSES AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURE.

Mr. BARKER asked :

1. What is the latest date up to which the Minister of Railways and Canals has received

interim reports of the gross earnings and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway since July, 1902 ?

2. What, according to such reports, have been the approximate gross earnings and working expenses of the railway from 1st July, 1902, to the date of such latest reports ?

3. What sum has been expended upon the Intercolonial Railway on capital account from 1st July, 1902, to the date of the latest interim report ; and what is the date of such report ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. April 30th, 1903.

2. Gross earnings for ten months ended April 30th, 1903, $5,292,639.69. Working expenses for ten months ended April 30th, 1903, $5,288,763.56.

3. Amount expended on capital account from 1st July, 1902, to the 30th April, 1903 is $910,576.99.

FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called I would ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if he has anything to announce to the House as to the action of the government in regard to the tenders which have been received for the Fast Atlantic service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Not to-day.

MONTREAL HARBOUR—ADVANCES TO THE HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

House went in committee on the following proposed resolution.

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide as follows :—

1. The Governor in Council may from time to time advance and pay to the corporation of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal (hereinafter called 'the corporation'), in addition to the moneys authorized to be advanced to the corporation by the Governor in Council by chapter 10 of the statutes of 1896 (first session), and by chapter 47 of the statutes of 1898, and by chapter 9 of the statutes of 1901, such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of three million dollars, as are required to enable the corporation to construct such further terminal facilities as are necessary properly to equip the port of Montreal.

2. No such advances shall be made unless the plans, specifications and estimates for the works to be performed by the corporation, and on which the money so to be advanced is to be expended, have first been submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council.

3. The corporation shall, upon any advance being made, deposit with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General debentures of the corporation equal to par value to the advance so made (which debentures the corporation are hereby authorized to issue), and such debentures so issued shall be of such amounts as the Minister of Finance and Receiver General determines, and shall bear date on the day when such advance is made, and shall be repayable within twenty-five years from the date of their issue, and in the meantime shall bear interest at the rate of three per cent per annum, such interest to be payable half yearly on the first day of July and the first day of January in each year.

4. The principal and interest of the sums advanced under the authority of this Act to the corporation shall be paid by the corporation out of its revenue mentioned in section 8 of chapter 10 of the statutes of 1896 (first session), and shall be a charge upon the said revenue in the same manner and to the same extent as if the sums so advanced had been borrowed by the corporation under the said chapter 10.—The Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). With the increasing and very rapid growth of the trade of the country, there has arisen necessity for better means of transportation and better terminal facilities at our ports, especially at the port of Montreal, which handles such a very large proportion of the total trade of the country. We have been aiding the port of Montreal during recent years by granting loans to the Harbour Commissioners to enable them to provide the necessary facilities. Going back as far as the year 1896, provision was made for a loan of $2,000,000 which was intended not only to deal with works which were then in hand but also to pay off some existing indebtedness. In 1898 provision was made for a further advance to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal of $2,000,000, and in the year 1901, a further advance of $1,000,000. So that by these three separate Acts of 1896, 1898 and 1901 authority was taken for the advance from time to time of sums aggregating $5,000,000. A portion of this was advanced at three and a half per cent, but the latter portion at three per cent. The advances made by the government under the authority of these Acts, up to a recent date, amount to $3,450,000—$2,000,000 of this was advanced under the earlier Acts at three and a half per cent and $1,450,000 under the later Acts at three per cent. Therefore there would be a balance available to the commissioners at present out of existing authorized loans of $1,550,000. Against that, however, the commissioners have entered into certain contracts and have works in contemplation which it is understood will absorb nearly all that sum, leaving about $294,000 which they have not applied to any work already authorized. Under the legislation now proposed, the commissioners will have available this sum of $294,000 out of the past advances, over and above their present contracts, and $3,000,000 under the proposed resolution now before the committee. The purposes to which it is contemplated to apply this money as stated by the commissioners is as follows :

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

Estimates of amounts required to carry out improvements.

Two-storey steel wharf sheds, including elevated roadways and ramps leading thereto, and conveyors complete on the Alexandria, King Edward and Jacques Cartier piers and shore wharfs at sections 12, 13 and 17, covering an area of 642,195 square feet and giving a floor space on the two storeys of 1,284,390 square feet...		$2,363,000 00
Paving wharfs—		
Alexandria, King Edward and Jacques Cartier piers..	$ 97,125	
Shore wharfs between the entrance to the Lachine canal and Victoria pier.	246,925	
Shore wharf between Victoria pier and the lower end of section 27..	242,835	
		586,885 00
Raising the wharf on the south-west side of Windmill Point basin to high level, as per plans, specifications and estimate approved by the Hon. the Minister of Public Works..		130,000 00
Additional railway tracks on the wharfs between the entrance to the Lachine canal and the lower end of section 27..		79,000 00
Floating crane..		50,000 00
New steel tug		25,000 00
		$3,298,885 00
Less—		
Balance of advance of $1,000,000 authorized by Act 1 Edward VII., chap. 9, 1901, available after providing for the payment of the amount of contracts for grain elevator, &c., &c., entered into $705,543.50..		294,456 50
Estimated amount required..		$3,004,428 50

These sums aggregate $3,298,885, against which they will have $3,000,000 applied for by the present legislation and the balance of nearly $300,000 under past authority. There will, I am sure, be no question on the part of the House as to the readiness of the government and parliament to afford all reasonable assistance to provide these facilities at the great port of Montreal. Perhaps, I should say, although it is hardly necessary, that the interest of these loans in the past has in all cases been promptly met by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners. They have from time to time met their obligations and they represent to us now that with the growing business of the port they will be able to meet the larger obligations which this resolution creates. As I have pointed out, two-thirds of this proposed loan, over $2,000,000, is to be applied to the construction of steel sheds, and they estimate that these sheds will yield a rental which will amply compensate them and enable them to provide the interest. They also represent that as respects the balance of the indebtedness the increasing business of Montreal will enable them to provide for it as they have done so promptly in the past. The trade which passes over the wharfs in Montreal is of course not the trade of Montreal itself but the trade of the whole Dominion, and the charges that are levied upon it have in the past enabled the commissioners to obtain a liberal revenue and to meet all their obligations. They are satisfied that with the increased business of the country they will continue to meet these obligations. The government, feeling satisfied that these representations are well founded, and that the object is one in which the House will readily concur, have brought forward this resolution asking that a further sum of $3,000,000 may be advanced to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal for the purposes stated and on the same terms and conditions as the grants of former years.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). There is no doubt that we cannot stand still in providing facilities for the port of Montreal, but that we must continue the improvements begun there, and these improvements, before they are finished, will cost a very considerable amount. I doubt very much, in spite of the details which the hon. minister has given us, whether it will be possible, with the sum of $3,000,000, to carry out these improvements to the very end.

But what I wish to call the attention of the government and of the committee to is the fact that we have adopted with respect to the port of Montreal a very singular policy. We are accumulating upon that unfortunate port an immense indebtedness; and the harbour commissioners, as the hon. minister has stated, have always been ready to meet their obligations when they have become due. I calculate that when this sum of $3,000,000 has been raised for the port of Montreal, that port will be indebted in the sum of $10,222,000, upon which it is impossible to conceive, if we are to make a success of that port, that the harbour commissioners shall be able to pay the interest, without reference to the considerable sum required every year for maintenance. If we are to meet that indebtedness and to maintain the port after we have finished it, we shall have to place charges against the port which will render it anything but a free port, and place it on a footing of inferiority to all the other ports on the continent of North America. The interest on that sum of $10,222,000, when we shall have spent it—and we must move for the spending of the $3,000,000 now being loaned without delay—will amount to $351,000 a year.

Let us look at the position of that port in the last three or four years. In 1901 the indebtedness of the port of Montreal for improvements, partly from loans advanced by the government, and partly from advances obtained otherwise, amounted to $4,372,000, bearing, I think, about 3⅞ per

cent. The annual interest charge was $176,032, and we paid for maintenance and repairs, $128,375; making a total expenditure in that year of $305,207; and our revenue was only $270,411. So that in the year 1901, even with this comparatively small indebtedness, we had a deficit of over $34,000. To-day the indebtedness of the port of Montreal amounts to $5,672,000, and we still have power to borrow, if I am not mistaken, $1,550,000. That is to say, at the present moment the borrowing power of the harbour commissioners amounts to $7,222,000. I have stated that I do not think, from my limited experience, though from close observation, that it is possible, even with this $3,000,000 referred to by the minister, and with the balance mentioned, for the port of Montreal to be fully equipped, as it was intended to be equipped, with all modern conveniences. I fix upon $12,000,000 rather than $10,222,000 as the amount which the port will have to incur in the way of debt before it can be equipped with modern improvements; and this would represent an annual interest charge on the port of $400,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is possible for the port of Montreal to meet that charge. It would cease absolutely to be a free port. Revenue would have to be gathered everywhere, in every imaginable way, and even then, unless the charges were absolutely exorbitant, we could not possibly raise that sum of $400,000 a year to pay interest on this indebtedness.

What I wish to call the government's attention to is this, that it seems to me we are proceeding otherwise with Montreal than we ought to do, and otherwise than we are proceeding with everything else connected with the transportation system. We have given a large amount of money to railways in the west. We have equipped or we are equipping ports on the great lakes at considerable expense. It has been admitted in the House that that equipment is necessary, and that we must be prepared to compete with our American neighbours in that respect. We have spent millions in improving the St. Lawrence route, so as to enable the commerce of the west to find an exit through that route; and recently we have taken off the canal tolls. Our object ought to be, with the advantages which nature has given us, to make transportation as easy and as cheap as possible, and to provide ports for ocean going vessels. It has been said, and I think with a great deal of truth, that we are not in a position to handle in the port of Montreal the freight from the west which nature intended we should receive, even if we had that freight. It has been said time and again that if we had a great inflow of grain into the port of Montreal, that port would be choked in a short space of time. So that it seems to me that the disposition of the government, however generous it may be, to lend money to the harbour commissioners for the equipment of that port, is contrary to sound policy. I cannot repeat it too often, that we ought, starting from the west, to have a policy of transportation clearly expressed by the government. We voted yesterday a very large amount of money for a railway in the west, and hon. members will notice that we had no declaration from the government, although it was insistently called for by the leader of the opposition, as to what link in the chain or scheme of transportation that railway was going to supply; and I have never heard, since I have had the advantage of sitting in this House, any clear declaration of policy in regard to transportation from this government. The reason is that it is impossible for the government to arrive at a clear, economic conclusion with regard to this great question, which interests us so much, without incurring the displeasure or disfavour of certain localities in this country. And yet, if there is a question perhaps more important than the question of protection, which has been so much discussed lately in this House, it is this question of transportation; and, strange to say, whereas everywhere else expense is incurred by the government with the object no doubt, of furthering in some way the attainment of that great national aim, when you come to the port of Montreal, you proceed upon a method which must inevitably it seems to me, lead to difficulty.

Unless at a future day the government is prepared to abandon its claim on the harbour commissioners, it seems to me that the bankruptcy of that port will be inevitable or the commissioners will have to impose charges on the shipping and thus take away from that port its national and free character. It is not merely the port of Montreal that is concerned. Our transportation system begins in the extreme west and ends on the continent of Europe. It has several stages. The stage represented by an ocean port is not confined to the port of Montreal. There is the important port of Quebec lower down, and if we are to have a winter port, then we must find that port on the coast and be prepared to equip it as we now find it necessary to equip the port of Montreal. It is therefore no sectional question I am raising, but the question of transportation in one of its phases and I venture to say that if we are to be saddled with this additional indebtedness, we will never be able to meet the interest and will have to go into bankruptcy. It seems to me therefore that it would be better for this government to make up its mind now as to the character to be given the port of Montreal, and if it should cost us $10,000,000 or $15,000,000, or even, as the equipment of many ports elsewhere have cost, $20,000,000 or $25,000,000, we should be prepared to incur that expense in order that the important obligations we are about to undertake with respect to railways for

the purpose of bringing freight from the west may prove fruitful and give to this country all the benefits we are entitled to expect from the investment. It seems to me that the government is lacking in frankness. It seems to me that it would be better for the government, instead of spending vast sums on wharfs in divers sections of the country, to concentrate its efforts on one, two or three ports, and place them in such a position as to be able, without making any charge to handle the very considerable amount of freight which must come from the west unless our expectations should be sadly disappointed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I am afraid that the suggestion of my hon. friend that we should abandon expenditure on wharfs elsewhere and concentrate all our expenditure in that connection on the port of Montreal is not one which would meet with general favour in this House. The alarm of my hon. friend regarding the bankruptcy of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners is not at all shared by the commissioners themselves. His suggestion is that these sums, which we are providing by way of a loan, should be presented as a free gift, and that the services which, under this scheme, will receive some compensation by way of a tax on the trade, shall be performed free. Let us see what these services are. About $1,000,000 of the loan will go into an elevator. Now elevator services are not free elsewhere: why should they be free in Montreal? Elsewhere elevators charge a reasonable compensation when service is rendered.

Mr. MONK. Are they not free in St. John and Halifax, or so low that there is not much revenue?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think that elevator services are given anywhere free. There are cases where a railway has an elevator on its line, and the elevator charge is included in the freight, but in all cases elevators are recognized as public utilities which may reasonably charge some compensation for the services they render. I do not think it would be wrong to say that a reasonable tax should be paid on grain for elevator service in Montreal. $2,000,000 out of the $3,000,000 are to be expended in building warehouses in Montreal, which is a very proper and necessary service in the handling of traffic. But we do not generally find warehouses supplied free elsewhere. Why should they be supplied free in Montreal?

Mr. MONK. Because they are simply sheds.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A shed that costs $2,000,000 is a very respectable kind of warehouse. The harbour commissioners do not share my hon. friend's alarm. They recognize that if they own a two million dollar warehouse, it is not unreasonable to ask the people who use it to pay a small charge, and they are satisfied that out of this small charge they will be able to pay the interest on the cost. They are satisfied that if these sheds, which are to cost over $2,000,000, be rented on terms which would not impose any undue burden on the trade, they will yield a sufficient return to enable the commissioners to pay the interest on their cost. If those who use warehouses elsewhere have to pay rent, why should they not have to pay rent when they use warehouses in Montreal? My hon. friend will find on reflection that, in his praiseworthy desire to advance the interests of the great city in which he lives, he is a bit unreasonable. The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, who have given this matter their careful attention, are satisfied that, with the increasing trade of the country, they will be able to meet the interest. The government, in advancing the money at the low rate of 3 per cent, is certainly doing something which, I am sure, will be appreciated, but unless it can be shown that charges, such as rentals for the use of these warehouses and of elevators, are excessive, my hon. friend has not much of a case. I do not think that the people of Montreal will be so unreasonable as to expect to be provided with free warehouses and elevators. In advancing this money at a low rate of interest this government and parliament are following out the policy which originated with our predecessors, and in my opinion the people of Montreal will be less alarmed than my hon. friend and more willing to recognize the liberal manner in which we are dealing with that great port.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). The question raised by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has a wider scope than the hon. Minister of Finance seems to imagine. It is not a Montreal question. I have no doubt that my hon. friend knows that last year the trade in the port of Montreal, export and import, reached the very large amount of $191,000,000—nearly half the trade of the whole country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not nearly half, but thirty-five per cent.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, let us say thirty-five per cent. But that in itself is a pretty large amount of money. My hon. friend, if he allows me to say so in all deference, takes a narrow view of the situation. He tells us that we must not expect that Montreal shall have free harbour accommodation. It is not Montreal that is asking that, but the trade of the country. Why did my hon. friend a few weeks ago, consent to have free canals this year? For the very excellent reason that he wished to help in developing trade through Canadian channels. The government holds the Canadian system of canals on which we have spent about $70,000,000. We are further equipping the

entrance to the canals at federal expense; we are equipping, at federal expense our harbours on the lakes. We have not done enough. Let us do more. But why, I ask, does the Minister of Finance wish to put a stop to the trade at Montreal?—for that is what it means. Raising a loan means paying the interest on that loan. I am sure that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) did not intend to convey the idea that the harbour commissioners of Montreal were going into bankruptcy. There is no fear of that; but there is fear, and well-founded fear, that if we go on piling up debts upon the port of Montreal the trade will go elsewhere. I believe that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is perfectly right when he says that Montreal is treated as no other port in the country is treated. The port of Quebec started borrowing money; the trade did not materialize; the interest is not being paid, and the port of Quebec cannot pay it. I do not blame them for not paying the interest—the trade does not afford the means of paying the interest. I would be perfectly ready to spend more money in Quebec, if it were necessary. But I say that it is a narrow policy—and I say it in no offensive manner—to raise a wall against the trade of Montreal both import and export. But that is just what the Minister of Finance is doing now. He has mentioned the harbour board. I happen to have had long and frequent intercourse with that body; and I know that, this year, the harbour commissioners were anxious not to borrow any more. But they have been informed, officially or unofficially, that they could not succeed in getting money. I have been told by several of them that that is the reason they have been obliged to accept a loan. I believe they are making a mistake. I have said it elsewhere, and I say here, that they should not have made a loan—they should not have consented to do so. Had they taken this position the government would have been responsible for the refusal to equip the port at federal expense as it ought to do, not in the interest of Montreal, but in the interest of the country at large. Now, there is no use in making long speeches; it is a very clear question. Are we going to have Canadian trade through Canadian channels? If that is what we want, let us take the means to bring it about, and one of the means necessary is to make our ports as free as possible. I agree with the Minister of Finance that we must not expect to have free elevators, to have free wharfage. But my hon. friend must not lose sight of one thing, and that is that, besides the interest on debts incurred, there is a very large expenditure of money for maintenance. It will always be necessary to raise money for that purpose. In my humble opinion, the government should assume the port of Montreal and deal with it as a great national problem, just as we deal with our great system of canals. Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax should be national harbours. In point of fact we have dealt with several of them—with all of them—partially in that way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not all.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, I said partially—that is the word I used.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But what the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said was that we had dealt with all of them partially as national harbours. I take exception to that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) say what exception he takes?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I take exception to that as applied to the port of St. John. All that the government has done at the port of St. John is to furnish railway accommodation. In the way of constructing piers and wharfs, it has done nothing whatever.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Unless my eyes have greatly deceived me, I have seen at the port of St. John wharfs——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. For railway purposes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Oh, well, my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) is drawing a red herring across the trail. And a very poor herring it is. Why my hon. friend himself has spent over $2,000,000 in St. John on wharf accommodation, shed accommodation and elevator accommodation. And he has done more than that, he has spent in Halifax a large amount of money in providing accommodation for which there is no trade. The elevator of Halifax costs this country a large amount of money every year. There is no trade for it. When it was built, we knew very well that there would not be much trade for it. I consented to the erection of that building, because I was of opinion then, as I am now, that the duty of a government is to go ahead of the trade, not to allow itself to lag behind it. I knew that the trade of Halifax would not come immediately. But that elevator in Halifax is an invitation to the trade. My hon. friend's elevator in St. John, I believe, is not doing very much either. But I do not care for that—the accommodation is there, and I have always supported him faithfully on the ground I have stated, that I believe in the complete and speedy equipment of our national harbours. Speaking from that standpoint, I do not hesitate to say that the policy of the government to-day is a mistaken policy. Why? We have spent, as I have said, $70,000,000 on our system of canals. We are going to spend millions upon millions to secure further railway accommodation. Where do we wish the trade to go? Through the St. Lawrence route. Mr. Hays, speaking elsewhere a few days ago said what is perfectly true, that we

are providing accommodation in the west, but we do not do anything for 'the spout' in the east. The port of Montreal, as it is equipped to-day cannot handle the trade that is coming to it. If my hon. friend would do us the pleasure of visiting our harbour now, he would find that there is not enough accommodation. A few days ago there were fifty large steamers in the port of Montreal. We are developing, deepening, widening the St. Lawrence river; we are lighting it in a first-class manner; we are going to spend even more money than we have spent in the past in completing all our other equipment. Yet, at the very most important strategic point we put up a wall against the trade. There is no sense in such policy. The government of which I was lately a member understood the position better in the past than it does to-day, because they agreed to a proposition of mine which is now being carried out, to complete, at federal expense, the harbour accommodation in the eastern portion of the port of Montreal. And what has been the result of that wise policy that my hon. friends followed with me in the past? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have located in the eastern part of Montreal their large works, works that will employ about eight thousand people. The Grand Trunk Railway Company, in view of the improvements going on in Montreal, have agreed to erect an elevator and warehouses. Is not this the best evidence that when we move in the path of progress we are rewarded immediately?

I am very much surprised at the statement made by the Minister of Finance a few minutes ago. He said: You cannot expect to have freight sheds. What he calls sheds are a necessary equipment of the harbour, that you find in every port in the world. Go to any well equipped harbour, and you will find that a bare wharf is not an equipment; you must have warehouses, you must have trade, you must have all the modern appliances that have made such nations as Germany, France, England and the United States so successful in the trade of the world. To the south of us we have neighbours who have magnificently equipped harbours. Why should we not have the same? Trade has been diverted from us, a great deal of our own trade is finding its way through American channels. When trade has once been diverted it is a difficult thing to get it back. The only thing we have to do is to give better rates, better accommodation, just as good rates and accommodation as other nations are giving. Unless we make up our minds to give as low rates as possible, to give as good equipment as money can make, we cannot expect to be rewarded to any large extent for the expenditure we are incurring now. Parliament was asked yesterday to guarantee for thirty years a loan for $9,000,000 for a railway in the west. That railway company will not send their trade to the St. Lawrence route unless you give them good rates. That railway company goes through Minnesota, Duluth is very near by, the United States routes are available; and I say again that unless you make the St. Lawrence route cheap, commodious and safe, you cannot expect trade.

Now, I think that on reflection the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches will admit that the views that I am stating—not now for the first time, I have stated them when I was their colleague, privately and on the floor of parliament—are correct views. When I was Minister of Public Works I tried to carry out those views, and with the help and co-operation of the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues I succeeded in beginning improvements and the equipment of our harbours in nearly all parts of the country. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is not doing justice to the government when he says, when he seems to imply, that we have not done anything. It is not fair to speak in that way. Large things cannot be done in a day, but the beginning is there, and a good beginning it is. There has been great improvement in the port of Montreal. I obtained from this parliament the sanction of a vote of $1,000,000 for the port of Quebec. Three Rivers is being equipped. I went to the port of St. John last year, on an electoral occasion, when the Minister of Railways, speaking of my visit, said that I was a very pleasant little man, and had gone down to the sea to offer public works. I went down at the request of the citizens. of the board of trade, of the merchants, to look into the accommodation which is necessary. I have no hesitation in stating here that the government should equip at their own expense the port of St. John better than it has been equipped in the past. There is not enough accommodation there. They are doing it to some extent in granting, as we did some time ago, a three per cent guarantee to a private company for a dry-dock. But that is not doing what I would like to see done. The government should equip these harbours themselves. The Minister of Public Works should take hold of these national harbours. When I was a minister I was often accused of monopolizing things. I cannot be accused of such a desire now. There is no fear that I shall be minister again very soon, so I am speaking independently when I say that this is a genuine national policy that should be followed by this government. Whoever may be Minister of Public Works, as a rule, he understands his business and his duty. I would trust these large national undertakings to any Minister of Public Works, whoever he may be. Therefore, I earnestly beg the government to think twice over the position they are taking to-day. I quite understand that it is too late to recede from the position they have assumed in reference to the port of Montreal, although they are

going back on what they have said in the past. Because the fact that we had agreed to build at national expense part of the equipment that is now being carried out in the port of Montreal, was a sanction of the principle that in future the port of Montreal would be treated as Port Colborne is treated, as Parry Sound is treated, as Fort William is treated, as Quebec is treated. I do not complain of the treatment afforded to these towns, I am glad to see it; I only want to remind the House and the country of the fact that Montreal is the most important port. It is really the largest port, and therefore should require our earnest aid. With these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, and reserving the privilege of dealing with the question again, I resume my seat.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). I listened carefully to gather from the speeches of my hon. friends from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) exactly what position they were taking with regard to the resolution now before the committee. If I could come to any conclusion it was that they were not offering any particular opposition, but they were of the opinion that the port of Montreal was in some way being discriminated against, and was not being treated, if I heard their language correctly, as well as other ports throughout the country. I do not think the facts will bear that out. I believe this parliament has recently done a great deal towards developing the port of Montreal. The port of Montreal is not situated on the ocean, and in order to make it one of the great national ports of the Dominion it could not be treated in the same way as other places. Nor do I think the impression should be allowed to go abroad that the citizens of Montreal have done more towards the development of their harbour and shipping facilities than the citizens of any other port, large or small, throughout the country. I think if my hon. friend will make comparisons he will find that in many of the smaller ports on the lakes and on the ocean, the municipalities themselves have come forward and have contributed more to create the necessary facilities for shipping than the great city of Montreal has done. I mention that only because the point seems to have been raised and the impression given that this port is being discriminated against, and not treated as well as other places. In regard to the statement of my hon. friend that the harbour commissioners will be bankrupt if they are called upon to pay interest upon the advances that have been made in the past and that which it is now proposed to make, I do not think there is any danger whatever. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has answered that when he said that it was not the opinion of the harbour commissioners, because they have applied for this loan and they have shown from the resources of the past and from the resources which they will have in the future it will be quite easy for them to pay the interest upon the amount that has already been advanced and upon this $3,000,000, and retain something like $100,000 for the maintenance of the works under their charge. As to the treatment which has been accorded the harbour of Montreal in the past, I find, according to the books of the department, that over $13,000,000 has been expended on the port of Montreal. Out of that amount the parliament of Canada has contributed something over $8,000,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Upon loan.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, not upon loan. On the development of the ship channel and improvements to the harbour something over $8,000,000 have been spent. Does my hon. friend say that it is not necessary to make improvements to the ship channel ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I say that it is not any more necessary to the development of the trade of the country than the building of the canals is. Why do you not charge the canals also to the port of Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Trade might have gone to other ports. One would suppose to hear those who are speaking about Montreal that the citizens of Montreal were taxed to pay the charges and the interest upon this loan.

Mr. MONK. They pay a good deal of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not take that view at all. I do not think any of them pay these charges, excepting those citizens who contribute to the trade of the country. The importers and exporters pay the fees that go to make up the interest that is paid upon these loans. I consider, so far as this large expenditure is concerned, that it is correctly chargeable to the port of Montreal. It may be said that this is a national port, that its development is necessary in the interest of the country, but the same thing can be said, in a comparative degree, regarding the development of any other port or channel throughout the country which is in the interest of the general trade of the country. Now, I am pointing this out because it appeared to me that there was a desire to give a wrong impression to the House and the country as to the actual state of affairs in regard to the improvements which have been made and which are being made at the port of Montreal. I think, whatever may be the future policy of the country in regard to this port, we are not prepared to say that every port in the country, both great and small, shall be declared to be free. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, the question as to what action may be taken towards decreasing the fees collected upon mer-

chandise received and delivered at these ports may be one for consideration, but so far as the general benefit derived by the parties using the elevators, warehouses, sheds and other works that are provided by public contribution is concerned, I think it is only right that those directly using them should contribute something for the advantage which they derive from their use. In the meantime, at any rate, that will be continued as the policy of the government. The port of Montreal, as my hon. friend says, may not be fully equipped for all the trade that will come to it, but the advances which have been made in the past and the liberal advance now being made, I think, if properly expended, will put the port of Montreal in better shape than it is to-day for doing business. We all hope the development of the trade of the country will be such at the port of Montreal, that greater facilities and greater improvements will be required, and I have no doubt that when the time comes this House will be ready to support any proper suggestion that may be brought down for the continuance of the improvements. The completion of the improvements now suggested and for which this money will make provision, I think, will do a great deal towards making the port of Montreal just what my hon. friend said it should be—a great national port. The general question of transportation comes into speeches made on an occasion of this kind. I am always listening attentively to hear what practical suggestions may be made. It is all very well to get up in this House, or on the platform, and talk about the importance of the transportation question, but what we want are practical suggestions as to what would be the best policy to adopt. So far as I am concerned, my greatest desire at the present time is to gain information of a practical character, and that instead of discussing the question in an academic manner on the platform and in the House, we may have the advantage of listening to some practical, business-like suggestions that can be carried out to the advantage of the country.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence). Mr. Chairman, I may state that I agree very largely with what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) have said on the question of making the port of Montreal a national port and a free port. But we are met at the present time with the fact that we have to continue the improvements that we started some years ago. There is no other way to do it than by borrowing this $3,000,000, and there is no way we can get it without paying interest for it. I would have been very pleased if the government had seen their way clear to giving that money without charging any interest, but that is not the policy of the government at present, nor do I think that it was the policy of the preceding government. I must say that I think the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), in charging the cost of the St. Peter channel to Montreal, is hardly fair to us. I do not think it is any fairer that the Lake St. Peter channel should be chargeable to the city of Montreal than that the Welland canal should be chargeable to the city of Toronto. They are all canals. I have a very good authority on that question, the late lamented statesman that we all thought so much of, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. He said that the canals of this country should not be chargeable to any particular part of the country, but to the whole country, as the whole country is benefited by them. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, says that the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) takes a narrow view of matters pertaining to the city of Montreal. I will not quarrel with him in that statement, but I am rather surprised that the hon. gentleman, when he was Minister of Public Works, did not soften the hon. Minister of Finance towards the city of Montreal. That would have been the time for the hon. gentleman to have used his influence. Not only was he Minister of Public Works, but, if report says correctly, he was also the master of the administration, and as such surely that was the time for the hon. gentleman to have insisted upon the government doing their duty towards Montreal. I believe they have not done so. I believe no government has done so. It is a fact that up to the present day not one dollar of public money has been spent upon the harbour of Montreal for which interest has not been paid. It is true that the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works did start, and that the government are now continuing, the building of a portion of the harbour of Montreal at the public expense. It is not really in the city of Montreal, as the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, knows well. It is a good work that the government are carrying on, and we take no exception to it. It is not the intention of the harbour commissioners to raise the tolls. No man knows better than the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, that within the last two or three years the tolls have been reduced by from 20 to 25 per cent.

Mr. MONK. It would be impossible to raise them.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The hon. member for St. Mary's was consulted in the matter at that time. He thought the reduction was not enough and we cut down the tolls until there was a 40 per cent reduction. It would be impossible to reduce them further. The intention is to charge the steamship companies and they willingly agree to pay it if you give them first class double-decked steel sheds in which they can do their business at much less expense than they are doing it at now. We all know that the

harbour of Montreal is very much congested and that goods are lying all over the wharfs. We will supply splendid storage facilities under this scheme and these men are willing to pay for that to the extent of the interest on the loan. Therefore if we spend $2,000,000 on sheds, these sheds will really pay for themselves. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in his statement that the port of Montreal is bankrupt at the present time. The port of Montreal has always paid every dollar of the interest on the advances made to it, and, Sir, I believe that if there was any danger of the port of Montreal becoming bankrupt the citizens of Montreal are loyal enough to their port to not allow it to become bankrupt. I believe the day is coming when not only the port of Montreal but all the ports of the Dominion, and especially those on the St. Lawrence and the Atlantic coast, will be made free to commerce. We must have free ports in Canada if we are going to compete successfully with the United States. There is no question about that, and I believe that this government will come to that conclusion. I think they see it now, but they are probably not just ready to do it, as no doubt there are a great many things they would like to do but cannot do at the present moment. But, Sir, I hope that next year the government will take over the port of Montreal and assume the debt. I hope they will do the same thing with Three Rivers, Sorel and Quebec. The only way in which we can keep the ports of Canada on a par with the ports in the United States is by making them free ports, and making the commerce of the country as free from tolls as possible. As to the elevator, I expect that it will pay its way when it gets running. We will then have a debt of between $10,000,000 and $11,000,000, but I must frankly say that it will not be sufficient to finish the work there. On the most conservative estimate I can make, it will take $12,000,000 to put the port of Montreal in good shape. If the government cannot see their way clear now to make Montreal a free port they might reduce the interest and if the debt were $12,000,000 and the interest were 2½ per cent there would be very little difficulty about raising the funds. Another thing the government might do is this: They might at least pay to the city of Montreal and the harbour commissioners the money they owe them. It is well known to the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that the government owes to the harbour at Montreal nearly $2,000,000, which was left over from the old Lake St. Peter debt, and which was charged up to the harbour commissioners. I trust that at an early date the government will pay this just debt which they owe to the port of Montreal.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) at the beginning of his speech said that when I was in office I should have commenced by getting public money for the port of Monteral, but knowing the facts as he does, he was obliged to correct that statement and to add that there are works at Montreal which have been carried out at the public expense, although he said these works were not in the port of Montreal proper. Well, the port of Montreal is the one thing.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I said they were not in the city of Montreal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman used the very words I attributed to him.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I did not mean it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I will take the hon. gentleman's correction. My hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) who is a harbour commissioner knows that to-day there is a very large trade which is being developed in the eastern portion of the harbour. When I was a minister I had the honour of bringing my colleagues to the principle that the port of Montreal as a national port should be equipped in future at the public expense. That work has been begun and my hon friend has expressed the hope that next year the government will give full recognition to that principle. I hope so. The hon. gentleman thought fit to allude to the fact that I was supposed to be the master of the administration. Well, the facts do not prove that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is of course quite true that every Prime Minister does not take the same severe view of his colleagues' speeches as the Prime Minister of Canada took of mine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have on my desk a very important speech delivered yesterday in the Imperial House of Commons in which Mr. Balfour says very distinctly that he had no desire to discipline his colleagues in the way some people expected he would discipline them. I was not the master of the administration, but I tried to be the master of my own mind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My mind was that we should endeavour to develop to the best of our ability the trade of this country on Canadian and national lines. I tried to bring about that result. However, if next year the government comes down with a policy which will better suit our views, I will be the first man to applaud and cheer them. My hon. friend from St. Lawrence knows very well that this $3,000,000 will not equip the port of Montreal, and that it will be necessary to spend a very much larger amount of money. There is no use hiding the facts. What is $10,000,000 to a great national harbour?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is it proposed that dues and fees shall be collected upon the works which are being constructed in that portion of the harbour which is not in the city of Montreal ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes. I stated to the House after having discussed the matter with my colleagues, that those works when completed would be treated just in the same way as other works.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was the understanding.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How much better off is the harbour then ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The harbour commissioners are not paying interest on that money, and it is the beginning of lowering the tolls.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But you are continuing to charge tolls ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend is not serious. If the public treasury gives $2,000,000, the harbour commissioners have not to pay the interest on it, and there is so much less to be charged on the port of Montreal. Surely the hon. minister has not thought twice. I will try to make myself clear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will have some difficulty in doing so.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The difference is just this. That when money is not borrowed we have no interest to pay on it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When the hon. gentleman says : 'We have no interest to pay on it ;' who are the 'we' ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The country pays it one way or the other.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am speaking as a Canadian member of parliament having at heart the development of Canadian trade through Canadian channels. Why have we spent about $20,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not the question.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is the question. It is on the same lines, because we expect to have more trade. Why are our hon. friends asking us to guarantee millions upon millions for railway companies if not to have more trade ? The harbour of Montreal should be treated on the same lines as the railways, for the same reason. It seems to me that the position I am taking is the right one. We have this year made the canals free. In saying we, I speak as a member of parliament, for on that question parliament was unanimous.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. May I ask my hon. friend a question ? I fail to understand him so far. Will he kindly point out what is the distinction from which the port of Montreal benefits, between paying dues and fees on works which are not under the control of the harbour commissioners, and paying the same measure of dues and fees on works which are under the control of the harbour commissioners ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It seems to me that the answer is very easy. The policy which I was endeavouring to impress on my colleagues, and which I thought I succeeded in impressing upon them, was that the port of Montreal should be made as free a port as it was possible to make it. Then, by our constructing, at the public expense, some of the works of improvement which are now going on, and the harbour commissioners having no money to borrow, they would have no interest to pay. The country would supply the money, and there would be so much less interest to pay.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who would pay it ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is another small herring my hon. friend is drawing across the trail.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that is very much like a whale, instead of a small herring.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I may be slow, but I do not see the wit of the word. Seriously speaking, what I was aiming at when I had the honour of being a colleague of my hon. friend, was to impress on the government and the country the necessity of having as cheap transportation as it was possible to make it. That is the reason why I have always been happy to help my friends in the maritime provinces to get accommodation for that part of the country. It is the reason why I have been preaching this gospel of transportation from one end of the country to the other ; and I thought I had succeeded in impressing upon the government the necessity of not saddling the port of Montreal with any more debt. Suppose we take the position that the port of Montreal shall pay for past debts, but that for the future it should be equipped at the national expense. That is in two words what I was aiming at then, and what I am aiming at now. I quite admit that it would be difficult to make the port altogether free, because there will always be the cost of maintenance ; but I do not know that the time will not come when public opinion will be so strong that even this government, which seems to be very steep at times on matters of national importance, will be obliged to realize that the sentiment of the nation is above party ex-

pediency. I say without any hesitation that the policy followed to-day is one of party expediency, because my hon. friends may be afraid to be reproached elsewhere for giving money to the port of Montreal. Well, we must recognize that geography cannot be changed. The port of Montreal has been placed where it is by the hand of Providence. It is the first port at the end of the lakes, at the head of navigation. I heard one of my colleagues say the trade could go elsewhere. Where could it go? It could not stop farther up without going to American ports, such as Portland, New York, Philadelphia, and other ports. Quebec will undoubtedly have its trade, but Quebec has always been where it is. To-day the port of Montreal is there, with its magnificent natural facilities; and, in spite of the fact that we have no great accommodation at Montreal, the trade is coming to that port, because trade is always inclined to go as far as possible into the land—this my hon. friends know as well as I do, if not better. It seems to me, then, that the policy that this country should follow is to make the port of Montreal and other ports of national importance as free as it is possible to make them. St. John, Halifax, Quebec, Three Rivers, should be made commodious and cheap ports, such as Canadian energy and Canadian enterprise and Canadian money can make them. This is not a sectional question with me. I recognize all the ports that are of national importance as forming part of the same system, and, unless we so recognize them, we shall be left behind. By improving the waterways you give competition and cheap rates to the farmers and the industrial interests, and you serve a great national object.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Mr. Chairman, no one can deny that my hon. friend invariably makes every subject he discusses in this House interesting, if not in itself, at least to those who listen to him. He has just now spoken of Montreal as having been placed where it is by the hand of Providence. I do not think there can be any doubt that Montreal is at the point where the rapids in the St. Lawrence begin and where the river navigation, properly so-called ends, as the act of Providence; but I think Providence had very little to do with the digging of the channel between Quebec and Montreal. I think we have to give some credit to man for the part he has taken in connection with the works of construction that have been carried on in order to enable Montreal to occupy the position it now occupies. My hon. friend talks of making Montreal a national port. There is some vagueness and uncertainty as to what he means by a national port. Do I understand that he means a port equipped with wharfs, sheds, and elevators at the national expense, to be used by all-comers for nothing? If that is what he means by a national port, in order to put Montreal on an equal footing with the other harbours of this Dominion, shall we not do the same thing for the other harbours?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Why distinguish? If we do that, it means that we must expend upon them a certain amount of money which comes out of the public exchequer, and on that money somebody must pay the interest. The people of Canada at large must pay the interest on that. Where is the difference in principle between paying the interest on money that would be expended in that way, and getting the interest back as we now do, out of the pockets of those who use the goods that go to the port of Montreal and get the benefit of these improvements? Is that not the more intelligent way, if I might use the word, of disposing of this matter—that those who use these improvements created by Canada shall pay for the use they make of them? My hon. friend says that we ought to equip our ports in a way to fit them to compete with the American ports. I can speak of New York. there is not an inch of wharf in the city of New York that is not paid for by the city. There is not an inch of wharf nor a foot of shed in New York which is not paid for. All those improvements made in the harbour of New York are paid for by those who use them. Why should we depart from the principle here? Why should a different policy be followed in our Canadian ports? It seems to be almost unavoidable that my hon. friend and myself should occasionally indulge in a little controversy with reference to the port of Quebec. I have no desire to enter into any discussion for the purpose of making parochial politics, and I am quite willing to admit that both my hon. friend and I are animated by the same spirit and desire to do all we can to advance the interests of our Canadian ports. My hon. friend knows that about three million dollars were spent on the port of Quebec. He knows too how that money was spent and to what extent we benefited by it. The result of the expenditure, as my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) told us the other night, is that we have in the Louise basin a berth for one ship. My hon. friend from St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) talks of the expenditure in Quebec made by the government and for which no return was made to this government, but what occurred? No sooner was the expenditure begun than immediately, for the purpose of drawing away the trade which the expenditure was intended to benefit, seven million dollars were expended on the channel between Quebec and Montreal. I am not questioning the right of the people of Montreal to use all their energies for the purpose of getting this expenditure of public money on the improvement of the waterway, but

I am simply pointing out that, as a matter of fact, it absolutely neutralized the expenditure on the part of Quebec. The expenditure was made absolutely useless because, in the first place, the money was expended at an improper place, and then, in the second instance, the government of the day immediately proceeded to expend millions on the lake St. Peter channel, in order to divert the shipping from Quebec to Montreal. I am not finding any fault with the government of that day for improving the channel, for we are going on the same lines, but I am simply pointing out how the port of Quebec was affected by that policy. My hon. friend must not forget that not only did we spend $7,000,000 in deepening that channel but that we are also spending at the rate of some $600,000 per annum on the maintenance of the channel, we are expending in the vicinity of from $800,000 to $900,000 on capital account for the construction of two dredges to be used in improving that channel. When we come to build elevators, there is no reason why we should make any distinction between Montreal and Quebec. We have two elevators in Quebec, built by private corporations. If the Montreal Harbour Board thinks it proper to build one in that port, I have no desire to interfere, but, the least the general public can ask is that those who use the elevator should be made to pay for it. We are asked to build sheds in addition to the elevators. Is there any good reason why those who use the sheds should not pay for that use ? We have built sheds in Quebec but without any government aid. I do not wish to detain the House, but it seems to me that if we adopt the principle of equipping Montreal as a national port at the public expense, in all fairness we should do the same for all the other ports in the Dominion. Quebec has greater natural advantages than Montreal, and if Montreal had not been so generously aided by the hand of man, the trade which is done there would be centred in Quebec. I go further and say, that until the government interfered for the purpose of building this channel between Quebec and Montreal, and so long as Quebec was left with its natural advantages, it was in advance of Montreal. I can remember when we had ten ships in that port for one in Montreal ; and although things have been changed since, that change is due to the result of government expenditure. In saying this, I am not casting any reflection on that policy. I am quite free to admit that whatever is to the advantage of Montreal, profits every other part of Canada. But, I would urge that all the ports in the Dominion be put on the same footing and each be given a fair field and no favour.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend and myself will agree no doubt as to facts of public notoriety. The port of Quebec was equipped in the same convenient way as the port of Montreal is being equipped now, namely, by a loan. If there is any one who knows how that money was spent, I am the one. My hon. friend knows a good deal, but perhaps I know more than he does, I know a good deal about it, but let by-gones be by-gones. We ventilated that question some years ago, and I hope that we will see nothing more of the kind in the future. There are some facts which my hon. friend seems to have forgotten. He says that in Quebec we are building sheds and not asking anybody for money to build them ? Well, I give my hon. friend the credit for the interest he has displayed in the port of Quebec by inducing the government to forfeit the rights guaranteed to it by the bonds in the hands of the hon. Finance Minister. The government gave up the precedence attaching to those bonds in order to enable the people of Quebec to borrow money.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let my hon. friend state the facts fully. In so far as that precedence is concerned, it had reference to the piece of wharf built immediately opposite the custom house. The money was spent on the construction of that wharf and had absolutely no connection with the sheds.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The sheds were built because the government gave up its precedence, and I am very glad it did so. The harbour commissioners at Quebec owe about $6,000,000 with the interest. I fully recognize that they cannot pay either the capital or the interest. I fully admit that a large volume of that money has been badly spent, but all the same the government advanced the money and has never been paid the interest. I am not complaining of this, but I say that the port of Montreal has not been treated in a like manner. That port pays the interest on every dollar borrowed from the government. It is not the people of Montreal who pay, but the trade of the country ; and if the trade of the country is obliged to pay rates that are too high, it will go through other channels. That cannot be denied. The port of Quebec has natural advantages. My hon. friend has said that the dredging of the St. Lawrence has diverted the trade from Quebec, but he forgets that the work of dredging the St. Lawrence began nearly fifty years ago—long before the Louise Basin was started.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But the diversion did not take place until about fifteen years ago. Before that we had more ships in Quebec than in Montreal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I shall not discuss that point. The trade is taking good care of itself. My hon. friend knows that most of the important harbours of the world are inland harbours. He knows that Hamburg and Manchester are both inland harbours.

Why the German nation have spent $75,000,000 on the Elbe and Hamburg works.

Mr. WADE. They have no ocean harbours.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, there is no use discussing such a question before such an audience. The port of Quebec is available; why, then, does the trade seek the port of Montreal? Because the port of Montreal is the natural centre of exchange between the west and the east. Why should a barge loaded with grain pass by Montreal, when there are sea-going ships waiting for her cargo? The city of Montreal with its suburbs and surroundings has a population of nearly half a million. Why should they displace themselves and send their trade elsewhere? That cannot possibly be done. Why did we build the canals? To take the trade through the St. Lawrence route. It seems to me that it is not necessary to adduce much argument to establish the position I take. My hon. friend has spoken of the port of New York. That port is fairly well equipped; but, on account of the high charges exacted there, it is losing ground every day.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). How is it in Boston?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How is it equipped?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. How are the charges?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have not the figures under my hand——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. How is it about the ownership of the wharfs, and the ownership of the sheds?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In the United States, there are several systems. In certain cities, the state governments contribute, and in others the federal government contributes. Take Buffalo, for instance, that port has been equipped partly by the state government of New York, and party by the federal government. But we have to face the simple question: Are we making up our minds that we will give the trade cheap rates? If so, we must take the means to do it. And the main reason why I object to the policy of my hon. friends on the treasury benches is that they are not taking the means to accomplish this great national object. However, we have made our position pretty clear. I hope that in the future my hon. friends will change their minds. If they do not change their minds we will try to induce the people outside to impress upon them the great importance of doing so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said that $1,000,000 was voted last year for the harbour of Quebec. I have looked over the estimates and I find that only $100,000 was voted.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) is a very clever man. But he is doing now just what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) tried to do—he is drawing a red herring across the trail. And let me explain to the committee how he is doing it. When I had the honour of being Minister of Public Works, I was approached, and the right hon. the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was approached at the same time by the representatives of the trade of Quebec. They represented that it was necessary that there should be further equipment for the port. My right hon. friend helped me, and it was understood and agreed that certain works should be carried out. I placed the plans of those works on the Table of the House last session, works the carrying out of which would have involved the expenditure of about $1,000,000. My hon. friend has only to read 'Hansard' to see that that is the case. I placed these plans on the Table with the consent of my colleagues, especially of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government. These plans were approved by the House. I asked for a vote of $100,000, of course, because we could not spend more during the present year; but at the time, I stated distinctly that these works would cost $1,000,000. These are the facts of the case. Now, my hon. friends have thought fit to change the plan. That is there business. What they are doing to-day is a good work—I do not complain that it is not a good work. But what I make bold to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is this—that if the government are going to provide this country with a fast Atlantic service, the accommodation being provided in Quebec is not sufficient. And if my hon. friend comes next year with an appropriation of the balance of the million dollars that I succeeded in getting, I shall be very glad to vote for it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). As my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has referred to me perhaps it will not be out of place for me to give a word of explanation as to the statement he has just made. My hon. friend laid before the House last year plans as to which there was a good deal of exception taken, and as to which, on the other hand, there was a good deal of approbation. These plans provided for the extension of the wharf at La Pointe à Carcy, towards the middle of the river and works towards the back. I agreed that he should take an appropriation of $100,000 for the extension of the wharfs extending up to the wharf at La Pointe à Carcy. As to the plans provided with regard to the extending of the works behind the Louise Basin, since I came back from Europe, it has been represented that there might be some danger to the existing works in carrying out the operations proposed. I asked my hon. friend the Minister of Public

Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) to have that matter decided before the work was gone on with. I agree with my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that the harbour has to be equipped; and, if we are to have, as we must have, a fast Atlantic service, considerable improvements must be added to give the accommodation necessary for that service. But whether we should go on with the plans that my hon. friend has provided for the extension of the work behind the Louise Basin is now under consideration. The plans are being considered by proper engineers, to see whether the plans proposed are correct or whether they should be amended.

As I am on my feet I may say a few words on the general topic under discussion. I take issue with my hon. friend in the view he has taken that the harbour of Montreal is being discriminated against. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) started that view. I took note of the statement he made, which, I think he himself will agree, requires some explanation. He said that we were dealing in a different way with the harbour of Montreal from the way in which we were dealing with the North-west. He said that we voted several millions yesterday for the North-west. That is true; but what we did for the North-west yesterday is precisely what we propose now to do for the harbour of Montreal—in one case, as in the other we are simply loaning the credit of the Dominion. Yesterday it was to a big railway company to build a railway, and to-day it is to the Montreal Harbour Trust to carry on their work. I think there is no necessity of pushing the comparison further—we have only to state the case to show that there is no essential difference. But there is a matter of difference which I wish to point out. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has started the idea that the harbour of Montreal should be treated like every other harbour in the Dominion, that no more charges should be put upon it than upon any other harbour I agree with him. But my hon. friend should remember that we are to-day proceeding, with regard to the harbour of Montreal in a manner which, he will permit me to say, received his approbation when I had the honour of having him for my colleague. There is no difference between what is being done to-day and what was done three or four years ago. At that time we gave authority to the harbour commissioners of Montreal to borrow a certain amount to equip the harbour. At the same time we gave authority to my hon. friend, then Minister of Public Works, to carry out certain works in the harbour. He says that it was intended that these works should be made national works. So it was. I will not enter upon the discussion at this moment whether or not the works done by the government were to pay dues or not. That is not of material concern, for I cannot see that there is any difference, if dues are to be paid upon the wharfs, whether those wharfs are built by the government or by the harbour commissioners. In either case the tolls are to come out of the shipping, which seems to be a very sound principle. But at the same time that my hon. friend was obtaining authority from parliament to build these wharfs which are now in course of construction, which certainly are of great utility and will be of still greater utility in the future, the harbour commissioners were empowered to borrow money on the credit of the country to carry on their own works. I understand my hon. friend to say now that the harbour commissioners instead of spending the money themselves upon sheds and elevators, should not be allowed to do so, but that the money should be paid by the Minister of Public Works. That is practically his criticism. I have only to observe that there is no necessity and no opportunity at this moment, to change the policy which he inaugurated a few years ago.

My hon. friend remembers very well that when these works in the harbour of Montreal were contemplated he was Minister of Public Works. He gave a great deal of time to the plans which were prepared, and he knows very well that the equipment of these wharfs which it was then intended to build by the harbour commissioners was to be supplemented by elevators and by sheds. Therefore the hon. gentleman ought not to forget that at this moment we are simply carrying out the plans which had his sanction, and which were provided for three or four years ago to keep this harbour in the best possible condition for trade. It was not sufficient simply to have wharfs, it was not sufficient simply to have the necessary appliances for ships to load and unload their cargoes, but further works had to be done to provide an elevator and sheds for warehouses. Now is it not better, under such circumstances, that the authority which had begun these works should carry them to completion ? If in future we have other works to complete in the harbour of Montreal, as we shall have, then the views presented by my hon. friend may be presented with better purpose, and we shall have to decide then whether they should be built by the harbour commissioners or by the Minister of Public Works. All that will come in due time. In the meantime, I take notice of the objection made by my hon. friend that the harbour of Montreal ought not to be burdened more than any other harbour. Sir, if the harbour of Montreal has been more burdened than any other harbour—I do not say that it is so—whose fault is it ? It is certainly not the fault of this government. My hon. friend was for a sufficiently long time a member of this government to defend himself and to defend the government of which he was a member at the time. We found the situation when

we came in, we found the harbour commission of Montreal in possession of certain works. They applied to us to continue what they had been doing, and I give credit to my hon. friend for this, that he contributed a great deal, I think, to improve the work done by the harbour commissioners and to continue it. But if the harbour commissioners have spent too much money, if the harbour of Montreal has been unduly burdened, I think it is a case that the board of trade and the citizens of Montreal may be trusted to come and represent to the government. I received a notice a few days ago from the harbour board that they wanted to interview the government on this question and I granted the interview at once. Then they sent me word that they would come at a later period. When they come we will hear their views, and they will say whether the harbour of Montreal has been saddled with a greater burden than Toronto or St. John. But at this moment the hon. gentleman ought to agree that he can find no fault with us for doing what we are doing now, that is to say, for continuing the policy which he approved himself when Minister of Public Works, of enabling the harbour commissioners to carry on and complete the work which they had undertaken under his own regime.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, will do me the justice to admit that when I had the privilege of being his colleague I always struggled, especially during the last couple of years, to have our national harbours equipped as fully as possible. He has in his hand a memorandum that I left two or three months before quitting office, in which my views are set forth very fully. I acknowledge that I have been a party to lending money to the port of Montreal, as I have also been a party to maintaining the tariff which is to-day in existence. There is always room for improvement in the world. It does not follow that because the port of Montreal has been treated in the past in the way we know, we must always proceed in the same direction. I was glad to hear my hon. friend say that perhaps in the near future the direction in which we are proceeding now might be changed. I paid a good deal of attention to his words, and if I understood them correctly, it is good news for us, because the policy which is being followed now is not the right policy. We are at present only putting up a gate that we should instead be lowering. Only one word as to the work in Quebec. My right hon. friend has said that representations have been made to him that the plans I submitted to the House last year might perhaps imperil the existing works. I am sure that no engineer made such representations to him, because no engineer who knows anything about the works could say anything of the kind. I will explain to my right hon. friend. He is not an engineer in public works, though he is a good engineer in some other directions. The works which were begun had no foundation; we cannot dredge in the Louise Basin because the works have been laid without a foundation. The plan I submitted provided for a deeper foundation, about fifteen feet deeper, and at the same time to make it more solid. That makes a vast difference. My hon. friend I am sure did not mean to misrepresent me on that occasion.

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not say it was a fact, I said that representations had been made.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There are representations that may be made with some motive. I know the cost of the Quebec harbour works. I have studied them carefully, but not in the direction that has been pointed out by my right hon. friend. There were some other interests, however, that I do not mean to allude to now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The harbour commissioners of Montreal have treated this question in a businesslike way, and the government, I think, is treating the question in the same manner. There is no difficulty about the harbour commissioners being in a position to meet the interest on the loan which they have asked the Dominion government to make to them. The resolution which I hold in my hand, dated May 5th, 1903, explains the position very well, there can be no misunderstanding about it:

> Resolved, that should the loan of $3,000,000 asked for from the government be obtained, that about $2,000,000 would be required for building two storey steel sheds on the Alexandra, King Edward and Jacques Cartier piers, and the shore wharfs at sections 12, 13 and 17, which it is proposed to rent to the steamship lines, the rental to be charged therefor not to exceed six cents per square foot of space which, for 1,284,390 square feet which would be provided in the sheds, would yield $74,903.40 per annum, of which $60,000 would be for the interest, and the balance of $14,903.40 for maintenance and insurance. The interest on the balance of the loan of $1,000,000, which is $30,000, would be provided for out of the ordinary revenue obtained from wharfage dues, as it is proposed to expend out of the aforesaid sum $586,885 on permanent paving, thus reducing the cost of annual repairs which in the past has been considerable for maintenance of roadways, and leave the expense which would be required for maintenance to be available for the payment of interest.

Now what are the facts? The interest on the sums which we have authorized them to borrow, in all $10,222,000, will make, with the maintenance, a sum to be levied every year of $450,880. Now, if you deduct from that sum of $450,880, $30,000 of revenue from the elevator and $60,000, the rental on the sheds, you will have remaining a balance of $360,880 to provide for. The revenue last year was over $322,000,

so that there should be no fear whatever that the harbour commissioners will have sufficient to meet the interest on the different sums that they have borrowed and those that they will borrow. Of course, it must be borne in mind that it will be only within the next few years that the whole amount can be borrowed because we can easily understand that the whole expenditure of this $3,000,000 cannot be made in one season. It would take two seasons at least in which this expenditure can be made. As regards the principle of advancing money to the harbour commissioners, I may say, as it has been said and repeated here, this is the same principle which has been in force since 1896 under this government. It is the same principle which has been applied by former governments. Well, if you look at the facts, in what position are you ? In 1896 the former government were able to reduce the harbour dues in Montreal by from 25 to 30 per cent. Under the present government the harbour commissioners have been able, although they have reduced their interest, and although they have spent every year large sums of money for maintenance which they will not be called upon to expend in future years, when the wharfs will all have been paid for—they have been able, as I am perfectly well aware, and as has been stated by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), to reduce the dues by 40 per cent and notwithstanding this their revenue has been increasing. Fault has been found with this procedure by the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). I can only repeat what has been stated already that this principle was concurred in in 1898 and 1899 when the harbour commissioners came before the government and asked for advances, so that, if this is the time to find fault with the principle and to say that it is wrong it must have been equally wrong in 1898 and 1899. I want to go further. I say the principle is not wrong at the present time. There may come a time when all the harbours and piers will be perfectly free, but all this does not come in a day. It takes years before this can be accomplished. Take, for instance, the abolition of the tolls on the canals. For years and years the navigation companies had been asking that the tolls on the canals the customs dues and the inspection fees should be abolished. It is only this year that they have succeeded in obtaining justice, but this is a beginning and I think the present government cannot be accused of not doing anything to aid transportation and navigation when it is easy to calculate that the amount of which the navigation companies have been relieved is nearly $400,000 annually. Now, the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works says that the principle is wrong and he states that he began himself the expenditure of public money to improve the port of Montreal. I have to differ from him on that point, because, what he says as to the expenditure of public money to improve the port of Montreal means simply this that instead of the interest on that amount advanced for the construction of the pier in Hochelaga bay being paid indirectly to the government by the harbour commissioners it will be collected directly by the government in harbour dues at this pier, because nobody will deny that it was perfectly well understood when the money was voted to build this pier and when the consent of the harbour commissioners was asked that this pier, which is being built by Messrs. Poupore & Malone, would not be free but that dues would be charged at the same rate and under the same conditions as they are collected on the rest of the piers in the harbour of Montreal. Everybody understands perfectly well that in the case of the pier being built now under the control of the hon. Minister of Public Works, dues will be collected by the government instead of being collected by the commissioners and paid over to the government as interest.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Who will pay the interest on that $1,000,000 which will be spent at Hochelaga ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be paid out of the dues. The government will pay the interest, but they will collect the amount in dues on the pier. Blanc Bonnet et bonnet blanc. It means exactly the same thing, except, of course, that the debt of the harbour commissioners of Montreal will be increased by $600,000 or thereabouts, or by whatever may be the cost of the pier. As regards the position of the shipping interests and the trade of Montreal they will be in exactly the same position whether vessels land their goods and merchandise on the pier built by the government or whether they land their goods and merchandise on the piers built under the system adopted by the harbour commissioners. Now, a good deal has been said about the expenditure on the port of Montreal and on the channel. The facts as regards the expenditure of money on the channel are fresh in the mind of every member in this House. The money spent on the channel of the St. Lawrence river between Montreal and Quebec was levied by the harbour commissioners of Montreal on the trade of Canada generally and on the shipping interest doing business in the city of Montreal. Great credit is due to the men of enterprise who, in 1840 or 1850, organized the harbour commissioners of Montreal and took in hand the work of improving the channel of the St. Lawrence which was then eleven or twelve feet deep on the flats of Lake St. Peter and who made it what it was in 1887 or 1888, when the government took hold of it. It was only fair and reasonable that the gov-

ernment, having taken charge of that channel, should assume the debt which had been contracted, although I think the government did not do entire justice to the harbour commissioners and citizens of Montreal, because, instead of reimbursing the whole amount that had been expended on the works of the channel they reimbursed only the capital expenditure without taking into consideration the interest. I know something about the matter, having been a member of the harbour commission for four years, and there is an account standing now awaiting settlement for interest paid on the sums advanced by the commissioners of nearly $2,000,000. Instead of pressing for the settlement of that claim against the government, the commission which is composed of men of business representing the vast corporations of Montreal, such as the Board of Trade, the Corn Exchange, the Shipping Interests, the Chambre de Commerce, besides six members appointed by the government representing the best business men of Montreal, after having studied this question since 1898 have come to the unanimous opinion that it is a businesslike course to proceed in the way proposed. The general plans for the the improvement of the harbour of Montreal had been approved in 1898 by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). These plans did not provide then for such works as permanent sheds, a complete railway track system, a steam crane and others which are included in the $3,000,000 loan. It is a well known fact that the harbour commissioners of Montreal are now in a better condition to execute these works properly and cheaply than any other body, because they have the whole organization at their disposal. They are in a position to undertake themselves works of this kind, except probably the steel structure which they will have to let by contract. The other works will be done under the supervision of their own engineer and staff which up to the present time has proven itself to be perfectly competent. There is no fear of the Montreal harbour commissioners becoming bankrupt, or that the trade will be charged more for tolls than in the past. On the contrary, if you take the trade this year since the opening of navigation which is only a comparatively short period, you will find that there were more head of cattle shipped up to the present time than during the whole season last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have twelve steamers more in the port of Montreal this season than up to the corresponding date last season. I am informed by those who take a deep interest in our commerce that there have been shipped through the port of Montreal up to the present, 2,000,000 bushels more of grain than during the corresponding period last year. That is probably due in part to the fact that tolls have been abolished on the canals, and that customs dues and inspection fees are no longer charged. As representing the largest division of the city of Montreal, I am entirely in accord with the proposition made by the harbour commissioners. It is the only reasonable proposition under the circumstances, and it is the best means calculated to equip the harbour of Montreal within a reasonable time. If the government were to take hold of these extensive works they would not have the necessary means and plant at their disposal, and it would take them a long time to get prepared for the work, while it is the hope of every good citizen of Montreal that these works will be finished next season, and then the works can be proceeded with in the east end of Montreal which have been already started.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I wish to add a word of correction and explanation. Touching the discrimination against Montreal, I am afraid my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) failed to catch the point of the question which I ventured to put him about the word 'we.' My only object was to emphasize the point which has been made during the debate as to who pays the interest on the loan. My hon. friend said: 'We pay the interest,' which was likely to convey the impression that the people of Montreal pay the interest.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I did not mean that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) admitted afterwards that this interest was paid by the trade of the country which passes through Montreal. As a matter of fact the citizens of the city of Winnipeg pay the interest as much as the citizens of Montreal. There are cities in Canada where the people are paying hard money in taxes for harbour facilities, but Montreal is not one of them. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) and I differed as to the extent of the trade of Montreal. He said that in Montreal the total trade was nearly one-half the total trade of the country and I said I thought it was not more than 35 per cent. I see by the figures that last year it was actually 29·25 per cent. I do not mention that for the purpose of undervaluing it, because that is a very great proportion of the trade of the country. As the figures we use in debate are often quoted elsewhere it is just as well that the correction should be made.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have the figures in my hand and I will read them. They are as follows:

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

Statement of revenue and tonnage from the opening of navigation to 30th September, in 1901 and 1902.

	1901.	1902.
From imports..	$ 93,500 00	$122,500 00
From exports..	47,000 00	52,500 00
From local traffic..	18,765 92	16,328 90
Total..	$159,265 92	$191,328 90

Increase in 1902 over 1901, $32,062 98.

	1901.	1902.
Tonnage of sea-going vessels..	1,144,004	1,163,778
Increase in 1902 over 1901..		19,774
Tonnage of inland vessels..	1,278,144	1,427,100
Increase in 1902 over 1901..		148,956

Total increase of tonnage in 1902 over 1901, 168,730.

I did not mean to say that the interest is paid by Montreal or elsewhere, but what I did try to urge was that unless you make the ports of Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax, cheap ports, the trade will not come to us at all. It is only from that standpoint that I am discussing the question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have been following this discussion with a good deal of interest, because I represent a constituency in which is situated one of the two principal Canadian seaports which are open all the year round. My constituents take a very deep personal interest in the question which is now to some extent under discussion. I have been desirous of hearing from my hon. friends who are criticising the present proposal, some very cogent reasons why this vote ought not to be passed, because I felt convinced that if they made out a case strong enough to show that a great deal of argument was capable of being advanced against the approval of this motion, then a very very strong case would be made in favour of the general adoption of the principle which the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) declares himself so strongly in favour of. There is no doubt that there is a difference between the manner in which some of the Canadian seaports are treated by this government and by all governments, and the manner in which other Canadian ports are treated. The Minister of Finance has correctly pointed out that the citizens of Montreal have not been called upon to pay any interest burden in connection with the expenditure upon their port.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The city of Montreal is contributing $1,000,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Now ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not aware of that fact, and the hon. gentleman permitted the statement of the Minister of Finance to pass unchallenged. If they have that in contemplation now, it is nevertheless the fact that up to the present moment the city of Montreal has not put its hand into its pockets municipally speaking, and borne any portion of any charge incident to the betterment of their harbour. That cannot be said, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has remarked, with regard to some other ports. It certainly cannot be said with regard to the seaport of St. John. When the business coming from the western country was being carried to St. John for ocean transport, which was bound to flow into that city, the people of St. John hoped that the government of the day would come to their assistance and enable them to handle that produce with advantage to the shippers and to the country. They could, I am free to confess, have secured assistance if they had been willing to place their harbour under the control of a trust, like one or two other harbours in the country. They did not agree to that, and therefore they received no direct assistance from the exchequer of Canada failing to get any assistance from the government of Canada, they set to work to provide the piers, sheds and other facilities, which were necessarily required if any business was to be done, by municipal taxation ; and a sum which exceeds three-quarters of a million and very nearly approaches a million dollars was actually paid by the people of that city in order to provide its harbour with these necessary requirements. The people of St. John are paying the tax on that expenditure. The business of the port does not bear it. There are no dues or fees collected in respect of the wharfs, because they had to be handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in order that that company would interest itself in making St. John a port of ocean shipment. The city has undoubtedly had some advantage from that expenditure. The business has increased and is increasing year by year. I cannot at this moment state exactly the gross amount of tonnage shipped last winter as compared with previous years ; but it has quadrupled since these works were established. So that the committee can see that there was every warrant for the people of St. John, from the point of view of the interests of business, to embark in this expenditure and provide the port with what it needed. But it appeared to me at that time, and it appears to me now, that we ought to appeal confidently for the support of the government ; because if it is a fact that all these transportation and shipping facilities that have been provided by the government are of national importance and are justified from the national point of view, the national interest does not cease to be involved when the shipment goes during the winter season from one of the Atlantic seaports. It is a national interest there if it is a national interest anywhere. My hope with regard to this—and it bears on the suggestion which the hon. member has made, that the government ought to make these ports free ports, and is a complete answer to any criticism that may be passed

upon us for making this vote—is that at the present moment the government, with the full knowledge of parliament, has constituted a commission, the object of which is to study the whole question as it bears upon the providing of proper facilities at the different Canadian seaports. Their business will be to look into the situation as respects them all, and to advise the government as to what, in their opinion, would be the proper method to pursue in order that those ports should be equipped in the manner which the national interests will require, and enable the business of the country to be transacted under the most favourable conditions. I cannot conceive of anything that ought to engage the more careful attention or consideration of this commission. I say, therefore, that it would be entirely premature, in view of the arrangements which have been made hitherto for the harbour of Montreal, to make any change at this moment in the matter under discussion.

Mr. McCREARY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if it would not be wise to hold over even this vote until that commission has made its report ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No ; if you did that, you would practically delay the improvements in the harbour of Montreal. These works, which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says were planned over ten years ago, have been partially performed. They were taken hold of four or five years ago by the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, and pushed on by the harbour trust with a considerable amount of energy. The plans contemplated the providing of sheds and other equipment.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The plans of the sheds are ready now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The plans of the sheds, I am told, are ready now, and it is a very serious matter to delay works of this kind. The harbour of Montreal has undoubtedly been suffering in the fact that it has not been able to furnish the required accommodation to the ships which came there last year. I have heard a number of shipping men say that they would have been willing to have their traffic carried through the port of Montreal if they had been confident that when it reached there, it would have got early shipping accommodation. I am very glad that the Harbour Trust of Montreal are prepared to go on with the work and push it rapidly to completion. One more word. My hon. friend, I think, ought to acknowledge that his criticism on this proposal of the government is not timely or justifiable. My hon. friend's language was that the government ought not to have refused to give money, and ought not to have insisted on the Harbour Trust of Montreal taking this money by way of a loan, as these resolutions provide. I do not think my hon. friend, as an ex-minister, and as one having so much to do with this question as a minister, was justified under all the circumstances, in getting up in his place and, without proper reflection and consideration, condemning the government for carrying out the very arrangements he warmly advocated when he was a member of the government.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Am I not advocating now what I did in the government for two or three years ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We must not tell.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Outside of it, then ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not find fault with the hon. gentleman for advocating what he advocates ; but advocacy is one thing, and criticism and condemnation of his late colleagues is another thing, for doing what he favoured and justified and arranged, and what they must do if his arrangements are to be carried out. What I complain of is that he says that the government should not have refused to give the harbour commissioners this money, and should not force them to take it as a loan. I say that criticism is unfounded, and I am surprised that my hon. friend should be so unmindful of the views and opinions he has held heretofore as to make that criticism on the present proposal.

Mr. MONK. I would like just to offer an observation or two, and I must begin by saying to my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that he surprised me a little in proposing, in an off-hand way, that the prosecution of these important works and the voting of this money should be postponed. My hon. friend, like many of his colleagues from the west, is always ready to urge the needs of the west in connection with this very question of transportation ; but I have often noticed that once they get to this end of Lake Superior, my hon. friend and some of his colleagues do not realize the importance of this end of the question. I cannot understand what my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) means when he says that, with respect to the wharf which we built below Montreal, we are in the same position as we are with respect to these projected works. The country in that case gave the money and there is no interest to pay, but in this case the government loans the money and there is interest to pay, so that I fail to understand how both cases are the same. Of course, as the hon. gentleman says, we collect harbour dues, but not as interest on the money.

I regret that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance should have seen in what I said

a desire to defend parochially the rights of Montreal. It was not in any local spirit that I approached this question. I view it as the general question of transportation. I have no interest in the harbour myself. My constituency lies outside the city, and I brought this matter before the House because I consider that in some parts of the country we are dealing with the transportation system in a different manner than we are dealing with it in other parts. In 1901 we collected $270,000; and if we are to accept the statement of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, last year we collected a little more. But we cannot, without sacrificing, not only the port of Montreal but any other port that we may wish to nationalize, collect such a sum as $400,000, and that would be the least we would have to collect. The hon. Minister of Finance talks of the warehouses that are going to be built out of the $2,000,000. He is mistaken. It is sheds that we are building.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A rose by another name will smell as sweet.

Mr. MONK. There is a greater difference than my hon. friend will admit. When he talks of a warehouse he is talking of something that will produce large revenue, but we cannot have very much revenue out of those sheds. The charges now are too heavy and should be reduced, but we will never be able to reduce them under this system. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has fallen into the old system of complaining about Montreal taking away the trade of Quebec. That is absurd. The deepening of the St. Lawrence was not made with the object of ruining Quebec but of meeting the demands of trade. We have no grudge against Quebec. We are glad that considerable business is being done there, but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that vessels all the world over will go as far inland as possible. My hon. friend must not forget that at present the port of New York is in a state of more or less decadence on account of its charges, and ships are going elsewhere. They go to Baltimore, Boston, Portland and other ports.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are harbour dues at all these ports.

Mr. MONK. There are and must be everywhere, but we must reduce them. If we want to compete with the American ports successfully, we must reduce our charges.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. There are no harbour dues in New York.

Mr. MONK. It comes to the same thing. There are charges and very heavy charges to be paid in New York. They take the shape of rentals, but it does not make much difference. I do not know what my right hon. friend meant when he said that it was Montreal's own fault if it is liable for this large amount on which we cannot pay interest. It is not our fault, but is due to the situation of the harbour. These plans, which were made long ago, must be carried out, and for that the citizens of Montreal are not to blame.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The majority of the harbour commissioners are government appointees.

Mr. MONK. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) was not exactly of the same opinion some months ago. He believed then that the harbour commissioners should be thrust aside and that the improvements to the harbour were so important that they should be carried out by himself. That point, however, I shall not discuss now. I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that we have given money in Montreal for the improvement of the harbour and have made great improvements in the approaches to the harbour and spent considerable sums of money. I might inform him also that in St. John the harbour charges collected go into the civic revenue. If that be the case, it makes a considerable difference. So that on the whole, I was right in saying that the government are to blame.

The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) told us a few moments ago that this nationalization of our ports—he did not speak of Montreal alone—was approved of by this government at the time he was one of the ministers, and I really so understood by words which fell from several of the ministers at the time. What I find fault with is that these hon. gentlemen are to-day going back on that policy. Unless we adopt that system for the port of Montreal and the other important ports of the Dominion, then the millions we have spent and the millions we pledged to spend on railways will be to a large extent useless.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Public Works has asked for practical suggestions, and I shall venture to offer him one. The hon. Minister of Finance said that it was the intention of the harbour commissioners of Montreal to spend $1,000,000 on an elevator and $2,000,000 in building a shed or warehouse, and that the revenue from the elevator would pay the interest on the $1,000,000 and the revenue from the shed or warehouse would pay the interest on the $2,000,000. But who is going to pay that? If we put a million dollars into an elevator, who are going to use it but the farmers? Who will pay the tolls but the farmers and not the people generally. Who will pay the rent of the shed? The steamship companies, in the first place, but from whom will they collect it? From the agriculturists of this country.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The charges are raised on the goods themselves.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is the steamship company that raises them.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, the harbour commissioners themselves.

Mr. TAYLOR. And it comes straight out of the pockets of the farmers. If I buy a million bushels of wheat in the North-west, the water rate from Port Arthur to Montreal is four or five cents a bushel, and to Europe another four or five cents per bushel. But if this elevator, which my hon. friend is going to erect at the port of Montreal, is going to charge a quarter or a half of a cent for transhipping from the barges to the ocean going steamers, I will have to buy from the farmer at half a cent a bushel less than if the elevator were free. Let the government, in place of loaning these $3,000,000, hand the cash over as a gift to the harbour commissioners of Montreal, so that they may make these improvements without increasing the tolls. Let us have no tolls charged the farmers on this expenditure, for they are the parties who will have to pay and not the general public. Let the government make this a national port, let them give this $3,000,000 out and out, and I am sure that the people of Ontario and the Dominion generally will be pleased to see Montreal made a national free port. We cannot compete successfully unless we have lower rates. If I have a million bushels of grain at Port Arthur to be shipped to Europe, and I get a ten cent rate by Boston and also a ten cent rate by the Canadian route together with these elevator charges, the grain will have to be shipped by Boston. One sixteenth of a cent will transfer the traffic from the Canadian to the American route, and this elevator charge at Montreal may have the effect of sending all the grain by the United States, and so we shall get no revenue whatever. There should be no elevator charges upon grain shipped from Port Arthur by the St. Lawrence route to a foreign market. Any charge that is made comes out of the pockets of the farmers of the North-west, or Ontario, or wherever the grain is grown. It comes out of the pockets of the farmers, and not out of the pockets of the people generally.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I spoke of the people of Canada generally, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is giving a meaning to the words that I did not intend. What I meant was that the charges had to be paid by those concerned in the traffic. I am as much a friend of the farmer as anybody. But I believe that if the farmer put his grain in a warehouse, he should pay for the privilege; if he puts it in his own barn he pays for the barn. I believe the farmer is ready to pay for any service that is rendered to him. Of course, we might easily give free warehouse accommodation, or—yes, as an hon. friend beside me suggests, we might pay the freight from Winnipeg; we might throw in chromo; we might offer many advantages; but these are not business. We believe the farmer should be treated like a man. As touching the question of these trifling sheds, —to cost about $2,000,000—to which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has referred, and from which he says nothing will be received, I may say that I have been informed that the steamship companies have made arrangements to occupy these sheds instead of putting up sheds of their own, and the harbour commissioners are satisfied that they will get a revenue of $74,000 a year from that source.

Mr. MONK. They will never get it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They say they will, and I believe they will.

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 201) to provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY—THE TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). I have no doubt the House and the country generally felt a sense of relief when the government promised an investigation into the matter of the concession of the Treadgold grant in the Yukon and other similar hydraulic concessions. But if the House and the public felt any sense of relief at the time that announcement was made by the government, I venture to say that this feeling of relief and satisfaction was superseded by disappointment and even by a shock, when the public and the House read the instructions which were given to the commission which is to be appointed to investigate that matter. I purpose reading extracts from the instructions which were laid upon the Table of the House last Monday, so that I may bring to the minds of the members the utter farce which the government is trying to perpetrate upon the House and the country:

On a report dated 1903, from the Minister of Justice, submitting that for several years placer gold mining has been successfully carried on in the Yukon Territory, particularly in the district

traversed by the Klondike river, and rivers, streams, and creeks tributary thereto.

That only such claims as enjoyed water facilities have heretofore been profitably worked; that gold is supposed to be distributed in the benches, banks and other elevated grounds along such rivers, streams and creeks.

That owing to the expense and difficulty involved in securing the necessary supply of water the successful prosecution of the industry throughout these last named localities has been seriously retarded and in many cases made impossible; that it has been represented to the government that great expense is required to be incurred to collect, store and distribute the waters of the said benches, banks and elevated grounds.

That it has also been represented to the government that the extent and value of the deposits of gold in the said benches, creeks and elevated grounds is at present unknown, and must remain so until a sufficient supply of water is available for the construction of hydraulic works, and that parties advancing the moneys for the construction of said works must necessarily take great risks with respect to their investment.

That while it is fitting that reasonable and proper privileges and advantages should be offered which will induce parties to construct such hydraulic works, yet it is essential:

(a.) that no grants or concessions should be made that would interfere with the right to water which any free miner is entitled to under the regulations governing placer mining in the Yukon Territory;

(b.) that the water so to be held and controlled by the hydraulic companies should be available on equal terms to all free miners whose claims can be profitably worked thereby, and subject to such reasonable rates and conditions to be fixed by the Governor in Council as shall secure the greatest possible advantage to the district in which the works are established.

That to obtain such hydraulic work and a supply of water for the benches, banks and elevated grounds above mentioned, certain powers, rights and privileges were granted by the Governor General in Council on the 21st of April, 1902, to Malcolm H. Orr-Ewing, A. N. C. Treadgold and Walter Barwick; that it has been alleged the said grant and concession constitutes a monopoly, which, while depriving the treasury of enormous revenues, is most detrimental to the mining industry of the Yukon.

Now I desire to lay stress upon this paragraph of instructions, because it is the most important of the whole document. It is the part in which the jurisdiction of the commissioners who are to be appointed is limited, and it is limited simply to the obtaining of information showing to what extent the said concession is likely to be beneficial or injurious to the mining interests of the said Yukon territory.

That it is very desirable that the commissioners making the inquiry should investigate generally all facts and circumstances which may afford information to the government and to parliament respecting the hydraulic or other means which it is desirable should be adopted to successfully develop the benches, banks and other elevated grounds which could only be worked at great disadvantage under natural conditions, or are not able to be profitably worked at all without an artificial supply of water.

The minister therefore recommends that under the provisions of chapter 114 of the revised statutes of Canada, being an Act entitled an Act respecting inquiries concerning public matters, it be referred—as commissioners to conduct such public inquiry for that purpose, holding the same in Dawson City and elsewhere in the Yukon as they shall determine, the said commissioners to have all the powers of summoning and enforcing the attendance of witnesses, &c.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be observed that the only power which is given to these commissioners who are to be appointed is to investigate the scientific problem as to whether or not the hydraulic system is to be introduced into the Yukon Territory for the better carrying out of placer mining in that territory. That is the whole scope of the inquiry. It extends to the Treadgold concession and to other similar concessions, but no further, and also to the obtaining of information 'respecting the hydraulic or other means which it is desirable should be adopted to successfully develop the benches, banks and other elevated grounds which could only be worked at great disadvantage under natural conditions.' It will also be observed by the terms of these instructions that the commissioners are to sit in the Yukon Territory only, that is, at Dawson City, or any other part of the Yukon Territory in which they see fit to sit.

Sir, since this matter was brought before the House some time ago, there is no doubt, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite will not controvert this statement, that there has been a general demand for an inquiry, not only from this side of the House, not only from people who are generally adverse to the present administration politically, but there has been a general demand from all those who have the true interests of the country at heart, that a thorough and complete investigation into all the circumstances surrounding the grant of the Treadgold concession and other hydraulic concessions in the Yukon Territory, should be made. The independent press has been unanimous upon this point, and has asked the government, has demanded from the government, that this investigation should be held. But, Sir, what kind of an investigation? Not merely an investigation of the scientific questions which are dealt with in the instructions given to the commissioners who are to be appointed, not simply to know whether these hydraulic concessions are to the benefit or the injury of the free miners of the Yukon, but an investigation into all the circumstances surrounding the granting of the Treadgold concession and of other concessions of a similar nature. In a word, I take it that when the question came up before the House the public conscience of this country was shocked at the revelations which were made and brought to the notice of parliament by the reading of the docu-

ments of which myself and those who followed me in the debate on this side of the House, gave cognizance to this House.

Sir, it was only following up what had taken place in the Yukon itself ; because as I stated, without wishing at all to refer to a prior debate, I brought to the notice of the House the fact that a petition had been presented to this House by the Dawson Board of Trade and by hundreds, yes, by thousands, of the citizens of the Yukon Territory, in which these concessions were denounced in unmeasured terms. I hold in my hand now the petition which was presented to this House on the 16th of April, 1903, by the member of the Yukon. As the House will see, it is a bulky petition, there are many signatures attached to this petition. It was signed by the most prominent citizens of the Yukon, belonging to all shades of political opinion, not only by the adversaries of the government but by those citizens in the Yukon Territory who have at heart the true interests of the Dominion and the pure administration of the affairs of this country. What does this petition say amongst other things ?

> That the benefits conferred upon the grantees are of incalculable value and involve an enormous exploitation of the public resources of this territory for the benefit of a few favoured concessionaires.

The House will understand what that means. It bore evidence on the face of it to the citizens of the Yukon Territory themselves that this was a grant which was made to certain favourites of the government and that it was an enormous exploitation of the public resources of the Territory to the detriment of the citizens of the Yukon and of the miners. This petition is a most important one because it comes from a public body of the Yukon which has no political leanings and it is signed by thousands of men who must know the condition of affairs in the Yukon and who come to this parliament and ask that an investigation be held into the charges which they make, not only against the concessionaires, but impliedly, also against those who gave these concessions to Treadgold and others.

I also hold in my hand another petition which was presented to the House of Commons from another public body in the Yukon. This is the petition of the corporation of the city of Dawson which is now before the House. It was also presented to this House by the hon. member who represents the Yukon on the 16th of April, 1903, and it contains exactly the same allegation as the petition I have just read; that is the petition of the Dawson Board of Trade. I take it that the condition created by these concessions must be grave indeed when all these citizens come to the House of Commons, call the attention of the House of Commons to these facts and take, as I believe, the unprecedented step of presenting these petitions to the House and of making these grave charges in the face of the whole country. But, that is not all. If these petitions from the Dawson Board of Trade and from the corporation of the city of Dawson could have been instigated by any political feeling, surely the Liberal Association of Dawson could not have had in its mind any unwarrantable attack upon the administration which it supports. I hold in my hand here the Yukon 'Sun' which is the organ of the Liberal party of the Yukon Territory, and not only that, but, if I turn to page 2 of the issue which I hold in my hand, I find that the Yukon 'Official Gazette' is the Saturday issue of the 'Sun' so that it is the official newspaper of the Yukon Territory. According to this paper on the 1st of April last :

> At a well attended meeting of the Liberal Club held last night at Pioneer Hall, steps were taken toward strengthening the hand of Mr. Ross, at Ottawa, on several matters of importance to the territory.

Further, a petition is resolved upon and adopted by the Liberal Club of Dawson, friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, their supporters in the Yukon Territory, and what do we find in this petition ? We find amongst other things this :

> Resolved, that an inquiry may be set on foot to ascertain the circumstances under which the leading hydraulic concessions were obtained in order that action may be taken by the Attorney General of Canada in the premises.

That was only following up what happened a few months ago in the Yukon Territory, because, as we all know, an election had taken place at which the hon. member who represents the Yukon Territory (Mr. Ross) was elected, and at that time he was asked very pointedly, in a question which was published in the papers, whether he would take steps to bring to punishment the officials at Ottawa and at Dawson who have given these large concessions to the favourites of the government. He was asked if he would not take the necessary steps to bring these people to punishment for the fraud which they had perpetrated upon the government or which these officials at Ottawa had perpetrated upon the government. We were told to bring specific charges—bring charges against any one, bring charges against any officials, or charges against any minister, bring charges of malfeasance against anybody in authority, make specific charges, say that you will give up your seat if these charges are not proved and we will grant an immediate inquiry. That is what was thrown out to this side of the House by hon. gentlemen opposite. We have brought to the notice of the House and of the government the charges which are made by these public bodies to which I alluded a minute ago—the Dawson Board of Trade and the corporation of the city of Dawson. We have

brought to the notice of hon. gentlemen opposite the charges made by their own friends in the Yukon, we have laid them before the House and we say now that the government is on its defence and that it should take up these charges. If they are not true it will be good for hon. gentlemen opposite to have an investigation so as to prove that these charges are false and that there is absolutely nothing in them. First of all we were promised an investigation, not an investigation of a scientific character, to ascertain whether or not the government have made a provident bargain by giving these concessions to wash the gold in the Yukon Territory, but we were promised a complete investigation into the charges which had been laid at the door of the government. We were promised this and it was said: We have not had time yet to investigate these charges or to appoint commissioners or a committee of this House to investigate them. We are waiting until the hon. member for the Yukon arrives. The navigation is not quite open in the Territory, but wait until navigation is open. Wait until the hon. gentleman takes his seat. I am sorry he is not here. I understand on very good authority that he will not be here again this session. Wait, and everything that you have said in this House will be investigated by the commissioner:

> When the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) returns to Ottawa,—he is at present in British Columbia, I understand—and we can have the benefit of his advice, it is our intention to fully carry out the representations made to the citizens of the Yukon to have a full investigation into all charges or suspicions that hon. gentlemen may be good enough to mention or entertain in regard to any matters connected with the Yukon administration. I give that public notice to my hon. friend, so that, in addition to the advantage he has had of ventilating his views on the floor of this House, he will have an opportunity to make good, if he can, any of his charges or suspicions before a tribunal where newspaper extracts and letters will not be the only evidence, but where gentlemen will have the privilege of pledging their oaths to the truth of all they say.

This was the pledge that was given to this House by the hon. gentleman who spoke for the government when this matter was brought up. The hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) in reply to the speech which I had the honour to make to the House on the 12th of May last, made a solemn promise to the House and the country that a full and complete investigation would be held into all the charges made at that time against the government, against officials, grantees and concessionaires. I cannot see why the government has changed its mind. We were notified the other day, it is true that the government had come to another conclusion, before these instructions were laid on the Table of the House. We were surprised that it should be given out in the House that the government had recanted, that the government had come to another conclusion, that it was not going to grant this full and complete investigation into the charges of fraud which had been laid at its door, but that it was simply going to grant the investigation which is foreshadowed in the instructions to the commissioners which I read a moment ago. At that time the surprise was great. We felt there must be some misapprehension in the mind of the hon. gentleman who was then addressing the House. We could not for a moment believe after that the solemn pledge which had been given to the House in the name of the government by the hon. Postmaster General, that the government would in such a short time change its mind and come to the House, with, as I said before, this farce of an investigation which is going to be confided to Mr. Justice Britton and others. What is the reason of that change of opinion on the part of the hon. ministers who are responsible for the giving of these concessions in the Yukon? Why do they not now say that they are going to grant a full and complete inquiry into the charges which these people from the Yukon make against the government and the officials who are in charge of this department?

What has come across the spirit of their dreams? The natural conclusion and the only conclusion to which this House and the country can come is, that there are guilty parties whom the government is interested in protecting. Here was a minister speaking for the government in this debate and he said on the floor of parliament: you should have known that it has been decided long ago by the government to give a full and complete inquiry into these charges; we are going to give it as soon as we can and this investigation is going to be so complete that you will have an opportunity of proving all the charges you have made. But when the instructions were brought down we found that the inquiry was limited to the one point as to whether it was provident or improvident on the part of the government to give these concessions in the Yukon Territory. I repeat, and the country will endorse me when I say, that every independent man in this country will come to the conclusion that the only reason why the government is limiting this investigation is because the charges that were made on the 12th of May in this House, the charges which were made by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) the other day, are absolutely true, and the government dare not go before a commission even of its own appointment to have these charges investigated, because they are so true that some one on the government benches probably would find these charges so true that he would have to retire from public life.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There is noticeable also a change in the manner of the right hon.

the Prime Minister. Compare his conduct now with his conduct in reference to the Drummond County matter. Here are his remarks delivered on February 15th, 1898—I quote from 'Hansard':

The reasons which compel the government to make this motion will be understood by every one in this House, and I presume also appreciated by everybody. Last year the government undertook to extend the Intercolonial Railway from the present terminus at Chaudière to Montreal. I am under the impression that this scheme had been engaging the attention of previous governments for some years past. The government selected a route which had the advantage of being, by twenty miles, shorter than the route existing between Lévis and Montreal over the Grand Trunk Railway and which had the further merit and advantage of avoiding the chain of mountains which are adjacent to the St. Francis river near Richmond.

I call the attention of the House to this part of my right hon. friend's remarks:

But, suspicious as to the dealings of the government with the company in question—the Drummond Country Railway Company—having been thrown out to the public, the government deem it their duty to court every inquiry and to see that all charges may be properly ventilated.

Here the Prime Minister states that the only reason why the government granted the Drummond County inquiry was because suspicions had been thrown out to the public with regard to the government dealings in the purchase of that railway. There were no specific charges made in this House. We were not defied to make these specific charges, but as the right hon. gentleman says, it was only because suspicions had been thrown out that it was the duty of the government to ask for a full and complete inquiry, and the Prime Minister moved:

That a special committee of the House be appointed to inquire into the expenditure of the subsidies granted by the parliament of Canada in aid of the construction of the Drummond County Railway and into all negotiations and transactions between the government of Canada and any member or officer thereof, or any person in its behalf, and the Drummond County Railway Company, or any director, officer or person in the company's behalf, relating to the acquiring of the said railway by the government; with power to send for papers, persons and records, and to report the evidence to this House, together with the opinion of the said committee thereupon.

How is it that the government has changed its mind now. Why is it that when charges are made by responsible persons in the Yukon, by the Dawson Board of Trade, by the municipal corporation of the city of Dawson, yes, and by even the friends and supporters of the government; why is it that these charges and these accusations are not to be investigated, while mere suspicions in connection with the Drummond County railway purchase were to be the subject of a full and complete investigation. There is one other reason why the inquiry is limited to discovering whether Treadgold should have the power to construct hydraulic works in the Yukon, and that one other reason is, that the commission is worded in this way in order to throw sand into the eyes of the public. Public opinion demanded a full and complete investigation into everything connected with the transaction, and this kind of investigation is granted so that the government may be able to say: oh, well, we granted an inquiry any way. We well remember how in the first years of this government they used to say to us: We will investigate every charge and every accusation you can bring against the government, and not only that, but we will investigate even every suspicion of wrong doing so that the people may know that the men who now sit on the treasury benches compose the purest government that ever held power in Canada. Alas; how they have changed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Probably the government is growing old and probably a little more wicked than it was in its earlier days, and now we see charges which have shocked the public conscience relegated to one side and not investigated. We object to the proposed investigation; first: because it is too limited in its scope, and second because it is an investigation by a royal commission. What the country demands is a full and complete investigation by a committee of parliament. Parliament is in session now and we can have an investigation before a committee of this House. We gave the reason some time ago, why we objected to the appointment of Mr. Justice Britton, and I shall not refer to that again further than to say that the independent press of this country unite in beseeching him not to accept the position which the government has offered to him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The Toronto 'News' is not a journal favouring this side of the House, and it can I believe be called an independent exponent of public opinion. On the 9th instant the Toronto 'News' wrote:

A Case for Diffidence.

There is no attack, so far as we are aware, upon Mr. Justice Britton as a judge. Not a word has been said in derogation of his impartiality. But it is a thoroughly recognized principle that the best and most impartial judge on the bench should not sit upon a case in which he has had, at any time, a private interest. British practice assumes that in such a case there is a possibility of the most upright men being swayed by an unconscious bias. British scrupulousness has impelled many judges to decline the embarrassment of cases in which their interest was more remote than Judge Britton's in the Yukon case.

Mr. Britton, as M.P., for Kingston, was the government's spokesman in the Yukon scandals debate of 1900. There is a clear historic con-

nection between those scandals and the Treadgold concession charges of to-day. The administration which Mr. Britton defended in 1900 is the same administration which he is to judge to-day. By declining to act, he will admit nothing save that he has the same diffidence and the same objection to anomalous positions as has distinguished the highest members of the British bench.

It seems to me that every word of that article is absolutely true. But let us pass over it; let us not say anything more about Mr. Justice Britton, although I may add that it is rumoured, and it seems to be true, that Mr. Justice Britton is closely allied with the partner of one of the Treadgold concessionaires. Under these circumstances, it is indecent for the government to appoint him, and it is still more indecent for Mr. Justice Britton to accept the trust which the government proposes to impose upon him.

The past experience of this country is not favourable to the appointment of members of the bench to investigate charges made in the political arena. I am free to admit, after some years of experience, that both parties have committed the mistake of entrusting to judges the very onerous and disagreeable task of inquiring into charges made by political men, either in the House or in the public press. These commissions do not satisfy public opinion, and, more than that, what is to be sincerely deplored by every lover of his country, they expose the bench to a loss of the confidence, the prestige, and the respect which the bench should enjoy.

As I said a moment ago, the House is in session, and there is no reason why a committee should not be appointed to investigate the charges which have been brought to the door of the government, not only in regard to the Treadgold matter, but in regard to the other hydraulic concessions mentioned in the instructions. It will probably be said that such an investigation would cost a great deal of money; but, Sir, in a case like this money is no object. If the government of this country are under a cloud, no question of money should come between them and the proof of the innocence of every minister who sits on the treasury benches. Nobody on this side of the House or in the country would grudge a cent of the money spent on such a laudable object. It may be said that it is too late in the session to hold such an inquiry. If it is too late in the session it is the fault of the government. These matters were brought to the attention of the government as far back as the 16th of April last, and also on the 12th of May last; and if the government were innocent of the charges brought against them, I say again, they should have been the first to rise in their seats, as they did in the beginning of their regime, and say, we court the fullest investigation, we want it, and we will go before a committee of parliament and show that all these accusations are false and that we are perfectly innocent.

The question of the relative value of an investigation by a royal commission or by judges and an inquiry by a parliamentary committee, is not new. I now proceed to quote some of the opinions which were given in years gone by, by eminent members of this House, some of whom sit in this House yet. Let me quote what the present Speaker of the House said on this question:

We have been able to find out what measure of light such inquiries can bring to bear upon the matters to be investigated. I remember that, in 1882, an extremely grave accusation was formulated by a member of the Quebec legislature, an accusation which involved a large number of members, and endangered their seats in the assembly. Instead of referring the matter to a serious tribunal, instead of referring it to a committee of the assembly, the government appointed a royal commissioner, Hon. Judge Routhier, to inquire into it. I have nothing to say against the character of this distinguished magistrate, but as he alone had the carrying out of the inquiry, without the help of a counsel for the accusing party, and as he naturally did not know where the guilt rested, nor what witnesses could enlighten him, he simply called a few witnesses designated by public rumour, and there was the end of it. We see by that the uselessness of having such inquiries made by royal commissioners, beyond the control of parliament, and before whom witnesses can not be heard who should be heard.

Further on he said:

The reason is that those inquiries, controlled by the House, have brought about monstrous revelations, as black as could be brought to light, and now it is the intention that the truth as to similar accusations must be kept from the public gaze.

One would think the hon. the Speaker was speaking from my place in the House, and was saying what I should say:

Such is the only reason, Mr. Speaker, why an effort is now made to refer these charges not to a committee controlled by the House, not to a responsible committee, but to a single person who will deal with the matter as he will think fit, who will hear the witnesses he will choose to, and from whom the House or the country cannot expect justice full and complete.

The present Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Carroll) also spoke on that occasion, and what did he say?

I am opposed to parliament depriving itself of a right which belongs to it absolutely. The members themselves are the natural judges where questions affecting the honour of the House are concerned. Moreover, as has unhappily been shown, judges acting in such places, depart from their functions, and by meddling with our political disputes, lose the prestige of impartiality which is necessary to them. Besides, judges appointed by the executive are under the control of the executive and should not be called upon to judge the acts of those who compose the executive. Their functions

are defined—let us not make them depart from these functions. The authority which appoints judges is that which grants or refuses the advancement, which is the aim of the functionaries of the judiciary as well as of the administration. This is sufficient for a judge, unless he be proof against all suggestions which individual interest may inspire, to feel that he is not completely independent, and to allow himself sometimes to render services, when judgments inspired by justice alone should be rendered.

Mr. Davies, now Mr. Justice Davies, of the Supreme Court, speaking on the same question, went so far as to say that to his mind the appointment of royal commissions in these matters was not constitutional. He said :

Is it constitutional ? If we are to take the authority of Todd we find it is unconstitutional to refer to a royal commission subjects connected with the ordinary duties of the executive government and with its relations to parliament ; that it is unconstitutional to refer to a royal commission an inquiry as to the acts of misconduct which may have been committed by a judge or by a minister of state. That is the law as laid down by Todd, to whose authority there has been no exception taken heretofore. Yet, hon gentlemen are asking their followers to adopt the course which is distinctly laid down as an unconstitutional course, in order that they may evade, and, if possible, postpone, to a future day, an exposure which if allowed to go to a committee, they feel is inevitable.

At that time the late Mr. Justice Mills, who always went into these subjects very fully, and who was one of the best exponents of constitutional history and law on the side of the House on which he sat, speaking on the same subject, said :

Sir, I have been taunted with saying that the rule which we asked to have observed in the trial of these charges is a rule which dates from the days of Edward III., and I think that is so. I have taken the trouble to copy that rule, and it is part of the law of parliament from that day down to the present. The rule is as follows :

'That it is the undoubted right of the Commons to inquire into public abuses, and to impeach the councillors of the Crown for acts of corruption.

That is the law as to the authority of parliament. Are the charges which have been made by the hon. member for West Ontario, charges which involve public abuses ? Remember, Mr. Speaker, that charges of this sort do not relate simply to members of parliament ; they relate to ministers of the Crown in their official capacity, and they relate also to any other officers of the state having important functions to discharge. Sir, parliament has never delegated to any other body this inquisitorial power ; it has never delegated to any other body the right to inquire into existing abuses, or into acts of corruption charged against members of the administration. It has stated at an earlier period than this that the House had nothing to do with inquiring into charges against members unless those charges related to acts performed by them in their capacity as members of the House. I do not understand that to be the law. It is the business of parliament to inquire into the conduct of the ministers. Ministers are entrusted with great power ; they have devolving upon them important public duties, and in the discharge of those duties they are responsible to this House.

Further on in the debate he said :

Sir, I might refer to the case of Mr. Butt. Serious imputations were made against that member and other members of the House. They were charged with corruption, and on that occasion they were charged by the 'Times' newspaper.

I would call the attention of the government to this fact. No charge was made in the House against Mr. Butt, no specific charge was laid at his door. The only charges against him were those made by the 'Times' newspaper.

They were not charged in parliament, and when a motion was made for the investigation of those charges a committee was at once granted. Lord John Russell declared that the charges having been made, it was the right of the member to have a committee to investigate those charges in order that he might vindicate himself and purge himself from those accusations. If that be so with respect to charges made outside of parliament, it is a fortiori, the right of every hon. member who chooses to make such charges or the member against whom they are made, to have them investigated by a committee of the House. It is the most expeditious manner of conducting these inquiries. It is the method which the law of parliament has provided, and it has been well said by one of the highest authorities in England, Hallam, that it is the most appropriate tribunal, considering the serious character of the accusations and the importance of the proceedings, for investigating into the facts and for vindicating the law.

I have shown this House that these charges have been made by public bodies in the Yukon Territory, by thousands of disinterested citizens in that territory, by the very friends and supporters of the government. I have also shown that at the beginning of the present regime, those hon. gentlemen, not only when accusations were made, but even when suspicions were thrown out to the public, immediately resorted to the proper tribunal, a committee of this house to investigate those charges, and clear their skirts. I have shown by the authorities that I have quoted, the Speaker of the House, the Solicitor General, the Hon. Mr. Justice Davies and that great authority, the late Mr. Justice Mills, that the proper tribunal before which accusations should be ventilated, is a committee of this House.

Under the circumstances the government has wholly failed to carry out the duty it owes to the country and to itself, and in consequence I propose in amendment :

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

For some time the grants by the government of Canada to certain parties and among others to one A. N. C. Treadgold and his associates of hydraulic concessions in the Yukon Territory have been publicly denounced as fraudulent ;

That at a convention held in the city of Dawson on or about the 1st of October, 1902, for the purpose of selecting a Liberal candidate to represent the Yukon Territory in this parliament of Canada it was among other things resolved that many of the concessions above mentioned were obtained by fraud and imposition.

That James Hamilton Ross, Esquire, now a member of this House for the Yukon Territory in accepting the nomination offered to him by the said convention promised publicly through the press to advocate a thorough investigation of the charges of fraud aforesaid :

That the Board of Trade of the city of Dawson and others on the 16th of April, 1903, presented to this House a petition in which it is alleged that the said concessions to A. N. C. Treadgold and his associates 'involved an enormous exploitation of the public resources of this territory for the benefit of a few favoured concessionaires.'

That on or about the 23rd March, 1903, the corporation of the city of Dawson addressed to this House a petition similar in terms to the foregoing petition of the Dawson Board of Trade ;

That the Liberal Association of the city of Dawson at a meeting held on the first of April, 1903, publicly denounced the said concessions as having been obtained by fraud and misrepresentations and petitioned the Government to institute an inquiry 'to ascertain the circumstances under which the leading hydraulic concessions (to wit the above named concessions) were obtained in order that action may be taken by the Attorney General of Canada in the premises.' That on the 12th of May last the government by the honourable the Postmaster General, during the debate on the Treadgold concession, promised to this House to fully carry out the representations which had been made to the citizens of the Yukon to have a full investigation into all charges or suspicions that could be mentioned or entertained in regard to any matter connected with the Yukon administration.

This House regrets that by the instructions given to the commissioners to be appointed to investigate this subject and which were laid on the Table of the House on the 8th of June instant, the proposed investigation is limited to the question as to whether the grant or concession to A. N. C. Treadgold and his associates of the 21st April, 1902, and other similar concessions are likely to be beneficial or injurious to the mining interests of the Yukon Territory.

And this House is of the opinion that a special committee of this House should be appointed with all necessary powers to make a full and complete investigation not only into the providence or improvidence of the terms and conditions of the several hereinbefore mentioned concessions but also into all the circumstances relating to or connected with the granting or procurement of the same and of all alterations therein, all negotiations and transactions between the government or any member or officer thereof and the said concessionaires or any person on their behalf with respect thereto or with respect to any alteration therein, the names of the persons directly or indirectly interested from time to time in the said concessions, the nature of their respective interests and the circumstances under which such interests were acquired.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). I wish, Mr. Speaker, that I could congratulate the hon. gentleman on having shown at least some measure of parliamentary courage in the way he has presented his case to the House. He has taken shelter behind his position as a member and, though challenged four weeks ago, has not up to this moment been able to summon sufficient courage to pledge his own faith to the charges he would fain have ventilated. He has told us that public opinion demands a full inquiry. But let us see what the hon. gentleman did ask by the motion he presented to parliament on the 12th of May last. The motion was as follows :

That all the words after the word 'that' be left out, and the following added instead thereof :—'this House regrets that by an Order in Council of date the 21st day of April, 1902, the government, for the ostensible purpose of establishing hydraulic works to supply water for the efficient working of auriferous deposits, have granted to one A. N. C. Treadgold, of London, England, and his associates, vast powers, franchises and concessions in and upon the bends, banks, valleys, slopes and hills of the Klondike river, Bonanza, Bear and Hunker creeks, and in and upon the waters of Rock creek, in the Yukon Teritory, with the right to establish for the benefit and advantage of the concessionaires, in and through the region and district through which these rivers and creeks run, hydraulic, electrical and other systems, and to enter and to take up and operate mining and other lands.

This House is of opinion that the said powers, franchises and concessions constitute in favour of the said Treadgold and his associates a gigantic monopoly which, while depriving the treasury of enormous revenues, is most detrimental to the mining industry of the Yukon.

And that in so making the said grants and concessions by Order in Council the government have exceeded their authority and have committed a gross breach of the duty entrusted to them under the constitution.

That simply referred to the Treadgold concession. It simply charged that great advantages had been given to the concessionaires and that the government had acted ultra vires. There is nothing in that motion making reference to other concessions or charging bad faith of fraud or concealment or misrepresentation. There is in it nothing whatever except that a grant had been made, which, in its financial aspects, appeared to have been against the public interest. That was the extent of the grievance which the hon. gentleman set up in his motion on the 12th of May. That represented the gravamen of his charge. That was the full extent to which he could go in seeking to make any insinuation or charge against the government. How did we meet that motion ? We made an order; we directed an inquiry. This order is far more comprehensive even than my hon. friend suggested on that occasion. It not only directed an inquiry into the Treadgold concession, but directed an inquiry with regard to all hydraulic concessions and also as to the best means of development of the placer mining interests of the Yukon —a far more comprehensive inquiry than

My hon. friend, with a great flourish, produces a petition from certain persons. He reads from that petition and suggests that the commission that has been appointed does not cover the case made in this petition. The petition does not deal with the matters to which my hon. friend refers, provided he read the whole of the petition. This petition, which the hon. gentleman has been kind enough to send me says :

The benefits conferred upon the grantees are of incalculable value, and involve an enormous sacrifice of the resources of this territory for the benefit of a few favoured concessionaires.

I have not read all the petition, but on that point at least, it will hardly be said that it is not covered by the Royal Commission. The Royal Commission, after reciting the Treadgold concession, proceeds to say :

That it is important in the public interest that inquiry be made for the purpose of obtaining information showing to what extent the said grant and concession is likely to be beneficial or injurious to the mining interests of the Yukon Territory.

What is the meaning of that part of the order of reference ? My hon. friend says that the charge is that the concessionaires have obtained great advantage at the expense of the public. The order of reference is to ascertain whether the grant is likely to be beneficial or injurious to the mining interests of the Yukon Territory. Will any hon. gentleman say that, under that order the charge made in this petition is not fully capable of being inquired into ? The order of reference goes on :

That it is also desirable that at the same time the inquiry should not be limited to the said grant and concession, but should extend to all similar concessions granted in the Yukon Territory ;

That it is further desirable that the commissioners making the inquiry should investigate generally all facts and circumstances which may afford information to the government and to parliament respecting the hydraulic or other means which it is desirable should be adopted to successfully develop the benches, banks, and other elevated grounds which can only be worked at great disadvantage under natural conditions or are not able to be worked at all without an artificial supply of water.

So, the point made in this petition is amply covered by the order of reference. But my hon. friend says that an article was read some weeks ago in this House emanating from the Yukon 'Sun,' containing certain charges, and that these are not made a subject of inquiry. I would like to know what would become of parliamentary practice if the charges made in newspapers were to be made the foundation of parliamentary inquiry. My hon. friend cites the case of Mr. Butt, in which, he says, a member of parliament was able to obtain a parliamentary inquiry to meet a charge made against him in an article in the London 'Times.' But where is the charge made against any named person in any newspaper or by any hon. member of this House ? The hon. gentleman has not dared to name a man. He has made insinuations. If it were parliamentry, I would say that he has assumed a most unworthy part; if I were permitted by the rules to say so I would say that he had adopted a cowardly course in making insinuations against members of this House—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I say, Sir, that if it were parliamentary I would charge him with having followed a most cowardly procedure in not having named some hon. member instead of insinuating. Let him rise in his place and make a charge against any man and we shall know how to deal with it. But, until he does so, let him not seek a parallel in Mr. Butt's case. In that case, the editor had the manliness to name the member, and the member availed himself of his position to ask for the benefit of an inquiry. Will the hon. gentleman say who is named in this case ? Has he ever named any one ? Does he now name any one ? I will give place to him, if he will rise and name some one in the government or out of the government against who he dare to level a charge. Let him, if he dare, put his honour in the balance with the honour of the man he assails, and we shall see which way the balance will go. But, until he does that, he has not made a case similar to that of Mr. Butt, but has rather put himself in a position which enables him to shelter himself behind the privileges of the House to utter words that will be spread broadcast throughout the country in the hopes that they will spread their poison in fertile ground. Mr. Chairman, the questions resolve themselves into two. The first point is whether there have been improvident grants—whether these concessions have been granted against the public interest. My hon. friend will not say that that branch of the question is not fully covered by the order of reference. Why be so indignant against the appointment of Judge Britton if he is not called upon to deal with the class of charge that my hon. friend shrinks from making but only insinuates ? If it is merely an inquiry into the business phase of the question, the personality of the commissioner is not of such special importance. If, however, the charge were of a different character then, perhaps, my hon. friend would have some force in his contention that, according to the form of the charge the inquiry might be before a different tribunal—perhaps, before a committee of the House. But, up to this moment, the hon. gentleman has not ventured to suggest anything that would commit him to the truthfulness or belief in the truthful-

ness or otherwise of any accusation. He simply alludes to the business phase of the question, shirking carefully any personal responsibility as to the accusations he has made. Now, I ask, Mr. Chairman, is it fair for the hon. gentleman to act in that way? Is it fair toward the country for him to make use of his position as a member of this House to make insinuation, and yet, at the same time, to shrink from the responsibility of making charges? Other members of this House in days gone by have, at different times, had the courage of their suspicions. But not so on this occasion. And yet my hon. friend seeks to add to his motion of the 12th of May, by pretending that it asked for more than it did, and endeavours to make out that the House is bound to do more than he asked for on that occasion, because, at a subsequent date, I made a statement, which, he says, would carry the inquiry beyond the limit to which it is at present confined. What were the circumstances under which I made the statement? My hon. friend was well aware that Mr. Ross, the hon. member for the Yukon is more or less familiar with the conditions of the Yukon, and more or less familiar with the state of public opinion in that district. He is aware that this question became a political question during the election in the Yukon, and the people there naturally look to Mr. Ross, as their representative, to take a more or less active part in dealing with matters that interest them. Therefore, when this question came before the House, at the time it did, it seemed to me inopportune that we should finally dispose of the case in the absence of the hon. member for the Yukon. At that time the member for the Yukon was not in his place in parliament. Every one knows that he has sustained a great bereavement and that his health broke down under the sad affliction, and although he hoped to be able to attend the session, yet his health has obliged him to absent himself. When this matter came before the House the government had no opportunity of consulting with him, we did not know his precise whereabouts, he was in the west moving about for his health. I think at the moment he was in British Columbia, and it was some time before I found out his whereabouts. But I stated in the House that when Mr. Ross came to Ottawa and we had an opportunity of consulting with him with regard to all the matters of the Yukon, we would issue a commission of inquiry of the character to which I referred. I have not yet seen Mr. Ross, he has not yet been to Ottawa, I trust his health will enable him to come here; but up to this moment we have not had an opportunity of seeing him, and therefore the inquiry which was proposed to be undertaken must be deferred until his arrival.

I would add that in connection with the same statement I made, I then suggested that the inquiry would be as extensive as the hon. gentleman's charges, and if it were limited to his charges at this moment, certainly it would not be a very extensive inquiry. Nevertheless, no matter at what stage of the session it be brought up, I tell the hon. gentleman now that whenever he is prepared to make charges against the honour of any minister, or against the conduct of any officer of the Crown, his charge will be dealt with in a parliamentary way. But it has not been the practice in the past, and I question if it would be a sound practice to inaugurate to-day, for an hon. member of this House to say that certain charges having been made broadcast over the country, therefore on such an unsound foundation, parliament should undertake a solemn investigation. Why, Sir, I would ask the hon. gentleman what is the nature of the inquiry that is to be made? He is a member of the bar. What would be thought of him if he were to appear in court in support of a plaintiff's claim, and there was nothing on record to show the nature of that claim? The most simple opportunity of pleading a case requires that some particulars of the complaint should be required. It is not sufficient to issue a writ and to bring the defendant into court on a writ. The defendant is entitled to more than that. In the first place, he is entitled to the particulars. In this case the hon. gentleman wants to bring unknown parties into court, giving no names of the parties accused, nor the offence of which he thinks they ought to be accused. What sort of a position is that? Yet that is the position into which he asks parliament to put itself.

I think at the last debate—if we may refer to that—the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and other gentlemen of fertile imagination spoke about rumours in London, rumours in New York, rumours in the Yukon. Fancy a committee sitting down to inquire into rumours in London, rumours in New York, rumours in the Yukon, rumours in the heart of members of the opposition. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the hon. member for Montmorency making such a speech; I am not surprised at his endeavouring by his quotations and allegations, made on hearsay, to escape from the position in which he put himself by the absurd argument he presented to parliament a few weeks ago. We have granted him the inquiry he asked for then.

But he says the independent press is in his favour. The only journal of the independent press which he ventured to quote from was the Toronto 'News,' and if I recollect aright the Toronto 'News' said that if Mr. Casgrain believed in the correctness of his charges it was due to parliament that he should take the responsibility of formulating them. I have got a file of the 'News' here, and I find a piece in the editorial col-

umn of a certain date absent. I do not know whether it is the date in question or not. But my impression is that the Toronto 'News' says that if he desired an inquiry he should have assumed the responsibility of making that charge.

Mr. CASGRAIN. You had better read the article.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot find the article containing that. But whether the independent press says that or not, I remember very well the practice of parliament, and until the practice of parliament changes, I presume this House will not, on this occasion, inaugurate such an absurd practice, as to refer to a parliamentary inquiry, rumours that have been heard on the streets of London, on the streets of New York, and the streets of Dawson, and are being circulated and added to, very frequently, by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MONK. That is what the hon. gentleman does not like, I think.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not mind fair play, Mr. Speaker, but I do object to unmanly conduct, even on the floors of parliament.

Mr. MONK. I would not go to the hon gentleman to learn fair play.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I wish the hon. gentleman would. If the hon. gentleman would appeal to me for a precedent he would find one. But, Mr. Speaker, we may turn this question over and over as we like, it all comes back to the same point. I put it now, and will put it as often as this occasion is presented, or other occasions are presented: Name some person, name your charge, and if it is worthy of investigation the government will order the investigation. But the investigation is probably the last thing the hon. gentleman wants. He will not put himself into the position of moving this House to make an investigation. Why won't he? Because, doubtless, he knows the investigation would fail. Knowing it would fail, he would cover his retreat by a pretense of desiring an investigation which he probably is the last one to hope will be granted. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the order of reference completely meets the motion of the 12th of May, goes far beyond that motion; and if the hon. gentleman desires any further order, he has only to put himself in parliamentary order and he will get the further inquiry desired.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I do not know whether the public will appreciate the conduct of my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) in the same way it has been appreciated by the Postmaster General to-night. But between the conduct of my hon. friend from Montmorency and the backdown of the Postmaster General, I think there will be many people in this Dominion, many intelligent people, to see the difference. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Montmorency brought to the knowledge of this House, not faint rumour, but facts. Does the Postmaster General pretend that the application of the Dawson Board of Trade, made, if I mistake not, to this House——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is fully covered by the order.

Mr. MONK. Does he pretend that it is not worthy of some notice?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is fully covered by the order.

Mr. MONK. It is not covered by the order.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Read it.

Mr. MONK. Nor is any other document covered to which my hon. friend refers. Is the clear, unmistakable manifesto of the Liberal Club of Dawson City, alleging that these concessions have been obtained by unlawful and corrupt means, and cannot have been obtained otherwise, is that fully covered by the order? Why, my hon. friend knows, himself, that when this matter was first brought to his notice, before the public press had given evidence, Mr. Speaker, of knowing a little more than my hon. friend dreamed was known among the public, my hon. friend was the first to get up in this House, and, speaking for the government, what language did he hold? I will read it again to my hon. friend and to hon. members of this House, so that they can see the difference between the language held on that occasion by the hon. Postmaster General and his vain effort to-night to try and crawl out by the back door and refuse that investigation, which is the only one that can possibly lay the real facts of this sinister affair before the public of this country. What did the hon. gentleman say?

I would also say to my hon. friend——

He was speaking to my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain).

—who tells us that he is so desirous of investigation that I am sure he must well know that it has been long the fixed intention of the government to hold such an investigation. The hon. gentleman must remember that, when the election was held, promises——

Because of the demands that were made, were given to the people of the Yukon that there would be a commission to inquire into the whole administration of that territory. There has been no opportunity since that date until the present to send in commissioners. I doubt if navigation is more than open, even if it is yet open. When the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) returns to Ottawa,—he is at present in British Columbia, I understand —and we can have the benefit of his advice, it is our intention to fully carry out the representations made to the citizens of the Yukon to have a full investigation into all charges or

suspicions that hon. gentlemen may be good enough to mention or entertain in regard to any matters connected with the Yukon administration.

And so on. There was at that time given to this House by the hon. Postmaster General, speaking for the government, the assurance that a full and thorough investigation would be made into all these suspicious circumstances which three or four responsible bodies of that important territory, which the population in its entirety have been exacting from the government; at all events, ever since there was an election held in the district. Under these circumstances it seems a monstrous injustice that the hon. Postmaster General, changing and shifting his position entirely to-night, should come before the House and endeavour to vindicate and defend an investigation so limited in its scope as to be absolutely useless. Names! My hon. friend wants names. He wants my hon. friend from Montmorency and he wants me, whose knowledge of the facts is limited to what I have stated here to-night and what I will state again, to name the men, to name the ministers connected with this nefarious transaction. We will not do it. But, Mr. Speaker, which is the department which must have engineered this grant? It is the Department of the Interior, and I say boldly here to-night that it is a strange thing during the whole of this long session, when these things have been noised among the people before the opening of the session, when we knew of them, that the hon. Minister of the Interior the (Hon. Mr. Sifton) should be absent. I say this boldly. I do not think it is necessary for the hon. Minister of the Interior to be away from his department during the whole of this important session and that whatever may have been his business on the other side of the Atlantic he could have transacted that business and instructed those called upon to defend the Alaskan boundary so that he could have been here in order to give us these explanations which in his absence we lack absolutely. This is not a political question. The absence of the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) is not an obstacle to a full and entire investigation. My hon. friend from Montmorency having quoted here the utterances of the board of trade of Dawson city, having given us, in addition, the utterances of the city council and given us, in addition, published in the Yukon official 'Gazette,' the statement of an important association, one which could not have been prejudiced against this government, that these concessions not only were erroneous, not only were destructive of the public good and of the prosperity of the miners, but that they cannot have been obtained otherwise than by corrupt and irregular methods. My hon. friend, having made us acquainted the other day with the pledges given by Mr. Ross, whose absence is regretted, upon the occasion of his election that he would ask for the revocation of these concessions and that he would, moreover, insist with this government upon a full investigation, it is vain under all these circumstances for hon. gentlemen opposite to endeavour to escape from the promise of the hon. Postmaster General upon the plea that we are not prepared here—members of this House to come down and incriminate in their absence other members of this House. I shall not take such a responsibility. It is not necessary for us to do so, but what we have to do is to announce to the government the utterances of these important bodies asking for an investigation which will go fully into the transactions previous to the obtaining of these concessions. Do the hon. gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches imagine that an investigation of the nature of that which they desire to hold is an investigation that would satisfy the people? I have referred to the rumours which exist throughout the country, which any man who takes the trouble to investigate will find to be absolutely logical rumours. Will these rumours be quieted by such an investigation as the hon. Postmaster General proposes to have? I would ask the right hon. gentleman who leads this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) fearlessly to-night if it is not the case that matters were brought to the notice of His Excellency the Governor General and by the Governor General brought to the notice of the right hon. gentleman himself.

The PRIME MINISTER. I deny that in the most positive and absolute terms.

Mr. MONK. We are obliged to accept the right hon. gentleman's denial, but the right hon. gentleman surely has heard these rumours himself or else none of the noises of this world that reach the country are heard by him. The matter has been repeated again and again not to people who are seeking scandal, not to people, who, in the delicate language of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) the other day were described as being people occupied in collecting garbage and spuming it out before this House—whatever may be the sense of that phrase. The thing has been repeated time and again from different parts of this Dominion and elsewhere and under these circumstances what my hon. friend the member for Montmorency has said is more than true. It behooves the right hon. gentleman and it behooves the hon. Postmaster General, if they believe in the vanity of all these sayings, if they believe that the utterances of these men who live far from here and who have denounced this transaction in the strongest possible terms that have ever been used to my knowledge in this House, to fix the guilt if guilt there is, upon somebody. It may be some inferior official, it may be

men who by fraudulent means have been the instruments of those who obtained these concessions it may be higher up because such things have been seen before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. Under all these circumstances, the Postmaster General has adopted a most unjust manner of getting out of this serious affair, in having this investigation held by a judge who is not acceptable to both parties for the excellent reasons already stated to this House. An investigation into the hydraulic necessities of the Yukon and the value of these concessions from an hydraulic point of view will not satisfy the people of this country. I believe, Sir, that it is constitutional and logical for us to take the stand which I have taken previously on this subject, and which is now taken by my hon. friend from Montmorency. It is neither constitutional nor fair, nor is it according to parliamentary law in Canada or England, that when the utterances of these responsible bodies living in a remote part of the country are brought to the notice of this House, that we should be told that the hon. member who brings them to the attention of the House must be prepared to stake his reputation as a member of this parliament and to make a specific charge against the guilty parties whose names are not yet known, before an investigation will be granted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the question is put, I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to one or two circumstances connected with this matter. We know that the election of Mr. Ross for the Yukon was heralded throughout the length and breadth of Canada as a victory for the Liberal party. We saw it paraded in every Liberal newspaper in Canada as a vindication of the splendidly pure administration given by this government to the Yukon Territory. Now, I would like to point out to the Postmaster General and to the Prime Minister what Mr. Ross's platform was on that occasion. I will leave out—no I will not leave out; I will read the whole of the sentence which contains the language to which I refer.

> I shall advocate the reduction of fees, which, I think, may now be safely done without impairing the revenue; the adoption of regulations compelling the actual working of claims; the establishment of an assay office in Dawson, where miners may obtain full value for their gold, such office to be operated in conjunction with the quartz mill, where ore may be tested free of charge; the thorough investigation of the charges of fraud made in respect to the manner in which certain concessions are alleged to have been obtained, and if such fraud is established, the immediate commencement of such proceedings as may be required to vacate the grants, and the enforcement of strict compliance with the conditions embodied in all Crown grants in the Yukon.

In passing I may say that this is the platform of Mr. Ross as contained in the official organ of this government, 'The Yukon Sun,' which received from the government last year no less a sum than nearly $2,400 for advertising and printing done by the individuals who happen to be the fortunate possessors of that paper. Then the advertised platform of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) is surmounted with a very good portrait of him indeed and the planks of his platform are laid down:

> 1. Reduced fee for miners' licenses and recording.
> 2. Government aid for a smelter.
> 3. Free quartz test mill and assay office at Dawson.
> 4. National ownership of large water rights.
> 5. Cancellation of concessions obtained by fraud.

That is the platform on which Mr. Ross comes to this House, and there is this significant feature in connection with it: that this platform is what the Postmaster General had in mind when a few weeks ago he pledged that there should be an investigation not only as to the providence or improvidence of this Threadgold concession, but an invesigation into every circumstance or suspicion that had been raised with regard to it. The language of the platform of the member for the Yukon and the language of the Postmaster General run on identical lines. The platform signed by Mr. J. H. Ross to the Yukon electors was:

> I shall advocate the thorough investigation of the charges of fraud made in respect to the manner in which certain concessions are alleged to have been obtained.

It is not my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) who is making these charges of fraud. It is the member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) who by his promise and pledge to the people of the country said that upon coming to this parliament he would advocate a thorough investigation of those very charges, the investigation of which is demanded by my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And my hon. friend from Montmorency standing in his place here to-night is only adopting the platform of Mr. Ross the member for the Yukon in asking the government to have a full inquiry.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Let the Postmaster General bear that in mind before he attempts to taunt my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) in the weak and unworthy manner in which he has attempted to taunt him to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The member for the Yukon says 'I will advocate a thorough investigation of these frauds,' and a few days ago the Postmaster General speaking perhaps a little hastily as he sometimes does, but speaking candidly said :

I would also state to my hon. friend who tells us that he is very desirous of investigation, that I am sure he must well know that it has long been the fixed intention of the government to hold such an investigation.

How was my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) to know it. He was only to know it from the fact that the member from the Yukon, elected as a supporter of this government had promised his electors that he would obtain for them a thorough investigation into these very charges of fraud which were brought to the attention of the House to-night by the hon. gentleman from Montmorency.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Postmaster General continued :

The hon. gentleman must remember that when the election was held, promises were given to the people of the Yukon that there would be a commission to inquire into the whole administration of that territory.

And in what language was that promise given. Let me read once more.

A thorough investigation of the charges of fraud made in respect to the manner in which certain concessions are alleged to have been obtained, and if such fraud is established the immediate commencement of such proceedings as may be required to vacate the grants.

That beyond doubt is the language to which the Postmaster General was alluding, and the platform of the hon. member for the Yukon is the only source from which the hon. member for Montmorency could have obtained the knowledge which was attributed to him by the Postmaster General. But the Postmaster General taunts the hon. member for Montmorency and he says : Name your names and give us something more than mere rumours. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, and the hon. Postmaster General, to show me the names that were given in the resolution moved by the right hon. gentleman with regard to the Drummond County Railway. I pause to ask either one of these hon. gentlemen to show me one single line in that resolution giving the name of any individual. And yet the right hon. gentleman, on that occasion, adopting a course very different from that which he asks the hon. Postmaster General to defend to-night, said :

The reasons which compel the government to make this motion will be understood by every one in this House. Suspicions as to the dealings of the government with the company in question, the Drummond County Railway Company, having been thrown out to the public, the government deem it their duty to court every inquiry, and to see that all charges may be properly ventilated.

Well, why do the government not deem it their duty now, when the platform of their own candidate in the Yukon demanded that these charges should be investigated, why do they not deem it their duty to court every inquiry, and why does my hon. friend the Postmaster General stand up in this House and say : Name me some names, and I will give you the inquiry ? What is the difference ? Having regard to the platform of their own candidate, having regard to the charges of the Liberal clubs, having regard to the charges put forward by the board of trade and the corporation of the city of Dawson, there is tenfold more reason why the government should on this occasion court inquiry than there was on the occasion on which my right hon. friend stood up in this House and, amid the applause of his followers, said : The government deem it their duty to court every inquiry, suspicions having been thrown out to the public ; and the same hon. gentlemen who hailed that announcement with applause sit in their seats to-night and hail with applause the announcement of the hon. Postmaster General that the government not only do not court any inquiry, but will not grant any inquiry unless names are named. I leave the hon. gentlemen to their own position in that respect ; but the public of Canada will not, I think, be slow to appreciate the difference in the attitude of the government on that occasion, when the right hon. gentleman thought it his duty to court inquiry, and on this occasion, when the hon. Postmaster General, having spoken for the Crown and having promised a thorough investigation of every subject, stands up and says that he has fulfilled every obligation to the people of this country by granting a mere investigation as to whether or not the concession granted to Mr. Treadgold and his associates was a provident or improvident concession. Take the resolution of my hon. friend from Montmorency, read that resolution from beginning to end, and point out if you can one single word in it that is not justified by the facts. My hon. friend the Postmaster General did not attempt to do that. He contented himself with standing up in this House and throwing a few weak taunts at my hon. friend from Montmorency ; and then, notwithstanding the platform on which his candidate was elected, notwithstanding his own direct reference to that platform a few weeks ago, notwithstanding his deliberate promise to this House, speaking, as he did, for the government, he has the audacity now to say that this government have fulfilled every pledge and every duty to the House and the country by granting this ineffectual commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be possible for the government, with the aid of their followers, to vote down this motion ; but all I have to say is that in doing so they are departing from their own direct pledge, conveyed to the House and the country through the hon. Postmaster General, and they are departing from the promise made by their own candidate to the electorate of the Yukon, upon which he obtained his election to this House, and upon which his election was hailed as a Liberal victory. If my right hon. friend and his colleagues are satisfied with the contrast their conduct on this occasion presents to the attitude of my right hon. friend when he moved for the inquiry with regard to the Drummond County Railway, we shall leave them to their satisfaction ; but when the country comes to pass judgment on this matter, I do not think that it will be so easily satisfied as are the members of the government and those who support them in this House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I think that any deliberate or calm-minded individual who may be present and hear this discussion, will feel rather compelled to the conclusion that our hon. friends opposite are endeavouring, by the violence of their language and the apparent intensity of their feelings, to make up for an exceedingly weak case—for a dearth of material and a lack of facts to fit the accusations which they are making against the government. My hon. friend starts out with intimating that in the proposal which the government has made for an inquiry into this Yukon matter, we are simply showing what an utter farce the thing has developed into, because we have limited the scope of the inquiry to the questions of hydraulic mining and the character of the country from the hydraulic mining point of view. If this is such an iniquitous farce as the hon. gentleman chooses to characterize it, then all the more readily is it capable of being proved that it is a farce, that we are not covering the ground which the public interests require us to cover, and that we are not going the length we ought to go in the investigation which we are to make. I take my hon. friend's resolution, and I am prepared to follow the various clauses and statements contained in it ; and I take it that my hon. friend has put forward the very best case he can ; that he has alleged the strongest possible facts ; that he has summoned to his assistance all that his ingenuity would suggest in the framing of the resolution, to lead up to the conclusion which he asks the House to draw, and which he has himself drawn, namely, that the proposal of the government is nothing but an iniquitous farce. My hon. friend says in this resolution :

> For some time the grants by the government of Canada to certain parties, and, among others, to A. N. C. Treadgold and his associates, of hydraulic concessions in the Yukon Territory, have been publicly denounced as fraudulent :
>
> That at a convention held in the city of Dawson, on or about the 1st of October, 1902, for the purpose of selecting a Liberal candidate to represent the Yukon Territory in this parliament of Canada, it was, among other things, resolved, that many of the concessions above mentioned were obtained by fraud and imposition.

Now, I ask my hon. friends calmly, if they can summon enough calmness for the purpose, to consider what this language means. Does not the hon. gentleman who moves this resolution feel in his own mind and conscience—if he does not, he ought to feel it—that what these people were complaining of was not fraud perpetrated by the government or to which the government was a party, but some fraudulent representations and impositions that had been practiced on the officers of the department and that had induced them to grant this Treadgold concession. Is there any warrant or justification for drawing from the language which the hon. gentleman has used in his resolution, and which is a counterpart of what is found in newspaper statements and in various other forms made by the Yukon people, the inference that there is any personal or political implication or accusation involved in it against the government or any member of the administration ? Is it not all that can be fairly implied from the language which the hon. gentleman puts forward, that there have been persons who, in procuring these concessions, practiced fraud and imposition upon the government or the officials acting for the government ? A fair reading of the clauses which the hon. gentleman has embodied in his own motion can bring one's mind to no other conclusion. If I am right in this, what foundation is there for the hon. gentleman to say that there is the slightest warrant in anything contained in these two clauses for saying that there is such a prima facie case established as would justify this government in treating these statements as reflecting upon the government or any member of it ? We know how easy it is in a country such as the Yukon, filled with all sorts of people, adventurers from all countries of the world, to create excitement of any kind. These people, so far removed from the control of government, and hoping to achieve great things in their thirst for the precious metals, feel as though they own the country, and had the right to distribute it among themselves. Such a class of people would not stop to consider what was best in the general interest or whether or not this policy or the other would not be more advantageous in the future. But would only look to their own immediate selfish interests. They would not be disposed to listen to reason, but would want to lay their hands on everything in sight, regardless of whether or not the results would be disastrous to the future

welfare and interests of the country. In that frame of mind, when the government had decided, after due consideration, that it was in the best interest of the country to establish a system of hydraulic mining upon a large scale and conducted on the most modern mechanical methods, they did not pause to consider whether or not the means which the government adopted would not in the long run be better for them, but determined to see in it only an obstacle in their way, and started this wild excitement. Under the influence of that excitement, therefore, they gave vent to these exaggerated statements and jumped to the conclusion that, because a concession had been granted, there must necessarily have been fraud and misrepresentation practiced on the government. I think that if a jury of non-partisans were summoned to consider the effect of the language used by these people, and if the jury brought its mind to bear on the conditions existing in the Yukon and the class of men gathered there and who created this excitement, they would be driven to the conclusion that the language used did not in any sense involve any reflection or imputation on the integrity of that government or any of its members.

The amendment goes on to deal with the representative of the Yukon :

> That James Hamilton Ross, Esquire, now a member for this House for the Yukon Territory in accepting the nomination offered to him by the said convention promised publicly through the press to advocate a thorough investigation of the charges of fraud aforesaid.

That I do not dispute. I dare say that Mr. Ross himself, although I do not know it as a matter of fact, may have been carried off his feet by that furious craze which had seized the people amongst whom this hydraulic system was going to be established. I could understand that my hon. friends opposite, cool-headed as they usually are when they see no political advantage to be gained, might, if they had been out in the Yukon, have been affected by the same wave of excitement. Everybody was at the moment carried away by it. They would not have paused to consider more than anybody else, but it devolves on this parliament to consider whether it is consistent with its dignity to appoint a commission in order that somebody may be subjected to inquiry to find out what that somebody did. If there had been practiced, as these people imagine—and as I am willing to admit, in this excited state of mind, they believed fraud and misrepresentation on the government, by means of which these privileges were granted, there will still be no necessity to grant a parliamentary commission. The law furnishes adequate means of getting at the facts. If anybody believed that fraud and misrepresentation had been practiced, he could appeal to the courts or to the department. All he has to do is to appeal to the department to have an inquiry, and he would be afforded every opportunity by the department of making his charges good. The law also affords a remedy. If the department refused to grant an investigation, he could take out a writ of scire facias, be given every opportunity to establish before the courts whether such fraud or misrepresentation had been practiced as would invalidate the grant. The court would have discretion to set aside the grant, and the person who claimed that he ought to get it and was unjustly deprived of the privilege of getting it, would have the course open to him to secure it. It is a case essentially to be dealt with by the court and not by a parliamentary committee. You do not want to take a sledge-hammer to break an egg. All you need do is to appeal to the proper quarter in the proper way, stating a sufficient case to enable the minister to judge whether, in his discretion, he should recommend that the expenditure be incurred, and you have all the remedy you could possibly ask.

Now, we come to the next clause of my hon. friend's indictment, or statement of the facts on which he relies :

> That the Board of Trade of the city of Dawson and others on the 16th of April, 1903, presented to this House a petition in which it is alleged that the said concessions to A. N. C. Treadgold and his associates 'involved an enormous exploitation of the public resources of this territory, for the benefit of a few favoured concessionaires.

Now, what does that mean ? Is not that simply an expression of the dissatisfaction of the board of trade, they being impressed, as the other people there are, with the idea that the system that the government has adopted would do injury to the country ? I am prepared to admit that they were so impressed. But, that being the case, is this anything more than an expression of discontent with the adoption of this policy ? 'Involving an enormous exploitation of the public resources of this country'—is that anything more than to say that the policy of the government is most disastrous to the interests of that section of the Dominion ? Where is the imputation there that would reflect on the integrity of a minister of the Crown ? Where is the warrant there, or in any statement the hon. gentleman has made, that would justify the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in rising in his place, having the responsibility of a member of parliament, and saying that he declines to take the responsibility of incriminating a member of parliament or a minister of the Crown who is not able, at present, to be in his seat in this House ? What is there in this amendment, from the beginning to the end of it, that would warrant any member of this House who has the slightest sense of the responsibility attaching to his position in making such an imputation as that ? I have no doubt—I re-

peat it—on the contrary I freely confess, that the people in the Yukon, whether you take the board of trade, the common council or any other organization or portion of the inhabitants, are deeply impressed with the idea that if you have these Treadgold concessionaires or any others operating this hydraulic system according to the only way in which it can be worked, you are going to deprive the people of advantages and privileges that they would otherwise individually enjoy, and so do injury to the country. But, that is a mere question of opinion. Would anybody be willing to allow the people in one portion of Canada, particularly a section filled with valuable minerals from which we expect to be able by adopting wise, modern, up-to-date methods to extract great values—would he allow those people to compel the working of these mineral deposits by the individual methods pursued in other times? Would anybody say that the people directly interested and concerned are the proper people to form a judgment as to the best methods by which these important questions in that country should be dealt with? Would anybody be warranted in saying that? We are not taking this step unadvisedly or without precedent. We are not adopting a system which has not been adopted elsewhere and used with success. We could point to dozens of places in the hill countries of the United States where these hydraulic methods had been adopted. And you cannot put two companies one alongside the other, to work the same territory. As I said the other day, when speaking of this matter, the method must be monopolistic or you cannot work it at all. These people complain because this is a monopoly. But how can you erect dams, accumulate water, and arrange for letting this water down to the lower levels to be used in connection with the work of mining, unless you have one organization and one management to control the whole matter—subject, of course, to proper government supervision? There is no alternative, except to leave things as they are. If there was any fault to be found with the terms under which this concession was granted, then, the government must submit to criticism as to those terms. But this is a question of policy. Can any man say that this government would be worthy of the place it occupies, would it be fit to manage the affairs of this country if, after having studied the question and considered the experience in other places, they were puerilely to do nothing and refuse to adopt the policy which is the only one from which the best results could be obtained? We would be open to the strongest condemnation if we declined to do what we did—always provided, of course, that the work is carried out by proper methods. If you read these clamorous complaints from beginning to end, you find little in them but an attack on the government policy. Therefore, I say, you are obliged, if you wish to be fair, not to take as conclusive the judgment of the people who have every interest, as they feel—I think mistakenly—that if they had their own way it would bring to them the best results. Dismiss from these clamorous complaints the idea that the monopoly itself is an evil, that it is an exploitation of individual rights, and you have absolutely nothing with which to deal. We are told that the board of trade made the complaint to which I have alluded. Granted. We are told that on or about the 23rd March, the corporation of the city of Dawson addressed to the House a petition similar in terms to the petition of the board of trade. Granted. The observations which I have made, as to the petition of the board of trade, if those observations at all commend themselves to the House, apply with the same force to the petition of the corporation of the city of Dawson. Then, in the next clause we are told that the Liberal Association of Dawson publicly denounced the said concession as having been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation. What does that mean? Does that not mean exactly what the second clause of the amendment means as I have explained it? It means that persons outside, interested in obtaining these concessions, used fraud and misrepresentation, and by these means secured the issue of these grants. I claim the right to conclude from this clause, as from the other, that there is nothing to warrant any suspicion that the integrity of a minister of the Crown is in the slightest degree impeached by the statements made. My hon. friend's motion goes on:

> That on the 12th day of May last the government by the honourable, the Postmaster General, during the debate on the Treadgold Concession, promised to this House to fully carry out the representations which had been made to the citizens of the Yukon to have a full investigation into all charges or suspicions that could be mentioned or entertained in regard to any matters connected with the Yukon administration.

I have, therefore, passed in review, perhaps, somewhat at length, all the clauses of this amendment which the hon. gentleman has placed one on top of the other, endeavouring to construct a superstructure which would prove that there had been charges made against the government, or involving the character and integrity of a minister of the Crown, I claim to have shown that the hon. gentleman has failed in his purpose, for that is manifestly the purpose which he had in view. He has correctly enough quoted what has been said in these speeches and newspapers and other documents. But, taking all these, and assuming, for the sake of argument, the the construction which is put upon them by the hon. gentlemen opposite, what do they lead to? In substance, as they interpret

them, they are a statement that charges of fraud have been made against the government in granting this concession. Now we are invited, upon that assumption, that unwarrantable assumption, to name a parliamentary committee. To do what? The hon. gentleman says, to investigate the charges. I will tell you what you are inviting the government to appoint a parliamentary committee to do. It is to sit down and find out what it is that is charged against the government. You have not told us what the government is charged with. You are simply saying that there was fraud in the granting of this concession, and that therefore a committee should be appointed. Now, could any committee which this House might appoint sit down to discharge its functions without trying, in the first place, to discover what it is of which this fraud consisted? The most rudimentary ideas of parliamentary government would compel hon. gentlemen opposite to tell the House and the country what are the facts which they think constitute a fraud in the transaction of which the government is guilty. Is it not reasonable that such a demand as that should be made upon hon. gentlemen opposite before they ask this House to vote a parliamentary committee? We have only a wild, indefinite, vague statement that there was fraud in granting the concession, a statement made by somebody, a statement of which no member of parliament will assume the responsibility of vouching for, or of saying he believes it. I say, Mr. Speaker, as I have said once before in speaking upon this subject, that the parliament of Canada would be placing itself in a very ridiculous position if it took any such course.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier stated, and the hon. member for Montmorency has stated, that we are taking to-day, in reference to this matter, a very different attitude from what we have taken hitherto; and he says that in the early life of this government, when vague and general statements were made, based on mere suspicions entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite, this government hastened to meet those statements and declared that they were ready, nay, anxious to have them inquired into. Well, Sir, I do not remember that any circumstance occurred in connection with the Drummond County Railway matter of a vague and non-specific character such as the hon. gentleman says exist in the present instance. I happen to remember something about that case, and I know that in the Drummond County Railway matter there was more than a sweeping charge of wrongdoing by the government. That is not said here, but it was said in that case. Now, I am prepared to accept the challenge which the hon. leader of the opposition made to this side of the House a short time ago when he asked us to name a single specific statement. I have not had time to look through the 'Hansard' for the purpose of giving all the statements that were made by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the Drummond Railway transaction, I am unable to do that in the time at my disposal. I remember very well that one member of this House then, now dead, made the very nastiest kind of imputations in respect to the Drummond County transaction; I remember that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals relieved himself on two or three different occasions of reflections upon the conduct of the present minister in that transaction. But after the committee had reported, and after the investigation had resulted in total and absolute failure, then they hastened to say that they had never made any imputation against the government or any member of it which would involve their integrity, but they had simply impeached the prudence of the arrangement, and the business character of the arrangement. They told us that after the thing was over, and their efforts had proved futile. Now I have here the speech which was made by the hon. member for Montmorency upon one occasion, and how often he made it, I have not been able to ascertain. But any one reading this will agree that there was matter of a specific character to justify any minister in claiming an inquiry and investigation, and that it was not of such a nature, emanating from the quarter it did, that it should be disregarded. The language I am going to quote will be found in the 'Hansard' of 1898, volume 1, page 514.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That was after the premier had announced that this committee would be appointed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it was on the 15th of February, I think it was before the commission was actually appointed, but after the statement was made that it would be appointed. You will see what the hon. gentleman then said, and I think the inference may fairly be drawn that if the hon. member, after he had got his committee, would make a statement of this kind, he would be not unlikely to make even stronger statements, statements that would secure the appointment of a committee which he might think, upon investigation, would disclose something of which he had no evidence, but which was matter of suspicion with him. He said:

> But what, above all, was it that made this investigation necessary? It was the extraordinary speech made in this House last session by the Minister of Public Works. Why, Sir, charged, as he was, in the public press with being interested in the deal he rose in this House and said that 'La Patrie' newspaper, in which he writes every day, which is his organ, which, if report is true—I do not know whether it is true or not, and I do not state it as a fact—virtually belongs to him, was bought for his sons with a cheque for $30,000 furnished by the president of the Drummond County Railway.

Now, the hon. gentleman could not put that statement upon the 'Hansard' and cir-

culate it through the country except for the purpose of creating the impression in the public mind that there was a bargain arising out of this Drummond County business, under which $30,000 passed from the president of the Drummond County Railway into the hands of the Minister of Public Works as a consideration for the transaction. He would not make the statement with any other design in view than to asperse and besmirch the character of the minister to whom he referred. If he did it then—and he did it—how was it possible for the Minister of Public Works otherwise than to say: You have made statements, and members of the House of Commons have made statements of that kind, and therefore I hail with pleasure an investigation into the matter in order that all the facts shall be brought out. But now, has there been a word said, except by insinuation, by the hon. gentleman indicating what the character or nature of the conduct was which he said was attributed by public rumour to a minister of the Crown? Not a syllable. There is nothing to take hold of, and there is nothing which any self-respecting parliament could regard as emanating from a responsible quarter involving such a reflection upon a minister of the Crown as would even leave that minister of the Crown, innocent as he might be and innocent as he is in the present case, the victim of the rumours which are always freely circulated by—I will not say members of parliament—but freely circulated by partisans of one side or the other to the disparagement of their opponents. Under such circumstances, in the face of such a lack of specific material, in the absence of any statement of fact which would show that there had been fraud or malfeasance in office committed by any minister of the Crown or by the government, I cannot see how it would be possible for this government to maintain a position of self-respect if we were to allow hon. gentlemen opposite to obtain a committee of this House to hold an investigation. The government has not changed its mind. I am not conscious that there is present on the treasury benches any member of the administration who would wish to treat questions, reflections, accusations, imputations or insinuations of that kind any differently to-day from the way in which he would wish to treat them two, or three, or four, or five, or six, or seven years ago. There is only one thing that I can imagine would influence the mind of a minister to-day. If the government had treated seriously some of the scandalous rumours which had been aired by hon. gentlemen opposite reflecting upon the government, if we had held investigations, and if our experience of such charges was that there was not a particle of foundation for them, we might very well hesitate when the same sort of procedure was again committed. But we have once, twice or three times allowed ourselves to assume that what has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite was entitled to be treated seriously and entitled to be treated with consideration. We have found, having acted under that impression, that we were deceived as to the knowledge that these hon. gentlemen possessed, or as to the foundation upon which they based these imputations, and having had the experience which we have had of the methods of procedure adopted by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, we will no longer continue to follow that course, but will ask and demand and require of these hon. gentlemen that they shall take the responsibility, if they want to reflect unfavourably upon the character of a minister of the Crown, of expressing the opinion that there is reason for the imputations which they have made, and we will demand that they shall take this responsibility manfully and honourably before the House. It is infinitely more to the credit of a member of parliament, who, believing these charges which have been talked about and rumoured in the country in regard to malfeasance or misconduct of the members of the government, should find out afterwards that he was mistaken in his belief, than that he should insinuate and impute misconduct, or that he should avail himself of the position which the people have placed him in to disseminate broadcast over the Dominion reflections upon the character of men who are filling ministerial positions. I do not care what party is in or who are members of the administration; for the time being the people have entrusted them with the responsibility of carrying on their affairs. For the time being they hold the distinguished and honourable positions of ministers, they possess the confidence of the people, and, representing the people, I think it is at least the duty of those who oppose their policy to recognize that they are in the positions which they fill by the voice of the people of Canada, and as such they are entitled to be treated with that respect which the choice of the people of Canada merits. I therefore claim that there is nothing alleged in the amendment which the hon. gentleman has moved, that there is nothing which has been stated in support of that amendment to justify this House in departing from the usual practice which obtains under all parliamentary governments through the various portions of the empire, and that there is no course remaining for us but to give a decided negative to the amendment which the hon. gentleman has proposed.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Mr. Speaker, I crave your indulgence for a very short statement that I feel it is my duty to offer. I was a member of the government when this Treadgold concession was granted. It came up in the ordinary

way of business. The matter lay within the Department of the Interior. All those who have been ministers know that the minister who has charge of a department brings before his colleagues matters that are under his control. That matter, as a matter of course, was presented to the government by the minister then in charge of the Department of the Interior. The matter was discussed with all the care and attention that we were able to give to it then. We looked into the question to the best of our ability. It was referred to a sub-committee. One of the members of this sub-committee is no more a member of this parliament. The concession was granted after, as I said, we had given our best attention to the question. It was a difficult question, as my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has said, when we were called upon to decide whether it was better to leave things as they were, to leave the miners to supply themselves with water, or whether it would be better to grant certain rights to parties who were undertaking to supply water under certain conditions. The first conditions that we imposed upon them were not carried out. They came to us later on and reported that they could not go on with their undertaking unless these conditions were changed. I think there were three changes. However, this has no great bearing on the case. So far as my own standpoint is concerned, all I can say is that I do not know that there is any one of my colleagues in the House to-night who was my colleague then, who I am sure has been guilty of an impropriety. As far as I can see, there is no member of this government within the precincts of this hall——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, I do not want my words to be misinterpreted. I am just going to explain what I mean. I do not want that my words be interpreted in a wider direction than I want to give them. I generally endeavour to speak my mind very clearly. Then I understand the hot words that my hon. friend the Postmaster General has used. He is not guilty I am sure of any impropriety; he has resented the accusation that has been made against the government and I cannot blame him for that. Speaking for myself I know that as far as I have been able to judge the matter has come before us in the ordinary way of business. Eight or ten months afterwards or perhaps a little less, a deputaion came to us to Ottawa. It was headed by Mr. Ross, who represents the Yukon in this parliament. Complaints were made that the concessions were too wide; that the concessions in point of fact should be cancelled or at any rate amended in such a way that they would not be the same thing at all. The matter was taken into consideration and the changes were made. Now, this is all I have got to say so far as the members of the government present to-day are concerned. Let me express my regret that the hon. Minister of the Interior and Mr. Ross are not here. I trust that if the Minister of the Interior were here, after the words that have been uttered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) he would take the position that I have taken myself in that famous celebrated and notorious inquiry of the Drummond County Railway. In 1897, there were vague accusations in that Drummond County matter. No direct accusations were made, but having read and heard these vague rumours, I got up in my place and I challenged any direct accusation against me. These accusations did not materialize. Let me tell my hon. friends on the other side of the House, now that they are looking to the wrong pew.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What did take place during the recess between 1897 and 1898 ? The hon. Mr. Foster, the ex-Minister of Finance, went to Toronto and addressed a large meeting in which my name and the names of my sons were mentioned. When parliament was convened in 1898 I made it a duty to ask the Prime Minister and my colleagues, to themselves ask for an investigation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would not allow the government of which I was a member to lie under the accusation that had been made against me outside of the chamber, but by a gentleman who had been a minister of the Crown. I thought that that accusation had been enough for me to go to the Prime Minister and to say that if I was guilty of having received directly or indirectly $30,000 in that Drummond County deal I was not worthy to be a member of the government any longer. That is the position I took. No direct accusation has been made against the Minister of the Interior to-day. Rumours have been circulated this evening. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has quoted these rumours without naming the minister but naming his department. I have no doubt—I hope at any rate that if the hon. gentleman who is the Minister of the Interior were here he would take the position that I now take. I shall not vote on this motion and I will tell you why, Sir. In view of the vagueness of the accusation I think that the government would have been justified in declining an inquiry. When there are questions of fraud directly or indirectly mentioned it is necessary; it is proper at any rate to be direct as the rules of parliament require. But the government has granted an inquiry. I was not able to be here when the first motion was discussed, but had I been here I would have spoken just as I speak now. The government have

granted an inquiry. In my humble opinion they have not acted as they might have acted had they paused a little more. An inquiry by a judge is always a doubtful thing. Some years ago I condemned in the press as a newspaper man, inquiries conducted by judges. It is a dangerous thing to involve the judiciary in such an inquiry as a rule. I do not say that there are not exceptions, but as a rule, parliament should keep the control of its own affairs. It is the safest rule. My hon. friends on the treasury benches have not followed that rule and they have thought proper to appoint a judge. I cannot approve of their action on that account. On the other hand in view of the fact that I have been a member of the government, that I have participated in the granting of the concession that the government is defending to-night, I cannot possibly condemn myself in voting for the motion which implies the condemnation of a transaction to which I have been a party. So far as I know it officially, as it came before us officially, I do not know of anything upon which I could base my judgment to condemn now what I have approved and participated in then. But not approving the procedure that my hon. friends on the treasury benches have adopted, I cannot vote with them.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I was so impressed by the eloquence and convinced by the logic of the Minister of Railways and Canals, that I have no hesitation in saying that if any hon. gentleman on this side of the House—no, I will withdraw that and apologize for it—if any benighted Tory between the Atlantic and the Pacific should be so bereft of his faculties as to suggest the case that the Minister of Railways and Canals so successfully controverted to-night, I would be ready to join with him in taking the proper means to have this irresponsible lunatic at once put under restraint. May I be pardoned before discussing the question, if I refer to the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals. He read the motion at present before the House; he read it carefully, clause by clause, so far as the clause charges were concerned, and he found that the sum total of these charges was that the people of the Yukon, irrespective of party, of politics, of creed or anything else; the board of trade, the citizens in public meeting, the Liberal association, everybody in fact had agreed that the government had been imposed upon, and that these concessions had been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation; but the Minister of Railways and Canals nailed his flag at the mast and said: We deny there is any charge there of dishonesty on the part of the government. Who said there was? But are the hon. gentlemen occupying the treasury benches more than demigods; have they eaten the fruit of the tree of knowledge; is it not possible that they may have been deceived? And if these charges be true—and all that is asked on this side of the House is that they be investigated to see whether or not they are true—if it be the fact that the hon. gentlemen opposite, despite all their ability and honesty and integrity—and nobody is accusing them on any of those points—have been deceived, and that these concessions have been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation; can anybody say that we, sitting here as representatives of the people, are doing other than our duty in asking for an investigation, in order to see if the government has been deceived, and if they have been induced by fraud and misrepresentation to make concessions which everybody in the Yukon says are ruinous to that part of the country? The question seems a simple question, and one would imagine that it would not require any great amount of oratory or discussion to decide it. I think my hon. friend the Postmaster General put the matter in a nutshell when he said that there had been a cowardly course taken and honour was in the balance. I am inclined to agree with him, and the question before us this evening is, who has taken the cowardly course, and whose honour is in the balance?

A reference to the undisputed facts of the case would furnish, I submit, a complete answer to these questions. It will be admitted that a few years ago the people of this country were possessed of a valuable domain in the Yukon. It will be admitted that by Order in Council, which is wholly invalid—because the hon. Postmaster General himself admitted it the other night—those lands were made over, without one single dollar being paid for them, to a few concessionaires. It is true, as I said, that the hon. gentleman says the Order in Council is invalid; but this House and the unfortunate people of this country have had experience before this of another invalid Order in Council. It was but a few years ago when we learned to our sorrow that a minister of the Crown—and the same minister who is in charge of the Interior Department which controls the Yukon—some seven or eight days before parliament met, rushed through an Order in Council authorizing a railway to be constructed into this very country. It is perfectly true, the order was hopelessly and helplessly invalid; and it is equally true that this unfortunate country paid over $300,000 on the strength of that helplessly invalid Order in Council. And so, Sir, it is perhaps not surprising that the people of the Yukon, excitable as the hon. Minister of Railways says they were, living on the spot, and finding all their hopes of that country blasted, declared in resolution after resolution that the concessions which were granted would mean that in a few years there would be in that country one Treadgold and several hundred people working for him. It is no wonder that

they asked this parliament to investigate the grounds on which these extraordinary concessions were given. It is all very well for the hon. Minister of Railways to say that they are an excitable people. Who are those people? The Board of Trade of Dawson; a public meeting convened in Dawson; aye, Sir, the Liberal Association of Dawson; aye, Sir, the representative of the people sent from Dawson. And so we find that the people of that country, whom we represent, and the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, the Postmaster General sitting beside him, and the Minister of Railways represent these people as much as they represent the people of their own constituencies—these people are to be called an excitable people because, feeling that everything worth anything in their country has been given away, they protested and charged the government, not with fraud, but with being imposed upon, and therefore asked their trustees, who are sent here to transact their business, simply to look into the matter and see if they had not been imposed upon, and if so, to cancel these iniquitous concessions. If we are taunted that we cannot find precedents in English history to meet a case like this, the answer is not far afield. No one can read of cases in which members of the British parliament have resigned their seats without appreciating the fact that the sense of honour is so sensitive there that even if these charges were made, as they have been, by public meetings, by resolutions, by newspapers in the Yukon, there would be not only an investigation, but a vacant seat behind the right hon. leader of the government long before this. But admitting, that the country owned certain lands in the Yukon, and that those lands were given away, though by an Order in Council which is invalid on its face; admitting that the people in the part of the country protested against this; we find that an election was held in that country; and we have been taunted by the hon. Postmaster General that it is idle for us to ask for any investigation into the affairs of the Yukon because the people of that country, in sending to this House a supporter of the government, had shown their confidence in the government which had passed these extraordinary concessions. If the right hon. leader of the government would read the platform of the Liberal Association of the Yukon, which I will not occupy the time of the House in reading, as it has been read already, he would find that it condemned these concessions as strongly as any Conservative member of this House could; and if he would look at the questions which were asked of the candidate, and answered, not by that gentleman, because he was absent from the country, but by a gentleman high in his confidence, who conducted the election for him—a gentleman in whom the right hon. leader of the government had implicit confidence, or he would not have named Mr. Congdon as Governor of the Yukon—he would find the following:

2. Will you agree to advocate for and insist upon the cancellation of the Treadgold concession?

3. Will you pledge yourself to advocate for and insist upon the punishment and exposure of officials, both in Dawson and Ottawa, by whose frauds or culpable negligence or inefficiency those concessions were granted in the first instance or are now continued in force after the same by their terms should be cancelled?

The answer given by Mr. Congdon to these questions is that Mr. Ross is out of the country, but 'I have no doubt he will advocate the course of action you suggest in your questions.' We find that this was the state of affairs in the Yukon. Then this parliament meets. A representative is sent here from the Yukon; pledged to the lips to secure the cancellation of these infamous concessions and to have an investigation as to the fraud or culpable negligence or inefficiency of the officials either at Ottawa or Dawson, through whose fraud or negligence or inefficiency these concessions were granted. The House met, and shortly afterwards a motion was brought up by my hon. friend from Montmorency on this very subject; and the government, speaking by the mouth of the hon. Postmaster General, gave no uncertain sound. Those who were here when the hon. gentleman spoke, will remember well how broadly he promised an investigation into these matters. The government was committed, if it is possible to commit a government by the solemn statements of one of its prominent members standing on the floor of parliament—and it is hard to conceive of any way in which a government can be committed if not in that way—to what? To the following:

I would also say to my hon. friend who tells us that he is so desirous of investigation that I am sure he must well know that it has been long the fixed intention of the government to hold such an investigation.

We are told by the hon. Postmaster General that promises were made to the people of the Yukon that an investigation would be held into the whole administration of that territory, and now we can see why a representative was sent from the Yukon to support the government. The hon. Postmaster General said further:

I doubt if navigation is more than open, even if it is yet open. When the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) returns to Ottawa,—he is at present in British Columbia, I understand—and we can have the benefit of his advice, it is our intention to fully carry out the representations made to the citizens of the Yukon to have a full investigation into all charges or suspicions that hon. gentlemen may be good enough to mention or entertain in regard to any matters connected with the Yukon administration. I give that public notice to my hon. friend, so that, in addition to the advantage he

has had of ventilating his views on the floor of this House, he will have an opportunity to make good, if he can, any of his charges or suspicions before a tribunal where newspaper extracts and letters will not be the only evidence.

I do not think that any language could more clearly express the promise that we would be given a full investigation, not into the hydraulic needs of the Yukon, but into the charges and suspicions of fraud and corruption. Yet, to-night we have the sad spectacle of that same minister of the Crown, who made that pledge, standing up before this House—not denying that he used the language I have just quoted—but professing that the pledge then given is being carried out by the appointment of the Crown made the other day. Mr. Speaker, we may well pause to consider whose was the cowardly course, and whose honour is standing in the balance. With the words of the Postmaster General fresh in our recollection, let us consider what the authority of this commission really is, what ground it covers. There is a number of recitals:

That it has also been represented to the government that the extent and value of the deposits of gold in the benches, creeks and elevated ground is at present unknown and must remain so until a sufficient supply of water is available by the construction of hydraulic works, and that parties advancing moneys for the construction of said works must necessarily take great risks with respect to their investments.

That is practical. That certainly relates to hydraulic operation.

That while it is fitting that such reasonable and proper privileges and advantages should be offered as will induce parties to construct such hydraulic works, yet it is essential that no grants or concessions should be made which will interfere with the right of water which any free miner is entitled to under the regulations governing placer mining in the Yukon Territory.

That the water so to be held and controlled by the hydraulic companies should be available on equal terms to all free miners whose claims can be profitably worked thereby.

That to obtain such hydraulic works and a supply of water for the benches, banks and elevated grounds above mentioned, certain powers, rights and privileges were granted by the Governor General in Council on the 21st of April, 1902 to Malcolm E. Orr-Ewing, A. N. C. Treadgold and Walter Barwick; that it has been alleged——

Alleged what? Now we are coming to the sting of the whole inquiry.

That it has been alleged that the said grant and concession constitutes a monopoly, which, while depriving the treasury of an enormous revenue, is most detrimental to the mining industry of the Yukon.

It is perfectly true that that has been alleged. No one on this side will deny it. But will any one pretend to say that that is all that has been alleged?

That it is important in the public interest that inquiry be made——

We all agree with that, and we felt, with the words of the Postmaster General ringing in our ears, that at last justice was to be done, and that not only the charges but the mere suspicions were to be investigated.

for the purpose of obtaining information, showing to what extent the said grant and concession is likely to be beneficial or injurious to the mining interest of the said Yukon Territory.

That it is also desirable at the same time that the inquiry should not be limited to the said grant and concession——

There we thought we were going to have something. We were going to get something at last. The hon. gentleman had repented, and even at the last moment they were going to give us what the Postmaster General promised solemnly, on the faith and honour of the government, we should have.

Showing to what extent the said grant is likely to be beneficial or injurious to the mining interests of the said Yukon Territory.

Then we read on. Another gleam of hope flashes across our mind, when we see that something more is to be investigated.

That it is further desirable that the commissioners making the inquiry shall investigate generally all the facts and circumstances——

Here we felt certain we had it.

—which would afford information to parliament, to the government and to parliament——

But our hearts sink within us as we go on to read:

—respecting the hydraulic or other means which it is desirable should be adopted.

Is this what the House wants investigated, or what the people of the Yukon desire to have investigated? It is not the hydraulic or other means but the means whereby the government were deceived and misled that this House and the country want to see investigated. But when we are given this commission and are coolly told by the hon. Postmaster General that everything asked by the hon. member for Montmorency has been given, I ask again whose course is it that is cowardly, whose honour is at stake? And I turn to the motion of my hon. friend from Montmorency for an answer. What do I find in that motion? Among many clauses, I find this one:

That all hydraulic concessions whose owners have not observed the conditions of their leases and the provisions of the mining regulations may be rescinded.

That an inquiry may be set on foot to ascertain the circumstances under which the leading hydraulic concessions were obtained in order that action may be taken by the Attorney General in the premises.

With that on the records of this House, moved by my hon. friend from Montmorency, the hon. the Postmaster General dared

to stand up and say that this Order in Council gives all—and he went beyond that, he out-heroded Herod, gives all and more than the hon. member for Montmorency asked.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that he is reading from the motion of the hon. member for Montmorency ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Yes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, you are reading from his speech.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am not going to be diverted from the point by the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is a question of fact. Is it the motion or the speech you are reading from ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is a paragraph of a resolution of the Liberal Club at Dawson. It is your own friends who said that.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I see that the hon. Minister of Justice is quite correct. In reading hurriedly a number of quotations marked here, I inadvertently read from the petition of the Liberal Club. The clause I read is in the petition of the Liberal Club of Dawson.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman said it was in the motion.

Mr. NORTHRUP. My hon. friend from Montmorency used that petition of the Liberal Club along with other material that came from Dawson, to show that charges had been made into which he desired an investigation. When the governments' own friends make these charges, when one of their own supporters was sent to this House to have them investigated, and the ministers of the Crown promised that they should be investigated, we on this side expected more than was given. When we asked for bread, we did not expect such a stone as that. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of taunting hon. members on this side with their obligation to make charges on their own responsibility, as members. It is very easy to make such a taunt, but it would be interesting to find how many members there are, either to your right or your left, Mr. Speaker, who know what the responsibility is that is incurred by a member so acting. I venture to say that outside the right hon. the first minister, there is not a member of this House who would declare that he knows what that responsibility is. I find on page 1040, of the 'Hansard' of 1892, a speech made by the late Sir John Thompson, at the time when the famous Parent charges were made. He expressed himself to this effect, and there is no one in this House who will not admit that few brighter, abler and more prudent jurists ever sat in this House. And Sir John Thompson said :

I am aware that there is a popular impression that a gentleman in this House who makes accusations of misconduct, impropriety, dishonesty, or other charges of that character against another member of this House incurs a serious responsibility, and may, if the charge is proven and unsustained be expelled from this Chamber. In view of the ground which I shall ask the House to take with regard to this resolution. I beg to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact, that that is an entire misapprehension. A member making a charge against another in this House may, of course, subject himself, as he does in pursuing any line of conduct on any piece of business before the House, to the censure of the House ; but, so far as his own seat is concerned he may make false charges against other members of the House with perfect impunity.

It is perfectly true that, in the same debate, the present Premier (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a few pages later, expressed himself to the contrary effect. He said :

The House expects from a member who makes a charge against a fellow member that he must have some good and strong reason for making that charge, and it is unquestionable that the common sense of the country would expect that, if any member should be guilty of making such foul charge against another member, without having strong reasons for making it and good evidence to support it, he would not be fit to associate with gentlemen and he ought to be expelled from this House.

So, on this point which has been so often referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite, surely, the ordinary member of this House may feel justified in being in some doubt when he finds that on so important a question as the Caron charges the Minister of Justice of that day and the leader of the present government, both gentlemen competent to speak, either of whose opinions, I am sure, any member of the House will bow to with the readiest deference, if they did not conflict—they are in such helpless conflict. But is that a fair taunt to throw at an hon. member on this side, when hon. members opposite are supposed to be equally interested with us in protecting the public property ? We find the charge made that the ministry has been imposed upon—and I wish to accentuate that, because it seems to be assumed that the charge is in effect that Mr. This or Mr. That fraudulently and feloniously betrayed his trust. If such a charge were made it might fairly be said : There must be some responsibility behind it and if you were going to make a charge which would involve the political ruin of a member of this House, you must take some risk yourself. The charges made in the Yukon we wish to have investigated and the charges made in the Yukon are that that country has been robbed and ruined and an imposition practiced on the government. The whole question for this House to decide is whether we shall assume as a matter of fact and law that the government is so immaculate that it cannot be imposed upon, and therefore there should be no investigation. If we cannot come to that

conclusion, I say with all respect and regret, there is only one other conclusion possible, and that is that the hon. gentleman who glibly promised this investigation a few nights ago, as the people of this country will infallibly say, must have received further information since, which compels him now to retract what he said the other night, and not only, if I might use the expression, eat his own words, but insult the intelligence of this House by saying that this present Order in Council gives a wider investigation than we on this side either asked for or desire. Now, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House longer, for it seems to me as I said in the beginning, that the whole question can be boiled down into a very small compass. If we, sitting in this House are not to be at liberty to investigate charges of fraud on the government, charges made by the practically unanimous voice of the people of a large and important part of this country, men may well say under what condition may we ask to investigate such charges. And when we find in this debate, one minister promising full investigation and another saying that only the hydraulic powers and rights are to be investigated, and when we find ministers coming down, and, amid the clamour of their supporters, who evidently have not read the resolution, saying to this House in triumph, that they had given more than we had asked for, are we not justified in coming to the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite are inclined to use the pious editor's words and say :

In short, I firmly du believe
In humbug generally,
Fer it's a thing thet I perceive
To hev a solid vally ;
This heth my faithful shepherd ben,
In pastures sweet heth led me,
An' this'll keep the people green
To feed ez they hev fed me.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The difference between tweedledum and tweedledee is illustrated by the speakers here to-night. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) supported by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), charged that fraud has been practiced by the government. My hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) changed the charge and now rings the changes on the suggestion that fraud has been practiced on the government. Which of the two are we to deal with ? I do not know that I should have been called upon to interfere in this debate were it not that I think it to be my duty to defend my hon. friend from Montmorency to some extent against a charge that was not made but was possibly suggested by the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The Postmaster General suggested, not that the hon. member for Montmorency was guilty of cowardice, but that, under the circumstances it looked like cowardice, to take the position he did. I have known my hon. friend from Montmorency for many years. I knew him under circumstances where men soon learn to understand one another's characters especially with regard to matters of cowardice and bravery—I knew him at college. No man who ever had any knowledge of my hon. friend would charge him with being a coward, either a moral or a physical coward. He is neither one nor the other. But he is something else—he is a pastmaster in the art of obscuring an issue. We have had experience of one another for many years in the college and in the forum, and if any man knows well how to make much ado about nothing, my hon. friend does. Now, let us see what has taken place. Let me justify my charge that my hon. friend has proven, in connection with this debate, that he is a pastmaster in the art of obscuring an issue. He came here the other day and made a speech. I need not say that it was an eloquent speech, for he scarcely ever speaks otherwise than eloquently. But after having gone through the speech, after having delivered himself of this oration and quoted copiously from resolutions passed by miners' conventions in the Yukon and so on, he finally offered a motion for the consideration of the House. I do not wish to weary the House with quotations, but I venture to make the statement that the pith of the whole motion is in these words :

This House is of opinion that the said powers, franchises and concessions constitute in favour of the said Treadgold and his associates a gigantic monopoly, which, while depriving the treasury of enormous revenues, is most detrimental to the mining industry of the Yukon.

That is the charge—that this concession constituted a monopoly and that the monopoly so constituted was most detrimental to the mining interests of the Yukon. What was there, then, to investigate ? That this was a monopoly went without saying—everybody admitted it. The thing was in its nature a monopoly, and we never pretended anything to the contrary. But what remained to be investigated was whether it was detrimental to the mining industry in the Yukon. What did we do ? Immediately when that motion was introduced a pledge was given that the charge made by my hon. friend would be investigated. What was the charge ? That this concession was detrimental to the interest of the Yukon. What do we find in the report to council upon which the commission issued ? The very words used by my hon. friend. This commission is appointed for the purpose of investigating that which he says was the result of the grant of this concession, that is to say, it was a concession detrimental to the interest of the Yukon. We use his own words in the order authorizing the investigation. Now, what

does he complain of? Evidently my hon. friend knows when he produces an effect, because ordinarily he does produce an effect—but in another sphere when he is in court. He discovered that in this instance he failed entirely to produce any effect, either in this House or on public opinion, and he was forced to go to the newspapers immediately after and write a long and interesting letter, which had some effect, because it was in some respects interesting. But he was not satisfied with that, he found it necessary to do more. Finding the letter was not sufficient, he had to come here and make this motion to-night. Now, what do we find in his motion at the present time? It is to the effect that the board of trade of the Yukon passed a resolution in which they said that this concession 'involved an enormous exploitation of the public resources of this territory for the benefit of a few favoured concessionaires.' Then he said:

That the Liberal Association of the city of Dawson, at a meeting held on the 1st of April, 1903, publicly denounced the said concessions as having been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation, and petitioned the government to institute an inquiry to ascertain the circumstances under which the leading hydraulic concessions were obtained in order that action may be taken by the Attorney General of Canada in the premises.

Then he goes on to say:

And this House is of the opinion that a special committee of this House should be appointed with all necessary powers to make a full and complete investigation, not only into the providence or improvidence of the terms and conditions of the several hereinbefore mentioned concessions, but also into all the circumstances relating to or connected with the granting or procurement of the same and all alterations therein, all negotiations and transactions between the government or any member or officer thereof and the said concessionaires or any person on their behalf with respect thereto or with respect to any alteration therein, the names of the persons directly or indirectly interested from time to time in the said concessions, the nature of their respective interests and the circumstances under which such interests were acquired.

What has that got to do with any charge against the government? What has that got to do with any suggestion of fraud by the government? Is there a suggestion that there was fraud by the government? Is there anything in this motion which would give the House to understand that my hon. friend is of opinion that fraud was practiced by the government, or by any member of the government, in connection with the granting of this concession? No, he is a too honourable a man to make a statement which he knows is not true. But what does my hon. friend say? He says the board of trade of the Yukon states that fraud was practiced on the government; he says that the Liberal Association of the Yukon echoes that charge. I have read the petition sent here by the board of trade, and I cannot find anything to support my friend's assertion in it, that fraud was practiced on the government. But I will say this to my hon. friend, and here I know I will not appeal to him in vain. This concession was granted under the terms of the Dominion Lands Act, all these concessions were granted under the terms of that Act. Now there is no man in this House who knows better than my hon. friend that there is a door wide open, not only to the board of trade of the Yukon, not only to the members of the Liberal club, but to any man in the Yukon Territory or out of it, who honestly believes that fraud was practiced on the government in connection with the granting of these concessions. The door is wide open; Section 57 of the Dominion Lands Act, 49 Victoria, chapter 54 says:

Whenever patents, leases or other instruments, respecting lands have issued through fraud——

That is the charge.

—or in error or improvidence, any court having competent jurisdiction in cases respecting real property in the province or territory where such lands are situate, may, upon action, bill or plaint respecting such lands, and upon hearing the parties interested, or upon default of the said parties after such notice of proceeding as the said court orders, decree or adjudge such patent, lease or other instrument to be void.

If fraud is practiced on the government there is a remedy, and ordinary fair play requires that that remedy should be applied, because every man who takes a patent from the Crown under the terms of the Dominion Lands Act takes it subject to all the conditions contained in that Act, and furthermore, takes it with the knowledge that the guarantees provided by that Act will surround the concession. He knows that if he has practiced fraud on the government he is exposed to have his interests brought before the Attorney General, and the Attorney General may issue a fiat for the purpose of testing the facts to ascertain whether fraud was practiced.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Must it not be an individual who is interested in the fraud? Can any person that is not interested bring a case?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Any person having an interest, however remote, in the district affected, can act as a relator in applying to the Attorney General for his fiat for scire facias. I say that with all deference to the legal opinion of my hon. friend. Now, I say the courts are wide open to these gentlemen in the Yukon, and therein lies the secret of the motion that has been made here by my hon. friend. He knows full well that this remedy is afforded to these gentlemen; he knows full well that if these men believe the charges they are making are well founded, there is a remedy open to them; and knowing that,

knowing that they did not take advantage of the remedy that was open to them, he would not take the responsibility of adopting their charges and make them his own in this House ; he would not do it, because he knew full well that if they were honest in their charges, if they could substantiate their charges, they might have done it elsewhere, and as they did not do it elsewhere, he would not take the responsibility of doing it for them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have something in support of that. In the motion itself of my hon. friend we find that the Liberal Association of the city of Dawson, at their meeting held on the 1st of April last, were careful to indicate what they wanted to have done. They asked that an inquiry should be held to ascertain the circumstances under which the leading hydraulic concessions were obtained in order that action might be taken by the Attorney General in the premises. Why did they not apply for a scire facias ? Why did they not adopt the remedy which the law gives them ? They were on the ground, they were cognizant of the facts. They had all the material at their disposal ; why did they not petition the Attorney General for a fiat ? I make the statement here and now, in the hearing of the Prime Minister, and with the authority of the government, that if an application of that sort is made it won't take five minutes to grant it, and an opportunity will be given to these gentlemen to make good their charges. More than that. In these instructions to the commission, what do we find ? We find they have gone very far in the direction of meeting this request of the gentlemen connected with the Liberal club of the Yukon. They say an inquiry should be made for the purpose of ascertaining the circumstances under which the hydraulic concessions were obtained in order that action may be taken by the government. The commissioner is required to investigate, not only the circumstances connected with the concession to Treadgold, but the instruction provides also :

That it is also desirable at the same time that the inquiry should not be limited to the said grants and concession but should extend to all similar hydraulic concessions granted in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. CASGRAIN. For what purpose ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The inquiry is to be general. The inquiry is to be held into all the circumstances connected with these different concessions.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No, no.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Will my hon. friend pardon me ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. It is not correct.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I accept the correction of my hon. friend. The inquiry is to be held for the purpose of ascertaining the facts and circumstances connected with all these concessions. The facts and circumstances will necessarily imply an investigation into the circumstances of these concessions which were granted. If it appears that fraud was practiced, the information will be in the possession of the government, but in the meantime it is open for any one to proceed as provided in the Dominion Lands Act. Let any responsible man come forward and make such charges as will justify the issue of a fiat and he will not have long to wait for it. I shall be content with recapitulating what has taken place. My hon. friend made his charge on the 12th May in regard to the Treadgold matter. He said it ought to be investigated. We granted an investigation. He is not satisfied with that investigation, but he says that we ought to inquire into all the facts and circumstances connected with that matter for the purpose of ascertaining whether a fraud was practiced on the government or on the public. The remedy is open to him under the Dominion Lands Act. I was not here when he began his speech, but I understand that my hon. friend found fault with the government for having chosen a judge to act in this matter. Hon. gentlemen opposite have reiterated the statement during the course of this debate that this was not a political matter, that all that was desired by them was to have an honest investigation into all the facts and circumstances connected with this concession, so that we might know whether or not it was providently or improvidently issued or whether this concession was tainted with fraud. They say it is not proper to assign a judge to perform the duties which are to be imposed upon Mr. Justice Britton and the commissioners to be appointed hereafter. My hon. friend did me the honour of quoting me in connection with the use of the judicial office for such inquiries. Would he allow me to reciprocate ? My hon. friend was attorney general in the province of Quebec and occupied in respect to that province the position which I occupy in respect to the Dominion of Canada. In 1902 charges were made involving political dishonesty on the part of political men—very serious charges of the grossest political dishonesty. My hon. friend did not hesitate to appoint a judge to make the investigation. He appointed three of them. He appointed one of them who was fresh from the fray, having been only recently appointed to the bench. I do not say that he acted improperly at that time. Far be it from me to contend anything of the sort.

Mr. CASGRAIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman who that was ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It was Mr. Justice Baby.

Mr. CASGRAIN. He was not fresh from the fray. He had been on the bench for fifteen or twenty years.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He had been sitting in this House a year or two before he was appointed.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No, ten years before.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. At all events a short time before.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was ten years before.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I say two years before, and my hon. friend says ten years before. The Prime Minister suggests that we are both wrong and fixes the time at five years. I believe it is five. In medio stat veritas.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The hon. gentleman must know that I had nothing to do with appointing Mr. Justice Baby, because I was not attorney general at the time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think that is correct. My hon. friend was not attorney general at the very moment, but he became attorney general a short time after, and, I presume, assumed responsibility for that act. Does my hon. friend remember another commission appointed in Montreal, I think, by him ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That one was a judge.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. And appointed by my hon. friend.

Mr. CASGRAIN. And that is one of the reasons why I believe after past experience that these appointments to royal commissions are not a success.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If my hon. friend will pardon me then he will have to leave it to me to say in future what my past experience has been. I contend that it would be desirable that our judges should be as far removed from politics as possible. I have had twenty years' experience at the bar and I have been engaged in a very great number of cases, sometimes for the Tories and sometimes for the Liberals. I have have been a little bit on both sides—not politically—but at the bar, and in all my experience I have never felt that I could appeal to the past and say that any judge had acted improperly from a political standpoint in any case I had before him. The experience which I have had has been such as to justify me in the belief that the judges of our country have been far removed from politics and that they are always prepared to do their duty.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Tory judges.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Mr. Rosamond) should not try to distinguish because there are those who think you should not judge others by the knowledge you have of your own. Under the circumstances, what has been done ?

Mr. CASGRAIN.

Mr. Justice Britton has been selected. This after all is an inquiry into an hydraulic concession, into what is after all nothing more nor less than ditches on a large scale. That is the explanation of the Treadgold matter. It is nothing more nor less than an inquiry into the conditions and circumstances under which water is distributed in the Yukon Territory. Mr. Justice Britton had a large experience in connection with matters of this sort in the province of Ontario as drainage commissioner. In addition to that there is an hydraulic engineer whose name has been mentioned in connection with the commission. Whether or not we can secure the services of this gentleman, I do not know, but to show the intention of the government an hydraulic engineer of continental reputation, against whose character not one breath of suspicion can be cast, was selected merely because of the professional position which he occupied. We have taken all the precautions to give my hon. friend what he wanted when he first moved in this matter, but it appears that he is satisfied, not that he did not go far enough in the first instance with the material he had, because no fresh material has been produced before the House, but that he did not go far enough to satisfy those who are desirous of lending a willing ear to street gossip and rumours, and to those who appear anxious to slander their neighbours to death, but have not got courage to come out as a man should, if a reflection has been put on any man, to charge that man and say he is guilty of wrongdoing, feeling satisfied that there is enough independence in this House to say whether he be guilty or not.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will that commission sit in Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This commission will naturally sit in the Yukon Territory to inquire into the facts submitted to it and especially for the purpose of inquiring into the fact as to whether these concessions were necessary and as to whether under the circumstances existing there, this hydraulic concession was a provident or an improvident one. But after having caused an inquiry on the ground, their duty would be to come here and hold any investigation that would be necessary under the circumstances. I think that having said that, I have shown the good faith of the government—of course they are not limited as to time, place and circumstance—and the desire of the government to have a thorough and honest investigation to establish two things. First, was the concession issued improvidently; was it contrary to the interest of the Yukon that such a concession should be granted; and second, was such fraud practiced on the government as would justify the government in coming to the conclusion—not to repeal the concession; there is no authority to repeal a concession for fraud; there is no author-

ity to repeal a concession for misrepresentation—but there is authority to take proceedings before the court for the purpose of having the concession set aside.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Before this debate comes to a conclusion I deem it my duty to refer to an incident which has taken place in connection with it, and which I think ought not to pass unnoticed. Twice within a few days my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has made the insinuation on the floor of this House, that I had been approached by some one who had made charges to me that there had been wrong-doing in this concession. Some few days ago my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) stated that while I was in London last summer some one had made similar charges to me. I denied the statement at the time. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) repeated it to-day in a more aggravated form and with greater emphasis. I gave it the denial which I should give it, and now for the third time I have to say to my hon. friend that there is not the slightest foundation for the insinuation he has made.

Mr. MONK. Does the right hon. gentleman say that I made an insinuation ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, Sir.

Mr. MONK. I asked if there was any truth in what had been said, and I made no insinuation at all myself.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend put the question to me the other day and I denied it, and when on a subsequent occasion he reasserts it I take that to be an insinuation.

Mr. MONK. I made no assertion. I deny that, Mr. Speaker. I asked if there was any truth in these remarks. I will not allow even the right hon. gentleman to put words in my mouth which I did not utter.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am speaking within the knowledege of the House—

Mr. MONK. My words are in 'Hansard.'

The PRIME MINISTER. 'Hansard' is my best authority, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) stated the other day that I had been approached by some one in England and that similar circumstances had been brought to my notice. I then denied it. To-day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) within the hearing of everybody on the floor of the House again put a question to me and after my denial, if that is not an insinuation I do not know what is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. When I stated here as a member of parliament, and I believe as a man of honour; at all events with the responsibilities I hold, that there was no such thing as had been stated the other day, and when the hon. gentleman again repeats it, for my part I take it to be an insinuation. If it is not an insinuation it is certainly not an accusation, and if it is not an insinuation or an accusation then I leave it to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) to say what he thinks of it.

Mr. MONK. Since my right hon. friend asks me; what I stated the other day was this : That these things were being said in the city of Montreal that when my right hon. friend was there the matter had been brought to his notice, and what I stated to-day was that it has been circulated also in the city of Montreal that upon the return of my right hon. friend the matter had been brought to his notice by the chief of the executive. I made no insinuation.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, I shall not parry the point any longer. I must however say to my hon. friend that the fact of his having twice asked me on the floor of the House whether or not I had been approached by some body with that charge of wrong-doing about this concession, implies that some one has gone to my hon. friend; that some one has poured something in his ear, that some one has gone to my hon. friend and stated to him; that either that man himself or some one else had come to me with charges of wrong-doing in connection with that concession. Now, the man who went to my hon. friend whoever he is and who stated to him that I had been approached either by himself or by some one else, that man must have a name; he must have a reputation; he must have a character since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) thinks it worth while to put questions to me about it. If he has no name; if he has no character; if he has no reputation, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) was very wrong to make this statement of a worthless man the basis of a question to me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. But if he had a name, if he had a reputation, if he had a character and if he made the statement, why has not the hon. gentleman the courage to repeat that statement by taking the responsibility for it on the floor of this House. It is his duty. He has information or he has not. The information that he has is worth something or it is worth nothing, and since the hon. gentleman has found it worth his while to put these questions to me in my official position, I assume the hon. gentleman attaches some responsibility to his information whoever his informant may be. If his informant has told him anything, and if his informant is worth anything, why in the name of common sense, why in the name of fair-play, why in the name of honour between man

and man, between members of parliament; why does he not come out with the charge that has been made to him. If any one has told him a tale whether it is true or false; if any one has told him a tale which he believes to be true, he knows his duty and his right as a member of parliament. Two or three years ago my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) had a tale poured in his ears in connection with the South African war affecting the honour or supposed to affect the honour of a trusted colleague of mine, the Minister of Militia. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) did not hesitate then to come forward with his charge; he thought he had proof behind him. But to-day neither my hon. friend or anybody else will take the responsibility of stating what are these charges of fraud and misrepresentation. The atmosphere is thick to-day with the words fraud and misrepresentation. The word 'fraud' is very vague; fraud may take a multitude of forms; misrepresentation may be of different characters and I ask my hon. friend, I will ask anybody in this House—I will not even appeal to my own friends—but I will ask anybody on that side of the House in the name of fair-play and justice, what are we to investigate when we do not even know the name of a witness. If fraud has been perpetrated who has committed the fraud; what is the character of the fraud? If misrepresentation has been committed to the minister or to anybody else, what is the character of the misrepresentation? If there is somebody to tell us that this fraud is so and so and such and such, that there has been such an act perpetrated by which the government has been imposed upon, then we would know where to go for evidence and for the facts which are going to be investigated, but shall it be said in an assembly of serious men, in an assembly of men such as we are here: that we shall cause investigation to go simply upon the use of the two words 'fraud and misrepresentation?' Who are to be the witnesses, and if we are to appoint commissioners to investigate these frauds and misrepresentations, surely we would have to give them the names of the witnesses and the facts which would have to be investigated? Sir, I have only to say upon this occasion that if the charges are formulated in the proper manner they shall be investigated. My hon. friend who leads the opposition appealed to me to act as we did in the Drummond County Railway charges. There was a great difference between the Drummond County Railway charges and the charges made upon this occasion. When the Drummond County Railway charges were investigated there had been made by a prominent member of parliament, direct accusations against one of my colleagues. It was important that these should be investigated. Although we granted an investigation at that time, it turned out after all that those charges were absolutely futile. It turned out that when the parties who made the charges were brought face to face with the investigation, they said they had nothing to prefer. Under such circumstances, I do not think that is a precedent to follow; but the precedent to follow is the rule that if a man is accused, he has a right to know who are his accusers, and what is the accusation against him.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, as the right hon. gentleman has made some personal references to myself, I will quote from 'Hansard' what I said the other day:

> Everybody knows that, and I demur to the proposition of my right hon. friend that a man is obliged, when he hears these rumours current in the public, when time and place and circumstances are stated—when it is stated, for instance, that my right hon. friend, himself, when he was in England, was made aware of certain circumstances connected with this matter——
>
> The PRIME MINISTER. I deny that absolutely.
>
> Mr. MONK. So much the better, Mr. Speaker; but I say that has been stated, and I demur to the proposition that we are here for the purpose of bringing accusations.
>
> The PRIME MINISTER. Do it, then. Do it, then.
>
> Mr. MONK. We are here for the purpose of conveying to the House the sentiments of the public and what is stated in the public.

I did not go further than that, Mr. Speaker, and when this evening I alluded to the same affair, I said it had been uttered in Montreal and elsewhere that the attention of the Prime Minister had been called to this concession upon his return to this country, by His Excellency the Governor General, and I asked him if that was the case. Now, Sir, in spite of what has fallen from the lips of my right hon. friend, I deny that I can be deprived in this House, as a representative of the people, of the right of stating what is current on the street, and asking for information on these questions from hon. gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches. I have made no charge. I have said this evening that I do not know where the wrong-doing took place; but I claimed that we should have such an investigation as would enable all those who had taken part in that transaction to be heard before a committee of this House.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I want to say a few words in regard to my friend the Hon. Mr. Ross, who is absent from the House. I do not think it is right for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to place Mr. Ross in a false position in this matter. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), who I am sorry is not in his seat at present, made the statement that Mr. Ross was pledged to the lips to have the Treadgold concession cancelled. Now, I want to say that Mr. Ross

did nothing of the kind. Mr. Ross subscribed to the platform of the Liberal party in the Yukon. In other words, he promised that an investigation would be held, and an investigation is going to be held. The hon. member for East Hastings also made reference to something Mr. Congdon had said. I do not think Mr. Ross is responsible for any statement that Mr. Congdon made in his absence. The government is carrying out any promise that Mr. Ross made to the people of the Yukon at that time. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) insinuated that the hon. Minister of the Interior was in some manner connected with this transaction. He did not go so far as to mention the name of the Minister of the Interior, but he mentioned the department.

Mr. MONK. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I said that it was in that department that these concessions were carried through, and I repeat it.

Mr. DAVIS. What is that but an insinuation ? If these hon. gentlemen have anything to say with reference to the Minister of the Interior, they are well aware that he will be in this House in eight or ten days. They will then have an ample opportunity, if they have any charges to make against him, to make those charges on their responsibility as members of this House. It would be well for them to remember that an hon. gentleman in the last parliament, whom some of them are imitating to-night, spoke for nine hours in reciting charge after charge, which he refused to take the responsibility of making ; and what was the consequence ? The leader of the opposition at that time, Sir Charles Tupper, repeated the charges which had been made by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). The leader of the opposition of that day and the hon. member for Pictou, who is absent from the House, had a great deal more courage than some of these hon. gentlemen have to-night. They had the courage to go outside and make on the public platform the charges which they had made in this House; and what was the consequence ? The leader of the opposition made the charge all over the country, that the Minister of the Interior had been connected with his law partner at Brandon in granting some licenses for the sale of liquor in the Yukon ; but when Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper spoke at a meeting in Brandon during the election of 1900 repeating those charges he was met with a letter written by Sir Charles Tupper, sr., in which he had taken everything back. I can read the letter if hon. gentlemen would like to hear it, as it is very interesting reading. This is the letter as it appears in the Winnipeg 'Free Press :'

Dear Sir,—Referring to a speech made by me at Brandon on the 20th of November last, during which you claim I made certain damaging references to you in reference to the importation or alleged importation of liquor into the Yukon Territory, I beg to say that such speech was intended to be directed by me entirely to a discussion of public questions, and my intention was not to reflect in any way upon you personally. If any of those present took a different meaning from what I said I now beg to say that subsequent investigation has shown me that the telegram sent in your name to Mr. Sifton on the 12th of June, 1898, asking that the letter in question should be amended so as to include the importation of liquor into the Yukon, and which telegram was referred to by Mr. Sifton on the floor of the House of Commons as having been received by him from you, was not sent or authorized by you and that you did not directly or indirectly in any way through yourself or any other person take or attempt to take liquor into the Yukon Territory under the authority of the letter given by Mr. Sifton to which I referred in my remarks, and that you were no party directly or indirectly to the attempt made to dispose of the liquor. I further beg to state that I have satisfied myself that there is no ground for believing that yourself or Mr. Sifton were concerned together in taking or attempting to take liquor into the Yukon Territory. I sincerely regret if anything which I said has been construed into a reflection on your character.

That letter is signed by Sir Charles Tupper. It was sent only after a writ was issued. The leader of the opposition went through this country repeating those statements on platform after platform, and when he found that he was going to be dragged into court, he wrote this apology. After repeating this all through the country, we find that he had to take it all back. It is within the memory of every hon. gentleman who had a seat in the last parliament that statements were made in this House charging the hon. Minister of the Interior with I do not know what. I could read you a nine hours speech of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, making all sorts of insinuations, and if the government are to be stampeded every time any hon. gentleman chooses to repeat gossip or make insinuations against them, we would have commissions appointed every day in the week. The hon. Minister of the Interior will be here in ten or twelve days, and if any hon. gentleman opposite has any charges to make, let him do as the ex-Minister of Public Works did some years ago, take the responsibility of making them and no doubt he will get all the investigation he wants.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Casgrain :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Barker,	Kaulbach,
Bennett,	Kidd,
Birkett,	Lancaster,
Blain,	LaRivière,
Borden (Halifax),	Lennox.
Boyd,	Maclaren (Perth),
Bruce,	McGowan,
Cargill,	Monk,
Carscallen,	Morin,
Casgrain,	Northrup,
Clancy,	Pope,

Clare, Pringle,
Clarke, Richardson,
Cochrane, Robinson (Elgin),
Earle, Roche (Marquette),
Gilmour, Rosamond,
Hackett, Tolton,
Haggart, Vrooman,
Henderson, Wilmot,
Hughes (Victoria), Wilson.—40.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault, LeBlanc,
Bazinet, Lovell,
Beith, Loy,
Béland, Macdonald,
Belcourt, Mackie,
Bernier, MacKinnon,
Bickerdike, Maclaren (Huntingdon),
Blair,
Borden (Sir Frederick), Macpherson,
Bourbonnais, McCarthy,
Bruneau, McCreary,
Campbell, McGugan,
Carbonneau, McIsaac,
Champagne, McLennan,
Christie, Madore,
Cowan, Malouin,
Davis, Marcil (Bagot),
Demers (Lévis), Marcil (Bonaventure),
Demers (St. John), Matheson,
Desjardins, Mayrand,
Erb, Mignault,
Ethier, Morrison,
Fielding, Mulock (Sir William),
Fisher, Parmelee,
Fitzpatrick, Paterson,
Fortier, Power,
Gallery, Préfontaine,
Gauvreau, Proulx,
Geoffrion, Puttee,
Gibson, Reid (Restigouche),
Girard, Ross (Ontario),
Gould, Ross (Rimouski),
Grant, Russell,
Harty, Schell,
Harwood, Scott,
Heyd, Stephens,
Holmes, Stewart,
Hyman, Sutherland (Essex),
Johnston (Cape Breton), Sutherland (Oxford),
Kendall, Talbot,
Lang, Tobin,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Tucker,
Lavergne, Turgeon,
Law, Wallace.—87.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor.
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Emmerson,	Fowler.
Charlton,	Tisdale.
Guthrie,	Porter.
Wade,	Avery.
Wright,	Culbert.
Smith (Vancouver),	Broder.
McEwen,	Sherritt.
Bureau,	Smith (Wentworth),
Sifton,	Sproule.
Roche (Halifax),	Robinson (Northumberland),
Brown,	Ball.
Tolmie,	Reid (Grenville),
Farquharson,	Gourley,
Monet,	McIntosh.
German,	Osler.
Copp,	Brock.

Mr. DAVIS.

Thompson (Haldimand and Monck), Ingram,
Cartwright (Sir Richard Tupper,
Johnston (Lambton) Simmons,
McColl, Ward,
Fraser, Bell,
Ross (Victoria), Ganong,
Costigan, Hale,
Lewis, Halliday,
Riley, Johnston (Cardwell),
Galliher, Thomson (Grey),
Meigs, Roddick,
Angers, Léonard,
Laurier (L'Assomption), Maclean,
McCool, Calvin,
Turcot, Lavell,
Ross (Yukon), Kemp,
Douglas, Alcorn,
Dugas, Seagram,
Martineau, Kendry.

Amendment negatived.

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

Experimental Farm, $90,000.

Mr. MONK. What amount was expended on each farm ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The central farm at Ottawa, $50,000; the maritime provinces, $11,000; Manitoba, $10,000; North-west Territories, $10,000; British Columbia, $9,000. The Ottawa farm includes the main staff.

Mr. MONK. Has the hon. minister ever considered the advisability of establishing a model farm in the province of Quebec, which would be more easily acceptable than the experimental farm here ? I have several times brought this matter to his attention.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe that the money which would be required for such a farm could be used more effectively in other ways. When the farm at Ottawa was established, it was considered that it would serve the two provinces of Quebec and Ontario. The climate and conditions in Ottawa are similar to those of a great part of the province of Quebec and also Ontario, and I think that the experiments carried on here are as useful to the farmers of Quebec as they are to the farmers of Ontario.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville.) (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, we should not lose sight of the fact that the province of Quebec is essentially agricultural. The maritime provinces could dispense with an experimental farm more easily than we could. I have ascertained by myself that the Ottawa farm is useful to our farmers. A great number of those who do not live very far from it are pleased to come and visit it every year ; but, as it will be admitted, that farm is of no easy access to the many. Therefore, I hope the government will have this matter under serious consideration, and that the province of Quebec will, before long, get that farm to which, in my opinion, it is rightly entitled.

Mr. MONK. If I remember well, the last time this question was brought up the hon. minister said he would give the question consideration. I do not know whether a register is kept of the farmers from the province of Quebec who visit the experimental farm, but there is no doubt whatever that a model farm, one that would not cost anything as excessive as the institution here, centrally situated in the province of Quebec and easy of access, would be of immense benefit to the young farmers of the province. It seems to me that three or four years ago, when the minister said that the matter was engaging his attention. Has he given it any further thought ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The matter has been brought to my attention several times and I have discussed it in all its bearings. The hon. gentleman speaks of a record of the number of farmers from Quebec that come to the farm. No record is kept in that form. The great bulk of the farmers come here in excursions organized from one locality or another. I feel safe in saying that more farmers come from the province of Quebec to visit the experimental farm than come from the province of Ontario, and I say that with pride, as being a representative of the province of Quebec. It shows an interest in progressive agriculture amongst the farmers of Quebec that is most creditable and satisfactory.

Mr. MONK. What becomes of the butter manufactured in the experimental farm ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is sold in Ottawa.

Mr. MONK. Is a record kept of the disposal that is made of it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. I am informed that the question was asked in the House some time ago and was fully answered.

Mr. MONK. I do not think it was. I would be glad if, when the hon. minister's estimates are next before the committee, he would have his officials bring down the book containing the record of the sales of butter manufactured at the experimental farm. It cannot be a very voluminous document, and I should like to look at it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. WILSON. For some years one portion of the experimental farm, two hundred acres in extent, has been set apart to be conducted as a farmer would conduct his own business. I would like to know the result, allowing a fair estimate of interest on the investment and also the expenses of working. I think this would be the most valuable information the experimental farm could give, because it would show the working of a farm in the ordinary way. We get great reports of the experiments in the small plots and we sometimes think that more attention is placed with the small plots than a regular farmer could give. Therefore, it would be very interesting to get a report upon this two-hundred-acre farm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That suggestion was made last session, and it is being carried out. But the year has not yet closed. A day-book is kept on the farm with a record of the work of every labourer. Labour, of course, is changed about from that part of the farm to the experimental farm and the same way with the teams. When the current year is closed, the accounts will be made up.

Mr. WILSON. I moved a resolution last year for a return of this kind. Either I did not make the resolution broad enough or the answers were incomplete. I did not get the information I sought. If the hon. minister would promise to give us, at the end of the year, the report that I have suggested, I think it would be satisfactory to the people.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not remember the exact terms of the resolution, but I remember the terms of the discussion. I think the information called for was in the form in which the book-keeping had been done up to that time—that is, each crop and field was reckoned by itself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) or some other hon. gentleman suggested the other method and that method is being worked out for the present year.

Mr. WILSON. In the return brought down a team taken from the ordinary experimental part of the farm and used so many hours was only allowed for at a certain rate for the number of hours employed. The same way with labour. But you could not run an ordinary farm that way. If you wanted a team of horses you would have to keep them the year round, and if you wanted a man you could not employ him for a few hours and then let him go.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But when we charge by the hour in that way, we charge more than the actual cost of keeping the horses.

Mr. WILSON. But, the hon. gentleman must admit that the system hardly works out the fair result in comparison with the ordinary farm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think it gives a result against the farm here at Ottawa. I know enough about the farm book-keeping to know that a team can be kept for the whole year at a moderate cost. The rate charged against the farm here, I believe, is $3 per day for man and team. If that rate were charged against the ordinary farm for the number of days' work done, the amount would more than cover the expense of keeping the man and team for the whole year.

Mr. WILSON. And interest on the investment also ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Interest on the equipment is charged separately.

Mr. WILSON. In the next report, will the minister give us a full account of the total cost of working the 200 acres ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think in the next annual report we will have a full statement of the expense of working that 200 acres as a whole.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). The minister said a few moments ago that the number of visitors to the farm at Quebec was larger than from Ontario. Some persons might draw the inference that the farmers of Ontario were not as anxious for information as the farmers of Quebec. There are some facts to account for that. In the first place, the central farm at Ottawa is quite a long distance from the bulk of the farming population of Ontario, and they would require to be here over night. Probably most hon. gentlemen know that we have an excellent college farm at Guelph, to which pilgrimages are made during the summer by farmers' institutes all over the country. They can go and come back in a day ; therefore, they patronize that farm at Guelph rather than come to Ottawa. I have often thought that it was desirable that farmers' excursions should be arranged from some parts of central Ontario to visit the experimental farm. I know they already get the benefit of the reports that are distributed, but I think they would see something to their advantage if they observed the working of the farm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Probably there are more individual farmers coming from Ontario than from Quebec ; but the large excursions which visit the farm come more frequently from Quebec. What my hon. friend says with regard to the farm at Guelph is no doubt quite correct.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not told us what mode he follows of keeping the accounts. I understood him to say last year that at a later date the accounts would be presented at the end of the fiscal year which had been prepared in a different manner from the mode adopted hitherto.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has been suggested that we adopt a new system of book-keeping. Under the present system each field is charged with the labour expended upon it, and credited with the returns obtained from it. For instance, we charge that field the number of day's work, either of men or of horses. I understood the request last session was that instead of charging each crop, reckoning up against each crop what we put upon it, we should take the whole 200 acres of land that is worked as a farm, and charge it with all the labour and work put upon it, and give it credit for all it produces. That is what we are trying to work out now, and which will appear in the next year's report. A record is now being kept of each crop or each series of crops. Hitherto we never took the whole of the 200 acres and treated it as an entity. We took each individual crop or field of grain on that 200 acres, each individual cow or herd of cows, and dealt with them, charging everything that is spent upon them and crediting them with everything they produce. But in addition to that, I understood that the hon. gentleman asked last session that we should keep a book for the whole farm collectively, without reference to the individual fields and crops. We will still continue the old system of charging to the individual fields and crops, so that we will be able to work out what the hon. gentleman alludes to in the future as we have been doing in the past. To-day we know the profits of each crop of oats, of wheat, of roots, and of each cow in the dairy, and we will continue that system of accounts, because we think it is absolutely essential to good book-keeping. But in addition to that we are going to keep a separate account of the collective work of the 200 acres.

Mr. CLANCY. Last year some criticism was made of the fact that in the statement furnished to the House by way of a return, $3 a day was charged for a man and a team. But there was no undertaking on the part of the government to account for all the labour that was paid for out of the vote that was given by this House to carry on the farm generally. The hon. gentleman charges $3 a day for a certain service, for a man and a team, but he does not show the cost of the whole outfit. That service might require the use of a roller, or of a drill, or a plough and harrow. We would like to know, not only how much the whole farm has paid, but how much each branch has paid or lost.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is what we propose to try and do.

Mr. CLANCY. What stock has been purchased during the year past ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got a list of all the animals. But we are constantly purchasing pigs, for instance, and selling them. During the last twelve months, I have directed that some French Canadian cattle should be purchased for the farm. Speaking from memory, we have not purchased any other thoroughbred animals except five head of French Canadian cattle, a bull and four cows. I think we purchased one or two grade animals, but we purchase and sell them according to the exigencies of the time, or according to what we require of

them. I am speaking without reference to the number of steers that we purchase every fall which we feed and sell again as beef.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Is it the intention to make this farm pay as a farm, or are the experiments that are there conducted regarded as a part of the revenue ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think that perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Ross, Ontario) may not remember that about three years ago I divided the farm, taking 200 acres of it and setting it apart as a farm with a regular rotation of crops and without any reference to the experimental work. That was put in charge of the agriculturist, Mr. Grisdale. He was informed that he must buy no manure and that he must keep as much stock as he could feed and see whether he could improve the fertility of that 200 acres, and show that it could be done at a profit. The whole farm includes 465 acres, and of this 200 is treated as a farm. The other 265 acres, including the orchard, arboretum, woodland, roads and buildings, as well as the land, are devoted especially to experimental work.

Mr. WILSON. I look upon the 200 acres as the more valuable part of the experimental farm. I think that we ought to get information not only as to the crops that it pays best to raise, but as to the kind of stock that can be kept on a farm of a given number of acres, the number of cattle, pigs and sheep and the kind of implements the farmer requires. We should have all this information, because I think it is the most practical part of the experimental farm, and I think it would be of more interest to the farmers than anything else.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister if he is making any special experiments at the farm, or is the same routine work carried on every year ? Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us of some line of work that was carried on during last year. There are constant improvements and changes going on in regard to the farming interest and we would naturally expect the experimental farm would be in advance of every other farm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not off-hand give the hon. gentleman details of all the experiments that are being tried this year. There are certain classes of experiments which extend over a long term of years. Experiments have been carried on as to the fertilization and treatment of soils. There was an exhaustive series of experiments conducted in regard to the fertilization of land by growing clover crops, and it took eight or ten years to prove the results, although we saw the effect earlier. We required to take that time to be sure that the effect of this treatment will be permanent. There are during every year experiments in the different methods of treating soil and in the growing of grain crops. These experiments are going on every year and we are steadily accumulating an immense mass of information which is from time to time worked up by the officers of the farm into details of the results and these results are published in bulletins and in the annual report. I do not at the moment remember any new thing that has been started this season. I was out at the farm the other day and was shown by the agriculturist an experiment tried for the first time in regard to the width between the rows or drills in sowing grain. Instead of sowing the drills all the same width apart, we have alternated the spaces. In one instance one of the spouts of the seeder is stopped and in another the whole of the spouts are used. Last year we tried very considerable experiments in ridging up part of the field and leaving it ridged up during the winter to show the effect of frost and to ascertain what the result would be in the spring in drying off and preparing the soil for the crop. One piece of land was rigged up and another left in the ordinary way. We are trying things of that kind all the time and they are explained in detail by the officers of the farm who come before the Committee on Agriculture of the House. They also appear in the annual report every year.

Mr. CLANCY. How many teams of working horses, how many other horses and how many cattle have you on the farm ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not off-hand say how many horses or cattle are on the farm. I have just asked the director and he cannot from memory state positively. There are between thirty-five and forty milk cows, about sixteen horses, four or five bulls and about two hundred pigs and about forty sheep. All these details are in the annual report which hon. members have.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman tell the committee how many thoroughbreds there are on the farm and how many grades?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are, I think, about twenty pure bred cows. Then, all the bulls are pure bred.

Mr. CLANCY. How many ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are five pure bred bulls, one Shorthorn, one Ayrshire, two Guernseys and one French Canadian. There are four French Canadian cows, six or seven Guernsey cows, eight or nine Ayrshire cows, and about five Shorthorn milking cows and some that are going to be milking very soon.

Mr. CLANCY. Has there been any pure bred stock bought during the present year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I bought five French Canadian animals.

Mr. CLANCY. Are they considered pure bred ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly. They are registered animals, and the purest blood there is on the continent of America.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that you had some of that breed years ago ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes ; ten or twelve years ago, but none remained.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the result with these French Canadian animals ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The result was to show that the French Canadian cow is a very economical producer of butter, giving a rich milk and costing comparatively little to feed.

Mr. CLANCY. How do they compare with the other breeds ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot speak as to the result of the tests in detail. I cannot say positively whether the French Canadian cows ten years ago on the farm showed up better than the short horns or the Ayrshires.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister must have had some reason to continue the experiment.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am pretty familiar with the breed myself in the province of Quebec, and know how excellent they are. The general average of milk in the province of Quebec is extremely rich, and the French Canadian cow has played a very important part in rendering the butter production of that province so high. At the Buffalo exhibition, in a dairy test lasting six months, the French Canadian herd made so fine a showing as to attract attention from one end of the continent to the other, with the result that there are now large sales of French Canadian cattle to the United States, as well as to the other provinces of Canada.

Mr. KAULBACH. Which breed would it be advisable for a farmer to keep for general purposes ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not presume to answer. It depends on the farmer's taste and the markets he has to supply.

Mr. KAULBACH. We find Shorthorns and Ayrshires crossed to be about the best.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Some people do.

Mr. CLANCY. What has been the result of your experiments in regard to the causes of soft pork ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The whole matter was fully published in a special bulletin which was issued two years ago.

Mr. CLANCY. We had the gentleman who prepared that bulletin before the Agricultural Committee, and his evidence was of the most unsatisfactory kind.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Whom do you refer to ?

Mr. CLANCY. I have forgotten his name, but he has been in the department long before the minister.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose it was Mr. Shutt, who, with Mr. Grisdale, conducted the experiments.

Mr. CLANCY. An experiment was being made in one of the packing houses in the city of Ottawa, and Mr. Shutt prepared a report, which was published broadcast from one end of this country to the other, of a most damaging character, if it was true. Mr. Shutt, when he appeared before the committee, was unable to verify the statements he had made in the report, and was compelled to admit that the reasons he had given why the pork was soft were mere conjectures. The bulletin contained the statement that a number of small pigs had been purchased in the corn district, and, without having any evidence as to their having been fed on a single grain of corn—in fact, they were of the age when they could not be fed on grain of that kind—he came to the conclusion that because they had come from what was alleged to be the corn district, that was the reason their pork was soft. It seems to me that a statement of that kind ought not to be made in the country, because it would convey the impression that all the pork brought from the west would be soft. I would like to ask the minister if these experiments have been since continued, or if he considers the case closed on the report of Mr. Shutt ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I must say that I am very much surprised at what the hon. gentleman says. The report speaks for itself. The officers who worked out the experiment consider that the report settled the matter, as far as an experiment of that kind could settle it. What the hon. gentleman says as to some of the hogs having been bought in what he calls the corn belt is perfectly true ; but that does not imply that they were fed on corn. The question was whether pigs which had been fed very largely on corn for a generation or two were practically born with a predisposition to make soft pork instead of hard pork ; and to test that question we bought some of the pigs we were experimenting with from the corn belt. Some of these pigs were fed on one thing and some on another, and the results were worked out in the report. I cannot repeat the conclusions exactly, but the hon. gentleman knows them as well as I do.

Mr. CLANCY. I can inform the hon. gentleman that there was no such conclusion drawn from the report as that from the long feeding of pigs on corn in the corn belt they had an inherent tendency to make pork that must necessarily be soft.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not say that any such conclusion was drawn. I said that we bought the pigs for the purpose of ascertaining what the results were. The results are shown in the report: I cannot tell the hon. gentleman what those results were.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows what that report contains. The hon. gentleman knows that it is a pure assumption that because these pigs came from the west that must be the reason the pork was soft. There is no evidence to support that assumption. There is nothing to show that on the farm from which they were taken they were not fed on mixed food. It was boldly assumed that by reason of their coming from that locality, the pork would necessarily be soft. Attention was called to this in the committee, and Mr. Shutt was compelled to admit that this was merely a conclusion of his own. I do not think the case should rest there. I think the matter is of such importance in the west, where large quantities of pork are being produced, that it should not be put under the ban of such a shadow of suspicion as that. I do not think it is fair to that part of the country, and I would like to know whether the hon. minister is now prosecuting the matter, or whether he intends to leave it in the shape in which it was, I think unfairly, left in the report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My answer is that the report speaks for itself. I am not going to dispute with the hon. gentleman as to quotations from the report, as I do not remember it sufficiently to quote from it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think that is a proper answer to the hon. member for Bothwell. As he contends that the report was altogether in error and misleading, and against the interests of western Ontario, particularly that part of the country in which corn is grown, he wants to know whether the minister is going to prosecute this inquiry further, to see whether or not his officers are mistaken. If he is not, he can tell the hon. member so; but if he is determined to prosecute the inquiry further, it would be very interesting to members from the west to know that their interests are still being looked after by the Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What I say is that I cannot quote the report, but my memory of it is that it contains no such reflections on the corn-belt pigs as the hon. gentleman supposes.

Mr. HENDERSON. We do not expect the hon. minister to remember the report. He pays so little attention to his department, being sometimes in England, sometimes in France, and sometimes in Japan, with a deputy minister who perhaps does not know the difference between hard pork and soft pork, and with a chemist who perhaps even does not eat bacon, but requires something a little more fanciful, we do not expect that the minister is going to be able to keep in mind these particular things which interest the farmers so much. We want to know, whether the hon. gentleman is going to send broadcast throughout this country reports of a flimsy character, which are misleading and calculated to do a great deal of injury to the agricultural community? We want to know whether he is going to spend some of this money in making further investigations with a view of having the matter entirely before the country?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The report is not a flimsy one but the result of two years investigation by the most competent officers in the department. Professor Shutt is a man whose standing no one would dare dispute, Professor Saunders is the man who organized the whole farm and worked it up from the beginning. It ill-becomes the hon. gentleman to cast unfair reflections on these officers. I am only the political head and do not take credit for this work, but to say that it is a flimsy affair is a statement which, to any one who knows the two gentlemen in question, refutes itself.

Mr. HENDERSON. There can be no doubt that the report is against the interests of the farming community.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it is, and the opinion of men just as well posted as the hon. minister is that the report is not a fair one. The investigation should not stop where it is, but further inquiry should be made to determine whether these men were mistaken or not. I am not casting any reflection on the officers of the department, but I do not know that a chemist is the best man to determine that particular thing. A practical farmer could investigate a matter of that kind just as well as a chemist. I do not see where chemical knowledge is required in such a matter. Mr. Shutt may be an excellent chemist, but I am not aware that his chemical knowledge would fit him better for a question of this kind than that of a man who is every day engaged in the feeding of hogs and the work of a farm generally. No doubt these are men well qualified to discharge technical duties, but I cannot see that because this opinion has been given by a chemist, it should have any more weight than if given by a butcher.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I remember very well reading this bulletin and I very well remember Professor Shutt appearing before our committee to illustrate by a bulletin the results of feeding different foods to hogs. I consider it an extremely interesting report, but perhaps I might agree with some of what is said by hon. gentlemen opposite. Possibly the experiment might be carried still further. The bulletin did certainly show that corn was the most excellent feed for hogs. That is the general result of the experiment, as I remember. I suppose that probably the best food for hogs is peas, as shown by the results, and one of the poorest foods is corn. It so happens that the western part of the country grows a great deal of corn and feeds a great deal to hogs, so that nearly all the hogs from that section are practically corn-fed. Of course, I make that statement, not from personal knowledge, but because large quantities of corn are grown in that section, and I presume it is fed to the hogs. The industry is one we cannot afford to lose. It is probably one of the most profitable branches of farming to-day, and if the results are such as were shown, it means to some extent some reflection on the hogs produced in the corn belt. Therefore it might be as well for the department to consider the carrying on of the experiment still further. In the section I come from, our farmers feed largely peas and oats to their hogs, and our hogs are noted as being first class. I have seen in the local papers complaints from the packers that corn-fed hogs were not as good as hogs fed on other food. Experiments were made and the animals were slaughtered and inspected and put through a process of chemical analysis, but that might not be sufficient to prove that corn was not as good feed for hogs, and under the circumstances I think possibly that the request of the hon. member for Bothwell is fair and reasonable and the experiment might be carried still further.

Mr. CLANCY. I was a little surprised at the curt manner in which the hon. Minister of Agriculture dealt with this question. I am not aware that he occupies a position which exempts him from replying to fair inquiries or that it is much to his credit to inform us, as he did, in a supercillious way, that he knows nothing about the reports in his own department. But he asserted very strongly that this report did not contain any such insinuation as I have stated. Well, let me read from the evidence given by Mr. Shutt in relation to the particular case to which I referred a moment ago. On page 124 of the report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, Mr. Shutt was asked by myself, with respect to the hogs that were slaughtered for experiment at the slaughter houses of Mr. Matthews in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Q. Then why did you assume in this case, that the mothers were fed on corn, to put it in your report ?

A. I do not think I made that statement.

Q. You made it.

A. I made a scientific conjecture, nothing more. I say that the unweaned animals, the young animals, may be affected by the milk of their mother, and I see no reason to hesitate to further say that supposing the mother be fed largely on corn, she having been brought up on corn, the fat of her milk would have a tendency to make flesh, or rather the fat of her young, soft.

Q. Have you made a test to show if that is true ?

A. No.

Q. Where did you purchase them ?

A. In Essex and Kent. I cannot give you the names of the parties from whom they were bought.

Q. I do not want that. That being the case, up to that stage they could not have been fed upon corn much, could they ?

A. No.

Q. Did you wish to give the impression that by the mere fact their mothers were fed upon corn that they were soft.

A. I did not state that as a fact, but I said that it was significant that these pigs were the softest two of the four young pigs examined. I think it is probable—it is quite possible, at any rate, that if the mothers were largely corn fed, the milk would at the outset give that character to the flesh of their young. I infer that such would be the case. In the light of our subsequent work I felt justified in saying so.

Q. Quite so ; have you any evidence that all the pigs in Western Canada are fed on corn ?

A. Oh, no. I have never said they were.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to read further to show that this gentleman came here and stated that this was a mere scientific conjecture, and from that, a report is sent out broadcast throughout this country as the hon. gentleman has stated, that contains on every page a condemnation which has no better ground than the statement of Professor Shutt on that occasion. That was an examination of which the hon. minister should have some knowledge. I am surprised that he does not know what is going on in his own department, that he does not read the report of the committee respecting the department over which he presides and knows nothing of the evidence given before it, but must come here with the confession that he has not read the report and knows nothing of what is in it, knows nothing of the effect in the country of the evidence which his officers are sending out. And, yet, he lies back and, in an injured tone, refuses to answer questions. Now, may I be permitted to ask, with great humility, if he is disposed to let that libel stand uncontradicted without further evidence ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the first place, I do not know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has quoted me quite correctly. I did not say that I knew nothing of what occurred in the committee.

I said that I could not remember the particular question that he referred to. I think I know something of what is going on in the committee and of the evidence given by my officers, but I confess that I do not carry all the details in my mind so as to be able to refer off-hand to any point which the hon. gentleman may happen to mention. He asks me if this evidence ought to be allowed to remain without further investigation. I confess that, up to the present, I have believed—and I have not yet seen reason to change my mind—that the conclusions of that report were fair and just on the whole. I did not draw from the conclusions as I remember them the inference which the hon. gentleman seems to have drawn, that those conclusions were an imputation against the pigs of a certain place in Canada; but I did draw from the inference that pigs fed almost entirely upon corn were more likely to be soft in their flesh than pigs fed in another way.

Mr. CLANCY. What led the hon. gentleman to that conclusion ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE The facts in the report.

Mr. CLANCY. But, if the hon. gentleman will permit me, his own officer declares that that is a mere 'scientific conjecture.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has quoted one particular phrase used in describing the results of experiments covering several hundred pigs and many different investigations. I confess I do not know just what Professor Shutt meant by the words 'scientific conjecture' but they apply to one particular incident, one of many parts of the evidence, which evidence tended on the whole to the conclusions drawn in that report.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not wish to disturb the hon. gentleman, but the hon. gentleman will remember, perhaps, from reading the report from his own department that these questions were on special incidents given in the report we are discussing. Examples were given of tests made without locating the quarter from which the pigs came. But this incident was selected, and Professor Shutt said he did not know what the mothers were fed upon, that this was a mere scientific conjecture on his own part.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say if that was the case, because I do not remember the surroundings of the incident. But I do know that the conclusions were based upon the whole series of experiments. I think they extended over two years' work. All these pigs were bought as soon as they were weaned and brought here to be fed. That was the principle of the experiment. Some of these young pigs were slaughtered when they were first brought here, to learn the condition of their flesh. Others were experimented on in feeding, and animals were slaughtered at different stages and their flesh subjected to examination. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) said he did not think the chemist the right man to do this kind of work. The chemist did only one part of the work. The animals were fed by the men in charge of them, and were slaughtered by the pork packers of Ottawa, who gave reports from their practical standpoint as to the character of the flesh. The chemist came after and chemically analyzed the flesh of every pig and different parts of the carcass of every pig. One of the points we wished to arrive at was to know in what chemically soft pork consisted. The trade could tell us that such and such a pig was soft or such and such a side was soft. We wished to know the chemical characteristics of soft and hard pork. That is the reason the chemists took part in the experiment. And as he was the officer who took part in the whole thing, he made up the report and worked out the conclusions, based partly on his own work in the laboratory and partly on the reports of the other men engaged in the experiment. I confess that up to this moment I considered that the public at large, including hon. gentlemen opposite, had accepted that report as a final conclusion upon the subject. I want to say that as a result of that report and the information that was given by the series of experiments during the last two years, I think there has been much less salt pork in Canada than there was for the ten years preceding. I hear very few complaints on the part of packers of salt pork. I do not mean to say it is all due to the experiment; but I do believe that the result of that experiment gave information to the feeders of pork in this country which enabled them to a certain extent to have less risk in making salt pork, because it showed the food that seemed to be the best to make hard, and it showed some food which seemed to be objectionable for that purpose. If I find that the public wish further information, we should certainly inaugurate another series of experiments.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman had carefully read the evidence that was given by Mr. Shutt he would find that the chemical experiments have been thoroughly unreliable. I have no hesitation in making that statement in this House. What did we elicit in Mr. Shutt's examination ? For instance, he was asked if, when he made the statement in his report comparing pigs bought in the west and those bought in the east, they were all alike, or was there some cause from which salt pork was found in the same condition in both lots, and he answered that was the case. If that is the case, how can you lay down any rule? It is dangerous for any one to set afloat statements upon mere scientific bubble-blowing. With

regard to the chemical experiments, I have pointed out the contradictory sections of that bulletin with regard to the oil test, as it is called, the temperatures and so on, where the temperatures were professedly the same and he got very different results. I make no apology for saying that it is a most unreliable and damaging report. There is no difference in the feeding conditions. People are not so stupid in the west, although they live in a corn belt where pigs are fed entirely upon corn, as not to know the value of feeding mixed grains other than corn. It was unfair to assume that because a lot of pigs were bought in the west, they were fed on corn any more than in the east. The farmers in the west understand as well as those in the east that it is to their interest to feed pigs upon mixed grains.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 1.35 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, June 12, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) to the order passed by this House on the 30th March in reference to some papers concerning the Woodstock post office. I am bringing this matter to the attention of the hon. minister in the absence of my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Hale). Two and a half months have elapsed since the order was passed, and surely the resources of the clerical department of my hon. friend's administration cannot be so severely taxed that these documents cannot be brought down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). I will make another investigation. There is no delay in bringing them down, but I think some mistake must have occurred in regard to the papers. They may be in the Department of the Secretary of State. I made inquiry, and it was reported that they had been brought down, but the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Hale), informs me that the papers which are brought down are papers in regard to some other building in Woodstock. I will inquire about it, and see that these papers are brought down at once.

Mr. CLANCY.

YUKON TERRITORY — INSTRUCTIONS TO GOLD COMMISSIONER.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the House whether any recent instructions have been sent to the gold commissioner of the Yukon in regard to the Treadgold concession ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Not to my knowledge. I will ask the acting minister, but I do not know that there have been any.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the right hon. gentleman would be good enough to make inquiry of the acting minister when he comes into the House, and if there have been any instructions, perhaps he would be good enough to let me know at a later hour during the sitting, if convenient.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

On section 155,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I move to strike out the words 'and is not the arbitrator named.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think that idea should be abandoned as part of the Act. Do you insert these words elsewhere ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I will explain that when we come to it.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move to add the words at the end of that sub-clause 'or is within the limit of deviation allowed under this Act.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you insert these words ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because we have already passed a clause which allows a deviation of 100 yards if the board approves.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This gives two alternatives; one that the land shall be required for the railway and the other that it shall be within the limit of deviation. Would not the expression 'is required for the railway' cover everything ? It is of no importance whatever that it is within the limit of deviation unless it is required for the railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under the Act the deviation may be allowed by the board without requiring that they should file plans, and if

within the limits of deviation more land is required, they could be allowed to take it without going through all the formalities necessary to secure the right of way in the first place.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that we should not use any language which enables a certificate to be given merely because land happens to be within the range of deviation. You cannot take it without some authority given in the Act, and yet you put that language in as an alternative clause to the other.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Although the words are left out in the Bill as submitted, these words are found in section 147 of the existing Act. In conference with the legal gentlemen who represent the various railway companies and who have given me the benefit of their views with regard to many of the clauses, they expressed a strong opinion that we had better restore the language of the old Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. I can understand that legal gentlemen representing the railway companies should want these words in because the railway company gets the whole benefit. It would not be necessary with these words in the Act, that the lands be required for the railway, but only that they should be within the limit of deviation. Although there might be a serious question as to whether the railway really required the land, yet they would contend that as it was within the limits, the onus was taken off them. Although it is presupposed that the board will not allow them to enter on this 300 feet deviation unless they think it necessary, yet they might say that the alternative was given and that they could take the land because it is within the limits of the deviation, just as well as if they needed it for the railway. Unless it is really absolutely necessary for the railway, they should not be allowed to cut into a private owner's property. We must not allow the landowner to hold up the railway company, but, on the other hand, we must not allow the railway company to hold up the landowner. Because the railway company had a right to take one part of a man's land, it might wantonly take another part which it did not require for the purposes of the railway. Sometimes directors of railway companies are interested in other ventures besides railways; and if they could, by virtue of using their rights as a railway company, make the landowner give land which was not needed for the railway, they might work serious injustice to the landowner. I would suggest that the word 'and' be used instead of the word 'or.' That would be my second choice, but my first choice would be to insert the words 'on the terms permitted by this Act.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The section does limit them. It is not the case that the railway company is allowed, on its own free will, and without the sanction or authority of the board, to take anybody's lands in the form of a deviation. The hon. gentleman will remember that the board is vested with jurisdiction for such purposes. This clause does not make provision for the taking of the land, but simply provides what the notice shall contain. I do not think it would help matters to substitute the word 'and' for the word 'or.' This language is in the existing law, and I do not think it has occasioned any difficulty or is likely to leave the way open to any serious outrages.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 156,

Mr. LANCASTER. The other night the hon. minister, in making the arrangements about the judges and the courts, agreed to add the judge of the county court; and I would suggest that it should be the judge of the county court where the lands lie, the same as in the Ontario Act. There is a different county court judge in every county. We do not contemplate that either party would go to a county a long way from where the lands are. That would be worse than compelling a man to go always to the headquarters of the province, whether the superior court is sitting. The language of the Ontario statute, which I would use as a guide, is that the judge will be the judge of the county court where the lands are.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has the county court judge of one county jurisdiction in another county?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, any county county court judge has jurisdiction over the whole province, but, of course, either party may apply for a change of venue.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would not do to put that in the interpretation clause.

Mr. LANCASTER. As long as the hon. minister accepts the suggestion, I care not where it is put.

On section 158,

If within ten days after the service of such notice, or within one month after the first publication thereof, the opposite party does not give notice to the company that he accepts the sum offered by it, or does not give notice to it of the name of a person whom he appoints as arbitrator, the judge shall, on the application of the company, appoint a person to be sole arbitrator for determining the compensation to be paid as aforesaid. 51 V., c. 29, s. 150.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that on the sixth line, after the word 'company' the following words be added: 'Six days notice of which shall be given the opposite party.' We have adopted the procedure laid down in the

existing law, but I am now proposing to change it somewhat, and I am quite sure that the result will be that there will be much less expense. I also propose that the following words be added after the word 'aforesaid': 'Provided that the judge shall at the request of the third party on such application appoint three arbitrators to determine such compensation, one of whom may be named by each party on such application.'

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON. Can you insert a clause limiting the expense of the arbitration? This expense often debars farmers from going to court. They find that arbitration often costs a great deal more than the high court. The hon. minister should put in a clause limiting the cost of the arbitration, or leave it to the county judge or some parties who would not charge so much. I have in my mind the case of a neighbour of mine, who, if he had not been a rich man and the case had gone against him, would have been ruined by the large amount of money that the arbitration cost. It is the duty of the government to try and give us cheap arbitration. I know parties to-day who have not settled with the railway companies and who are afraid of going into arbitration owing to the costs.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is very much in what the hon. gentleman says. Very serious instances have come to my own knowledge such as the hon. gentleman has mentioned. I do not see, however, how I can make any improvement, but will be happy to accept any suggestions. If people were content to allow the judge to determine the question of value, that would do away with a good deal of expense. We provide that the judge shall do it unless one of the parties asks the appointment of two additional arbitrators. It would be rather extreme to say that the parties shall not have that right, but it is almost certain to entail additional expense.

Mr. LANCASTER. Before that section is adopted, I would suggest that this is the place where the qualification should be inserted clearing up the question for the judge. The judge should be the judge of the county where the lands lie. We do not contemplate that either party will deliberately seek to make expense, but it is well to reduce the chances for expense as much as possible. I would suggest that after the word 'judge' should be inserted the words 'of the county wherein the lands lie.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am well disposed towards limiting it in that way. But should it be done here; should we examine the whole subject and consider the insertion of a subsection declaring that the county court judge of the district shall be the judge referred to in these clauses?

Mr. LANCASTER. Better let the section stand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it would be better to prepare a subsection rather than repeat the words in each case.

Mr. LANCASTER. So long as it is not forgotten——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will look into it.

On section 159:

If the opposite party within the time aforesaid, gives notice to the company of the name of his arbitrator, then the two arbitrators shall jointly appoint a third, or if they cannot agree upon a third, the judge shall, on the application of the party, or the company, after notice of at least six clear days having been given to the other party, appoint a third arbitrator.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that this be struck out altogether.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to know if I am right in thinking that the object is to do away with the two arbitrators, meeting to choose a third. The minister proposes not that each party shall appoint one arbitrator, and, if necessary, the two so choosen meet to try to agree upon a third, but that each party shall name one and the judge name the third?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. That will save expense.

Motion agreed to, and clause struck out.

On section 161—compensation for lands and damage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to substitute for section 161 the following:

The arbitrator or arbitrators, in deciding on such value or compensation, shall take into consideration the increased value that will be given to any lands through or over which the railway will pass, by reason of the passage of the railway through or over the same, or by reason of the construction of the railway, and shall set off the increased value that will attach to the said lands or grounds, against the inconvenience, loss or damage that might be suffered or sustained by reason of the company taking possession of or using the said lands as aforesaid.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is the wording in the old Act?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. While that is being discussed, I have an amendment which I

intended to propose to the section as it appeared in the Bill, but it will be applicable to this amended section, except that the lining will be different. This is an important matter, and I think I had better mention the amendment I propose and explain the reason for it, in order that the minister may consider it, and, if he agrees with me incorporate it in the Bill. There are two sorts of increases in value that appertain to lands taken for railway purposes. First there is the increase of value common to the whole locality due to the construction of the railway and the opening up of the section of country it traverses. The second is a special increase and is involved also in the existing law, which the minister proposes to re-enact.

But, I am sorry to say that in the province of Ontario the judges do not agree on what the law means. The best opinion—if I may say so ; I mean what seems to me the best opinion—is in accordance with what I attempt to make clear by my amendment ; and that is that no farmer or other owner of property shall be charged, as a set off against the damages to which he is subject, with any increase in the value of his land which increase is common to himself and others by reason of the construction of the railway, but only such increased value as attaches to his land and not to neighbouring land. The late Chief Justice Burton was strongly of opinion that the law is as I have suggested by my amendment to make it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not the recognized law.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, I am sorry to say it is not, and that is why I am going to make it safe in this Act, so that people having these cases may not have an appeal from the arbitrators. I have had perhaps as much experience as any lawyer in Ontario of my age with regard to these railway arbitrations. I have lately been an arbitrator, as well as counsel in such cases for fifteen or twenty years, and I have found many a time there was an appeal owing to the disagreement of the arbitrators and coming down from the price it was really thought the man would be entitled to, because they could not otherwise agree upon what they thought the law was as to what was to be set off. The late chief Justice Burton was strongly of the opinion that the law was as it is made by my amendment, that it meant what I am saying now, that the man should not be charged against the damages to which he was clearly entitled any set-off for increased values to his remaining land which value was common also to his neighbours. But other judges have not agreed with him, and I find arbitrators, among whom are county judges and lawyers of good ability, disagreeing on that point. I had the misfortune to sit upon an arbitration myself in Hamilton, where the arbitrators had to disagree; they could not agree whether they should allow as a set-off for damages the benefit the party received for the increased value of the rest of his land when that value was common to his neighbours, because, it was argued, that man could get to market quicker, he can ship fruit easier, and so on. But it was stated on the other hand, well, but that is a benefit common to his neighbours who do not give any land, and there the arbitrators, I am sorry to say, were not able to agree upon how they should put that point. I think we ought to make it clear, and that a man should not be charged with the benefit to his property against the damages which he suffered through the passing of a railway across his land, unless it is a special benefit not common to every one. If the minister does not agree with me, I am prepared to debate the point at considerable length, that a man should not be charged against for any increased value unless it is the value special to him over that which his neighbours receive.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to hear the opinion of the leader of the opposition on this question. I do not know that the proposition will strike the committee favourably. I am under the impression that in my own province the law is generally accepted as stated by the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster). I would be inclined to accept the amendment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not familiar with Ontario decisions on the point. The idea in my mind was, how would you deal in that case along similar lines with the inconvenience, loss and damages to the lands traversed ? I have no particular case in mind, but the general principle is that a man can recover damages where his lands have been taken, or some of his lands. Then he can also recover damages in respect to other lands not taken but being part of the same lot ? That is to say, you may have two lots side by side, one lot owned by A and another lot owned by B. Taking into consideration the detriment which is occasioned to the land of A because a portion of his land has been taken, you take into consideration the circumstances affecting the value of that land as a whole; whereas the land of B immediately adjoining may be affected in the same way, but you cannot grant him any compensation at all because no land is taken. My hon. friend from Lincoln wishes to put the man whose land is taken on the same basis as every one else. in respect of increase to the value of his land. But how are you to deal with the corresponding principle. All the community alongside of you is affected exactly in the same way as you are, so far as detriment is concerned, and if you are to be put on the same plane as every one else with re-

gard to advantage, are you not to be put on the same plane as every one else with regard to detriment? It seems to me if you are to equalize the question of advantage you ought also to equalize the question of damage. The object of my hon. friend's amendment is to say that a man whose land is taken must not suffer any reduction of the price on account of increased advantage if all his neighbours have an exactly similar advantage to that which he receives. If the principle is good to that extent should not the converse be good.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the arbitrators have generally proceeded upon the principle that a man whose lands are not taken by the railway does not, in the case put by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), sustain quite the same damages. It is the severance of a man's farm that creates the trouble. If a man's lands are not taken by the railway they are not severed at all. In the abstract, as put by my hon. friend, it appears to be one and the same question, but it does not work out in that way once in a hundred times as a matter of fact. The man whose lands are not taken is not damaged because they are not severed. The railway does not cut him off from his woods or his pasture field, it does not run between his house and his barn or his house and the highway, and therefore it does not damage the remainder of his land. The man who is not damaged has all the advantage of the railway running there and perhaps a greater advantage than the man whose lands are taken because he is almost as near to the station as the man whose lands are taken, and he does not sustain any damage by the severance. I do not therefore think he is in a position to say that the other man is getting more than is given to him when he gets his damages in respect to the severance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The illustration the hon. minister referred to a moment ago is on the same principle. The Intercolonial Railway was running along Water street in the city of Halifax. The railway went along that street under the terms of a special statute enabling the highway to be used for that purpose and also by permission of the corporation of the city of Halifax. It took up one half of the street from the curb, the result of it being that the land on the other side of the street was reduced in value by at least 50 per cent and some of it by 75 per cent. The people went to the Exchequer Court and they could not recover a dollar. I think that is what the Exchequer Court held, although it may be that their petition was dismissed by that court under the statute of limitations. I think that is what the court would have decided in any case. If the land of one of these proprietors had extended across the street there would have been a different condition of affairs under which the man who owned this land which had been taken would not only have had damages for the land so taken, but damages for the injury to buildings on the other side of the street; whereas, this land did not extend across the street, the land was not taken and the owners had no status in the court at all. I think in all fairness from one standpoint that the amendment which my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara suggests has something commendable in it, but I would like to see whether or not, if you are going to amend the law, you could not adopt some principle which would deal in an equitable manner with the converse condition. I suppose from the standpoint of the public it would be the fairest not to regard the principle which has prevailed in the past, that damages cannot be recovered unless the land is taken, but I suspect that it would be very difficult for the railway company to know just where matters were going to end if a principle of that kind in respect of line through any thickly settled district were adopted. You remember the question which arose in New York when the elevated road was constructed. Damages were recovered on account of vibration and everything of that kind and the litigation extended over many years. I think the amendment of my hon. friend is well worthy of the serious attention of the committee, but we had perhaps better think of it a little before adopting it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would be very reluctant to undertake to make any material changes in the principle upon which the courts have been acting heretofore in respect to these valuations. We would not know where we might land ourselves. A very long course of judicial interpretation as well as of legislation throughout the English speaking countries, I think, has pretty well synchronized in a uniform way, and I would not care to take the responsibility just now, when dealing with this Bill, to make what might be thought to be a progressive movement. I would feel like agreeing to my hon. friend's amendment to-day, because it seems to me to be in accord with the doctrine which obtains generally in our courts, if it were not a departure. I should like to have an opportunity to consider it, and I think I would prefer not dealing with it in this form, but defer consideration until some later session when we might deal with the subject separately.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is not intended as a departure. I do not think it has that effect.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If it were felt to be desirable to make some provision to meet the case which the hon. leader of the opposition has

referred to, we would find it a very large undertaking. These things ramify in such extreme directions that we cannot anticipate where they are going to carry us. We cannot establish uniformity any way. I think, that, having gone as far as we have, we ought to stop. I would agree that the words should be added if the committee approve the amendment which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) proposes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think it is dangerous to alter the wording of the Act as it is. The only advantage which the landowner whose land is taken can have over another neighbour is better access to the station and better drainage for his land on account of the passage of a railway over it. These advantages are allowed at present and changing the wording of the Act would lead to confusion.

Mr. LANCASTER. I quite agree with the member for Lanark that drainage and access to a station are the two things that are generally brought forward. I know where it has worked hardly with the landowners, because in order to get the award of two of the arbitrators there has had to be a compromise which would not have been the case, if it were established what their rights were.

Mr. LENNOX. The amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) is within reasonable limits, and I think it would meet the difficulty. No deduction should be made from compensation because of benefits from the passage of a railway that are common to all the lands in the neighbourhood.

Mr. GILMOUR. Would this amendment have the effect of preventing compensation being given to other lands, not taken by the railway which are not damaged.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not affect them at all. I move that section 161 be stricken out and the following substituted :

The arbitrators or arbitrator in deciding on such value or compensation shall take into consideration the increased value which will be given to any lands through or over which the railway will pass by reason of the passage of the railway through or over the same, or by reason of the construction of the railway, and shall set off such increased value that will attach to the said lands or grounds against the inconvenience loss or damage that may be suffered or sustained by reason of the company taking possession of or using the said lands as aforesaid.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER. I beg to move to amend the section by inserting after the words 'increased value' the following words : 'beyond the increased value common to all lands in the locality.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Section 168, proceedings upon application for disqualification, struck out.

On section 169, subsection 2, appeal from award,

Mr. LANCASTER. I move to add after the number two at the very beginning of the section, the words 'whenever the award exceeds $1,000.' The present law limits these appeals to amounts exceeding $400, but this Bill strikes out the limitation and allows an appeal in any case, no matter how small may be the award. The old Act provides a limit of $400, but in my opinion, we should not allow an appeal except in cases where the award is over $1,000. As my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Robinson) said, the expenses of arbitration are considerable, and by the time the three arbitrators have come to a conclusion they know pretty well all about the case and what the damages really are. I may be a little influenced by the fact that the landowner can stand an appeal less easily than the railway. A railway company, having an award of $500 or $600 against it, might worry the landowner into accepting $200 or $300 rather than have an appeal. The costs of an arbitration, which he cannot collect from the company, are considerable. What he can collect are the witness fees and the arbitrators' and other fees, which are principally disbursements, but he gets a very small portion of what he has to pay his counsel for preparing his case. And if the railway company should take the case to appeal to the court in Toronto, the landowner must have the case argued over again, and the appeal may go against him or the amount be reduced, and in any case he will be considerably out of pocket. Even if the appeal should be dismissed with costs against the railway, the landowner would not be able to get as much as he would have had if there had been no appeal, because there is a large amount of work which the lawyers have to do and for which they cannot charge in the bill of costs against the company. I think, therefore, that if the award do not exceed a thousand dollars, the railway company should not be allowed to bring it into review. I first thought of making the amount twice as large, but on reflection I thought that the amount of $1,000 would be more acceptable to the House. If the award of the arbitrators is not more than $1,000 against the railway company, selected as the arbitrators are by this Act as arranged by the minister—an arrangement with regard to most of which I entirely agree—I think there can be little doubt that that award will be substantially just, and that to allow an appeal would be inadvisable. For, if an appeal from the award is allowed in the case of say $800, the owner may be persuaded that it is better to take $600 or even $700 than to face the expense of an appeal. He is forced to

take it, not because the law obliges him to, but because he feels it would be more profitable to him in the end. In some cases property owners are inclined to regard this almost as a species of blackmail. The agent of the railway company says: We can make you pay a great deal out of this award, if you do not accept a reduction. And so, as the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) said, the farmer is compelled to sustain a loss which he ought not to be called upon to sustain. I submit with confidence that the line should be drawn at $1,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The difference that arises is as to the amount. I had intended to suggest that the minimum should be something less than $1,000. I confess that I did not view it as the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) does, entirely as a question of appeal on the part of the railway company. I think we may very well consider that either party or both parties may be dissatisfied with the award and may desire to have the subject reviewed. If we are to view it as the hon. gentleman does, I think I would be prepared to go as far as he proposes. But are we justified in so doing? I have not had great experience with respect to these matters, not nearly so much as the hon. member has had. Therefore, I should be very much disposed to be influenced by his views. If we are to take for granted that in only a very small percentage of cases are these valuations complained of by the landowners, and in the great majority of cases by the railway company, I am prepared to say that the amount should be a good deal larger than I had in mind, and I do not say I would not be willing to make it as high as $1,000. It might be well, perhaps, to consider the point further. Where lands are being taken for railway purposes in country districts, one would hardly find one instance in fifty, I suppose, in which the valuation would run as high as $1,000. The effect of this, therefore, would be to allow no appeal in the great majority of cases. I do not think that would be a serious objection. I am quite sure that the tribunal referred to would be likely to reach a fair result, so far as the farmer is concerned, and I would not be particularly sensitive with regard to the other. Of course, I would not like to see any system which would be manifestly likely to result in gross injustice to the company. They are entitled to fair treatment, and, of course, we depend on the arbitrators, one of whom is to be named by the railway company, to do what is reasonable and just. I think this clause may stand as it is for the present.

On section 169, subsection 3—practice and proceedings on appeal.

Mr. LANCASTER. This subsection provided:

Upon such appeal the practice and proceedings shall be, as nearly as may be, the same as upon an appeal from the decision of an inferior court to the said court, subject to any general rules or orders from time to time made by the said last mentioned court, in respect to such appeals, which orders may amongst other things provide that any such appeal may be heard and determined by a single judge.

I have an amendment to propose, a copy of which I have just submitted to the hon. minister. When I drew this amendment I assumed that the meaning of 'court' there was the Superior Court. Of course, I do not pretend that they should appeal to the county court. This subsection treats the award of the arbitrators as the decision of an inferior court. Now, speaking for the province of Ontario—and I think the same applies in other provinces—you never appeal from any court to a single judge. The present law in that respect says, among other things, that the court may provide that appeals shall be determined by a single judge. That is the principle I am assailing. My contention is that no one judge, I care not who he may be, should set aside, upon law and fact the decision of three arbitrators in which at least two must have agreed. There is no other case within my knowledge of the courts, where one judge can do that. It is a bad principle, and it does not work well—speaking for the province of Ontario—in these arbitrations with railway companies. This appeal in railway arbitration is wider than the ordinary appeal. Speaking as a lawyer, I think the appeal from an inferior court is not to be set aside as easily as an award can be. The award here can be set aside if the court determining that appeal think the judge erred on the question of fact, or on the weight of evidence, or the weight to be attached to either class of witnesses. Now, those liabilities to attack do not exist in the ordinary jurisdiction of an appellate court. The law at present is that one single judge can do more than is the result of an appeal from an inferior court. He is allowed, upon a hearing of an appeal, the same power as in the case of original jurisdiction. That is, the court has a right to read the evidence over without seeing the witnesses in the box, or hearing their manner of giving evidence, which properly guides the lower court. The appellate judge can disregard all that, and determine from the written evidence just as if he was accorded original jurisdiction. Now, on principle, I do not think it is right that one judge should have all these wide powers to set aside a decision on a question of fact as well as on a question of law. There is no other appeal, so far as I know, from a lower court, at least in the province of Ontario, that is heard and determined by a single judge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Exchequer Court judge.

Mr. LANCASTER. His is an inferior court, and a party can appeal from him to the Supreme Court of Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may say to the hon. gentleman at once, to save him the trouble of arguing at greater length, that I think I would entertain his suggestion. But instead of providing that the appeal can be dealt with by one judge, I would provide that such appeal should be to a Superior Court judge.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. To which of the courts of appeal would you appeal to ? To the divisional court or the court of appeal ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The Act says that upon such appeal the practice and proceedings shall be as near as may be the same as upon an appeal from an inferior court to the superior court. In Ontario that is to a divisional court. In Ontario the appeal goes to the divisional court of the high court of justice, because the high court of justice is a superior court.

Mr. GERMAN. Under the practice in Ontario and under the rules, an appeal can go either to a divisional court or to a court of appeal.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not from a county court.

Mr. GERMAN. Yes, the section provides that the superior court can make and change the rules whereby an appeal from the board of arbitrators, in cases of the appraisement of land taken for railway purposes, can be to a single judge ; but unless the superior court in the province of Ontario, and I apprehend in the other provinces as well, makes an order different from any order that exists at present, there can be no appeal except to a divisional court.

Mr. LANCASTER. We do not appeal to a single judge in these arbitrations. There has been a standing rule of the high court for ten or twelve years, under which all these appeals do now go to a single judge.

Mr. GERMAN. This is a section altogether different from the section in the general Railway Act, which says that upon such an appeal the practice and proceedings shall be as near as may be the same as upon an appeal from the decision of an inferior court. Now, the practice and proceedings at present, on an appeal from an inferior to a superior court, are that the appeal shall be either to the divisional court or to the court of appeal. You appeal from the county court to the divisional court, and from the divisional court to the court of appeal.

Mr. GERMAN. You appeal from the county court to the divisional court and from the divisional court to the court of appeal.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not in a county court. You are limited to one appeal.

Mr. GERMAN. I quite admit that. We understand the practice in Ontario as well as the hon. gentleman. Under the provisions of the subsection the practice in an appeal from the board of arbitrators would be exactly similar to the present practice in an appeal from an inferior to a superior court in the province of Ontario, and that is either the divisional court or the court of appeal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid this is going to introduce some complications. It is not going to be easy to arrange for this unless you make special references to the various courts in the different provinces. I understand that in the province of Quebec the superior court is constituted by one judge, and that is a court of appeal from inferior courts.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would not be so simple a matter as it appears at first sight.

Mr. LANCASTER. What I object to are the words in the subsection which provide for an appeal to a single judge. What my amendment provides is that such an appeal shall be heard by at least two judges. If the committee thinks the amendment should not be made, I would propose that we should strike out the words :

> Which orders may amongst other things provide that any such appeal may be heard and determined by a single judge.

Because there is a distinct understanding that such an appeal shall go to a single judge, and it might create mischief.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is not an appeal properly so-called. It is a question of supervision or control by the court over the award of the arbitrators, and when that supervision is exercised by a judge of the court in the first instance, then there may be an appeal to the court of appeal afterwards. But, that is to be taken under the ordinary procedure which exists in the different provinces and I do not understand why we should seek to depart from the rule which has existed heretofore under the Railway Act. This section of the Bill is a mere reproduction of the old Railway Act. Why distinguish the word 'court' in the different provinces ? It is a court of original jurisdiction. What necessity is there for changing it.

Mr. LANCASTER. The necessity is that I do not think any one judge should sit in appeal over these arbitrators.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The arbitrators are only enlightening the conscience of the court. When an appeal is taken they are merely expert witnesses.

Mr. LANCASTER. Surely the hon. Minister of Justice does not contend that a man expects to go to a court. Surely it is intended that people will get their rights settled by the arbitration. They do not expect that they will have to go to a superior court.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What is the object of the section ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The object of the section, as I understand it, is that if the arbitrators go wrong upon some principle upon which they have decided there shall be an appeal.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Exactly.

Mr. LANCASTER. If it were limited to a matter of law I would not have so much to say about it, but a single judge could say that the arbitrators had erred on a question of fact as well as on a question of law. I do not think any single judge ought to be able to do that. I know it has been so until now. I know, as I said at the outset, that I am amending the law as it stands to-day, irrespective of the Bill which is before the committee. I do not think the law is good in its present form. I am saying when you are allowing an appeal from three arbitrators, two of whom must agree that it ought to take more than one man to set aside the decision of these two. I think the decision of these two ought not to be set aside on a question of fact without more than one judge to do it. An appeal from the county court goes to at least two judges. I have drawn the amendment in this way so as to make it consistent with the text of the section relating to inferior courts.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You could not make it to have universal application because one judge will review the verdict of the twelve men.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not like this parliament to say when we are providing a tribunal for settling these disputes between the railway and the landowner that we will allow the province of Ontario, or New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia, or Manitoba to say what tribunal shall sit in appeal over these arbitrators. This section says that you can take this appeal from these arbitrators to a single judge or to more than one judge, because, in all of the provinces there are courts of appeal with more than one judge. This says that no matter what may be the usual practice in an appeal from an inferior court in any province you may make a special rule which is not the general rule to allow an appeal to one judge alone.

Mr. COWAN. That is exactly the procedure that prevails in this province. You can appeal from the arbitrators to one judge in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is exactly what I say. That is what I understood the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) to dispute.

Mr. COWAN. Not at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. I object to this appeal going to a single judge, and if that is the practice now, I think this parliament ought to correct it. The fact that it is so now does not make it right. We are here to make these laws correct. The hon. minister of Railways and Canals would not listen to me if he were to suggest an amendment and I were to offer the objection that he was changing the law as it exists to-day. We would not be making provision for this railway commission if the railway law was all right. We are dealing with the Railway Act and amending it as far as we can to make it proper as far as relates to the railway commission and other matters. The hon. minister is amending this section and he has amended several other sections relative thereto. I am not going to dispute with hon. gentlemen opposite about what is the existing state of affairs because we agree on that point. We agree that in Ontario to-day this appeal goes to a single judge, and I am contending that it ought not go to a single judge.

Mr. COWAN. Then why not amend the provincial procedure ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is where my difficulty is.

Mr. LANCASTER. You can say that there shall be no appeal, and if you say there can be no appeal you can also say that there shall be an appeal, and you can therefore say what kind of an appeal there shall be.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. How would my hon. friend amend this section so as to make it applicable to the conditions existing in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I thought that in all the provinces no appeal from an inferior court went to less than two judges ? If I am wrong in that, my amendment is not quite right. That is why I made it at least two. I know that in the court of appeal in Ontario there are five judges. That is more than two, and therefore my section would apply. I am not wedded to the words of my amendment, but I think it should be provided in some way that one judge should not sit in review. I do not think we should indicate that it is proper that a single judge should review all the questions of fact and determine from a typewritten copy of what the evidence was in a case of original jurisdiction, better than two or it may be three arbitrators who have seen the witnesses. We expect the arbitrators to do their duty, and I do hope that there will not be many appeals,

but if there is an appeal it should be decided before more than one judge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The more the suggestion is studied the more difficulty it presents. We have already declared that the court shall mean a county court as well as superior court, and if we give the county courts jurisdiction you could not make a proviso that there must be two judges. In Quebec, for instance, you could not go to a superior court because one judge constitutes that court, and therefore you would have to go to the highest court in the province. I do not think the jurisdiction of such a court should be invoked in such a case. If the limitation is $600 or $800, there would be few appeals. I should think that a county court judge, experienced in the consideration of evidence and the knowledge of the law, would be competent to decide if necessary that the award of the arbitrators may be set aside.

Mr. LANCASTER. We seem to agree that if possible we should have this decision reviewed by more than one judge. Of course appeals will be limited if you increase the amount, but I am contending for $1,000. The appeals may be few, but every appeal is an important appeal. Even though my amendment be not accepted it would be better to strike out all the words after 'appeals' on the third last line, and then we have the province in each case providing the court of appeal from the inferior court, and we have these appeals from the arbitrators going to whatever court that may be in each province. Is not that safer than to provide that in each case it shall be an appeal to a single judge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would prefer that, to the other suggestion you have made.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the section is amended by merely striking out those words which my motion provides for striking out, the result will be that in my province, whatever the proceeding for an appeal from an inferior court may be, that proceeding will prevail. Perhaps that is safer than specifying the number of judges. In drawing my amendment, I thought I was safe in saying two judges, because I thought that there could be no appeal in any province to less than two judges. I think we ought to fix what in our opinion ought to be the constitution of the court, and if there are appeals in any province to less than two judges strike out the words which indicate that the appeal may go to a single judge.

Mr. WADE. This section would be workable in the province of Nova Scotia if the Bill had not been changed to include the county court. With that change, I do not think it is workable. If we say that in the province of Nova Scotia the appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court, that will meet the difficulty.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that, with the assistance of gentlemen from the different provinces, on both sides of the House, a section might be drawn providing that in the province of Ontario the appeal should be to such-and-such, in the province of Quebec to such-and-such, and so on for the different provinces.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the 2nd subsection would be a great deal better if it said 'a superior court' instead of 'the court.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that the word 'the' before the word 'court' in line 44 be struck out, and the words 'a superior' be inserted in lieu thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that in the third subsection the following words be struck out: 'which orders may amongst other things provide that any such appeal may be heard and determined by a single judge.'

Mr. GERMAN. I do not think it is wise to strike out those words. In the province of Ontario at present an appeal must be taken from the arbitrators either to a divisional court or to the court of appeal. Unless the rules of the province are changed, an appeal cannot be taken from an inferior court to a single judge.

Mr. LANCASTER. I argued two appeals last year from arbitrations to a single judge.

Mr. GERMAN. I am not talking about what the hon. gentleman did last year. I am talking about what is allowed to be done under this section if it is passed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is the hon. gentleman proposing to allow a single judge to hear the appeal?

Mr. GERMAN. No, I am not, but I think that it is perfectly right that a single judge should, under certain circumstances, entertain an appeal. The expenses would be considerably less, and under the practice of the province of Ontario at present, and the provisions of this section, an appeal would only lie to the divisional court or the court of appeal of the province. Then if the courts of the province desire to make a change in the rule and send an appeal of this kind to a single judge, that would be for them to say.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see any objection to a superior court judge hearing the appeal.

Mr. GERMAN. I may add that in the province of Ontario our courts are getting very considerably congested. Any body go-

ing to the court of appeal has to wait months for a decision. Even in the divisional court, you have to wait many months, whereas if you can go to a single judge, you will save this delay. The judges of our Ontario courts consider that it is equitable, that an appeal should be given to a single judge, and they make an order to such an effect. That would work out a larger measure of justice than by going to a court of appeal and having your award held up for a year and perhaps longer. I have a case of appeal now standing a year and a half.

Mr. WADE. I have one which has been standing for six years.

Mr. GERMAN. That is even worse. When a farmer is granted an award, he wants to get his money as speedily as possible, and the appeal should be to a court where speedy justice can be obtained.

Mr. LANCASTER. What I want is sound justice and not speedy decisions which might not be sound justice. I prefer to wait six months and get a sound decision than go before a tribunal which I did not think the one best fitted to give a decision. The congestion mentioned by my hon. friend from Welland is being cured. They are now constituting another court in Toronto, and endeavouring to have two more judges appointed. They are proposing to make four divisions of the high court of justice, so as to relieve that congestion, and that will no doubt be accomplished if the hon. gentleman will bring his eloquence and ability to bear on the government to have more judges appointed. My object is to have the section amended so as to provide what the minister contemplates, namely, that this appeal should be as nearly as possible like an appeal from an inferior court to a superior court. What I contend for is that we should have at least two judges to determine. If this parliament is not going to decide that there must be at least two judges, I think that the amendment of the Minister of Railways is the best remedy we can have, and this to provide that whatever the provision may be in each province for an appeal from an inferior to a superior court, that provision will apply to this appeal from the arbitrators. But, as I have suggested already to the hon. Minister of Justice, I think that we could manage to draw a section designating under little sub-heads to what court the appeal should lie in each province. It does not seem to me that hon. gentlemen are wedded to the one judge idea. In my opinion, the preponderance of evidence is that we should have more than one judge to review the decision of two arbitrators.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the practice in Ontario ?

Mr. GERMAN.

Mr. LANCASTER. At present the one judge holds the appeal, and that is why I have moved to amend——

Mr. RUSSELL. How does that work as a matter of fact ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I have been trying to explain that it does not work out well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has worked perfectly satisfactorily.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am giving evidence that it does not work out satisfactorily. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to say that it does.

Mr. COWAN. In what respect has it not worked satisfactorily ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Because awards are set aside by one judge who views the evidence in a different light, reading it from a typewritten copy, from what the arbitrators did who heard the witnesses.

Mr. COWAN. Is not that the same in every case ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The principle is what I am contending for. Does the hon. gentleman think, as a general principle, that one judge who has not heard nor seen the witnesses is a better judge of the facts than two judges would be ?

Mr. RUSSELL. If you had a half a dozen judges they would be under the same disability as regards the witnesses.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. member perhaps has not noticed the particular appeal that is given here. This is not a case of an ordinary appeal. In the case of an ordinary appeal the judges who have not heard the evidence and observed the demeanour of the witnesses, cannot reverse the decision of the lower tribunal on a question of fact. We are providing a special appeal here, the widest appeal that can be known. We are saying in this Bill that you shall not only appeal like an ordinary man from the inferior to a superior court, but you shall be subject to have the decision in your favour reversed upon grounds upon which it cannot be reversed in an ordinary appeal. You are using language here to take away the benefit a man gets in the decision of a tribunal that saw the witnesses and heard their evidence, and more than that, you are proposing that one judge shall do that. I think we can draw a section that will get over that difficulty. If the amendment that such an appeal shall be heard and determined by at least two judges does not work out properly, we can draw a section in the interest of making these appeals satisfactory, so that justice may be done with as little expense as possible, and a speedy decision may be accelerated. I am not in favour of so-called quick justice unless it is sound justice. I am contending that no one judge ought to

be allowed to reverse the decision of two arbitrators appointed in the careful way the Minister of Justice has arranged to appoint them by this Act. I would suggest that this section stand until we make it right, and provide that in the province of Ontario the appeal shall be to such and such a court, that in the province of Quebec it shall be to such and such a court, and so on through all the provinces.

Mr. WADE. Don't strike out those words in the latter part of the section but let it stand as originally drafted, then the whole section will be perfectly workable. I think the appeal should be such a court of appeal for hearing these claims, as will be found most advantageous. In our own courts, if we struck out those lines, the appeal will have to be heard by at least four judges, and that might not be necessary in the case of small claims. I think it would be better to leave the control of the constitution of the appeal court in the hands of the superior court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The question I think is not well stated by the hon. gentleman from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). He wants to change the existing conditions for the province of Ontario. I do not apprehend any question will come up in that province. We have had a court operating there which has enabled these appeals to be entertained by a single judge. In all human probability this clause has been very well considered, because it would be necessary there to invoke a court consisting of more than one judge. There being such a clear difference of opinion among the legal gentlemen from Ontario, and the appeals likely to be taken under the Act being very few in number, I think we had better leave this clause as it stands and pass on.

Mr. LANCASTER. I cannot withdraw my amendment. I am not talking here idly in what I have been saying. Of course I will have to be bound by the majority of the committee, but I think my amendment is proper.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman thinks so, but there is a difference of opinion.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have not heard any arguments showing that the principle that I am contending for is wrong.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I want to ask the hon. gentleman a question. Is there in the province of Ontario under the Judicature Act they have there, such a system as we have in our province, by which a judge in a given case may appoint three arbitrators for the purpose of determining certain issues that are raised between parties ?

Mr. LANCASTER. No. There is a rule stating distinctly that the courts will not refer cases to arbitration. But it often happens that counsel agree that a case is proper to be referred, and then a reference is made to a judge of a county court. But there is no board of arbitration in civil cases. When a case comes to trial counsel may agree that it may be referred to a county judge, or perhaps to the Master in Chancery. I persist in moving my amendment that subsection 3 of section 169 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'appeals' in the fifth line, and inserting the following in lieu thereof : 'And such appeals shall be heard and determined by at least two judges.'

Amendment negatived.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. COLIN F. McISAAC (Antigonish). Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines (Mr. Hyman) I move :

That the order of the House for Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company be discharged and the Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines for further consideration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What effect will this have on the notices that have been given of amendments to this Bill in committee on third reading ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). They could stand until the Bill comes back.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We could have an understanding that these notices stand until the Bill comes back.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not necessary that notices that have been given once should be given again.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 145) respecting the Quebec Bridge Company, and to change its name to 'The Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.'—Mr. Power.

On section 3,

The undertaking of the company is declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the ground on which the undertaking is de-

clared a work for the general advantage of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). This bridge crosses the St. Lawrence to allow the Intercolonial the Grand Trunk and other railways to enter Quebec. The purpose is to enable the company building the bridge to have terminal facilities, that is, short spurs of railways to connect with the bridge of the Grand, Trunk, the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific railways.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

HAMILTON, GALT AND BERLIN RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 149) to incorporate the Hamilton, Galt, and Berlin Railway.—Mr. Cowan.

On section 9,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Twenty-five thousand dollars a mile seems to be a high bonding power for this railway. Has the hon. Minister of Finance considered it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not given very much attention to these Bills in the Railway Committee. I presume my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has given his consent to it, and has seen that the powers given here correspond with those granted to other companies.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman who is promoting the Bill can tell us whether the amount per mile for which bonds are authorized to be issued, was considered in the Railway Committee ? It seems to me it is a large amount.

Mr. COWAN. It is not a large amount for building a railway through that section of the country. There are several ravines and gullies to be bridged, and it is a populous section where the purchase of the right of way is expensive. The capital stock has been cut down to $500,000 for sixty miles of road. Besides, it runs through several villages and towns.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the estimated cost ?

Mr. COWAN. Between $30,000 and $35,000 per mile, exclusive of rolling stock.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

VANCOUVER AND COAST—KOOTENAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the length of this line ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is nobody here who can give the information and I think that the committee will have to rise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly hon. members who have charge of Bills ought to show sufficient interest to be present and give any information required.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. member who has charge of the Bill spoke to me about it. He said that it was impossible for him to be here and he asked me to see that the Bill came up in committee. I, however, am not aware of the details.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) may be able to give the information

Mr. MORRISON. I think that the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Finance is a good one, and the Bill should stand. I was not in the committee when the Bill was up. This line will traverse another route, for which a charter was granted some years ago, and it might be well that the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill should be present to show that it does not conflict with any existing road.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Unless my hon. friend can give the information required, the Bill will have to stand. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

THE HURON, ERIE AND BUFFALO RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 123) to incorporate the Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

On section 9,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That gives a total bonding power of $35,000 per mile. What is the length of the line ?

Mr. COWAN. About a hundred miles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This question of bonding power received a good deal of attention in the committee and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COWAN. The intention is to double track the line. It is an extension of the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway, now acquired by the Père Marquette system. The intention is to make it equal to the Trunk line of the Michigan Central.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ST. MARY'S RIVER RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 139) respecting the St. Mary's River Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 4,

Section 8 of chapter 79 of the statutes of 1900 is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor :—

The company may issue bonds, debentures or other securities to the extent of fifteen thousand dollars per mile of the railway and branches, and such bonds, debentures or other securities may be issued only in proportion to the length of railway constructed or under contract to be constructed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the capitalization of this company ?

Mr. OLIVER. The company was organized some years ago, and the capital fixed at that time. I have not the Act of Incorporation before me, so cannot give the capitalization. This Act merely provides for extensions of the company's already existing line, and provides for a bond issue on the extension, but not for any increase in the capital stock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This section covers the whole line, and authorizes a bond issue of $15,000 per mile. I do not say that this is additional to what was already authorized. I wanted to know the length of line and the capital stock, so that we might have some idea of the total capitalization. I hoped to hold this Bill up as an object lesson to the committee, because I felt that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) would not promote any Bill authorizing a large capitalization, for I know his strong views on that subject. I hope to have an example to point to for the benefit of the hon. members who promote Bills authorizing a capitalization of $35,000 or $40,000 per mile. But the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) does not seem to have made very close inquiry into the matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have here the statutes of 1900, chapter 79, of which relates to this Bill. It authorized a capital stock of $500,000 and has bonding powers of $10,000 per mile. This section changes it to $15,000 per mile.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the length of the line ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not stated here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought the hon. member for Alberta might know.

Mr. OLIVER. I believe the length of the line already built is thirty miles. This authorizes extensions, the two main ones being thirty miles each.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is sixty miles with a capital of $500,000 ?

Mr. OLIVER. Ninety miles, including the thirty miles already built. That is, of course, a rough estimate. But I have travelled the country, and I think I am about right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) is satisfied that the capitalization is not excessive or likely to interfere with the proposed control of rates hereafter.

Mr. OLIVER. Inasmuch as this is a narrow-gauge line, and, with its branches, only ninety miles in length, I did not take the rates into as careful consideration as I would have done if it were a trunk line.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). 'Little drops of water, little grains of sand'—you know. If you have a number of small lines brought together, you may find that their total capitalization inflicts a burden upon the people which might have been prevented if we had looked carefully at the capital of each small concern when it was being chartered.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very glad indeed to find that the position I have taken meets with such approval from the leader of the opposition. With the support of the opposition for the principle I have always upheld, I should be glad to receive suggestions from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and support any wise amendments to the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am very glad that the opposition for once, has won the commendation of my hon. friend from Alberta.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). I would say on behalf of this company that I think they are doing splendid work in the west. They have a large irrigation scheme and have done a great deal of work in that way. The object in asking for these branches is to extend the road from place to place through that territory. A great deal of the land belongs to the company, and it is being settled very fast. I am satisfied that the bonding powers are not too large for the enterprise they have undertaken. They are doing the work practically with their own capital. I think the committee can feel perfectly satisfied that it is justified in granting the powers asked for.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As a matter of fact, the bonding privilege asked for is very much smaller than many of the railways whose Bills have been before us to-night, and I have no reason to think it is excessive. But I have been making a practice throughout the evening of asking what is the total capitalization, and also of making some inquiry as to the cost of the road, that I might judge whether or not it was wise to grant the powers asked for.

The difficulty with most of the charters applied for in parliament is that the bonding powers demanded are usually enough to construct the road without regard to the capital stock. That I am not inclined to regard as a very good principle. I think in that respect my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and myself are pretty well

agreed. I was only trying to get a statement of the cost and the capitalization of this road, in order that I might hold it up as an example in contrast with some of the other Bills which have passed, and the capitalization of which seemed to be very ample.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe that charters have been granted where the bonding privilege was probably too large. But of companies which actually intended to do the work, to complete it and put the road in good shape, I have hardly ever known a case yet where that company was incorporated and built any amount of the road, that they have not had to come back to parliament for increased powers in this direction. However, I think the principle of keeping down to a reasonable amount the bonding privileges is a very good one. But what I wanted to say in this connection was that this road is, as my hon. friend says, a narrow gauge road; so it is in some pieces, but the powers granted here are with the intention of making it a standard gauge road. That was explained in the committee. I understand that part of the road has already been constructed of the standard gauge, and that it will take fully this amount and more to make it a standard road.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE CARDIFF RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 140) to incorporate the Cardiff Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 3,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the length of the line?

Mr. OLIVER. About eight miles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is a pretty large capitalization for eight miles.

Mr. OLIVER. The solicitor who had the Bill in charge asked that the subsequent provision relating to bonding powers should be struck out, so that the company only depends on the stock to build the road.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman would consider that a fair amount.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not prepared to be responsible. The committee seemed to think it a fair amount. In fact, I believe the chairman suggested that the stock should be increased from $200,000 to $250,000, which I believe was also declined by the solicitor.

Mr. HYMAN. It is a peculiar Bill in that the promoters do not require any bonding privileges. It is intended to build the whole road out of their own money, and for that reason the stock was left at this amount.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is so unusual that I do not think we ought to say much about it.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure I have the approval of the leader of the opposition on this occasion.

Mr. HYMAN. We ought to adopt that as a model Bill.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

NIAGARA, QUEENSTON & ST. CATHARINES RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 154) to incorporate the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharine's Railway Company.—Mr. German.

On section 4,

Mr. COWAN. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the capital stock of this company has been cut down from $1,000,000 to $250,000. It is an expensive road to build in so far as it is to be built from St. Catharine's to Niagara, and then along the banks of the Niagara river crossing the ravines as far as Queenston, and then coming back on the third side of the triangle, as it were, to the city of St. Catharine's. The right of way is very expensive; the construction along the banks along the Niagara river is expensive and the promoters of the Bill say that in cutting the capital stock to $250,000 it will not enable them to build a first class road in first class condition. I move that the capital stock be increased to $500,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What does the chairman of the Railway Committee say to that? I presume that all these arguments were submitted to the Railway Committee.

Mr. HYMAN. When the Bill was before the Railway Committee the promoters were asked as to the cost of the road and taking into consideration the capital stock at $250,000 and the bonding privileges which were given in the Bill, the Railway Committee considered they were quite sufficient. I think $250,000 capital stock is quite sufficient and I cannot agree with the motion made by Mr. Cowan.

Mr. COWAN. Then, I suppose I might withdraw it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not see that it makes any difference whether the capital stock is $250,000 or $500,000, because I do not suppose they intend to put a dollar of stock into the road. I understand from the Minister of Railways that railways are not built that way. I presume they intend to build the railway by the issuing of bonds, and it does not appear to me that it will be an expensive road to build. I asked the promoter of the Bill if they were going to ascend Queenston Heights and he replied, no, that he was going to keep down below in coming back to St. Catharines. In that way the cost of construction will be very

much less. I think the judgment of the committee should be sustained.

Motion (Mr. Cowan) negatived: Yeas 9, nays 34.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Lake Huron Railway Company.—Mr. Clare.

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 142) respecting the Elgin and Havelock Railway Company.—Mr. Fowler.

Bill (No. 171) to incorporate the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.—Mr. Stephens.

Bill (No. 177) respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—Mr. McIsaac.

Bill (No. 63) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—Mr. McGugan.

Bill (No. 144) respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

SUPPLY—THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to bring to the attention of the government a communication I have received from Dawson City, referring to a supposed declaration by the government that the Treadgold concession is not in force, and stating that the gold commissioner is enforcing section 14, which exempts from representation Mr. Treadgold's private holdings. Is that covered by the communication which the acting Minister of the Interior, the hon. Postmaster General, sent to me this afternoon?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I only read it casually, and passed it over to my hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is a second communication, it may be, referring to the same thing. It will be covered, I suppose, by the communication which I received from the hon. gentleman?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no knowledge of the matter beyond what I had in the memorandum.

WOODSTOCK, N.B., POST OFFICE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to point out to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, that I think the hon. minister was mistaken in informing me, as he did when I brought the matter up in the House this afternoon, that the order of the House adopted on the 30th of March has been complied with. An order of the House asking for certain information in respect to the drill shed at Woodstock has been complied with, as is shown on page 385 of the 'Votes and Proceedings.' That is not the order to which I called the attention of the hon. gentleman. The order, which was passed on the 30th of March, is as follows:

Order of the House for copies of all papers, letters, telegrams, contracts, specifications, and correspondence of every description whatever, between the Minister of Public Works, or any other member of the government, and the contractors, sub-contractors, and other parties, in connection with the repairs to the post office, and the building of a new retaining wall, in connection with the post office, in the town of Woodstock, N.B.

Since I brought that matter to the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works, I have received a letter stating that the return was brought down. I find that the hon. Minister of Public Works is mistaken and there is some misapprehension about it, for I can find no trace of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall call his attention to my hon. friend's remarks.

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

Census, $35,000.

Mr. CLANCY. I notice that in the third volume of the census there are parallel columns showing the number of schedules in 1891 and 1901. Take the first item appearing in those schedules under the heading of 'Living Persons,' in 1891 there are twenty-five questions and in 1901 thirty-four. Will the hon. minister tell us what these questions are?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I would require to have a copy of the schedules here to give that information in detail which the hon. gentleman asks for.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman had better send and get them. It is very important that we should know.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. While we are waiting for the information asked for by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy), I may explain briefly the reason for the reduction in the census vote for the ensuing year. The current year's vote was $120,000, and, from present appearances, that will not all be used, but very nearly. The vote for the ensuing year is $35,000. The reduction is due to the fact that the work of compilation is drawing to a close. The end of the present fiscal

year will see it brought to a stage where, so far as can be estimated, very large reductions in the staff will be possible. It is anticipated that the vote for the ensuing year will complete absolutely the whole compilation. It is probable that the work of compilation will be finished by the month of January, although, there will be some slight work in closing up that vote. I am now able to give the information asked for by my hon. friend. I believe he desired to know what questions were asked in the census of 1901 with regard to living persons that were not asked in the census of 1891. I find in the book the hon. gentleman himself quoted a paragraph at the bottom of the first page, showing that four questions which were asked in 1891 were not asked in 1901. There having been nine questions more in 1901 than in 1891, the absence of these four would mean that thirteen questions in all must have been asked that were new in the census of 1901. There was an inquiry to ascertain the country or place of birth of each person, and the year of naturalization, if not a British citizen by birth, and the racial origin and nationality. There were also inquiries to ascertain the trade, occupation or profession, and the time each person was employed in the same, and the amount of his earnings in the year. Then about education and language, in 1901 there were additional questions as to the time at school in the year, and the language spoken, and whether a person spoke both English and French or only one, and his mother tongue. Those, I think, cover the whole list of extra questions.

Mr. CLANCY. The schedule states there were twenty-five questions in 1891. What the hon. gentleman is reading from the introduction does not explain what I was endeavouring to get. There were twenty-five questions asked in 1891 and there are thirty-four asked in 1901. I wanted to know if any of those asked in 1891 were dropped, and if not, what were the additional questions that were put in 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were four questions dropped which were asked in 1891; the place of birth, of father and mother, the origin if French Canadian—that question was not asked whether he was a French Canadian—third, whether he was unemployed during the week preceding the census, and fourth, whether he was an employer and the number of hands employed during the year. Now, to balance those four there was a question to ascertain the country or place of birth of each person. That was not asked in 1891.

Mr. CLANCY. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that four questions were dropped, and a substitute for them is to give the place of birth, that is the same question as one of the four.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the place of birth of the father and mother is not the same question as the place of birth of the person himself. The question I am speaking of is the country or place of birth of each person other than the question of the place of birth of the father and mother. Another question asked was the year in which the person came into Canada, if he was born outside of Canada. That was not asked in 1891. The year of naturalization, if foreign born; his racial origin and nationality. Then there were inquiries to ascertain the trade, occupation or profession of the person, and the time he was employed therein, and the amount of earnings in the year. Then, under the head of education and language, there were additional questions as to the time at school in the year, if he was of school age, and the language spoken. Then there was a question whether he spoke both English and French, these being the official languages of this country. I have just had handed to me the whole list of questions in 1891, also the list of questions in 1901.

Mr. CLANCY. I was anxious to get the additional questions.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To do that I would have to read over the list of questions in each census and compare them, and work out those which were asked in the one which were not asked in the other. In 1901 the list figures up 34, and in 1891 only twenty-five. The order of questions is not quite the same in the two censuses and I would have to go over every question and compare it to give the hon. gentleman the information he asks. The general statement I gave a few minutes ago from the introduction of the census, shows practically what the hon. gentleman asks.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure the hon. minister will recognize the fact that the committee ought to be in possession of the changes that I have asked for. Although it may involve some work, I am sure none will appreciate more than the hon. gentleman himself the importance of giving us that information. I suggest, as we cannot hope to get through the item conveniently to-night, the hon. gentleman should have an opportunity of getting that information. It is Friday night, there is a thin House, and this is a very important question as the hon. gentleman will see. I think it will be well to allow him an opportunity of getting that information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not think of the House adjourning at the present time. This is a good opportunity of discussing this vote and putting it through. The hon. gentleman has had these schedules before him for a long time, and if he had chosen to look at them he could have compared them and made out

exactly what he wants. I could work it out myself with fifteen or twenty minutes study, but I do not think my seat in the House of Commons is the place to do that. When I consider that the schedule of 1891 has been published for twelve years and that the other has been published for two years, it does not seem quite reasonable that a work of that kind should be asked for in the House of Commons by the minister who is endeavouring to pass his items. I think it is hardly fair to expect the minister on a vote of this kind, to go over the information which is patent on the face of the returns which have been published for years, and which can be obtained at any moment with a few minutes work if any body chooses to go at it.

Mr. CLANCY. I might be able to agree with the hon. gentleman that the hon. minister would not be expected to work out at his desk in the House of Commons such information, or in fact any other information that is asked in getting a vote like this passed, but the hon. gentleman, I am sure, will assent to the proposition that his deputies should be prepared with the work, and if they are not prepared with it the hon. gentleman has no right to ask for this vote. The hon. gentleman surely cannot ask this committee to pass these estimates involving thousands of dollars of expenditure unless we know what the value of this expenditure was. I agree that it is not the time now for the hon. minister to sit down and work out these tables, but he should be prepared through his deputies to give such information to the committee, and I appeal to the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) if it is a fair thing to ask us to go on at the close of the week with other parts of the estimates and say that we have no business to ask such questions, when there are records that we may appeal to. The hon. Minister of Finance usually gives the information that is required of him. He does not ask us to go and hunt up the information that the minister ought to have. It is the minister's business to know through his deputies and give that information to the House. I think I am not at all unreasonable in asking this. There has been a large increase in the cost. If the money has been well spent, the minister should have credit for it, if not the committee has a right to criticise it and it has a right to the information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that we ought to be prepared to give all such information. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me, on the other hand, that it is quite possible in committee for any hon. gentleman to ask questions that a minister cannot be ready to answer offhand, and if he gives the assurance that later on such information will be brought down, the committee should be content with that. If any hon. gentleman wanted to do so, he could ask a series of questions that would embarrass a minister and which he could not possibly answer offhand. The only protection the minister has is to give the member the assurance that the information will be brought down in due course, but I do not think we should delay the proceeding of the House on that account. There will be ample opportunity to get this information later on, and if the hon. minister gives the assurance that it will be brought down, I think that ought to satisfy my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have asked one of my officers to get that information. I think he can get it in half an hour. In the meantime the hon. gentleman can go on with other questions, so that we can proceed with the business of the House. I do not think I am asking anything unreasonable in asking the hon. gentleman to wait for half an hour for the information which he requires and which is being prepared.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister knows very well that it is not this side that is delaying this vote. No minister can complain if questions are asked which the committee are entitled to have answered. I want to say a word to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I should have to be much more reasonable than the hon. gentleman is, and I think he is a very reasonable man, if I were satisfied with the proposition he has made. The hon. gentleman surely was not hinting that the questions which are being asked this evening have the slightest embarrassing effect upon the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I should rather judge, from the intimation of the hon. gentleman, that embarrassing questions are put. They are not embarrassing unless the minister is unprepared. If the minister is unprepared all such questions are embarrassing. Large sums of money have been expended and I am sure the hon. Minister of Finance will not be so unreasonable as to press the question unless we are prepared to get all the information in detail. The hon. gentleman is a very busy man. I think he can see that members of the opposition cannot be idle men. They have very much to do. The proper stage at which we should have information, as the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, as an old parliamentarian, is when the item is under consideration, and when the subject is fresh in our minds. To bring down that information afterwards, at a time when there is no opportunity to pay attention to it is utterly useless for a fair and intelligent criticism. I do not desire to ask unreasonable questions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has used the word 'embarrassing' in a sense different from what I have used it. These questions are not embarrassing except as questions

to be answered at the moment. These questions will be answered within a reasonable time. They are only embarrassing in the sense that my hon. friend insists upon the hon. Minister of Agriculture answering them at a particular moment. If he gets the assurance that the information will be furnished I do not imagine that he would wish the business of the House delayed while we get it.

Mr. CLANCY. It is an unfair thing to ask the opposition not to press for an answer when the vote is under consideration. The hon. minister should be ready with his answers right now, and it is not the fault of the opposition that he is not ready.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have informed my hon. friend that I will have the answer within half an hour, and it may be within a few minutes.

Mr. CLANCY. 'Deaths in public institutions.' Thirteen questions were asked in 1891 and thirty-five were asked in 1901.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend has not read it quite correctly. In 1891 'deaths in public institutions' comes second and not first, but in 1901 it comes third. The difference in the figures is the difference between thirteen and fifteen.

Mr. CLANCY. I am very sorry that the minister has chosen this time to bring up this estimate when there is a very thin House. The hon. gentleman is not responsible for that, but he does take responsibility if he presses the matter to a vote unless we have the information. Why should not the minister come down to the House at the next sitting prepared with answers to such questions as may be asked regarding the meaning of the schedules. I am sure the hon. gentleman will save time if he does that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I regret that the hon. gentleman did not move for a return because it will involve an elaborate calculation and take considerable time. If the hon. gentleman thinks for a moment that we wish to burk inquiry or refuse information, I shall be very glad to leave this vote and take other votes in my department, and I ask the hon. gentleman's assistance to pass these votes tonight so that the House will make reasonable progress. We can take the item for exhibitions.

Exhibitions, $150,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The vote for the current year of $195,000 has not been all expended. It was expected that the Louisiana Purchase Exhibition at St. Louis would open in May of this year. It has been postponed until 1904. The vote included also the exhibition at Osaka, Japan, which opened on the 1st of March last and will close on the 1st of August. The Osaka exhibition has been provided for out of the current year's vote except a comparatively small amount which will have to be expended between the 1st of July and the 1st of August. The St. Louis exhibition is to be held in the ensuing year, and I am asking $150,000 to have Canada properly represented there. The exhibition will open on the 1st of May next and will continue until the 1st of December, so that next year I will have to ask for a portion of the expenditure. The vote taken now will prepare the exhibits and the accommodation necessary and enable us to carry on the work until the 1st of July, 1904. It is represented that the St. Louis exhibition will be a magnificent one. There is always a rivalry between Chicago and St. Louis and the St. Louis people are endeavouring to eclipse the great Columbia exhibition at Chicago in 1904. The people of the state, the citizens of St. Louis, the national government, and a number of the states have combined to contribute large sums of money, one circular representing that $30,000,000 would be spent by the people of the United States on the exhibition. Under these circumstances I feel that it is very important indeed that Canada shall make a creditable exhibition there because I believe it will help to make—or rather to sustain, because it is already made—the reputation of our country as a place of glorious production, immense capabilities, and splendid possibilities.

Mr. CLANCY. What will be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have spent about $6,000 out of the current year's vote on preparations. I hope the $150,000 will carry on the work during the ensuing year, although I cannot be positive of that until next spring when the exhibition opens. If I find it to be necessary I would be disposed to ask for a supplementary vote. We hope now that the $150,000 will carry us to the 1st of July, 1904, with the probability of spending $60,000 in the following fiscal year ; say $225,000 altogether in round figures.

Mr. CLANCY. Are we erecting buildings.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The exhibition provides the buildings. The arrangement is that the exhibits shall be classified according to their character and they refuse to allow any national exhibition in any one building. In explanation of that I may say that at Glasgow, at Wolverhampton, at Cork, and at Osaka, we concentrated the exhibits in one building, and in that way made a more effective display, and one more economically and efficiently managed. I think it is a much more effective way of displaying our resources, and directing attention to our country. But in St. Louis, the plan and scope of the exposition will not admit of that. We have to put our

agricultural exhibits in the agricultural building, our horticultural exhibits in the horticultural building and so on through all the classes. But it is proposed to have a Canadian building there, which will contain offices for our commissioner and staff, and which will be a rallying point for Canadian visitors and for persons desiring to obtain information about Canada. That would probably involve the erection of a moderate sized Canadian building.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose the hon. gentleman will be able to give to the committee some idea as to how this sum of money, which he is asking for, is to be spent—how much in buildings, how much in exhibits, and so on.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have not yet had plans submitted for the building, but it will probably cost $20,000 or $25,000. The space for our exhibits in the large buildings is given free, and the ground for our own building is also given free by the authorities. As our exhibits will be scattered in a large number of buildings, we shall be obliged to have a large staff to watch over them and keep them in order and explain them to visitors. If we had them all in one building, we would not require more than one-third or perhaps one-fourth of the staff that will be required. There will be considerable expense incurred in collecting the exhibits. We have found it desirable that the government should collect and manage exhibits of natural products—agricultural, horticultural, mineral, and forest exhibits—as we cannot get individual exhibitors in these lines to work up creditable exhibits. That has been our course at all the great expositions. That work requires a considerable amount of preparation and a considerable expenditure of money. One part of that exhibit, in which we have been uniformly very successful, is a cold storage establishment, in which our products are displayed behind glass throughout the whole exhibition. That is an expensive exhibit, but it is a very striking and attractive one, and has always attracted an immense amount of attention. Then there will be the maintenance of the staff, the carriage of the exhibits to the exposition and return, and the incidental expenses. The estimate which is here made has been made upon our experience of other exhibitions.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman give us approximately the cost of the cold storage plant, the salaries of those employed, and the cost of transportation ?

The MINISTER OF AGTICULTURE. When we were fixing the amount of this vote, I discussed with the exhibition commissioner the amount that would probably be required, and he made a set of figures which were quite approximate, as my hon. friend will understand. I have not them at the moment in my mind ; but, speaking from memory, the cold storage plant, including installation, carrying on and management, will probably cost $5,000 or $6,000. Salaries and wages for the whole year, roughly speaking, will come to $20,000 or $25,000, that is for the Canadian staff, in addition to which we always have to employ temporary labour from day to day as we need it. The collection of exhibits in the four classes that I have spoken of would come to at least $50,000 or $60,000, which, I think, is an inside figure for all the work of searching, collecting and preparing them. I have been requested by some of those interested in Canada to make a live stock exhibit at St. Louis. If that should be undertaken, it would involve an expenditure of $250,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman propose to make a live stock exhibit at the expense of the country ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not answered the request. But even supposing the country would not pay the expenses of the individual exhibitors, if Canada does make a live stock exhibit, the management of that will cost the department probably $50,000. I have not yet decided on that, as there is an objection to a live stock exhibit in St. Louis, owing to the fact that it is extremely hot there in summer and many of our best breeders would not like to send their best animals to St. Louis in that season. If we cannot get their best animals, it would be useless to have an exhibit of live stock there at all.

Mr. CLANCY. In the $60,000 required to defray the expenses of placing an exhibit in St. Louis, is any expenditure on live stock included ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not in that item. That is just the item of the four classes—agricultural, horticultural, forestry and mineral exhibits. These have to be collected from all parts of the country. To-day the farmers are growing grain for us by special arrangement to be sent to the exhibit at St. Louis. We are making every effort to make our display an impressive one. In days gone by we have been very successful at the different exhibitions, and as this exhibition is still more important than those which preceded it, we must do everything possible to give our country a very effective showing.

Mr. RICHARDSON. How will the building compare with the one we had at the Pan-American ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It will be much finer. The building at the Pan-American cost us $14,000 or $15,000. We expect to spend on this $25,000, and perhaps more, as the cost of building will be much heavier. The labour people in St. Louis are making arrangements to charge very high rates.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is to be hoped that we will have a much better building than the one we had at the Pan-American. From the expression I have heard from a number of Canadian visitors, that building was totally unworthy of this great country. Even if we should have to spend two or three times the amount we should not hesitate to do it in order to have a proper building. Has the site been selected ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, a very favourable site has been allotted to us, not far from the exhibition office and close to the agricultural exhibition building. Our exhibition commissioner went all over the ground and located the site in conjunction with the president of the exhibition association there.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is an important item. The site of the building at the Pan-American was very detrimental to the appearance of the building itself and it is to be hoped that a better location will be found at St. Louis.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At the Pan-American the site was very much injured by a large restaurant being built just opposite, and another inferior building just along side, but that was not understood when we secured our site.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think that there will be any disposition on this side to oppose any reasonable vote that will enable Canada to take at this exhibition the proud place she has taken at other exhibitions. I think it would be a great mistake to count too closely the cost. I join with my hon. friend from South Grey in pointing out that there was a general expression of disappointment on the part of Canadian visitors to the Pan-American, both at the location and the character of our building. As regards the location, the government made the reasonable excuse that they had to take whatever they could get, but I am glad to hear that we are to be better treated at the St. Louis exhibition. While dealing with the question of the Pan-American, perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell the committee what was the winding up of that exhibition, and what disposition was made of the buildings and the large outfit we had there ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the furniture. That did not belong to us, but was an exhibit made and loaned by the Canada Furniture Company, a combination, I might call it, of the furniture manufacturers with headquarters in Toronto. They wished to show their furniture, and loaned it to us in the understanding that it was to be used in the Canadian building. So we spent nothing on it, except some $200 at the end of the exhibition to make good some little damage. The building was, I might say, simply got rid of. At the end of the Buffalo exposition we had almost to beg people to take the building off the grounds, as was required of us under the contract we made with the exhibition people. We sold the glass and some other parts of the building for $622.50, and the building itself for about $200 or $250. The contractor had to take it down and remove it. In the case of many of the other buildings, those who had built them were called upon to pay large sums to have them taken away and so fulfil their bargain with the exhibition authorities, which was similar to ours. My hon. friend can understand that, with so many buildings thrown on the market at the end of such an exhibition it would be practically impossible to get anything for them. At the Wolverhampton and Glasgow exhibitions our buildings were put up by contractors under agreement that the contractors should take them back at the close of the exhibition. So we got the buildings for the purpose for which we needed them for a less price. But we could not make such a contract in Buffalo, although, I am satisfied that the system is a good one.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice among the items of expenditure in connection with these exhibitions that many purchases have been made in the country where the exhibitions have taken place. Would it not be better to buy Canadian furniture and fittings throughout, so as to have everything as far as possible of Canadian manufacture ? This would help our producers and would be likely to attract more attention at the exhibition. Would it not be worth while also for the hon. minister to consider if we could not make an arrangement for the designing of a building in Canada and the preparation of the material here ? For instance, the roofing material, whether tin or galvanized iron, could be manufactured in Canada as we have large producers in that line. Of course, the lumber could be Canadian. Then, the carpeting, fittings and furniture could be supplied here. The arrangement of the hon. gentleman made with the Canadian Furniture Company for the supply of furniture at the Pan-American was, I think, a splendid arrangement. It filled every purpose from a Canadian standpoint. I would like information with regard to one particular item of expenditure for the Pan-American. There is an item here—the W. C. Edwards Company, two oak stands for grain exhibits, $745. This seems a very large item for such a purpose. What has become of the stands referred to ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Let me answer the hon. gentleman's last question first. The stands he refers to are at the experimental farm waiting for the St. Louis exhibition. They are large erections, and the two stood in the main hall

at Buffalo. They are of hardwood, polished, and elaborate in their construction.

Mr. BLAIN. Were they made under contract ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A bargain was made before they were ordered.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. minister regard that as a good plan for——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I think so. I may explain that I have been very fortunate in having the services of a gentleman who has been most successful in the decorative work of our agricultural exhibitions. I refer to Mr. Hay, who used to be accountant at the experimental farm, but whom I may now call a permanent officer of our exhibition staff. For five years, ever since the Paris exhibition, he has been engaged in decorative work in connection with the agricultural displays we have made at the various exhibitions. He has made a most wonderful success of this work. Our agricultural decorations at these exhibitions attract great attention and win universal admiration, and have been the means of our gaining a great deal of credit. I may say that Mr. Hay designed the Canadian arch in London on the occasion of the King's coronation, and succeeded in making a display of grain and other agricultural products which attracted the favourable attention of the millions present. The stands referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) were designed by Mr. Hay for the express purpose for which they were used. The hon. gentleman spoke of Canadian materials in our buildings. These buildings are made of rough lumber covered with staff or stucco, and must be made on the spot. The wood being entirely covered, there is no particular object to be served in having it taken from Canada, particularly as the expense of taking Canadian material to cities where the exhibitions are held would be very heavy. If we were to follow that course, we should also have considerable difficulty with the contractors. We have found it best to put up these buildings by contract, and the contractors themselves wish to furnish the materials, as they find it most convenient for themselves. Even at Buffalo, so near Canada, we found it impossible to supply the material ourselves. For instance, we have in Canada firms that supply a very fine metallic roofing, which has been widely exhibited. But that concern would not undertake to supply the roofing for our building in Buffalo for anything like what we could get it done for there. I believe their price was something like four or five times what the contractors put the roof on for. The roofing concern wished to exhibit, but they did not want to roof our building, and to have got them to do it would have greatly increased the cost. I grant that the hon. gentleman's idea is a taking one, and it is one which possesed my mind on the occasion of the Buffalo exhibition. But it was not found feasible.

Mr. BLAIN. On the question of the two oak stands supplied by W. C. Edwards & Company for $745, I do not think that the hon. gentleman's explanation will be wholly satisfactory to the committee. The objection I raised is this, that you spend $745 for stands to put grain upon, and you take them around to the different exhibitions, first at the Pan-American and now at St. Louis, and the people who go to these exhibitions see just the same thing.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is only a part of the exhibit.

Mr. BLAIN. It is a very important one. Here is an appropriation of $745 for stands to put grain upon. I say that no matter what decorator you have, you send him to the Pan-American exhibition and he puts grain upon these stands, they are decorated in one way. The minister says they are now in Ottawa waiting to be sent to St. Louis. Now, the exhibition in St. Louis must be very similar to the Pan-American. I look upon that expenditure as too large altogether. It would be better to make such changes as advancement would require. The fact is that these stands, no matter how well they are constructed, will be covered up with some decorating material.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman's idea is quite correct. Those stands are made so that they may be adapted to circumstances. They were in one shape at Buffalo ; they are made in sections, and can be so set together as to present a different shape of stand according to the necessities of the building in which they are put. I may say that our designer, Mr. Hay, has worked out designs for an exhibition of agricultural products for several years, and he has never yet had two exhibitions which were at all similar.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice an item here in connection with the Pan-American—'James W. Woods, Ottawa, flags for decorating purposes, $422.' I do not object to the item. But I notice that when the hon. gentleman came to sell these flags, which were only used for a short time, he only got $20 for them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is confusing two items, because we have those flags yet. We have hundreds of flags for decorating purposes.

Mr. BLAIN. If that be correct, then the Auditor General's Report is misleading. I repeat that under the head of the Pan-American exhibition we have the item 'James W. Woods, Ottawa, flags for decorating purposes, Pan-American exhibition, $422.55.' Turning over the page we find 'Less sales of goods, and refund in connection with the

Pan-American exhibition.' I see an item of $20 for sale of flags.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Those are some that were injured and were old. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that probably ninety-five per cent of the flags that he alludes to as having been bought from Mr. Woods, are here to-day, and will be used for the same purpose.

Mr. BLAIN. I see another item, 'Consolidated Plate Glass Company, London, glass, mirrors, &c., $2,050.' Perhaps the hon. gentleman can give us some explanations about that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That includes all the glass in the windows of the building. We bought that in London and sent it over to Buffalo, instead of buying more at the latter place. We sold it when the exhibition was closed, and I think we got $622. A large reduction, but the hon. gentleman can understand that glass that had been taken out of the frame and carried away from the building, could not be expected to sell very well.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose no duty is paid on goods that are taken over there ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No duty was paid until they were sold.

Mr. BLAIN. One other item, page D—17 : 'William Hutchison, commissioner, living allowance, 76 days, $10 a day.' Is that expenditure all right ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think so, quite. The commissioner had to live at Buffalo when the exhibition was going on, as representative of Canada. He had to live in a respectable manner, and I think an allowance of $10 a day was perfectly reasonable.

Mr. BLAIN. That means entertaining, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is what he was paid for his living expenses. He could do what he liked with it.

Mr. CLANCY. Was he supposed to do some entertaining ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was no special allowance for entertaining, but knowing Mr. Hutchison's character, I am quite sure he would entertain.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Hutchison was at Buffalo, Mr. Scott was at Glasgow. There was some difficulty about the buildings at Glasgow, was there not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware of any.

Mr. CLANCY. I understood that either the city, the British authorities, or some other parties, had borne a certain share in the erection of the buildings.

Mr. BLAIN.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman must be thinking of Paris. There has been nothing of that kind, either in Glasgow or Wolverhampton, since the Paris exhibition. We have done all the work by ourselves, and after our experience we have made up our minds to have nothing to do in conjunction with any other authority.

Mr. CLANCY. How is the building constructed at St. Louis ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We propose to let it by contract.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman will not be subject to the alien labour law ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose we will be subject to whatever laws are in force in St. Louis.

Mr. BOYD. During what months will the exhibition be open at St. Louis ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. From the 1st of May to the 1st of December.

Mr. BOYD. In connection with the matter of a live stock exhibit I would like to know what association representing live stock breeders asked the hon. minister for the amount that he says they have asked him for.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All live stock associations in Ontario had a joint meeting not long ago at which they passed a resolution, and I am informed that in other provinces they have done the same.

Mr. BOYD. Whence comes the protest that the stock would likely be injured by the heat at St. Louis ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was no protest from an association, but a number of breeders themselves told me that while they had no objection to an exhibit being made they did not think they would like to send their best animals to the exhibition at St. Louis during the heated term.

Mr. BOYD. It was only some individual breeders who said that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BOYD. You have no protest from the association that asked for the money ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. None.

Mr. BOYD. You are influenced by individuals as against the request of the association.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said that the question was an open one and that I had not decided. I did not say that it had been settled. I simply stated the diffi-

culties there were in connection with the live stock exhibit.

Mr. BOYD. I can see no objection at all in the fact that one or two men do not see fit to send their animals to such an exhibition as the St. Louis exhibition is to be. Because a few men are not disposed to do that why should the whole exhibition be stopped? I think the Breeders' Association which has asked for this grant will require some more lucid explanation than has been given in that respect.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Explanation as to what?

Mr. BOYD. An explanation as to the reason why the minister would not give an answer to this association?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not say that that was the reason why I did not give an answer. I said I was discussing and considering the question, and I shall be prepared to give an answer. I pointed out that certain people had said that they did not care to send their best animals to St. Louis during the hot weather and that weighed with me to a certain extent.

Mr. BOYD. May I ask the hon. minister when a decision will be arrived at?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Before long, I hope.

Mr. BOYD. Is there any exhibit that can be taken to St. Louis that will bring greater profit to this country than an exhibit of live stock?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think, if a successful exhibit can be made there, it will be most advantageous to the country.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is any strong intimation given by the breeders by way of protest, implied or otherwise, or in the way of suggestion of the difficulties of taking valuable stock there, and if that objection were adhered to by the breeders in Canada it would go so far as to affect the character of the exhibit, or to interfere with our placing the best stock that can be produced in Canada on exhibition. If it had that effect I think it would be a great mistake for Canada not to have the best stock there and that we should either have the best or none.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Quite so.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has pointed out to-night that it would be a serious thing if our Canadian breeders should draw the line too closely. People would be wanting in loyalty so to speak, in presenting the case of Canada not to assist the hon. minister in every way, even at some slight risk, and an exhibition from Canada devoid of that branch would, I think, be very much impaired. But, on the other hand, if there is a possibility of not making the show that Canada could make there, it would be equally as great a mistake. I must admit the gravity of the question and I hope the hon. minister will succeed, as my hon. friend from Macdonald suggests, in inducing the Canadian breeders to assist him in carrying out what no doubt is the wish of Canadians generally.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister how the selection of live stock was made in connection with other exhibitions, for instance, the Pan-American exhibition.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By the Live Stock Association. There was a dairy contest at Buffalo and in connection with that work of selecting and obtaining the cows to go into it it was left in the hands of the live stock commissioner of my department. He worked in co-operation with the Live Stock Association but he did most of the work of selecting the animals.

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. minister decides to have a live stock exhibit at St. Louis, will the same policy be pursued?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should say so. It was successful before and I think it ought to be carried out again.

Mr. BOYD. Is the hon. gentleman seeking to procure any information as to the months in which the live stock is to be exhibited?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The authorities of the exhibition have been asked over and over again to give us information in regard to that, but we have not been able to obtain it. I do not think they have yet formulated their own plans. In consequence of the representations that were made to me by the Live Stock Association, I am arranging for a delegation to come down and discuss that question.

Mr. BOYD. I suppose the hon. minister recognizes the importance of such an exhibit in that particular portion of the United States?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. BOYD. I suppose he understands the enormous amount of high grade cattle that have been taken into Missouri, Kansas and Illinois. I cannot understand why the hon. minister should for a moment entertain the proposition of any individual breeders as against the proposition of the association which represents all the high class breeders in the country. I trust the hon. gentleman is seeking information as to the months during which the live stock exhibit will be held, and also as to what the mortality would likely be or has been in that state of Missouri during the months when the fair is likely to be held.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The mortality in the state would be no indication of the work of an exhibition. It is well understood how severe exhibition work is on the animals exhibited, because, during an exhibition, the difficulties in a hot place like St. Louis would be very much accentuated. If these breeders will pledge themselves to send their stock, nobody will be more pleased than myself to make an exhibit that will be creditable to Canada, but, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) says, if we find a considerable number of live stock breeders who say that they cannot afford to send their best animals it would be a misfortune to be represented by second rate animals.

Mr. BOYD. Who are the breeders who have made these representations ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot give the names at this moment.

Mr. BOYD. I think we should have that information later on so that the Breeders' Association which has made the request for a grant may know. The least the hon. minister owes to this association is that he should let them know who the men are who are objecting.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not said any men are objecting. I have said that they have represented to me the danger and difficulty of sending stock to St. Louis during the hot weather and I doubt whether they would be willing to send their best animals. I am not setting that against the representations of the association, but merely putting it forward as one of the difficulties in connection with the live stock exhibit which I conceive it my duty to consider.

Mr. BOYD. The minister left the impression on my mind that it was his intention to do it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is entirely a wrong impression, because I stated positively that the matter was under consideration.

Mr. BOYD. The association should know from what source these protests come.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). If the minister is not in a position to tell the House during what particular months the live stock will be exhibited there, I do not see how individual breeders could object when they do not know themselves. I agree with the minister that if it was the general opinion among the breeders not to send their first class animals there, it would be much better that we should have no exhibition at all. If this objection emanated from some gentlemen who are not yet aware as to what particular months they are expected to send their animals there, it can only have come from a few of them at the most. Can the minister tell us what proportion of the breeders have objected ? Every consideration should be given by the minister to the representations of the Breeders' Association both in the east and in the west.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is going to be the commissioner and the secretary at St. Louis?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Hutchison is the commissioner and Mr. Brodie is the acting secretary. Mr. Burns is acting secretary at Osaka.

Mr. BENNETT. At the Glasgow Fair there was more than one commissioner.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There has been no arrangement made as regards honorary commissioners.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know they were honorary or not at Glasgow, but they drew considerable salaries. The Hon. A. Boyer got $5 a day, and Colonel O'Brien also. Will there be representative gentlemen sent to St. Louis ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There has been no discussion on that point yet.

Mr. BENNETT. Is Colonel O'Brien connected in any way with this exhibition ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I might put in a word on behalf of Colonel O'Brien. He is a faithful follower of the government, and I think it would be acceptable to him if he were to get employment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is a very good man.

Mr. BENNETT. It would only be fair return for the political services he renders to the government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is not the way we do this work.

Mr. BLAIN. I see some very familiar names here. A. N. C. Treadgold got $491 for interest and expenses on gold exhibits at the Glasgow exhibition.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Treadgold had a collection of Klondike nuggets and he offered it to us and we undertook to pay the interest on the value and the insurance.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is Mr. Treadgold ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman knows as much about him as I do.

Mr. BLAIN. But I am asking for the information. I thought perhaps he might be some connection of the gentleman in the Treadgold concession.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I imagine he is the same man.

Mr. BLAIN. Has this anything to do with the concession ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nothing whatever.

Mr. BLAIN. The Bank of Commerce got $1,000 for a similar exhibit at Wolverhampton.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They have a branch in Dawson and we took their nugget and gold-dust exhibit and paid the interest and insurance.

Mr. BLAIN. J. Egan, of Halifax, was paid $600 damages done to his natural history exhibit. What is the explanation. It would appear to be carelessness on the part of the government employees.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In sending these natural history specimens from Paris to Glasgow they were damaged by sea water in such a way that they became practically worthless. We were responsible and we paid the value.

Mr. BLAIN. How were these exhibits selected ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The selection was made on the anthority and advice of Colonel Gourdeau, deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BENNETT. There are other familiar names besides Treadgold here. The Diamond Baker Lumber Company, of London, got $171 for fruit cases. How are these purchases made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are made where the articles can be obtained to the best advantage. Those in the fruit trade consider this to be an eminently good package and they were purchased for sending our fruit exhibits.

Mr. BENNETT. Among other familiar names we have McPherson and Schell of Alexandria, who got paid for cheese boxes. Is that Mr. Schell the member for Glengarry ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell whether he is or not.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps some of the minister's officials could tell him.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say just who the gentleman is. He is Mr. Schell, of Alexandria. Whether he is the member of parliament for Glengarry or not, I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister tell us at the next meeting of the committee ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will try to do so.

Mr. BENNETT. In case he proves to be the member for Glengarry, may I ask whether members of parliament will be preferred in future for supplies ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAIN. I see that for decorating and dressing exhibits Cl. Damond was paid $803. Is that the gentleman who the hon. minister said had charge of the decorations in connection with the different exhibitions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, Mr. Hay was the man I mentioned. I should imagine that is for the supply of materials, but I do not know.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the minister able to say what form that gold exhibit took ? Was it in the shape of nuggets ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was almost altogether nuggets, but there was a little dust also.

Mr. EARLE. Did these nuggets come from the Yukon or British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Those I refer to came from the Yukon. There were others that came from British Columbia, which were supplied by the provincial authorities.

Mr. EARLE. What other exhibits had you from British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We had a large mineral exhibit, given, I believe, by the provincial Department of Mines. We had also forestry and wood products, grains, foods and fish from British Columbia.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose it is not usual to pay interest on gold-dust and nuggets. The gentleman would scarcely expect to deposit them and get interest on them from the banks.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, yes, gold-dust may be turned into money at any time. We asked to have the use of them just as we might ask to have the use of so many dollars and pay interest on them.

Mr. CLANCY. Had Mr. Treadgold any interest in that exhibit other than that, as I suppose, he had a concession that he was advertising at the time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware of it. Mr. Treadgold owned the nuggets and loaned them to us, and we paid him for the loan of them.

Mr. CLANCY. Had he a concession in the Yukon at that time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know. I had nothing to do with the concessions.

Mr. CLANCY. Was he the same man who had the concession ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe he is. I know him personally, and I always took for granted that he was the man who got the concessions.

Mr. CLANCY. He was at that time, I suppose, attempting to float some scheme ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know the dates of Mr. Treadgold's various investments or schemes. But his name never appeared on those nuggets. Nobody who saw them knew that they came from him, or knew where they came from beyond the fact that they were from the Yukon. All that appears on them were the names of the creeks or mines from which they came.

Mr. CLANCY. Who owned the mines from which they came ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman that. I haven't them in my mind, and I do not know that we have a list of them ; but they were all in the Yukon. I may add that the transaction was arranged through the high commissioner's office in London.

Mr. CLANCY. It does not change Mr. Treadgold's interest in the transaction whether it was arranged in the high commissioner's office or in the hon. gentleman's.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, but the fact that his name did not appear on the exhibits would dispose of the idea that they were used by him for advertising purposes.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. minister can recall what mines were mentioned and who was associated with the mines ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that there was no name of any individual claim or mine. There was simply the name of the creek, such as Bonanza or Eldorado, over the specimens which came from that creek ; but the individual claim or mine or washing from which they came was not put on.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman say that they bore the name of any creeks or localities that are in any way associated with the Treadgold concession ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I confess I do not know just now what those creeks are, and I cannot tell exactly what creek the specimens came from, and consequently I cannot tell whether the names of those particular creeks were over the exhibits or not. But I believe that some of the richest claims were on the creeks whose names were mentioned.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the department or the high commissioner decide to make the exhibit of the gold nuggets, or did this whole matter originate with the High Commissioner in England ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say exactly where it originated. We were discussing our mining exhibit, and the question arose where we could get at reasonable cost some gold exhibits. Speaking entirely from memory, it seems to me that I received a letter from the High Commissioner stating that this exhibit was in London, and that we could get it on reasonable terms, and that I replied asking the High Commissioner to arrange to get it.

Mr. BLAIN. The fact is that Mr. Treadgold had these exhibits in the old country, and was advertising them in the interests of his mining speculations, and I suppose he suggested to somebody representing the Canadian government that it would be a good idea to have those nuggets exhibited at the expense of the government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When the arrangement was made this gold was in transit from the Yukon to London, and was not in London. It arrived after the arrangement was made.

Mr. BLAIN. When the nuggets were in transit an arrangement was entered into by the High Commissioner to pay Mr. Treadgold $491 for the use of them as an exhibit. Will the hon. minister regard that as a proper way to make a collection of the gold of the Yukon ? Would it not have been better for him to have made the collection on his own behalf ? Evidently Mr. Treadgold made a selection of the nuggets to advertise his concession, the government paid him $491 for the use of that collection as an exhibit, and Mr. Treadgold got all the advantage of the advertisement without any expenses, and made a profit on it beside.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As a matter of fact, this collection was not made for the purposes of the exhibition. But the government seized the opportunity of getting hold of a good collection of nuggets from the Yukon, and was fortunate in having had the opportunity. The arrangement was made to pay five per cent interest on the value of the gold and the insurance, and it seems to me that the government is to be congratulated for having been able to get a good collection of nuggets at that low price. To have made a similar collection ourselves would have entailed a good deal of expense. There was no advertisement of Mr. Treadgold's nuggets.

Mr. CLANCY. Could the hon. gentleman not have borrowed the money on the credit of Canada at as low a rate ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Then there can be no question of the saving of interest in that case. Does it not occur to the hon. gentleman that the government was made use of by Mr. Treadgold for the purpose of advertising his mining scheme ? The excuse offered by the hon. gentleman, namely, that these nuggets were accepted because Canada would have had to invest a good deal of money and lose the interest on it in making a collection of its own, is the last reason that

should be offered in a case of that kind. Has the hon. the Finance Minister brought the treasury into discredit by permitting such a transaction ? He is fond of boasting about his surplus of millions, and yet we have to capture an individual on the road and get him to part with his nuggets for the purposes of exhibition. The government accepted Mr. Treadgold's nuggets and paid him the interest ; that was not done in the interest of Canada, but for the special advantage of Mr. Treadgold and his scheme.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose it is because I am not blessed with such a lively imagination as my hon. friend, that I cannot see the evil in the transactions that he does. I cannot see any criticism he has made on it which would not apply to the obtaining of gold from any other living being. The government does not keep a stock of nuggets on hand. It will be generally admitted that the resources of Canada should be represented at these exhibitions. If we are making an exhibit of minerals, would it not be desirable that we should have an exhibit of gold from the Yukon and British Columbia and Nova Scotia ; and if we are to have such an exhibit, how are you going to get the gold ? The government do not keep it in stock. They must buy it or rent it, and wherever they get the gold they have to take the representation of those who own it as to the part of Canada from which it is taken ; and if on this particular exhibit the name of that portion of Canada from which it came was placed on it, where was the wrong ? The hon. member insisted that the name of Mr. Treadgold was on it.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not, from first to last, say or insist that his name was on it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman said it was used to advertise Mr. Treadgold's concession, but how could that be done if his concession was not mentioned in connection with it ?

Mr. CLANCY. I will tell the hon. gentleman later on.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It seems to me utterly impossible. If gold nuggets are accepted and they come from British Columbia, or the Yukon, or from some particular creek in Canada, is there anything wrong in our saying so ? In all our mineral exhibits, the place where each exhibit comes from is always indicated. We have dealt with this as we would have dealt with any other mineral exhibit. We placed it as a specimen of the wealth of Canada, and put on it a label telling what portion of Canada it came from. As to paying the interest, if we bought gold sovereigns we would have to pay the interest. And I think that when the Minister of Agriculture was able to make an arrangement for which he got the gold at simple interest at five per cent, that was a reasonable and fair and honourable arrangement ; and any person, including my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), if he were serious, would congratulate the Minister of Agriculture upon making such an excellent arrangement for exhibiting the gold of Canada.

Mr. CLANCY. I am quite ready to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture upon the simplicity which led to his being imposed upon. I do not attribute anything wrong to the minister. He has stated, what is, no doubt, the fact, that the arrangement was made not through him but through the High Commissioner.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He says it is a good arrangement.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, come to the other part of it. I stated that Mr. Treadgold's concession was advertised through the machinery and at the expense of Canada. His specimens were accepted and he was paid interest on them. When this is objected to, the answer was given that specimens had to be had somewhere. But let us see whether Mr. Treadgold or Canada was advertised. Mr. Treadgold was, naturally, anxious to bring his concessions to the notice of the investing public—these concessions that he had bought—no, I should almost apologize for saying that he bought them—the concessions that were given to him. Mr. Treadgold himself fixed the places where these specimens came from—there was no other way. Of course, every one of them would be announced as coming from some spot within the limits of his concession, and the effect of the arrangement was to advertise the specimens from Mr. Treadgold's concession at the expense of the country. So, I do not retract one word that I said, that Canada paid a sum—not enough to bankrupt the country, being only $400—for the use of specimens which were exhibited at our expense for his benefit. I think it would have been better had he paid Canada some thing to take charge of his exhibit. Of course, Mr. Treadgold did not take specimens to England to advertise other people's claims, but to advertise his own, and every one would be marked as coming from his concessions. I am not sure that no one can see more clearly than the Minister of Finance that Canada not only advertised Mr. Treadgold's concessions, but, in the form of interest on his specimens, paid him for the privilege of doing so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As I view the matter, there is not the slightest foundation for the statements the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is making. Every word he has said against the marking of these specimens with the locality of their origin would apply equally to a piece of stone, a column of coal, or a specimen of silver-lead ore. The origin of these things had to be marked upon them. When I go

through the Imperial Institute in London, I see specimens of Canada's mineral wealth, all marked, showing the portion of Canada from which they come. No doubt, Mr. Treadgold's specimens were treated as the other specimens were. Mr. Treadgold was the only person who could tell where they came from. Those who furnished specimens, being responsible people, would be looked to for that information and their statements would be accepted. If these specimens were labelled as coming from Eldorado creek or Bonanza, that would be following precisely the same course as would be followed in the case of a piece of silver-lead ore marked as coming from Rossland. I have no knowledge of the case except what has been stated here to-night, but I understand that these specimens were not labelled with Mr. Treadgold's name or with anything to associate them with his concession.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) prepared to say that these specimens were not associated, in the way of being labelled with the locality of origin, with Mr. Treadgold's concession ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already said that I have no knowledge of the case except what has been furnished by this discussion, and I presume that most members of the committee are in the same position. I say that, according to the information furnished by the Minister of Agriculture, these were not associated with Mr. Treadgold's concession or Mr. Treadgold's business venture, but they were marked with the place of origin, just as any other mineral specimens were. It would be as reasonable to say that because a specimen of ore was marked as coming from Rossland, B.C., you were trying to promote the interest of some speculator in Rossland. The whole thing is utterly absurd.

Mr. CLANCY. It is quite usual for people from the province of Ontario and elsewhere to exhibit as private persons or companies. We found such exhibits at the Pan-American, and they are to be found at every exhibition. It is perfectly right to use such exhibits for the promotion of business interests of the exhibitor. But does anybody suppose that Mr. Treadgold having these concessions, that he was endeavouring to place upon the English market, would give as the place of origin of any of these specimens any claim that was not covered by his own concessions ? My hon. friend may be imposed upon in some other way, but I am sure that he sees how Canada was imposed upon in this case. I wish to point out the difference between specimens of gold and specimens of coal or any other mineral. Though Mr. Treadgold was probably in the way of making his own exhibit, the government received his specimens, marked, no doubt, as coming from claims in Mr. Treadgold's concession, and allowed him interest upon them. The expense involved was a small sum, but to that extent, Canada was used entirely for Mr. Treadgold's purposes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will admit, for the sake of the argument, that every specimen furnished by Mr. Treadgold was marked as coming from some mine in Mr. Treadgold's concession. But that makes no difference whatever. They were treated in exactly the same way as other mineral specimens, so far as that was concerned. The only difference between specimens of gold and specimens of other minerals is that gold is an article of value, and, while you have it, you must pay interest on it, whereas the owners of coal or other less expensive products are ready to offer specimens without charge.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, but the hon. gentleman was advertising Mr. Treadgold's concession as against the concessions of other people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then, if a specimen furnished by some British Columbia mine owner, say Mr. Dunsmuir, or some other, were marked as coming from the place of origin would that be advertising the owner's business at the expense of Canada ? The only difference, as I say, is that gold is a valuable article, and represents so many gold sovereigns, and, you can only get it by paying interest.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has any statement been made as to what has been paid to my fellow townsman (Mr. Egan) for his exhibit ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was not in the House when I explained that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The cases of birds were damaged.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But surely Mr. Egan must have been paid interest, because his specimens were articles of value.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But not valuable articles in the same class as gold.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to claim that the amount paid was not enough ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, I dare say that was all right. What was the value of Mr. Egan's exhibit ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was sent to Paris, and, though somewhat damaged there, it was furbished up and sent on to Glasgow, but was so damaged that it was not fit to be used again.

Mr. BENNETT. There is one consolation in this matter, and that is that if Mr. Tread-

gold's scheme was advertised at the expense of the Dominion, it did not cost as much as another famous exploitation of the Yukon. It will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen that when the famous Mackenzie & Mann exploitation of the Yukon was launched on the British public, it was advertised at the expense of this country, for Mr. Ogilvie went over there and lectured throughout Great Britain while under the pay of Canada in order to capture the public there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Ogilvie was an official of the people of Canada long before this government came into power, and was generally regarded as a most honourable and capable officer, and I do not think he would engage in anything which was inconsistent with his duty. I cannot contradict my hon. friend's statement, because he may have facts which I do not possess, but I do not think Mr. Ogilvie would take such a step at variance with his duties.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This exhibit was not the only gold exhibit, as a matter of fact there were other gold exhibits there, treated in the same way. The Bank of Commeree had a large exhibit at Glasgow and also at Wolverhampton. There were a number of other persons treated in the same way as Mr. Treadgold, and had just the same advertisement. But there was no advertisement in any shape or way. The whole mineral exhibit, whether gold or otherwise, is labelled showing the places from which it comes. We get the best specimens we can collect to show the minerals of Canada, and we label the places from which they come, just as these gold exhibits were labelled. That is the only advertisement there was, and it cannot be called one.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Would this particular exhibit of Mr. Treadgold have been exhibited had it not been taken over by the government ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. It was on its way over to be sold in London, and the moment the exhibition was over it was taken by Mr. Treadgold and melted down and sold.

Mr. BOYD. The most important item the minister is asking for now is to pay for the exhibit that is to be taken to St. Louis. and the most important part of that is the live stock. Therefore I think the minister should be prepared to give the names of these individuals who object to taking live stock, which the minister says has not yet been decided on.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is not the reason it has not yet been decided.

Mr. BOYD. I think until it is decided upon, the committee should rise and this item should not pass. At any rate, I must appeal to the Minister of Finance and protest against the way he is forcing us to go on when so many members of the House are absent. I appeal to him, because he comes from one of the outlying districts whose members are compelled to remain here and do business, while those living nearer go away every Friday night. We find that every Friday night this House is practically without representatives from the province of Quebec, and largely from Ontario. There are only two men from the province of Quebec in this Chamber tonight, and every Friday night from four o'clock onwards there is scarcely a quorum of members here. Indeed there would not be a quorum if it depended on members sitting opposite. Every Friday night these important questions are brought forward, and it is only members from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories and British Columbia who remain here. If we could get away as easily as those other men do, there would not be a quorum in the House. I protested earlier in the session at the late date at which this session was called together. Here we are now well on into June, and I am told we are to be pressed into three sessions a day in the course of another week, that we are to have ten o'clock sessions. The chief business of the session has not yet been taken up. It is well known that the most important issues that were to engage the attention of this House were the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill, the Redistribution and the estimates. The Grand Trunk Pacific Bill and the Redistribution have not yet come before us. The important departments of the Minister of Railways and the Minister of the Interior have not yet been touched. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the Minister of Finance who is leading the House and who comes from one of the outlying districts, to say to his followers : All right gentlemen, if you must go home on Friday evening or Friday morning, we will adjourn at six o'clock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot agree with my hon. friend's conclusions, though I may sympathize with much of his reasoning. I do not think he is in a position to throw any stones at the province of Quebec. The province of Ontario has a larger representation than the province of Quebec, and if you count the members you will find that the province of Ontario, that sends the largest number of gentlemen to either side of the House, is not much better represented in proportion than the province of Quebec. Therefore, the hon. gentleman should not single out Quebec in respect to the absentees. There are always a few faithful Tories and a few good Liberals present to attend to the business. But, I sympathize with what my hon. friend said in regard to members being absent not only

on Friday night, but sometimes on other nights. We are not much better off on Mondays than we are on Fridays. But, I cannot agree that that is a reason why we should not do any business on Friday night. There are only three, or perhaps four, days in the week during which we can have a full attendance, and if we are not to do any business except on those days we will be here till October next. In regard to what my hon. friend said about three sessions a day, I have not heard any resolve on the part of the government to have three sessions a day, but I must say that I would rather have three sessions a day than adjourn on Friday. As to the question of government business, there has not been a session within my experience, and I have no doubt within the experience of other hon. gentlemen, when the government business has been more ready for the House than it has been at this session. There has never been a moment when there was not ample business to engage the attention of the House. In regard to the statement of my hon. friend that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) have not asked for anything, the complaint is, on the other hand, that we have been asking too much. When we bring on the estimates we are told we must bring on Bills, and when we bring on Bills we are told that we are afraid to face the opposition by moving supply and that, therefore, we bring on Bills. It is exceedingly hard to please hon. gentlemen opposite. It seems that whatever we do is wrong. I want to appeal to my hon. friend—he and I come from those outlying parts of Canada ; we belong to the faithful few who are here day and night—whether the best way to punish the absentees is not to stay and go on with the work so that they will lose the opportunity of participating in the discussion. Seriously, I am quite sure my hon. friend cannot ask this item to be held over simply because he has misunderstood an observation made by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has found fault with hon. members representing Quebec for being absent on Friday night and he says he is here because he cannot get away. I do not think he should find fault. It is the members who can get away that are away.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) during the past couple of weeks, has been almost entirely absent from the House. Doing what ? Is it not an awkward situation for him to be in to be lecturing other hon. members for being away when he has been absent for two weeks ?

Mr. BOYD. I have not been absent for two weeks, or one week. The statement I made is correct, and I think I have a right to protest in the manner I have done. Nothing that the hon. Minister of Finance has said has relieved the situation so far as the real business for which we were brought here is concerned. The three important questions that we were brought to this House to consider have not yet been brought to the attention of the House, notwithstanding the late day at which the session was called. I still have to say that if we are to be treated as we have been treated in the face of the absence of so many members we should not be expected to sit until the early hours of the morning.

Mr. COWAN. You are not accustomed to going to bed early.

Mr. BOYD. I understand all that. If we are to be treated in this way we should not be forced to sit on Friday evening and to continue until the early hours of the morning.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is addressing the wrong audience. Instead of scolding those present he should try to get an audience of the absentees and read that lecture to them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) is not making any mistake, because this same thing prevails in church. It is only those who are there that get the lecture.

Mr. COWAN. I hope you are not insinuating that the hon. member for Macdonald belongs to that congregation.

Mr. BLAIN. At page D—26 of the Auditor General's Report I find this item :

Alex. Carder, Winnipeg, mounted heads and birds used for decoration,$1,015.

Would the hon. gentleman give us an explanation as to how these were selected, and by whom ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were selected in the same way as the Egan collection was for the Paris exhibition, and they were sent from Paris to Glasgow. I believe they are now in the High Commissioner's office.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister states that this collection of birds and heads together with the collection which was made at Halifax was sent from one exhibition to the other in the old country. I wish to take exception to that system of exhibiting specimens from Canada. I would like the hon. minister to give us a statement as to what classes of goods were sent from one exhibition to the other in the old country and whether he proposes to follow the same system at the St. Louis exhibition. If he does the people who attend and see the Canadian exhibit, will come to the conclusion that we have just one set of samples, and that we send it around to exhibitions in the same way as the ladies show their quilts at the fall fairs. If the hon. minister wishes to make a creditable display at the St. Louis exhibition, he should not get the exhibit up

out of old exhibits, but he should make a new selection even if it costs a little more money. Notwithstanding what the hon. minister has stated, I wish to say that I think that some agreement should be entered into between the government and the manufacturers whereby the government could expend a large amount of money in the preparation of a building so that they might be able to make an exhibition of Canadian goods within the Canadian building. I should like the hon. minister to make a statement that whatever furnishings are purchased in connection with the St. Louis exhibition will be Canadian goods. It would be well to make a Canadian gold exhibit, that if $491 is to be paid out of the Canadian treasury it shall be paid to some Canadian, rather than to Mr. Treadgold, who lives in the old country. In looking at the detailed expenditure in connection with the Paris exhibition, I find that there are thousands of dollars paid to people living in the old country for the furnishings that were put in the Canadian building. There could not be a better opportunity of exhibiting Canadian goods than to take Canadian goods over there even if it cost more money. The building in itself, if it is Canadian, will represent Canadian shingles on the roof, Canadian siding, Canadian furniture, and even printing material. All this will stand for Canada and show the people what we are doing in the way of manufacturing, &c. The minister has stated that he will consult the Live Stock Association as to that exhibit, and he might very well consult with other representative bodies as regards other exhibits. It would save a great deal of expense if he did so and it would result in a much more creditable exhibit on the part of Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A large industrial building will be erected in St. Louis in which all the manufactured goods will have to be exhibited under the rules, so that the Canadian building will not be for exhibition purposes but will be furnished and arranged so as to illustrate Canadian products. For instance, there would be no use taking Canadian nails to use in the erection of the building. If we drove them into the boards on the floor they would make no sort of an exhibit, and if I can get nails in St. Louis at one-third the price of buying them here and sending them there it would be folly not to buy them in St. Louis. I hope of course to have a splendid exhibit of Canadian nails at St. Louis and I merely use that as an illustration of what I mean.

Mr. BLAIN. If the minister has an exhibition of Canadian nails he might use some of them in the construction of the building. In my humble opinion every particle of the material used in the Canadian building at St. Louis should be of Canadian product. If the employees could say that everything in the building was manufactured or grown in Canada it would be in the interest of Canada, and it would be a pride to Canadians and the friends of Canada who visit that exhibition. The minister cannot pretend to say that it has been the practice in the past to use goods of Canadian manufacture, because at the Paris exhibition thousands and thousands of dollars worth of even furniture not of Canadian manufacture was purchased. In one case $1,000 was paid for carpets which were not of Canadian manufacture.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Was any portion of the expense of the Manitoba exhibit at the Pan-American exhibition borne by this government ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All we did with regard to the provincial exhibits was to facilitate their arrangement through our commissioner. The Dominion government did not make a special exhibit at the Pan-American beyond the decorative exhibits of the Canadian building.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the minister made any general remarks on the benefits of these exhibitions to Canada and more particularly the Japan exhibition, which he has had the pleasure of attending, and which prevented his presence here during the early part of the session ? It would be of interest to the House if the minister told us about that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Do you not think it would be too bad for the absent members to miss that lecture ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It might have the effect of punishing them for not being present.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is the first question that has been put to me in regard to this exhibition. I will not at this late hour of the evening detain the House at very great length.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the minister proposes to speak at some length, I would not ask him at this late hour of the night. He might do so on some other occasion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think there would be any other opportunity for it, but I may tresspass on the patience of the House to say a word or two with regard to our opportunities and the hopes for trade with the empire of Japan. I suppose I may say that I am myself personally responsible for the fact that we took part in that exhibition. For many years I have been reading about and studying the orient and the question of trans-Pacific trade. I felt that in the future, I believed in the near future, there would be an enormous expansion of trade between this continent and the continent of Asia. Believing that, I have been looking into the progress of the nations on the other side of the Pacific ; and it seems to me that

there was every indication, from the enormous development of Japan during the past sixty years, since the revolution there, of a most magnificent trade between the western coast of this continent, and even the eastern part of this country, and the orient, especially the empire of Japan. Japan is a densely populated country, with over 40,000,000 people, very thickly settled in a country which can hardly feed them, even under the old conditions, when their food was of the simplest character. They are now opening their gates to foreign countries, and they are adopting the methods of an enormous industrial development. Heretofore, their industries have been what are called home industries, the people doing their work in their own homes or in small workshops. They are now establishing enormous factories and works all over the country according to the method of occidental nations, and consequently the people are being taken away from the production of food to these industrial centres. As an illustration, I may mention that the city of Osaka, where the exhibition was held, increased in population in the last four years from 700,000 people to over 1,000,000, the city of Tokio increased in the last ten years from 700,000 or 800,000 to 1,500,000, and the population of Japan has increased in the course of the last ten years by over 5,000,000. The result is that the people of Japan can no longer feed themselves; and, as they ask for better food and more of it, they must go abroad for that food. Up to the present time our American neighbours have had practical control of the market there. It has not been an extremely large market. They have not been asking greatly for foreign food; but now they are doing so, and I believed that it was very important that Canada should make an entry into that market in this early stage of its development and show what we could do in competition with our neighbours. Therefore I urged on my colleagues the importance of making an exhibit in Japan, and I rejoice to say that the result of that exhibit and of my observations there has most amply justified that view. I believed that the best things for us to exhibit in Japan were the class of goods which seemed most likely to find a market there. Flour is one of the chief articles of trade between America and Japan. Heretofore what is called Oregon or Washington flour has held the complete market there. That is very far inferior to our Canadian flour, not only in quality, but in strength to make bread; and I was quite sure that any intelligent people who could see the bread made from Canadian flour, and how much more could be made from a barrel of Canadian flour than from a barrel of Pacific coast American flour, would be glad to get our flour.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There were tests made at the exhibition, I suppose?

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We made tests years ago. We have known for years that Canadian flour contained a much greater proportion of gluten than any other flour in the world, especially than the flour made from the soft wheats grown in the United States. Knowing that, I asked Mr. Hutchison, who is himself an old miller of long experience, to have comparative investigations made of the flour sent from the United States, and the flour that we would send. We were so satisfied with the results of that investigation that we felt convinced that a special exhibit of the qualities of Canadian flour at the exhibition would yield good results. We not only arranged to send an exhibit of flour, but appliances for baking, and we had bread baked in the exhibition from Canadian flour. The result was one of the most enormous successes in the whole exhibition. People were simply wild and crazy to get samples of the bread. We had orders from hotels and restaurants throughout Osaka, who agreed to take all the bread that we could give them. We gave it to them on condition that they would state on their bills of fare that it was Canadian bread made from Canadian flour. We were able to supply them with bread of a quality such as they had never seen before. The result of the exhibit is that we have been already besieged with orders for Canadian flour, and I am glad to know that two of the great milling companies have arranged to send special agents to Japan. I may say in this connection that while we have done that, Canada will not reap the benefit of that expenditure and work unless the men engaged in the business in this country will make the necessary sacrifices to push their trade in the face of the energy and activity of their rivals in the United States. As confirmation of what I say, I may state that in American journals there have been letters from Americans in Japan most severly criticising the government of the United States because it allowed Canada to get ahead of it in the way we did at the Osaka exhibition. I have been most gratified at the result of this exhibit. Not only for our western farmers and millers, but even for eastern Canada there is to-day, as a direct result of the exhibition we made there, a market for an enormous trade in flour, in the empire of Japan, in China, and in the whole orient; because visitors from China, Hong Kong, Manilla, the Straits Settlements and Singapore, were at that exhibition, and were all attracted by our Canadian exhibits and the excellence of the arrangement. On the very day that I sailed from Japan, the first of May last, a special messenger was sent from Osaka to Yokohama to present to Mr. Hutchison, who came with me, a medal for the best arranged and most artistically designed exhibit at the exhibition. That was awarded to the Canadian exhibit by the unanimous voice of the jury of awards for the whole exhibition, and it has been

brought here and placed in the department as a trophy of our victory. I have spoken of this flour exhibit. It was, however, only one of several. In addition to that, I venture to say that there is also a good chance for developing a large market for lumber and all the products of the forest in Japan. Japan is a forest country, but the demand for lumber is increasing and its forests are becoming exhausted. I was rather disgusted, I must confess, to find first-class Canadian lumber sold as Oregon pine. The people took for granted that it came from the United States, and it was handled by the merchants of Seattle, Takoma and Portland, and not by the merchants of Victoria and Vancouver to any great extent. If our lumbermen from the western provinces will only undertake to push their goods in that market, there is abundant scope there for a large and profitable trade. Among other things we showed was a small furniture exhibit. When we were arranging the exhibit, the Consul General of Japan advised us to rent a furnished house as there was not much accommodation at the hotel for European and American travellers, and in that connection I may say that the Japanese methods of living and the arrangements of their houses are entirely foreign to us and very inconvenient and uncomfortable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Occasionally they are described as picturesque.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but not comfortable. We did not succeed in renting a house, and my commissioner made arrangement with a hotel to take our people on a reasonable basis. This furniture was put on exhibition and attracted a good deal of attention. We could have sold it fifty times over at prices that would have given plenty profit after paying all the charges, duty and commission. To-day that furniture is all sold to people of prominence who were eager to get it and to show it as a trophy of the Canadian exhibit, and it will be an advertisement of Canadian furniture for a long time to come. I have been urging the same organization which sent furniture to the Buffalo exhibition to immediately send an agent to Japan, and if they do they will get a large trade of a most profitable character. We also had another exhibit of pulp and paper which ought to result in a large trade. It may be rather new to many people that the Japanese are extremely fond of newspapers, and that there is an enormous press circulation there. They get all their paper from Europe and I believe that a great deal of it is made from Canadian pulp, which is sent to England and France and then exported to Japan in the shape of paper. In the city of Osaka, there are two newspapers with a circulation each of over a 100,000 daily, besides a large number of newspapers with even greater circulations. We had an exhibit of pulp in its different stages of manufacture as well as the raw wood and the different kinds of paper made from it in Canada. This attracted great attention and many inquiries, and if to-day our paper and pulp manufacturers can meet the demand, they will find a large market in Japan. We had in addition a cold storage exhibit of our fruits, which excited great interest. There is undoubtedly a market in Japan for British Columbia green fruit. In that respect Japan is rather backwards. They grow very little of the fruits we are accustomed to. They have cherry trees without cherries, plum trees without plums, and peach trees without peaches. We hear a great deal of the cherry trees of Japan, but they are grown from blossoms and have no fruit, and the same may be said of their plums and peaches. They have been growing apples in recent years in the northern part of the island, which were introduced from Europe and America, and are doing so most successfully, but they cannot meet the demand of the people for fresh fruit. Our British Columbians can send over there fresh fruit to large extent and find a good market. Canned meats, fruits and vegetables would also find ready sale. In salmon there is already a considerable export from British Columbia and that trade is steadily increasing. Under these circumstances there is evidently a great opening for trade with Japan. The ordinary labouring class there are getting better wages than ever before and they are beginning to understand European and American ways of living; they are asking for the thing used by us. The Americans are active in the propaganda of their own trade, and if we are to reap the advantages to be derived from an exhibition of this kind, our people must wake up and push their work. Trade is not going to fall into our mouths while we lie on our backs. The people who want to take advantage of the Japanese market must wake up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon. gentleman any suggestion to make as to any particular step we should take?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The first thing is for us to send our agents there. Our furniture organization ought to send our agents, so ought our paper mills. Our smaller industries could combine together and send out agents. They should do so at once, and as the name of Canada gets better known there will be more and more trade to be done and better facilities for doing it. I may say to my hon. friend that until this exhibition took place, there were scarcely any people in Japan who knew of the existence of Canada. Everything that came from the American continent was credited to the United States, even in the case of goods from British Columbia. British Columbia was not known to Japan except as a country which tried to legislate against the Japanese. I may

tell my hon. friend that the chief difficulty I had in dealing with the people there was the fact that British Columbia was attempting to legislate against the Japanese. The Japanese are proud and rather sensitive. They are a nation in the sense of coming lately into the comity and family of a nation of the world though their civilization extends back a thousand years. Amongst the people of the western world they are a young nation, and they are proud of the fact that recently they have been accepted as the ally of the British empire and have been received among the civilized nations of the world. They resent extremely the idea of being classed with the barbarian Chinese, and of having any special legislation against them in any country with which they are asked to trade, I say this because it is the only one thing that interfered in any way with the desire on the part of the Japanese to trade and to open up more friendly and more extended relations with us. I may say that, in consequence of the fact that I was a minister of the Crown here—partially at all events, but not altogether perhaps, because the exhibit had been arranged before I reached there and the impression had been largely created—I was received with the greatest cordiality and courtesy by everybody. Every facility was placed at my disposal to present the views and ideas of Canada, and every opportunity to let the people know what we had to sell and how we could open and improve the trade there.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the hon. gentleman deliver any addresses in Japan ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was entertained at three or four banquets, and spoke at them, dwelling a little upon these matters. That was not, however, the only or the most important fact. Perhaps it is a little difficult for us in this matter of fact country to understand the point of view of the oriental mind. They are a people of ceremony, a people very largely impressed with titles. And when the Minister of Agriculture from Canada was received by the Minister of Foreign Affairs or entertained by the government of the country or presented personally at a special audience to the Emperor and Empress, that created an impression amongst these people which we here can hardly appreciate or understand, because we do not think so much of these things as the people in the orient do. These facts were circulated all through the country, and people who had never heard of Canada before began to ask where Canada was and what it was. Then, I must say that the authorities at the exhibition and everybody connected with it, were most kind and courteous, and gave us every facility, if I may say so, to advertise our wares and our country. In that way, perhaps, an impression was created greater than could have been created in any other way. I know that Americans and Europeans travelling through the country were immensely impressed with what Canada had done. They were astonished, and not only did they congratulate us, but they went so far as to criticise and condemn their own governments for having let slip an opportunity of which Canada had taken the greatest advantage. I am afraid I have rather wearied the House by speaking so long on the subject. But personally I believe there is a great deal in it, I am satisfied that great benefit will accrue to Canada through the expenditure made in this service, if the people who are engaged in the lines of trade affected will take it up and push it now while the impression that Canada has made is fresh in the Japanese mind, and when they can do the best work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did the hon. gentleman come to any conclusion as to the future of the industrial life and activity started in Japan in its effect as to the export of the manufactures of that country ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I watched that very closely and investigated it as far as the time at my disposal would allow. I spoke, a few moments ago of the fact that only recently the industrial production of Japan was what might be called home industry. That system of production results in individuality of product, but not in uniformity. They have now adopted the factory system in textiles and in all matters of iron production. In some other respects, they have refused to adopt that system. As a matter of fact, the government found that the change was so rapid and produced such crucial effects that it was almost shaking the foundations of their society. Therefore, a check has been deliberately put by the authorities upon the change that was taking place in the direction of adopting the factory system. In their factory production we see the effects of the old training. A thousand pieces of cotton turned out by a Japanese factory are not so perfect or so uniform as a thousand pieces turned out by one of our factories. The old inherent quality still remains with the present generation of their people, and I think it will be some time before you can get as uniform and as generally perfect production as those of our old established industries and well-trained operatives. I think it will probably be a generation or two before Japan can reach that point. At the same time she is making great progress in that direction, producing great quantities of goods, which, though not quite as good as can be produced in the United States or England or Canada, still are fairly good. I do not believe that Japan is going to enter into competition with the occidental nations in the market of the world for some time to come. But there

are certain lines of goods that we cannot sell them now. Cotton we sent. Silk goods, of course, we cannot pretend to send. They make the best silk goods in the world, and send out large quantities, this being the largest article of their trade. Iron goods we cannot sell to them. They make wonderful tools, with marvellous temper and edge, and in ordinary castings, &c., they have been very successful in adapting themselves to the American and European methods of production. They show wonderful facilities in organizing new industries. I visited several of these and was astonished to find great establishments employing thousands of operatives, without a single European or American among them; organized from top to bottom by Japanese, managed by Japanese, the work-people all Japanese, and turning out—especially in the iron industry—most excellent work. When I say most excellent work, I do not say that it is quite up to the best work in America and Europe, but still very good work. I had the opportunity of visiting a large ship-building yard in the town of Kobe. At the head of it was a man of about thirty-five, a graduate of Cambridge University. He had taken the scientific and engineering courses, and had spent seven years in Europe preparing for his work. Returning to Japan he organized this industry. The concern employs four thousand operatives, and has a most complete organization. He had organized a savings bank for his operatives, established reading rooms and museums, in short, had as complete and modern an organization as any I know of in Europe or America. That concern was completely organized and carried on by a Japanese, for Japanese, with Japanese capital. That is only one instance of many. For that reason, I have not dwelt so much on the general possibilities of trade in ordinary manufactures there. Still I am not prepared to say that there is no opportunity; I think there is in certain lines.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the hon. gentleman sits down, I would like to ask if he was able to make such observations of the social and economic conditions as would justify him in coming to a conclusion with respect to the effect that extensive emigration from Japan might have upon our conditions in Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am satisfied, in the first place, that there will be no such emigration from Japan. The Japanese are a home-loving people, and they have abundant opportunity for progress and industry in their own country. The Japanese government itself forbids the emigration of anybody from the country without a permit, and for several years past, they have refused to issue a permit to any Japanese to come from Japan to Canada who is a labourer or of the ordinary labouring class. Permits are issued only to merchants, students and travellers.

Mr. CLANCY. Did that extend to emigration to any other country than Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The system extends to every country, no Japanese can leave his own country without a permit from his government. The government there, in accordance with negotiations with our government, have issued orders, I think, about two years ago, that for the future no permit should be given to a Japanese, except the classes I have mentioned, to go to Canada, and that has been strictly maintained to the present time. I had the assurance of the government there, personally and in writing, that that policy would be maintained.

My hon. friend spoke about the possibilities of industrial invasion. I consider that there is no prospect of that. The Japanese are a home-loving people, proud of their nation, proud of their empire, and a most devoted patriotism seems to inspire them from top to bottom of every class, men, women and children. The one thing that strikes a visitor is the intense and devoted patriotism of the Japanese for their own country. That means that they do not wish to leave it, they want to stay there. To be sure, some enterprising people go out, but generally speaking the people remain at home. They have now, with their industrial development, an abundant opportunity for labour in their own country, and consequently there is no great inducement for them to go out. Wages are improving, and they are satisfied apparently with their condition.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the hon. gentleman's opinion as to the articles of food now entering into general consumption by the masses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Among the articles of food they are going to take up first, will be bread. They ate rice before, and bread is beginning to take its place. The ordinary labourer uses bread only as a luxury, while the well-to-do people are beginning to eat it as we do. Flour therefore is the first thing. They are beginning to eat more meat, they do not produce much meat in that country. They have very few animals, so few as to be hardly noticeable. They eat a large quantity of fish, very good fish, and they have great fisheries. I believe there will be considerable trade with them in canned meat. I do not believe we can send mutton there, because the Australians are sending in large quantities, and we cannot compete with them. But we ought to be able to send beef there, and hog products. They are beginning to eat pork and bacon, although at first, when Europeans began to go there, they did not seem to care much for them. They have a good deal of poultry there, I

do not think we will be able to send much poultry or eggs for some time to come.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They have extensive fisheries of their own, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but still they buy considerable fish from British Columbia, and their purchases are increasing.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Have they any native dairy products ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Practically none. We can send them butter and some cheese. I may say my department has been sending them butter for two or three years. But since I have been there the trade, I think, will decidedly improve. As a rule, however, they do not eat butter. They use a great deal of rape seed oil instead, for cooking. But as they begin to eat bread they will want butter with it.

Mr. BLAIN. What about their tariff regulations ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They have got a low tariff.

Mr. BLAIN. What would be the duty on furniture ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think 10 per cent or 12 per cent; on flour about the same, but I am speaking from memory only. It is a decidedly low tariff, and we stand in the same position with respect to all these articles as everybody else. They have treaties with certain countries giving them the most-favoured-nation advantages which those countries give them on certain articles, but it happens that nearly all those articles are things we do not produce. Now, I wish to say to my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) that I am ready to go back to the census item and to give him the information that he asked for.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is so late now I think we had better stop. I am sure we are all very much indebted to the hon. gentleman for the very interesting account he has given us of the exhibition and the people of Japan.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not want to be unreasonable, but in the early part of the evening the hon. member for Bothwell refused to let me go on with the census item because I had not certain information. I have that information now, and I would like to give it.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not object to the information but there is a great deal more that the committee will want to get.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have asked my officers to stay here and get this information, and I propose to give it to the committee. The hon. gentleman wanted information as to the questions asked in the schedules of the census of 1891 and of 1901. In schedule 3, are questions relating to houses and constructions, houses inhabited and houses uninhabited. These are in schedule 2 of 1901, but were not in the schedules of 1891. Then questions in relating to the French Canadians and place of birth of father and mother, and persons unemployed during the week preceding the census, the employer to state average number of hands employed during the year, were not asked in 1901. The questions relating to colour, to the month and the day of birth, to the year of birth, to the year of immigration to Canada, to the year of naturalization, racial or tribal origin, nationality, living on one's own means, working on one's own account, working at a trade, in a factory or in the home, months employed in trade in a factory, months employed in trade in the home, months employed in other occupations than at a trade in a factory or in the home, earnings from occupation or trade, extra earnings from other than the chief occupation or trade, months at school in the year, whether can speak English or can speak French, which is the mother tongue, if it is spoken—were all in the census of 1901, and not in the census of 1891.

Mr. CLANCY. That relates to schedule 2 in 1901, as compared with schedule 1 in 1891.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As compared with schedule 1.

Mr. BOYD. How long is this going to take to read ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It will take some time.

Mr. BOYD. There is no quorum in the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think there is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are only nineteen members in the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) will find that there is a quorum in the House. There were five questions in 1891 which were not asked in 1901, and there were nineteen questions in 1901 which were not asked in 1891.

Mr. CLANCY. In connection with what schedule ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In connection with the schedule I have just read over.

Mr. CLANCY. That is No. 1 schedule ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, schedule No. 2. There were questions asked in 1901 that were not asked in 1891—place of habitation, name of municipality

or township, or parish, range or concession, number of lot, street and house number, or other description. Then there were also the number of families in the house or institution, number who remained in the house or institution, religious denomination and number of communicants, capacity of the edifice or church. Under Sunday schools, there were religious denomination, number of officers and teachers and number of scholars. All these are questions that were asked in 1901 and were not asked in 1891. That is in schedule No. 2.

Mr. CLANCY. Were there any questions in schedule No. 2 of 1891 that were asked in regard to deaths in public institutions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, there were none in schedule No. 2. In schedule No. 3 there was one question in 1901 that was asked in 1891, that is as to whether they were single, married or widowed, and there was also a question in addition as to whether they were divorced.

Mr. CLANCY. How many were dropped in 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was one additional. There were none dropped in schedule No. 3. In schedule No. 4——

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister has not finished No. 3. Schedule No. 2 in 1891 corresponds partly with schedule No. 3 in 1901. Schedule No. 3 in 1901 would seem to correspond to some extent with schedule No. 4 in 1891. The hon. gentleman has not given a comparison between No. 3 in 1891 and No. 3 in 1901.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Schedule No. 3 in 1891 included real estate, orchard products, vineyards and market gardens. Schedule No. 4 in 1901 includes farm land, fruits and plantations. That corresponds with schedule No. 3 practically.

Mr. CLANCY. How many were dropped in 1891, and what was the increase in 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were none dropped in 1901, but there were several added. In schedule No. 4 there were sixteen questions asked in 1901 that were not asked in 1891.

Mr. CLANCY. None in No. 4 of what census ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. During the last census there were sixteen questions that were not in any schedule in 1891. I have them all marked here. I can read them if the hon. gentleman wishes it.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman had better read them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All right,—number of fruit-bearing apple trees, number of non-bearing apple trees ; and then there is the same question in regard to peach trees, pear trees, plum trees, cherry trees, grape vines ; and besides that there was a question as to the acreage of trees planted, the plantations of forests and the number of trees planted.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that include Nos. 3 and 4 in the census of 1891 ? The hon. gentleman will see that there is a question as to farm products.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were none of these questions that I have just read out in the schedules of 1891.

Mr. CLANCY. Were any dropped that were asked in 1891 ? If hon. gentlemen are becoming unruly it must be that they are impatient with the Minister of Agriculture. We cannot hear anything. There are fifty-three questions in Nos. 3 and 4. Are they covered by the thirty-seven items in item 4, in 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Schedules 3 and 4 in 1901 cover real estate, orchards, nurseries, vineyards, market gardens and farm products, and that included item Nos. 4 and 5 schedules in 1891 in part. There are in these two schedules of 1901, seventy-four questions, while in the corresponding schedules of 1891 there are only fifty-three. In 5 there is question as to the number of acres of buckwheat, beans, forage crop for summer feeding, for winter feeding, for winter fodder, acres of tobacco, acres of hops.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there a column for fallow land ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there a column for fallow land in the census of 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman intend to press this item through to-night ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not see why we should not.

Mr. CLANCY. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it involves a good deal of discussion, and I do not think he ought to press it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the early part of the evening the hon. gentleman asked me a question in regard to this vote, and I told him it would take a little time to get the answer. I asked him while I was getting the answer to ask any other question, and I would give him the information. He said he had nothing more to ask.

Mr. CLANCY. I did ask other questions.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We sat here for ten minutes, and the hon. gentleman did not ask another question. I

got up and made a few explanations, and after I sat down I gave him another opportunity to ask questions, and he did not ask any until the information came down.

Mr. CLANCY. That is the fault of the hon. gentleman himself. I never knew a minister before not to have the information the House is entitled to, and then to rebuke members for not asking questions. If he took time to get the information we desired, it was his fault for not having the information. And now the hon. gentleman attempts at half-past one in the morning to lecture the committee for his own neglect. I do not think he will be acting in the best interests of the country to urge this item when there is so much in it that must be discussed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not lecture the House at all. I am ready to wait a while longer and answer the questions which the hon. gentleman wishes to ask.

Mr. CLANCY. The members of the committee are their own judges as to the questions they ask, and the hon. gentleman should be ready to answer them as they are asked.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is where I take issue with the hon. member. I have looked down from the gallery on Conservative ministers who have not been able to answer questions as they were asked, and promised to bring statements later.

Mr. CLANCY. What ministers in the past have done is no answer. We have not yet touched the fringe of this very important question. Surely the hon. gentleman is not going to press it at this hour.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am quite willing to let the hon. gentleman go on and discuss the question, and when the time comes to adjourn, we will adjourn.

Mr. CLANCY. Then the hon. gentleman may go on. Perhaps he will give us No. 5 schedule.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I gave the hon. gentleman the question in No. 5.

Mr. CLANCY. What was in the corresponding schedule of 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The corresponding schedule of 1891 did not contain these questions.

Mr. CLANCY. There was live stock in both of them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. 5 of 1891 does not correspond with No. 5 of 1901. No. 5 of 1891 is live stock; No. 6 is live stock in 1901.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman give what corresponds in these two columns?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In No. 6, live stock and animal products. The question is the number of pure-bred horses, pure-bred cattle, pure-bred sheep, pure-bred swine, and pure-bred poultry; poultry slaughtered, or sold for slaughter or exported; and the dozens of eggs. These questions were in No. 6 in 1901, and not in the census of 1891 at all. Schedule 5 in 1891 asks for the number of working oxen. That is asked, with a question about other horned cattle, in schedule 6 of 1901. Schedule 5 of 1891 asks for the number of swine over one year and under one year. That is contained in question 8 of schedule 6 of 1901. Schedule 5 in 1891, question 20, asked for the production of home-made cheese. This question was not asked at all in 1901; practically the product of home-made cheese has ceased in this country. In schedule 5 of 1891, question 25 asks for the quantities of home-made fabrics; that is not asked in 1901 at all.

Mr. CLANCY. What about furs ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Furs are included in the forestry schedule No. 9 of 1901, and there are three questions asked in regard to them.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice a great many changes in the different columns, and would like to have a general explanation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the introduction of the census volume No. 1, the hon. gentleman will find each individual change explained.

Mr. BLAIN. Why is it that the fallow land was not taken down ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because there is not much fallow land in Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. There is a great deal in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Compared with the quantity of cultivated land, it is very small.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that there is hardly a farm in western Ontario of a hundred acres in which there is not some fallow land every year. It seems to me rather strange that in the taking of the census you have the number of acres of wheat and oats, but not the number of acres of fallow land.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman's statement is worthy of every consideration. That question was not asked in 1891 nor in any of the former censuses in Canada. I believe that amount to be inconsiderable.

Mr. BLAIN. In western Canada and in Manitoba and the Territories, on every farm

there is a considerable amount of fallow land. Did the department give instructions to the enumerators when they began their work and afterwards withdraw those instructions and send out new ones ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that there was one item of instructions sent out in which there was a mistake, and we then sent other instructions in its place.

Mr. BLAIN. This would cause increased expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the printing probably, and in the corrections.

Mr. BLAIN. It was found that the totals would not correspond, and that the instructions were consequently not correct. If that be true, there must have been some change, and it would cost something to send out fresh instructions.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It did cost a few dollars.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how fresh instructions were sent out ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Telegrams were sent to the commissioners immediately with the amended instructions.

Mr. BLAIN. Why was the mistake made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was not noticed when the instructions were issued.

Mr. BLAIN. How did the enumerators receive their instructions. As I understand it, there was a commissioner for each county and an enumerator for each polling subdivision ? The enumerators were called together and the commissioner gave his instructions. Is that correct ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. And did the commissioners call the enumerators together a second time to correct the instructions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that the correction was made before the commissioner had given the instructions, so the correct instructions were given to the enumerators at first.

Mr. BLAIN. In every case ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that the correction was made in almost every case.

Mr. BLAIN. That was not the impression given when this matter was discussed last year. The impression given was that the enumerators had to be called together again to receive fresh instructions.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was a wrong impression.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not completed the schedule.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I read No. 6 of 1901. What else does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) want now ?

Mr. CLANCY. I want No. 7.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a schedule of agricultural values. All the questions except two are new. Shall I read them ?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, better get them on 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are as follows :

Value of : Land, buildings, rent of land and buildings, field crops, fruits and vegetables, nursery stock sold, horses, cattle, young cattle, sheep, swine, poultry, pure bred stock, bees, live stock sold in the year, cattle sold or slaughtered, sheep sold or slaughtered, swine sold or slaughtered, poultry sold or slaughtered, eggs, honey and wax.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman read the corresponding schedules for 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They did not exist. There were no farm values. That is one of the great blots on the census.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the nature of the questions as to land values ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have just read the list.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not ask for the list, but what is the nature of the questions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The value of the land was asked. I do not know what I can give more than that ?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman should keep a better temper. Assuming that an enumerator went to a house and found the husband or wife absent, what means did he take for obtaining the information ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He went back again and again until he found somebody who could give it to him.

Mr. CLANCY. Those were the instructions, but is the hon. minister warranted——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am warranted in saying that, because it is the absolute truth. Enumerators went again and again to get the information.

Mr. CLANCY. How does he know they went the second time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because, in hundreds of cases, they complained of the trouble of obtaining the information and said they were not paid enough for their trouble.

Mr. BLAIN. There has been a good deal of discussion over the census item during the last few years. Will the minister please

give a full explanation of the reasons of the increased cost of the taking this census as compared with the cost of taking the census of former years ?

Mr. SCOTT. Does the hon. gentleman want that to-night—or rather this morning ?

Mr. BLAIN. It seems that we are in no particular hurry. We are not responsible for the time when this item comes up. I was surprised, as a new member of the House, when the minister asked the committee to enter upon a discussion of this item at one o'clock.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At nine o'clock.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman commenced his estimates with the census item, but when some questions were asked he could not answer them, but sent for the information. Then, after some consultation with the Finance Minister, he said he would pass over that item.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said I would take up another item until I got the information.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. gentleman said it would take——

Some hon. MEMBERS. One at a time.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to set the hon. gentleman right. We have several hours to remain here, and hon. gentlemen opposite had better be good natured. The hon. minister said that the information I required would take a great deal of labour and suggested that I should call for a return. And he intimated to the House that there would be no reasonable probability of the information reaching here to-night.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have got the information here to-night.

Mr. SCOTT. Let the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) move for a return, in place of asking for this lengthy explanation at this hour of the morning.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think we had better rise unless we can have better order. So far as information is concerned, the Prime Minister himself suggested to us the other day when he took Mondays and it was pointed out to him that no returns could be moved for, that we could get the information during the course of the estimates. But that is not a reason for sitting here all night, that the minister does not have it until half past one o'clock in the morning. If the minister does not have the information ready at a reasonable hour, he can give it on another day. The only reason for our sitting so late to-night is that some information was asked for which the hon. gentleman said he did not have at the moment ; then the House, on the suggestion of the government, proceeded to take up another item. Then the minister himself entered into somewhat lengthy remarks at my own suggestion, and at the conclusion of those remarks the item under discussion passes, but then he tells us that his information has come and he proposes that we shall sit here for hours afterwards.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend has not put the matter quite fairly. I was quite ready to go on with the census estimate and discuss it, and if it had been discussed in a reasonable manner, we would have gone on and passed it. But the hon. gentleman refused to go on discussing that question until certain information of a special character was obtained. That information I have now got which the hon. gentleman wished to have. I have not got away from that information yet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Because the hon. gentleman has the information now at nearly two o'clock in the morning, that is no reason why we should sit here until four o'clock.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would have given it if I had been allowed to.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like the minister to give us a full explanation of the reasons of the increased cost of taking the census. For example, I might say that in the county I have the honour to represent—if hon. gentlemen opposite will not make less noise I can wait for them to quiet down.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I move that the committee rise.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is impossible for us to continue unless we have better order. There seems to be some disposition on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to prevent the progress of business, and I do not much wonder at it at this hour. We are sitting here at an unusual hour to gratify a whim of the Minister of Agriculture. Unless the Finance Minister who is leading the House can keep better order, I think we had better rise, unless he can assign us adequate reason for continuing to sit.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am as anxious as my hon. friend to get home, but when a considerable portion of the evening is occupied in questions which, in our judgement, are unreasonable, we may be pardoned if we want to sit a little while and overtake some of the business. As to the question of order, I quite agree with my hon. friend that as long as we are to remain here we should have perfect order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is not the case at the present time, we are not being heard. If the Minister of Finance cannot control the House he should move that the committee rise and report progress, and ad-

journ the House. He does not seem to be able to control the House very well this evening. There has been a great deal of interruption and noise during the latter part of the evening, conversation has been going on in an ordinary voice all over the House. I do not think the Minister of Finance should insist on going on at this hour of the morning.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend saved me the trouble of moving that the committee rise, he has made the motion which is now before the Chair.

Motion that the committee rise, negatived.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman asked for a certain answer and I am ready to give it. I am happy to give all the information I can. But, the hon. member for Peel asked me another question which I will answer.

Mr. BLAIN. I would be very sorry to interfere with the general statement on the schedules which the hon. gentleman is making and the answer to my question may remain over.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was not giving any general statement of these schedules but I was giving details to the hon. member for Bothwell. In general terms the reasons for the increased expenditure are such as have already been explained, the very great number of increased questions asked and the consequently greater time required to be spent and the greater work to be done by the enumerators. The fact that there were large areas in this country in which a great number of the enumerators had to be employed, where in 1891 very few indeed were employed and in some cases none at all added to the expense. I refer to British Columbia and the North-west Territories, Manitoba and the northern parts of Ontario and Quebec. Another reason is the fact that in 1901 the general scale of living and the expense of work were much greater than in 1891. The result was that we had to pay the men more to do similar work and more of it. In addition to the fact that a great many more questions were asked, the enumerators had in consequence of that not only to ask more questions but they had to do more work in working up and preparing their schedules and sending them in. Some of these questions were more complicated and the result was that the enumerators were obliged to go back more frequently and ask questions than in 1891. In consequence of the more extensive nature of the schedules they have required greater attention and a larger number of clerks have been employed in the compilation which has been going on since the census has been taken. These circumstances have contributed to make the census very much more expensive. I frankly admit that it has been much more expensive than I hoped it would be.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. minister could give an explanation in regard to the county of Peel. It is very difficult to understand why it is that the census of 1901 in the county of Peel cost almost double the amount expended on the census of 1891, notwithstanding the fact that there were 1,700 less people in that county in 1901 than in 1891.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The cost of living affected the whole rate of pay throughout the country. Everything we required to get was more expensive in 1901 than in 1891. In 1901 the rate of pay for the enumerator of each living person was five cents per head instead of three cents per head in 1891, for each death five cents instead of three, for each farm, twenty-five instead of fifteen, and for each factory, thirty cents instead of twenty cents. This made an increase in the neighbourhood of fifty per cent, so that half of the increase to which the hon. gentleman alludes is accounted for through that alone. We found it necessary to allow horse-hire at the rate of $1.50 a day in the country parts. That cost a very considerable item and added very considerably to the expense.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister regard that as a sufficient explanation when he takes into consideration that there were so many less people in the county of Peel to enumerate in 1901? Perhaps the hon. gentleman could give us the names of the enumerators, the name of the commissioner, and the livery bill which the hon. gentleman has referred to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The census in the county of Peel cost $1,102 in 1891 and $1,961 in 1901.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total horse-hire?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will have it added up.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could give us the population while he is hunting up the other information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. 13,687 in 1901 and 15,466 in 1891. The horse-hire was $457.25.

Mr. BLAIN. Was every enumerator in the county paid horse-hire?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not in the towns.

Mr. BLAIN. Was an enumerator paid if he used his own horse?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We did not inquire.

Mr. BLAIN. Was horse-hire allowed for taking the census in the county of Peel in 1891?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. I cannot understand how it cost twice as much to take the census of Peel in 1891 as in 1901 when the population was less.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It did not cost twice as much. It was $1,102 in the one case, and $1,991.81 in the other.

Mr. BLAIN. That is a large increase.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is, but it is not double.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that a considerable number of the staff in Ottawa were dismissed. Can you give us a list of those who are retained ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot. I have not decided on whom I shall retain.

Mr. BLAIN. How many are proposed to be laid off ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say until I find out the exact state of the work. Last fall sixty or seventy were laid off and there are now 117 employed altogether. I have stated that fully 75 per cent of those would be laid off, but I will not bind myself to that proportion. They will be laid off on the 1st of July.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the intention of the minister to keep a permanent census staff ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not given any positive statement of that kind.

Mr. BLAIN. But that matter is under consideration ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is under consideration in a sense. I believe it would be a good thing, and if I could see my way clear to organize it properly, and if I get the assent of my colleagues, I think I shall propose it.

Mr. CLANCY. In the town of Brampton one enumerator was paid $4.50 horse-hire.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That might be to go to meet the inspector to receive instructions. Some divisions were partly in the town and partly in the country.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Peeker an enumerator in the town of Brampton got $4.50 horse-hire.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have these accounts certified by the commissioner of the county and if the commissioner certifies the account as proper, it is paid.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there an enumerator appointed for each subdivision as organized for municipal purposes ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No; for Dominion election purposes.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand the minister to say that horse-hire was allowed to the enumerators in the country districts, and not in the towns and cities.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Generally, that is correct.

Mr. BLAIN. Then I would inform the hon. minister that it is not correct for Peel, because Mr. Peter was an enumerator for one polling subdivision in Brampton, and he was allowed for horse-hire.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was probably allowed to him to go to meet the commissioner to receive instructions.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the hon. minister to state in the early part of the discussion that the enumerators were called together and the commissioner gave them instructions in a general way. They were called together in the town of Brampton, and the commissioner gave the instructions there. Mr. Peter would not drive twelve miles from his residence to receive the instructions.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. I have not the account of Mr. Peter for horse-hire. I will be glad to give the explanation on concurrence.

Mr. CLANCY. Take the town of Bothwell, having a population of about 900. For that there were three enumerators, and I find that one received $1.50 and another $6 for horse-hire. Is the hon. gentleman able to tell what the horse-hire was for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think it was probably for going to the commissioner for instructions. The enumerators were allowed travelling expenses for that purpose, and if they drove instead of going by train, they would be allowed for horse-hire.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman know that to be the case ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know this particular instance.

Mr. CLANCY. I will take the town of Wallaceburg. One Isaac Little was paid $60.10. The enumerators for Wallaceburg were paid, one $60, another $54, and the other $49. What was Isaac Little paid that $60 for ? He was not one of the enumerators ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the account. It is in the possession of the Auditor General.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman can get it, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It seems to me that the proper place for the discussion of the details of that account is in the Public Accounts Committee. It is impossible for the minister to have the de-

tails of every little account in the Auditor General's Report. I can get an item of that kind and lay it on the Table.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman seems to prefer to have it discussed here. That is a matter that needs explanation—what was Little employed for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know whether Mr. Little was an enumerator at Wallaceburg or in some part outside of Wallaceburg.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman ought to know.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not a list of all the enumerators in the country just now.

Mr. CLANCY. I am only asking about Wallaceburg at this moment.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not able to supply the hon. gentleman with the information he requires, but will bring it on concurrence.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman expect that we will have the money voted without this information being given now ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not possible to give it. If the hon. gentleman takes up item by item and requires information on every little detail, he cannot expect me to have it all at hand. If I were to allow this vote to stand until another night, we would have all this questioning into the most trifling details gone into over again.

Mr. BLAIN. I have been trying to get from the hon. minister some explanation for the increased expenditure in the county of Peel. He said that it was the policy of the department to allow livery hire in the rural districts, but not in the towns and villages. But taking up the Auditor General's Report, I find that in the town of Brampton three or four enumerators were allowed horse-hire, and coming to the village of Streetsville in the county of Peel, which is not part of any other municipality, the enumerator was allowed horse-hire. Thus, in four cases out of five, horse-hire was allowed in towns and villages against the policy of the hon. gentleman and in contradiction of the statement he has made to-night. If that be the case in one county, what must it be in other counties ? I would also require explanation of another strange item. The commissioner's allowance is $100, and he is allowed besides $136.91 for revising the returns.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The $136.91 is a per capita allowance to the commissioner for his work as census commissioner. He was allowed so much per head of the population. The $100 was to cover extra expenses.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the livery bill ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot give the exact explanation, but the bill of $6 was probably the livery hire for bringing the enumerator from Switzer to Brampton. Considering that the commissioner had to revise these bills and initial them, and that then they had to pass the accountant of my department and the Auditor General, I take it that they were reasonable bills. I cannot explain as to the three enumerators in Brampton, unless some of the people lived out of town and had property in town and the officers in Brampton had to take their trip to the country to get the information. Of course, that is only a conjecture.

Mr. BLAIN. I see that $13 is allowed for expenses for one enumerator and nothing for the others.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That item has a foot note 'instructing enumerators.' This gentleman, I believe, was a sort of superior enumerator, who was doing extra work in assisting the commissioner.

Mr. BLAIN. Does that mean that Mr. Bracken, the commissioner, did not understand the work, or does it mean that the commissioner was overworked and had not time to reach the different enumerators ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only say that this is for work done in assisting the commissioner, I do not think it necessary to infer that the commissioner was incompetent. I have to turn to this gentleman for information. But I suppose he required some assistance.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the hon. gentleman cannot give the details of this item of $13.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nothing further than the foot note in the Auditor General's Report 'instructing enumerators.'

Mr. BLAIN. Does this item appear in other counties generally ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not find it charged for other counties.

Mr. BLAIN. It seems to be a special case, and I think there should be some special explanation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As I have said, I have not the details of the bill, and cannot give the explanation.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Agriculture stated that the correction of instructions to enumerators involved only a trifling cost to the country, for the reason that the imperfect instructions did not reach the counties until the amended instructions were ready. Can the minister say whether Peel was one of those in which no expense was involved by this mistake ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that there was no delay in the county of Peel.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister can give some explanation with regard to the neighbouring county which is really a part of Peel, Cardwell. Why is there an increased cost in that county with a decreased population ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only give the same explanation as already given with regard to Peel. I think that also applies to Cardwell.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. minister tell whether there was horse-hire paid in Dresden ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, $1.50 a day for each enumerator. I take it for granted, though I do not know positively that this was to meet the commissioner and receive instructions.

Mr. CLANCY. Take the township of Cambden. The hon. gentleman will find that horse-hire is allowed to the enumerators as follows :—Mr. Forshie, $22.50; Mr. Sturges, $12; Mr. Shaw, $31.50; Mr. Fetherson, $22.50; and Mr. Law, $25. I know this part of the country and am acquainted with the enumerators and know where they reside. There is no reason in the nature of the country for the disparities shown here.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) knows the commissioner.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only say that the commissioner endorsed and recommended payment of these amounts, and, as he knows the locality, I take it, there must have been some justification for these charges.

Mr. CLANCY. But the commissioner may have been mistaken. The minister ought to be able to show what the number of days is in each case.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The number of days would be : Mr. Forshie, 15 days ; Mr. Sturges, 8 days ; Mr. Shaw, 21 days; Mr. Fetherston, 17 days; and Mr. Law, 16⅔ days.

Mr. CLANCY. Why is one man allowed $31 and another only $12 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot explain that, I am sure. It is not possible to explain every detail of every bill. These bills are sworn to and certified by the commissioner, then they pass under the scrutiny of the accountant of the department; after that they go to the Auditor General and are scrutinized and passed by him.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the nature of the special allowances ?

Mr. BLAIN.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The special allowance here was for receiving instructions. They were allowed a certain time to go to the commissioner and receive instructions, and were allowed pay for those days.

Mr. CLANCY. But there are many cases where the special allowance is not charged at all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The law says that the remuneration should not exceed more than $3 a day for approved service of eight hours. When the charge per head of the number of people they recorded came to more than $3 per day, they could not make a charge for receiving instructions, because the whole remuneration was not to exceed $3 per day.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice on page D—251 'claims, 70 days at $3.' What does that mean ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was an unorganized district where we had to deal with the enumerators on a different principle, away in the north part of the county of Pontiac. There we had to allow them so much per day without reference to the number of people that they enumerated, where the population is very scattered.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us a full explanation of the difference between organized and unorganized districts, and the instructions that were given to the different enumerators.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the unorganized districts where it would not be fair to pay them by the head because they often had to travel long distances, we paid them $3 per day and travelling allowances according to the vouchers supplied for their expenses. This man seems to have claimed seventy days, but he was not paid for seventy days because he only received $199.60.

Mr. BLAIN. Who checked the amount and struck off the sum that was deducted ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It may have been the commissioner in the county when he sent up the account, or it may have been the accountant here.

Mr. BLAIN. How were the absentees taken down in the census ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The census was taken on the de jure system. When a person was not actually living in the place where he was taken, the question was asked whether he was going to return, and if the answer was that he was only away temporarily, his name was taken down. The limit of temporary absence which justified his being counted, was one year ; that is to say, if he was expected to be away more than one year he was not counted. That is the same as the

limit of time in 1891. If his parents or friends answered that he intended to be away less than a year, then he was counted as being a resident.

Mr. BLAIN. If there was a family of four living in Ottawa and the enumerator found that three had been absent for nine months in Chicago working, they would be taken down as residents of Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, if it were stated by the parent or person giving information that they had not been absent more than a year and were considered as residents of Ottawa.

Mr. BLAIN. In that case the census would not be correct ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No de jure census is absolutely correct in that sense. Of course these people would have to say their absence was only temporary.

Mr. CLANCY. I see that in the town of Paris, county of Brant, Mr. Kent charges for horse-hire $10.50. Mr. Wilson charges precisely the same, while Mr. Hoey does not charge anything, but charges $3.50 for expenses. Mr. Shannon charges $10.50 for horse-hire, Mr. McCammon $9 and Mr. A. W. Rousell $10.50. There seems to be a general agreement fixing the charge at $10.50. There is uniformly $9 charged for instructions.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They drew $9 each because the commissioner kept them three days giving instructions.

Mr. CLANCY. How does there come to be this uniformity in regard to horse-hire ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose the men had to pay about the same price to go over the same distance with their horses. If they went from Paris to Brantford, I presume the price would be the same for one as for the other.

Mr. CLANCY. We are not asking for the hon. gentleman's supposition. Why not produce the accounts ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have explained that so often, I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman ought to give a better reason than that it is not convenient for him to do so. I will take the case here of Mr. Hoey. Mr. Hoey does not get anything for horse-hire. How did the others get it, while he does not get it ? Mr. Hoey gets $3.50 for expenses. What were the expenses in that case ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I explained a little while ago that if the charges amounted to more than $3 a day they could not be allowed. Mr. Hoey's charges may have amounted to more than $3 a day and consequently he could not be paid for horse-hire, or Mr. Hoey may possibly have driven with one of the other enumerators from Paris to Brantford and not have charged for it. I cannot tell the reason myself. The only way would be to ask Mr. Hoey why he did not charge for horse-hire.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows that their earnings must appertain to the recording, so that it did not arise in that way. I have just pointed out a case where one enumerator got $23, another $26, another $29, another $27, another $26 and another $38. I am presuming that the populations in that case were not the same in different polling subdivisions and therefore the differences would arise there. But, the other must have been for horse-hire actually used by each of them and the instructions must have been uniform. We have paid the enumerators $3 a day while getting their instructions. What were the instructions on that point ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A special allowance was made for the time spent in receiving instructions of $3 a day. Apparently nearly all of the enumerators in Brant county spent three days receiving instructions. One of them appears to have been absent part of the time and consequently he did not charge for three days.

Mr. CLANCY. What were the instructions given the recorder in regard to how they should be paid as to the days employed taking instructions and the days they were employed enumerating? When they were at the work of enumeration they were not to earn more than $3 a day. What instructions were given to the enumerators as to how they should be paid for their services ? The chief commissioner is sitting there and he could tell the hon. gentleman and the hon. gentleman could probably read the instructions to the committee. Was any alteration made in regard to the allowances made to the enumerators from the first intimation they had.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was no alteration made after the first table of allowances.

Mr. CLANCY. There were complaints in the newspapers that the minister had misled them as to the amount of compensation. If a man went to a farmhouse and asked a number of questions it should not cost much more expense than if he asked a dozen questions. Many of these schedules are worthless if they are ever to be used. We have for the first time a record of divorces. That is rather a delicate question. Did the enumerator put that question to the minister himself ? Does he think that such a thing as that should be put on record ? Some of this is the most trashy stuff that ever went to the country. How many vol-

umes will there be in this census and the number of pages ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The first volume has already been issued and the matter for the second volume is almost ready for the printer. If we put only the information in the second volume that was in the second volume of 1891 it would be ready now.

Mr. CLANCY. Will all these tables be published.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. CLANCY. When will the part containing information with regard to the industries be ready ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I expect it will be ready for the printers in a little over a month.

Mr. CLANCY. If I remember rightly, it was out in 1892. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why that has been so long delayed, so much longer than it was in 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is not correct in his statement. The third volume of the census of 1891, which contained the returns of manufactures, was issued on the 20th of February, 1895. I expect that the returns of the industries of Canada will be out in July, 1903, or about twenty months earlier than those of the census of 1891.

Mr. CLANCY. I spoke somewhat subject to correction. I heartily congratulate the hon. gentleman upon being right for once. How did he take the census, say, of the district of Alberta and the other outlying districts of the country—the Indians and so on?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The census of the Indians was generally taken by the officers of the Indian Department.

Mr. CLANCY. How is the population taken in Alaska and in the country around Hudson's Bay ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. So far as I know, the population of Alaska was taken by the census commissioners of the United States. With regard to the districts around Hudson's Bay and the other unorganized territories, we sent some of our own commissioners for that purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How does our progress compare with that of the United States and the mother country in the compilation and publication of the census returns ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Our census is taken a year after that of the United States ; but independently of that, I think our census is not quite as far ahead as that of the United States in compilation. We have not so large a staff, even in proportion to the area of the country, as they have.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do they not use some mechanical devices for the purpose of tabulation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, very largely. We discussed that point, and came to the conclusion, and it was the experience in 1891, that it would take so long to train people to do the work, and the machines are so very expensive, that it would involve more loss than gain to use them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have read descriptions of their work, which seems to be wonderful.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is quite true. Some years ago, when I was in Washington, I visited the Census Bureau and saw the working of these machines, and Mr. Blue, the chief census commissioner, went down there to see what was best to be done. These machines have been of great value in expediting the work of the American census, but for a small work such as ours is in comparison with theirs, we made up our minds, for the reasons stated, that it would not be advisable to adopt these machines. I may say, however, that we use six adding machines. As a general rule, the permanent employees do more of the intellectual work in connection with the census than the work of compilation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is purely mechanical ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For a person who is an expert it is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are they very expensive ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. About $1,500 a machine.

Mr. HACKETT. I called the attention of the hon. minister two years ago to the fact that the cost of taking the census had been largely increased in the province of Prince Edward Island. I also called his attention to the fact that one Doyle, who was appointed enumerator, had sold out his job to another man named Broderick for $30, and Broderick was appointed in the place of Doyle. Did that $30 come out of Broderick's pocket, or was it paid by the department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was no money paid to Doyle by the department. Broderick was appointed from here in Doyle's place on the recommendation of Sir Louis Davies.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The amount paid Broderick was twice that paid the enumerator in 1891, and one would judge therefore that the payment to Doyle by Broderick came indirectly from the department. It may be that the increases generally in the

cost of taking the census was due to matters of that kind. Two years ago I brought the matter before the House, and the hon. minister said he would make an inquiry and give me the information I desired, but none has been forthcoming yet. I have seen both the men since. All that Doyle would say was that he had $30 in his pocket for doing very little work. In all the other districts increases have taken place, despite the fact that the population of the island was 5,000 souls less in 1901 than it was in 1891. What is the explanation of that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only repeat the explanation I have given already. A great many more questions were asked, and more time had to be spent by the enumerators. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, three questions were asked in 1901 for every question asked in 1891, in round figures. That took more time and the enumerators had to be paid more. Again, the whole scale of wages and of living is higher than in 1891, and people would not work at the same pay. Consequently we were compelled to make allowances for horse-hire and for the time spent in receiving instructions and returning schedules. These taken together make up the difference.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) I presume, has taken a fair census in the province of Prince Edward Island. He will notice that there has been a decrease in population there, and, in consequence, the province is losing one representative in this parliament. I would ask the hon. gentleman if the same system of taking the census was followed in the province of Quebec and in the province of Prince Edward Island. This is a very important question in connection with our representation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Exactly the same system was employed all over Canada.

Mr. HACKETT. Did not the hon. minister refer to the curés for information ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) mean ? I asked the same question of everybody in the province.

Mr. HACKETT. Did not a certain Mr. Coté issue a circular to the priests of the province of Quebec asking for a return with regard to the census taken by the priest in that year, and was not our census largely based on the returns made by the clergymen ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly not. The enumeration taken by the parish priests of the province of Quebec was obtained only after the census returns were made up and complete. It was obtained for the sake of comparison and information, but our schedules were not changed in any consequence of that information.

Mr. HACKETT. That is somewhat different from the statement we had two years ago, when we were told by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself that this means of taking the census in Quebec had been resorted to because of the timidity of the people of the province with regard to census enumeration. When approached by the enumerator they imagined that it was a matter of additional taxation, and were afraid to answer the questions asked by the enumerators. In consequence of that, Mr. Coté, the assistant commissioner, issued a circular to each of the Roman Catholic priests of the province of Quebec asking them for a return of parties who had left the province in their respective parishes, not only those who had left temporarily but those who had left intending to remain away. So, parties who had left the parish within the year were enumerated as residents of the province. If that was the system adopted in the province of Quebec, it must have had the effect of increasing the unit of representation, and relatively depreciating the enumeration in the province of Prince Edward Island. I have not time at the present, it being a little early in the morning, to refer to 'Hansard,' of 1901, yet, if the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fisher) will take the trouble to read it, he will find that his leader made the statement I have just referred to. The Coté circular was sent not only to the parish priests of the province of Quebec, but it was sent to certain clergymen in Prince Edward Island in the districts where there was known to be a French population. The Rev. Dr. Chasson, of Palmer Road parish, where there is a large Acadian population, received a copy, and so did the Rev. Mr. Gallant, of Bloomfield, another gentleman at Rustico and Father Boudreault, at Egmont Bay. The Rev. Dr. Chasson was the only one to reply to the circular, and, as he said, he did not think it right that the priests should interfere in the census in any respect, but should leave it to the enumerators and the people. Now the taking of the census in Prince Edward Island in 1901 cost a hundred per cent more than the taking of the census in 1891. I find no fault with the census on the ground of correctness; it may have been correct. But it has resulted in showing a falling off of 5,000 people in the province of Prince Edward Island. While the schedules with regard to nationality, race, religion and other matters were strictly applied in the province of Prince Edward Island, yet, it would seem that a different system was applied in the province of Quebec, the pivotal province, upon which rests the representation from all the provinces of Canada. I wish the hon. gentleman to be definite and say whether his leader, the Prime Minister, was incorrect when, in 1901, he made the statement I have

repeated to you. But if the Coté circular was distributed as the first minister stated and the enumeration of the people of the province of Quebec was based upon that circular, I say that a gross injustice has been done to the people of Prince Edward Island. The highest privilege of any people is the exercise of the franchise for the election of representatives to parliament, and that sacred right should not be tampered with. I would ask the minister to make it perfectly clear whether this right has been tampered with or whether the same system has applied to Prince Edward Island that was applied to Quebec. I believe that if the system had been the same, there would not have been shown a decrease of 5,000 in Prince Edward Island, with the resultant loss of one member in this House, but a large increase. I ask the hon. gentleman to make a clear statement because the people of Prince Edward Island are very much excited over the loss of one representative in this parliament.

It should be fully stated in this parliament whether the same system of counting the people has been applied to the province of Prince Edward Island as was applied to the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Absolutely the same system, the same regulations in every respect were carried out in every province. The circulars the hon. gentleman refers to, one of them was sent out for the purpose of asking the priests, not only in Quebec but wherever there was a French population, to explain to the people that they must give full and ample information to the enumerators. The other circular was sent out to make certain inquiries in regard to the number of people in each parish who were away to stay away, so that they would not be improperly counted. The people who were not coming back were not to be counted. It was desirable to check the work. But the replies to that circular were never put into the hands of the compilers here, and were only compared with the schedules by the superior officers, and the result was no change in the schedule returns.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if this circular was sent out to the clergymen of any other denomination in Canada at that time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. HACKETT. Then it was simply confined to the province of Quebec, and a few circular letters were sent to the parish priests in the parish of Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it was sent to others besides.

Mr. HACKETT. To which of the other provinces was the circular sent ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To all the French districts all over Canada.

Mr. HACKETT. Sent exclusively then to the French districts ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. HACKETT. There was some reason then for sending out that circular. He says it was sent out to receive information for the purpose of checking the work done by his sworn officials ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The first circular was sent out for the purpose of asking the parish priests to impress upon their people the necessity of answering freely. It is well known that among the French population of the country there was more or less fear with regard to the answers to the census enumerators, and this expedient was adopted to remove that fear. The second circular was sent out, as I have explained, because it was understood that a large number of French Canadians who had gone away to the United States, and we wished to check the numbers of those who had gone there to settle and not confuse them with those who had gone there temporarily.

Mr. HACKETT. So it was sent especially for the purpose of ascertaining the number of French Canadians who had left Canada in previous years and gone to the United States ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was the purpose.

Mr. HACKETT. Then why should the hon. gentleman endeavour to keep the run of the French Canadian people any more than the English speaking people of Canada ? I cannot see why he should incur this extra expense for the purpose of ascertaining the drift, the current, or the movements of the French people in the province of Quebec, when the same thing had not been done with regard to the English speaking people of the other provinces. I say there must be a deeper reason than that. The hon. gentleman appears not inclined to answer that question. It is a question that affects the sacred rights of the people of Prince Edward Island and their right of representation in this parliament, and I insist that the hon. gentleman answer it. When he adopted such a mode of counting the people of Quebec, the province that fixes the unit of representation in the other provinces, in justice and fair-play to the other provinces, the same means should have been taken to count the English speaking people of Canada.

In consequence of this, I believe that in Quebec, according to the hon. gentleman's

own statement, ascertaining the current of immigration from Canada to the United States, they counted thousands of people in Quebec who had left during the previous year that were not counted in the other provinces of Canada, and as a result of this unfair system of counting the people of Prince Edward Island are asked to submit to the loss of representatives in this parliament. I would like to have a definite reply from the hon. minister, if he found it necessary in order to have a fair count of the people to issue this circular, why he did not send a similar document to the clergymen of other denominations in order to ensure a fair count of the English speaking people.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The same circular in regard to the French population was sent all over the Dominion. The hon. gentleman has asked another question. There was not a single name added to the list of the population of Quebec as a result of the answers which came in reply to that circular.

Mr. BELL. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he authorized the issue of the circular which was sent to the curés of Quebec?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman asks me if I authorized it. I cannot say I gave any orders to have it issued.

Mr. BELL. When did the hon. minister learn of the purpose for which it was issued ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I knew about it, but did not see the circular before it was issued.

Mr. BELL. I will read what the hon. minister said in the House of Commons in 1901. Mr. Barker was speaking :

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he is aware that Mr. Côté has issued another circular, one that is quite as improper, apparently, as the one issued in Ontario, in which he asks that returns be made direct to him as assistant commissioner of matters wholly outside his duty as commissioner ? Does the hon. minister know that Mr. Côté has asked to have returns made to him of French Canadians who do not live in this country at all, but who live in the United States ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will answer the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Barker's) question first. I am not aware of such a circular as the hon. gentleman indicates.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend is now referring to the second circular. The answer I gave a few minutes ago was in regard to the first circular.

Mr. BELL. That cannot be possible. It is impossible. The hon. gentleman says that he knew of the circular issued to the curés before it was issued.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Pardon me. What I said a few minutes ago was——

Mr. BELL. What the hon. minister states now is that he knew of the circular before it was issued.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Which circular ?

Mr. BELL. The second circular.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not state so.

Mr. BELL. The hon. minister stated so a few minutes ago. Two years ago his recollection should have been much better when he stated that he did not know of the issue of such a circular. Now, he is in direct contradiction of himself. He says he did know. The first circular did not refer to the French population at all. The first circular that was brought to the attention of the hon. minister was brought to his notice by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). This was the circular brought to his notice in 1901, and it was issued apparently for the purpose of getting political information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have made no reference to that circular to-night.

Mr. BELL. During the discussion of the question of the circular issued to the French curés, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) asked the question :

I would like to ask the hon. minister if he is aware that Mr. Côté has issued another circular, one that is quite as improper, apparently, as the one issued in Ontario, in which he asks that returns be made direct to him as assistant commissioner of matters wholly outside his duty as commissioner. Does the hon. minister know that Mr. Côté has asked to have returns made to him of French Canadians who do not live in this country at all, but who live in the United States ?

That is the French curés' circular.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What was my answer ?

Mr. BELL. The answer of the hon. minister was :

I will answer the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Barker's) question first. I am not aware of such a circular as the hon. gentleman indicates.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Exactly.

Mr. BELL. Just a few moments ago he said that he was aware.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said I was not aware.

Mr. BELL. I understood the hon. minister to say he was aware.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said that in regard to the circular issued to the parish priests of Quebec asking them

to impress upon their parishioners that they must give full information to the census enumerators which is another circular altogether. There were two circulars issued to the priests of Quebec, one before the enumeration asking them to get their parishioners to give full and complete returns, and another six months after the enumeration which the hon. gentleman has just referred to and in regard to which I answered Mr. Barker at that time.

Mr. BELL. I understand that there were at least three circulars issued by the Department of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were two circulars issued. I know nothing of any other circular issued by the department or any officer of the department.

Mr. BELL. Two circulars were issued to the French curés ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Has that gentleman a copy of these circulars here ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got them here. They were laid on the Table of this House when the question was up before.

Mr. BELL. It seems to me that the hon. minister should lay on the Table of this House a copy of the circulars, because it is quite clear that there have been circulars issued which are entirely outside of the usual understanding of what is the purpose and the work of the census commissioner.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They have been in possession of the House for more than a year.

Mr. BELL. What did the minister say as to the circular regarding political leanings.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No such circular was ever issued by my department.

Mr. BELL. When was the minister aware that such circular was issued ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When I was informed of it later on.

Mr. BELL. What was done with that circular ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know.

Mr. BELL. Did the minister take any action in reference to that circular ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When I heard of it I immediately gave instructions that such a circular had not been issued on my authority and that they must not pay attention to it.

Mr. BELL. Did the minister come into possession of copies of the circular?

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was read on the floor of parliament.

Mr. BELL. It was issued by some one in connection with the department.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was not.

Mr. BELL. It was acted upon by certain enumerators and it evidently imposed on them. Did the minister take any steps to ascertain who they were who were guilty of what was practically a forgery.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My name was not forged to it.

Mr. BELL. Does the minister feel that he has done his whole duty in the matter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BELL. If the minister holds such opinions I would not wonder if more of such circulars would be issued. How many schedules were issued in the census of 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Fifteen.

Mr. BELL. How many questions were included in the first schedule ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman had been here during the sitting, he would have heard the answers to the questions he is now asking, and I am afraid I shall have to refer him to 'Hansard' if he asks any more questions about matters which have been discussed this afternoon. In the first schedule there were thirty-four questions.

Mr. BELL. I do not think there is any justification for the minister refusing to answer a question of a member because he has been absent from the House for a time. Have all these thirty-four questions been answered ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BELL. How many questions were there in the second schedule ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Twenty-five.

Mr. BELL. Have all these been answered ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BELL. How many questions in the third schedule ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Fifteen.

Mr. BELL. What is the total number ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman can add up as correctly as I.

Mr. BELL. How many questions in the fourth schedule ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Seventeen.

Mr. BELL. How many questions in schedule number five.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Thirty-seven.

Mr. BELL. To what do these questions refer to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To field products.

Mr. BELL. What field products ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. the field products usually grown in Canada.

Mr. BELL. I do not wish for a general answer by a detailed list.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have read those questions in detail to the House and will not do it again.

Mr. BELL. I am sorry for the county of Pictou. This is the second time the hon. minister refuses to answer a question. Might I ask the hon. minister at what date these questions will be completed by the officers in his department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The compilation will be completed about the middle of next month.

Mr. BELL. How many schedules in all were asked ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Fifteen.

Mr. BELL. Of these we learn that four have been compiled, and the hon. minister expects to have the compilation of all the schedules completed in the course of the year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said in the month of January next.

Mr. BELL. In seven months the hon. gentleman expects to complete the compilation of eleven schedules and it has taken his department twenty-four months to complete four, or an average of six months each. He now expects to complete the work of compiling eleven schedules in seven months.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman shows that he has not been following the debate for his statements are not in accord with what has been said.

Mr. BELL. I must admit that, to a certain extent, I have not been following the debate, because I was not aware of the rare intellectual treat the chamber was having. I understood from the hon. gentleman that there are fifteen schedules, I understood further that his department has completed four. The census was taken in April, 1901, and we are now at the end of June, 1903. It has, therefore, taken twenty-four months to compile the answers to four questions, and the hon. minister expects to complete that whole work of compiling the census in January, 1904. Now, from June, 1903, to January, 1904, is seven months. So, the hon. minister will find my estimate correct when I say that he expects to compile the answers to the eleven schedules in seven months, whereas it has taken him twenty-four months to compile the answers to four. If he impugns my accuracy, may I ask him on what ground ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman's statement as to four schedules is incorrect.

Mr. BELL. The hon. gentleman informed me that the fifth schedule is not completed. I inferred that four were completed. Perhaps that is not the impression that he intended to convey. Was I mistaken ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is not accurate.

Mr. BELL. We shall have the opportunity of referring to 'Hansard' in a few days to see what the hon. gentleman said.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman asked me a question whether the answers to these four schedules were completed, and now he is asking about a compilation that I know nothing about.

Mr. BELL. Then we may begin over again. Have the answers to the fifth schedule been compiled ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The compilation is not yet finished.

Mr. BELL. Have the answers with reference to the preceding four schedules been compiled ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In some cases they have and in some they have not.

Mr. BELL. Then it appears that I was crediting the minister with too much when I said that the answers to four schedules had been compiled. Will he tell me how many of the six hundred odd questions in the schedules have been completed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Schedule 1, schedule 2 and schedule 3 have been compiled. Schedules 10 and 11 are also finished. In the rest the compilation is under way. Schedules 4, 5, 6 and 7 are verging towards completion, and schedule 8 will be completed before the end of next month.

Mr. BELL. What is the number of the schedule referring to manufactures ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. 8.

Mr. BELL. How many questions were in that schedule ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Sixty-seven.

Mr. BELL. There was a limitation with respect to manufacturing establishments in the census of 1901 as compared with that of 1891. Will the hon. minister state what it is ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891 every room or shop in which one or two persons were employed was called a manufacturing establishment. In 1901 the rule was followed that five hands must be employed before an establishment could be considered a manufactory.

Mr. BELL. Can the hon. gentleman form any idea of the number of establishments that have been struck off the schedule by adopting the form of question he adopted for the census of 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. An establishment not having five working people in it is not taken as an establishment and could not be struck off. We have not reached any point in the compilation that will indicate a fair estimate of the difference brought about by this different mode of taking establishments.

Mr. BELL. How many questions were asked under schedule No. 6 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Twenty-six.

Mr. BELL. The twenty-six classes into which the live stock of Canada is divided must include, I suppose, poultry ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Does it include the eggs of the farmers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Eggs are included in farm products.

Mr. BELL. Has a distinction been made between different breeds in this classification ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a distinction made in the different breeds in pure bred stock but not in grade animals.

Mr. HACKETT. Does the hon. minister expect that this amount will complete the taking of the census and when will the second volume of the census be put before the public ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is expected that this amount will complete the compilation of the census and that the second volume will be issued before the end of next month.

Mr. BENNETT. The presence of four Cabinet Ministers in the Chamber this morning is the best proof that the Grand Trunk subsidy has been settled because there will apparently be no meeting of the Cabinet on this 13th day of June. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) who is not present in the Chamber now but who will be here in a few minutes, stated last night that we were going to have three sessions of the House per day soon and although the Minister of Finance contradicted that the Minister of Agriculture seems bound to have an all day and an all night sitting too.

I find by the Public Accounts that the census of 1871 cost about $400,000, the census of 1881 considerably under $500,000, and the census of 1891, not much over the half million mark. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture what the present census has cost up to date ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The expenditure up to June 1, 1903, was $1,137,533.37.

Mr. BENNETT. When the people see these figures, and compare them with the cost of previous censuses, they will be rather staggered. What further sum will it take to complete the taking of this census ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am asking for a vote of $35,000 for the ensuing year, and I suppose it will take about $8,000 for this month of June. They will make about $43,000 more.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand that when the amount is spent, it will complete the census in its entirety ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I should think the people will be rather thankful that the census is at an end. I think the minister should explain why this census has cost so much. I am going to give some of the reasons. First and foremost, I think it was due to his bringing Mr. Blue here as an officer of this department. Not that I lay anything to Mr. Blue personally ; but he had been a government officer in the province of Ontario, that land where the grafters thrive, but where, thank God, their day seems to be nearing an end. Mr. Blue was brought down here, and what has been the result ? The published reports of the province of Ontario are printed by a private concern, on the ordinary terms on which business is done by the Ontario government, without tender ; and, of course, the greater number of reports published, the greater the profit to those party friends who publish the reports ; so any one can understand that they print any number of them. In every one of these reports we see the name of Mr. Blue, and when it was known what salary he was to have, one can imagine the feeling of envy that ran through the mind of every Ontario official. Then if the hon. minister will look at the names of those who are engaged as enumerators, more particularly in Ontario, he will find

there his old friends, the Ontario government heelers. Take the riding of East Simcoe, where the cost of taking the census is simply enormous, when I look at the names of the grafters who got in their work there, I can congratulate him in getting off so safely. Are there any complaints of non-payment to the enumerators by the officers in charge ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware of any.

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad that these sub-enumerators got their money paid to them at last. Politically, these sub-enumerators have done the government no good in East Simcoe because they complained that they could not get paid. In 1891 the cost of taking the census in East Simcoe was $5,473, and in 1901 it was $10,949. I find there were two enumerators appointed there at a total of $614, where in the previous census there was only one and the cost $386. How many ridings in the province of Ontario had government commissioners appointed in order that the government might reward its political heelers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware of any who were appointed for any such reason.

Mr. BENNETT. Why was Mr. Duncan McNab allowed $13.50 for horse-hire at $1.50 a day for the town of Orillia ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In some cases the enumerators charged horse-hire when they went to get their instructions. If that was not the reason, I cannot give any reason.

Mr. BENNETT. I can give the hon. Minister the real reason. Mr. McNab is a very warm political friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, now engaged in the Public Works Department in connection with a work going on in the riding. I notice that Mr. J. B. Henderson did not get any hore-hire. Yet he is a very important portion of the party machine. It will afford amusement to the people of East Simcoe to find that Mr. Henderson, in his innocence, did not put in a claim for horse-hire, while Mr. McNab sends in his bill for $13.50. What member of the hon. gentleman's staff directed to whom these allowances should be made for horse-hire ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were made on a well defined principle, and the commissioners for each locality had to certify the bills.

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad to have the hon. gentleman's statement. But what instructions were given by the commisssioners to the enumerators on this subject. I would like to have something in my hand by which to go to the electors of East Simcoe when I discuss this question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No instructions except that the commissioners were given latitude, and were to certify the account.

Mr. BENNETT. If you take these accounts all through you will find that wherever the political party hacks were at work they got all the allowances, whereas the man who was merely attending to the work of enumerating got little or nothing. Has the schedule been completed showing the return of crops ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The compilation has not been completed. We hope it will be completed about the middle of next month.

Mr. BENNETT. With regard to the schedule for manufacturers, the effect of the change the hon. minister has made has apparently been disastrous to the flour industry. Ten years ago there were a number of flour mills in practically every riding in Ontario. But it is a large flour mill that employs five men, so many flour mills have been left unenumerated. One comparing this census with that of 1891 would suppose that the number of flour mills in Ontario had greatly decreased. Can the hon. gentleman tell what will be the effect of the method of taking the census upon the showing of the flour mills of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The compilation is not yet completed.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the hon. minister will be able to give us some pertinent information next week when we go on with this item, because such an interesting item we cannot hope to dispose of at this forenoon session. I may say in passing the advantage is going to be taken of hon. gentlemen who are not present because the hon. leader of the House has not given notice that there would be a sitting to-day and consequently hon. gentlemen who are absent will not have an opportunity of taking part in this discussion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the suggestion is calculated to bring us all to serious reflection. There are two large items remaining on this page of the estimates, and I am going to suggest to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that we should agree, if the committee are wililng, that we should reserve the remaining discussion of the the census item and take the other items remaining on the page—that is item No. 56. That will clear up that page of the estimates except the census.

Mr. CLANCY. That stands ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would have to stand, of course.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that would be a reasonable suggestion at this hour. Possibly it might have been reasonable at an earlier hour, but we will not say anything about that. The only stipu-

lation I would like to make is that, if we pass the next item, and as there cannot be very much discussion now if we are going to have any breakfast, anything that would be open for discussion under that item shall be open for discussion either under the census item or some other convenient item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Item No. 52 allowed to stand.

For the branch of the Commissioner of Agriculture and dairying, including live stock, dairy, cold storage, extension of markets, poultry, seed and fruit divisions; employees' pay from this sum not to be subject to the Civil Service Act, $220,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. Minister of Agriculture might just briefly explain the increase of $10,000 if it is convenient.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is due to some enlargement of the work in connection with what I may call the outside markets division in connection with the sale of our goods in the old country. This has been pretty successful but there seems to be an opportunity of increasing the market.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask what business will be taken up on Monday.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will take up the consideration of the Patent Act, The Diseases of Animals Act, perhaps the Criminal Code, the Bill concerning Dry Docks and the Bill Respecting the Good Shepherds. I do not anticipate that on any of these Bills there is likely to be very much debate, and if not we will have time to resume the consideration of the Railway Committee Bill. If we reach Supply we will continue with the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Better not start too late.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6.20 a.m.—Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 15, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 169) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of James Sinclair McDougall.—Mr. Gallery.

Bill (No. 185) respecting the Canadian Steel Company.—Mr. German.

TORONTO AND HAMILTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the Order being called:

House in committee on Bill (No. 147) to incorporate the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Mr. SPEAKER. This Order stands.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose it is at the request of the government that this Bill stands. Is it the purpose to refer it back to the committee for reconsideration?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). We have had a request from the mayor of Toronto and the mayor of Hamilton and some other gentlemen representing municipalities, and in the absence of the hon. member who has charge of the Bill, we feel it only proper and courteous to allow it to stand until he is aware that the request has been made.

Mr. CLARKE. Under the rules, when will this Bill come up again?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At the hour for Private Bills on Wednesday evening after eight o'clock.

Order allowed to stand.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—DEMURRAGE.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. What are the regulations concerning the demurrage on cars loading and unloading at Intercolonial Railway stations?

2. What amount of demurrage has been collected at each station during six months of the present fiscal year, from July 1, 1902, to January 1, 1903?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The answers to these questions will be very voluminous, so that I shall have to ask the hon. member to move for a return.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BUILDINGS, &c., AT SUSSEX, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Is it the intention of the Railway Department to erect in Sussex a roundhouse in place of the old wooden shed now doing duty in that respect?

2. Is it the intention of the Railway Department to place gates at the railway crossing in Main street, in the town of Sussex, N.B., in order to protect the travelling public from the accidents which are of frequent occurrence there ?

3. Have plans been prepared for a new railway station at Sussex, N.B. ? If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair).

1. No, it is not the intention to erect a roundhouse at Sussex. There is only one engine that stands there over night, and a suitable building to house this engine will be built during this summer.

2. No, it is not the intention to place gates at the railway crossing, Main street, Sussex. An electric alarm bell has been placed at this crossing and kept in good order, and has, it is believed, served its purpose very well. It does not impede the street traffic as gates would, and it gives good warning to the public. The department is not aware of accidents being of frequent occurrence at this crossing.

3. No, plans have not been prepared for a new railway station at Sussex, it not being considered that a new station is a necessity at present.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALBERT S. WHITE.

Mr. FOWLER—(by Mr. Lancaster)—asked:

1. Was Albert S. White, barrister, of Sussex, N.B., employed, at any time during the year 1901, or 1902, by the Railway Department ? If so, for what purpose or purposes ?

2. What duties, if so employed, did the said Albert S. White perform ; and why was it necessary to engage his services ?

3. How many days was he employed ; and at what rate per day ?

4. What were the several amounts paid to the said Albert S. White for services and expenses respectively ?

5. Between what dates was the said Albert S. White so employed as aforesaid ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair).

1. Yes, Hon. A. S. White, ex-Attorney General of New Brunswick, was engaged during a portion of the yeasr 1901 and 1902 drafting the Bill to consolidate the Railway Act and establish a railway commission.

3. Ninety-five days at $25 per diem.

4. Services, $2,375. Expenses, $441.19.

5. September 26th, 1901 to December 19th, 1901, and between January 24th and February 18th, 1902.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS AT OTTAWA.

Mr. HOLMES asked :

1. Is the government aware of the condition of affairs indicated by the following extract from the report of the commission appointed to inquire into the Martineau defalcation :—

'Although not strictly within the terms of the commission, the commissioners cannot refrain from bringing to the notice of the government the danger from fire to the records in the upper part of the Eastern Block, owing to the proximity of the steam-pipes to the woodwork in the corridor leading to the Indian Department. They think this calls for immediate attention. The charred condition of the floor touching the pipes shows that a conflagration is imminent, and measures should be taken to avert it. The lack of provision against fire also applies to the attic of the Langevin Block, where the records of the surveys under the control of the Department of the Interior are stored. These records are exceedingly valuable, as they represent the results of very large outlays of public money, and cannot be duplicated.'

2. Is it the intention to guard against such a contingency ?

3. Are the fire appliances in the various public buildings ever tested to see if they are in working order ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. Jas. Sutherland).

1. The steam heating pipes in attic of eastern block run in brick trenches covered by wooden traps which are lined with tin. At the place referred to the tin was stripped off the boards which were discoloured, but there is no danger as there is no authentic instance known of a steam-pipe setting fire to wood. In the attic of the Langevin block the floors are fireproof and the roof of iron—and in the attic and roof there are four hydrants connected with the electric fire pump and two connected with the city pressure.

2. The matter will receive the attention of the department.. The government contemplate the erection of a special building for the storage of records.

3. Yes. The electric pumps are examined and tested every three or four days and the hydrants and chemical fire extinguishers throughout the buildings are in charge of the Dominion police and are kept in order and tested regularly by the force.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 174) to amend the Customs' Act—The Minister of Customs.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 184) to amend the Patent Act.—The Minister of Agriculture.

On section 7, subsection a,

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I do not know whether the point which I brought up in the absence of the minister has been considered. The case is something like this. A gentleman invented a certain apparatus. One of his workmen who had assisted in its manufacture left his employ and made some of the machines, and they were in use while the inventor's application for his patent was before the department. I understand that under the law at present there is nothing to prevent the use of these machines, and the patentee cannot interfere.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This Bill makes no change in that respect,

and I do not quite see how it would be possible for us to take the matter up. After the application is put in and until the patent issues, the patent is not valid and there is nothing to prevent the use of the article. If at the time of the application the machine was in use, the application would have to be rejected; but I do not know how we could protect a patentee in a case in which the article was manufactured and used while the application was pending.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I would like the minister to look into the case. I think it was before the department a month or six weeks ago.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The only cases that come before the department is where a workman who has also made a machine applies for the patent as well as the inventor. There is then a conflict between the two which has to be decided by reference to arbitration.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But how will the department proceed to stop the other man from using the machine ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That would be a question for the law courts.

On section 9,

The validity of any extension heretofore granted or assumed to be granted under section 37 of the said Act, of the period of two years limited by that section, or by that section as heretofore amended, for the commencement of the construction or manufacture of a patented invention, or of the period of twelve months thereby limited for the importation of the patented invention, shall not be open to impeachment, because—

(a.) such extension was so granted or assumed to be granted by the deputy commissioner of patents, or, as acting deputy commissioner of patents, by a person performing the duties of deputy Minister of Agriculture under the provisions of the Civil Service Act in that behalf, instead of by the commissioner of patents ; or because

(b.) in the case of the invention to which such extension relates, there had been granted or assumed to be granted a previous extension or previous extensions of the period of two years or the period of twelve months, as the case may be, so limited.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I move that after the word 'impeachment,' in the thirtieth line, the following be added: 'Nor shall the patent of any invention in respect of which such extension has been granted be deemed to have elapsed or expired.'

Mr. CLARKE. Several of these artificial light patents have expired, will any of them be re-established by this Bill ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This Bill will not reinstate any patent whose term has expired. The only patents to be affected by this are those which had complied with the law, as interpreted by the department, but which interpretation was set aside by the Supreme Court in December last in the case of Power vs. Griffin. That court decided three main points ; first, that being ready to manufacture was not sufficient, as it had been held to be by the department, to fulfil the requirements of the manufacturing clause ; second, that the extension of time by the deputy or acting deputy was not valid and that only the minister could make that extension ; third, that not more than one extension could be given. Under this reading of the law, there is a considerable number of patents which have not fulfilled those requirements, although they had fulfilled the requirements as formerly held by that department. This Bill would reinstate the patents which had thus expired and lapsed. Besides the Bill goes into the point of the existence in Canada being dependent on the existence of the same patent in a foreign country, and relieves the patentees in this country from the necessity of renewing their patents in foreign countries. In consequence of the change in section 9, it will be necessary to make corresponding amendments in sections 10 and 14. I would therefore move that after the words 'be impeached' in section 10, the following words be added : 'Nor shall such patent be deemed to have lapsed or expired.' I also move that in the subsection 2 of section 10, after the word 'section' the following be inserted : 'Or which by reason of the provisions of this subsection is to be deemed not to have lapsed or expired.'

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). These amendments I suppose are simply in line with what has been done in section 9 ? It is a little difficult to follow the effect of amendments made in this way.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the insertion of these words is simply to carry out what has been done in section 9. Section 14 should also be amended by the addition of the following words after the word 'Act' : 'Or which, by reason of any such provision is to be deemed not to have lapsed or expired.' Then, there is an omission in the printing which makes it necessary to add, after the word 'sell' the words 'the same.' Then, I wish to add to section 14 :

And in case any person has contracted with the owner of the patent for the right to manufacture, use, or sell such patent in Canada, such contract, which shall be deemed to have remained in full force and effect, notwithstanding that the patent may have become void as aforesaid.

This will have the effect of validating the contracts. As we are reinstating the patents, it seems only fair that we should validate the contracts also.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The object of this section is entirely different from this amendment.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think not. The object of the section is to protect acquired rights, and the idea of this is that contracts in connection with the patent rights are rights and should remain in force.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the scope of section 14 is to provide that persons who have begun to manufacture while the patents were actually void may continue to manufacture notwithstanding the enactment of the Bill. The proposed amendment deals with rather the converse of that, namely that the revival of the patent shall be accompanied by the continuance of any contract between the owner of the patent and any third person. I understand the purpose, but it seems a little remote from the purpose of section 14. I would suggest that it would be a little more in conformity with the scope of the Act to amend some previous section or add a subsection.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I see the point made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and think there is a good deal of force in what he says. In this matter I took the advice of the Department of Justice and they seemed to think that this clause would be sufficient. I would not object to inserting it before clause 14, or we could contrive a clause. Perhaps it would be better to leave it as it is here drawn by the law officers. I would move that this clause be added to section 14.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do the concluding words of section 14 as it stands at present, cover everything the minister intends :

Any person who has, between the time when such patent became void or when the ground for such impeachment arose, and the time of the passing of this Act, commenced to manufacture, use or sell in Canada the invention covered by such patent, may continue to manufacture, use or sell in as full and ample a measure as if this Act had not been passed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The expression 'invention' in the interpretation clause of the Patent Act is defined to mean 'any new and useful art, machine, manufacture or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement in any art, machine, manufacture or composition of matter.' So the word 'invention' is intended to cover anything that is patentable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have you a provision in this Act that it should be construed as one with the Patent Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is an amendment to the Patent Act, it is not a new Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not remember whether there is any provision in the Interpretation Act that amendments shall be always regarded and construed as one with the general Act. We want to make that definition apply to this Act.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Minister of Justice says that amendments to any Act come under the interpretation clauses of the Act.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like the Bill to stand a day or two for the third reading. Some suggestions have been made to me with regard to amendments which I hardly think are necessary, because I think they are already covered by the terms of the Bill. But I would like to communicate with the gentlemen who have made these suggestions and indicate to them what my own opinion is with regard to it, and ascertain whether they have anything further to suggest.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It might be well to have it reprinted now before reading it the third time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I can arrange that.

DRY DOCKS CONSTRUCTION—GOVERNMENT AID.

Bill (No. 178) respecting the encouragement of the construction of dry-docks, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The general features of this Bill were discussed at an earlier stage. There are a couple of new provisions necessary to carry out the arrangement which is contemplated. We have provided in the general clauses which we discussed in committee, for the increase of the amount of subsidy, and I stated that provision would be made for a tariff of fees in these dry docks, to be submitted to the government. If hon. gentlemen will give their attention to section 2 they will find we have inserted a clause providing that no tolls or rates should be levied except those which have the approval of the government. There is a further clause that the company should be obliged to submit a statement of its affairs, showing the exact amount of money which it has realized from the issue of the various classes of stocks, and all the aids it has received from public bodies. The object is that if we are to be called upon to judge as to the fairness of the rates, we must know what amount of actual cash has been invested in the enterprise, so that we may fix such tolls as may yield a fair return on the cash actually invested in the project. These are the only clauses which have been added to the Bill since the matter was discussed in committee.

On section 1,

Mr. BENNETT. Has the government any policy on the question as to the establishment of dry-docks? I see that there are, in this section, these words:

If any company or body corporate approved by the Governor in Council as having the ability to perform the work.

Is it understood to be the policy of the government, that, if a body of gentlemen come forward and show that they have the financial ability after another body of gentlemen have been assisted, they shall be equally helped, or is it going to be laid down as the policy of the government that no second dock shall be instituted or helped by the government, because, upon the help it receives will depend the commencement and completion of the work in its entirety, without some fixed rule being laid down as to the number of miles that must intervene between the dock already assisted and the one proposed to be built?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no fixed rule as respects that point. I take it for granted that if a dock had been constructed in any locality and it was shown that it was not able to meet the demands of business, and another dock was proposed to be built, that would be a matter for consideration. As to the number of miles that should intervene, that point has never come before us and I think, as I suggested, that the matter will settle itself pretty well commercially. It is not likely that another body of men will desire to build another dock unless there is room for another dock in a commercial way.

Mr. BENNETT. Then are we to understand that no second dock will be assisted unless it has been shown that the dock that has been assisted has been inadequate for the requirements of business?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already told my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) that there is no fixed rule or policy of the government at all. Each case will have to be dealt with on its merits as it arises.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand the hon. minister to state that it is a condition precedent that it must first be shown that the government-assisted dock has been entirely unable to cope with the requirements of the trade.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The conditions precedent are the conditions laid down in the statute. I cannot by any words of mine lay down conditions.

Mr. BENNETT. But you can lay down the line of policy which the government intend to pursue?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think this is a matter which calls for a more definite decision of policy than has already been laid down. I think the matter will settle itself commercially. I do not think there is any danger of a company establishing another dock where there is one in a locality which is able to do the business.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand the hon. minister to say—of course 'Hansard' will show whether he made the statement or not—that the government will not entertain any proposals for the assistance of a new dry-dock until it has been shown that the established dry-dock, in a certain locality and assisted by the government, has been unable to cope with the business. After that it would be quite in order on the eve of a general election to appeal to Midland, Owen Sound and other towns with the promise that a government supporter's return will result in the establishment of a dry-dock, and I am quite confident that I will be able to show that the hon. Minister of Finance made the statement that this would be one of the conditions under which such a proposition would be entertained.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend can get so much comfort out of my remarks as that, I would be sorry to deny them, but I think he will find that they will not bear the interpretation that he puts upon them.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether the government will have any say as to the charges which shall be made for the use of this dry-dock?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it is proposed that the owners of the dock must charge according to a tariff which has been submitted to the government, because, when they are receiving this large amount of public aid we think they shall establish fair and reasonable rates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the government any report as to the probable cost of this work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not heard anything on the subject since the last discussion took place. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is not in his place and I do not know whether he has anything on the subject or not. However, we will be able to ascertain later.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the meaning of the words 'on the cost of the work?' Surely it does not refer to repairs. The old dock is entering into the construction of this dock at Collingwood. The section says:

The Governor in Council may authorize the payment . . . . of a subsidy not exceeding three per cent per annum on the cost of the work.

Then, there is a qualifying clause at the end which says:

The cost on which it shall be calculated shall not be greater than the value of the work as estimated by the said minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are not new words. These are words which have been in the Act for twenty years. The purpose I have no doubt is that while we may pay interest on the cost, we shall not pay a subsidy on an extravagant cost. They must submit an estimate and they must satisfy the minister that the cost is the bona fide cost, so that we shall only pay a subsidy in return for a bona fide expenditure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). While these words might have a certain interpretation if an absolutely new dock was being constructed the hon. Minister of Finance will, of course, recollect that in the resolution as passed and in this Bill as proposed the words include the completion of a dry-dock now in course of construction. In this dock at Collingwood, for example, a portion of a former dock constitutes an important part of the new dock. If you were building a completely new dock you could say what is to be the actual cost of the work. But, suppose you introduce into the question a portion of an old dock partly completed, such as there is at Collingwood, and which has not been built under the supervision of the Department of Public Works, a difficulty would be introduced, which you would have to consider.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that to say that the dock at Collingwood is an old dock repaired, is hardly to make a fair statement. The information we have is that the dock at Collingwood is practically an entirely new dock. The only excuse for saying anything about the old dock is that there was an old dock in former years. It was a small affair, and I understand all that remains of the old dock is a hole in the ground and that that hole is not big enough for the purposes of the new dock. I understand that there is nothing of the old dock there to-day so that properly speaking it is a new dock that is to be built at Collingwood.

Mr. LANCASTER. Might I suggest that in the 27th line of the section you insert the word 'new' before the word 'work?' If the hon. Minister of Finance means to pay this subsidy only on a new work instead of on a work partly old and partly new this will make it clearer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is certainly the intention, and for the present I see no objection to the proposed amendment. We might reserve the third reading of the Bill lest we find that this amendment contains something that we do not intend, but I see no reason why the hon. gentleman's amendment should not be accepted.

Mr. LANCASTER. A work having been completed might be useless for want of repairs, and it might be said that the work is worth more because of the repairs. It is a question whether you would pay on the total value as it was then or merely on the cost of putting it into shape.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I do not quite follow the hon. gentleman's argument, but I hardly think the word 'new' would properly express it because this paragraph is apparently contemplating new work and it would be a redundancy to put in the word 'new.' I think it would be safer to say that this would only be calculated on the alluding to what you think might be the expenditure on an existing work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Suppose you have a dry-dock that might be valued by the owners at $50,000 and you want to build a dock that will cost when completed $300,000—a new company pays $50,000 for the old dock although they might not get value for more than $15,000. If you insert the word 'new' it would prevent them getting any return on the money they had to pay for the old dock, and which would be an expenditure on their part just as much as if it were for a new work. I think we should pause before inserting that word.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is also the danger that the cost of the land which might be a very considerable item could not be taken into account if you inserted that word. I can assure my hon. friends that there is no intention of subsidizing any old broken down enterprise.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The dry-dock at Collingwood was assisted by the town to the extent of $50,000 and the town got possession of it and made an absolute present of it to this company. In such a case assistance should be given only to the new work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the corporation of a town gave them some aid, that would certainly enter into the valuation for which they would receive a subsidy, but they could not earn a tariff of tolls on it. We have provided that they must make returns on all aids received from corporations and they cannot earn any money on that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This company at Collingwood should have no claim on the government for the site or for any assistance that the town gave.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would not like to answer that off-hand.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But they should not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman need not be concerned about Col-

lingwood, because I made a statement at an earlier stage of this debate and I received a letter since from the president of the company, Mr. John Long, in which he says that my reference to conditions at Collingwood were correct. I may repeat what I then said. I stated that it was true that they began with the hope that they would utilize some of the walls of the existing dock, but they found it impossible to make any use whatever of them, and instead of getting any benefit they had to go the extra expense of removing the walls so that all that was left was the hole in the ground. So far as Collingwood is concerned, there was practically no value to the company in the dock which they attempted to enlarge, and ultimately had to abandon.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is not inconsistent with my statement that the company had to pay nothing for it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know anything as to how they acquired it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They are in possession of the work which the town gave them for the benefit of the town and the country in the hope of getting government assistance. This company has expended nothing except to remove the old works as the Postmaster General states.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Expended nothing on what ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On the dock; excepting the removal of a portion of it which could not be utilized.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are expending a much larger amount of money than the subsidy.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I know, but what I wish to guard against is the value of property being calculated before these new works are commenced.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether this three per cent bonus applies as well to a floating dock as to a dry-dock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The wording of the Act deals with dry-docks, and I think we have never had application for the construction of a floating dock. A case of that kind might have to be dealt with by special legislation. If there is a place where a floating dock is more suitable than a dry-dock, that might have to be considered.

Mr. MACPHERSON. There is a large company in the city of Vancouver who contemplate the building of a floating dock, and I doubt if they would be likely to go into the enterprise unless they were assured of the three per cent bonus from the Dominion government. As a matter of fact a floating dock is much preferable to a dry-dock.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am inclined to think that a floating dock is a dry-dock, so that it would come under the operation of this dock. A dry-dock means a dock that is made dry so that you can repair a vessel, and I suppose a floating dock would answer the purpose of repairing vessels the same as a dry-dock. There would therefore be no difference in reality between a floating dock and a dock on land. The essence of the thing is that you should have a dock where you may repair ships, and whether afloat or ashore I think it would come under the spirit of the Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is not a dry-dock when you fill it with water so that vessels may be floated into it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Bermuda dry-dock was taken out from England.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand there is an engineer from the Public Works Department superintending the construction of the dock at Collingwood.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has been built under the general direction of the Department of Public Works, but whether they have a resident engineer there or not I would not like to answer.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think the Postmaster General said on a previous occasion that the work was being done under the superintendence of an officer of the department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The plans have to be approved by the department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not necessary to have a resident engineer, but for their own satisfaction the department may have sent an engineer.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As the minister has assented to the insertion of the word 'new,' I think it covers all objections.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid that the insertion of that word would make it too restrictive. For instance, you could not pay for the land in the case of the St. John dry-dock, and my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) does not mean that. I think the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) can safely accept the assurance of the Postmaster General, who is familiar with Collingwood, that it is a new dock, and that there is no question of repairing an old one.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The insertion of the word 'new' would certainly cover the cost of the land.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not sure that it would.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You might as well take our assurance as to ask us to take the assurance of the Postmaster General.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The one is a matter of law and the other is a matter of fact. We are able to form an opinion on a matter of fact, but when it comes to a matter of law we have to refer it to our legal adviser.

Mr. LANCASTER. We are all agreed that there should be some improvement in the clause in the direction intended, and if the insertion of the word 'new,' may not suit, we may perhaps get something else.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Act in that respect is exactly as it has been for twenty years, and, as none of these difficulties have ever arisen, I think hon. gentlemen rather magnify them, especially after all the conversations we have had with reference to the Collingwood dock; and I am afraid that if we amend the Bill to meet that case, we might put an obstruction in the way of the erection of docks elsewhere.

Mr. LANCASTER. I had not in mind the Collingwood dock; but it struck me that as the object of the Act is no doubt to encourage the construction of works which will be useful for the purpose, we are not to pay upon anything except what has been brought into existence by the people who are looking for a subsidy. As the clause reads now, if there was some work of value done before the new work, it could be strongly argued that the whole work, after its completion, would be entitled to a subsidy, although perhaps only 25 per cent of the work might be required to make it a complete work. In such a case, I do not think over 25 per cent of the work ought to get the subsidy. I think there should be a qualifying word of some kind inserted in the section.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The object which my friend has in view is commendable, but I am afraid that the word inserted there might possibly defeat itself. Let us dispose of the Bill in committee, and we will look into it and see if any change is needed later on.

Mr. CLARKE. Did I understand the hon. Postmaster General to say that he had received a communication from the president of the Collingwood Dry-dock Company in which that gentleman said that the old work had no value, or that there was nothing of it there to-day except the hole?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said I had received a letter from Mr. John Long, the president of the Collingwood company, stating that he had read the debate in 'Hansard' and had read my statements in that debate, and that they were correct.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the minister added something else.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, nothing more than what I have said just now. When the matter was before the House on a former occasion, I stated that I had visited Collingwood and had seen the condition of the work, and I described the extent of the new work, which practically made the whole thing a new work.

Mr. CLARKE. Then there was nothing left of the old outfit?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was nothing left but the hole of the smaller dock.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Were the walls wood or concrete?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When I was there, there was only one wall partially built—the east wall of the new structure, and it was of stone. There was excavation going on in other directions.

Mr. CLARKE. The only part of the old dock to be taken into account is the hole?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is my information.

Mr. BENNETT. The dry-dock which formerly existed at Collingwood was not by any means an unimportant work. It was capable of accommodating the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers, which are over 300 feet in length. I myself have seen them in that dock. It was also stated in the debate the other day by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Thomson) that it was a very fine dock. It must be quite clear that when this company took the old dock as a present from the town of Collingwood, it was a dock of considerable value, and if the walls were of stone, this new company have a very valuable asset. I assume that the government do not propose to pay on the material taken from the old dock which enters into the construction of the new dock, and of which this company have been made a present?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Even if they did, it might not be such a monstrous thing as the hon. gentleman seems to suppose, if the dock as originally constructed received no subsidy. However, I do not think that is likely to arise in this case. These docks are sometimes given assistance from various quarters.

Mr. BENNETT. The town gave $50,000 of cash bonus to the company which failed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know that in the case of the Halifax dock the city gave a large sum, and yet the subsidy could be collected on the whole cost of the dock. I do not see anything wrong in that. It is by a combination of these various aids that people get the resources to build the docks. If the land for the Collingwood dock was a free gift from the town, it still formed a fair part of the cost of the dock. I do not think we should object to that.

Mr. BENNETT. The Department of Public Works should be able to supply all

the information required by the committee. Although Mr. Coste has been supervising this work, and has visited Collingwood time and again in connection with it, we are without a single bit of information in regard to what has been done.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That shows that the Department of Public Works are carefully looking after the work, and I do not think we should apologize for that.

Mr. CLARKE. But they are keeping the information religiously to themselves.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No; if the hon. gentleman will specify the information he desires, I will bring it down on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). Was the government consulted before that work was undertaken?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). And has the government had anything to say in regard to the way in which it should be constructed? If so, it should be constructed of cement rather than stone. Cement is used all over the United States, and is very much more economical.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is an engineering question, on which I cannot give an opinion.

Mr. CLARKE. Before the Bill finally passes, we should have the size of the dock, the material to be used, and the reports of the engineers made from time to time with respect to the progress being made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall bring down information on all the points mentioned by my hon. friend from Toronto, (Mr. Clarke) and if any other point is specified, shall be happy to bring down all the information possible.

Mr. WILMOT. Is the site for St. John decided on yet?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am under the impression that there is an arrangement between the city of St. John and the promoters of the company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have the plans submitted for the Collingwood dock been approved by the Governor General in Council?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The plans were originally prepared on a smaller scale than is now contemplated, but I am not sure whether plans on a large scale have been submitted or not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman surely has the dimensions of the dock?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of the dock first proposed, but it will be made larger.

Mr. BENNETT. We should know whether the stone going into the construction of the dock is the same material as was used in the construction of the old dock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Whatever information we may have will be brought down. Under the wording of the Act we make a provision for a financial statement before we pay the first instalment of the subsidy, but as the company may receive other aid, it is desirable to have that statement submitted annually so that we may know how much bona fide investment there is. I propose to add after the word 'Act' on the second line of the new section six the following: and thereafter annually before the first of January.' The clause will then read as follows:

The company before receiving its first payment of subsidy under the authority of this Act and thereafter annually before the 1st of January shall file in the office of the Minister of Public Works a financial statement, verified to the satisfaction of the Minister of Public Works, setting forth in detail the receipts and expenditures of the company, and also all gifts, grants, or aids to the company from any municipal or public body, the amounts received or to be received by the company on account of stocks, bonds, or debentures of the company, and particularly the amount of money derived from the issue of stock or loans to the company and actually expended in the construction of the dry-dock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is no provision as to the use of the docks by United States ships. In the case of Halifax, under the contract with the Imperial government, which gave also some aid, it was provided that Her Majesty's ships should have the first use.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They paid handsomely for it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We are paying somewhat too.

Mr. CLARKE. Our new Canadian navy should have the preference.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no doubt that we will get the preference without putting it in.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is certainly worth considering. The navy have precedence in the Halifax graving dock and they do not pay the same rates as ordinary shipping.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot say positively but my impression is that the only thing they get is priority. It would be hardly fair to give the company a subsidy with the one hand and take it away with the other. If we use the dock, we should pay for it.

Mr. CLARKE. But should we not have priority?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are not likely to be so rushed with business

that we need fear any difficulty on that score.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman should provide that the company shall not do as the old company did, utilize the dock for the purpose of constructing vessels in it. A dry-dock is intended for repairing ships but there was so little business done that they built one or more vessels in the dock. That was a detriment to the public, for the public could not get the use of the dock for repairs when it was being used for building ships.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no reason to believe that the Collingwood Dock Company would be influenced in this way. They will find it advantageous to themselves to have the dock ready for shipping. Their own interest, I should think, would protect the government against what the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The clause would do no harm.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The graving dock at Esquimalt is practically in the hands of the Imperial government at all times, that is, it is occupied by His Majesty's ships; but when it is not, of course, the merchant vessels can be attended to. I understand that the tolls charged by the Canadian government are ridiculously small, very much smaller, than those of any other dry-dock or graving-dock on the Pacific coast. It would be advisable for the government to recognize fully local conditions in fixing the tolls of any other dock. I suppose the Esquimalt graving-dock is run at a loss. But if a private company went into the construction of a dock, say at Vancouver, it would be hardly fair that they should be put upon the same scale of rates as the Esquimalt dock, which is not available at all times for the merchant ships.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The government should take power under this clause to take into consideration in the payment of subsidy as well as in the fixing of rates, any grants from municipal or other public bodies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The subsidy is fixed by the Act itself.

Mr. CLARKE. In all seriousness, if there is anything in the statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) recently, that the government intend to establish the nucleus of a Canadian navy, there should be right reserved in the Bill for priority for repairs of government vessels whenever there is necessity.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We already have some vessels for the protection of fisheries.

Mr. CLARKE. As the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) suggests, we already have vessels engaged in the fishery protection service, and we are given to understand that we are to have cruisers on the Atlantic and the Pacific, as well as training ships. This will be a pretty extensive outfit, and the vessels of that outfit should have precedence over merchant vessels when the government desire to have them overhauled or repaired. Moreover, we ought to have an explanation from the minister as to his policy on this particular phase of the government's policy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I fancy that in time of war we should not need an Act of parliament to give us priority in these matters, and, in time of peace, my idea would be to give precedence to the ships of peace rather than to the ships of war.

Mr. CLARKE. But the time to stop a leak is when the leak occurs. This question of the priority of government vessels should be given consideration. And, in the absence of the Minister of Militia and Defence and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I think it would be better to allow the Bill to stand until we can get their opinion as to the merits of the situation.

Progress reported.

ACT RESPECTING INFECTIOUS OR CONTAGIOUS DISEASES AFFECTING ANIMALS.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 194) respecting infectious or contagious diseases affecting animals.—The Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). This Bill was passed in committee except section 12, which was reserved for consideration of suggestions made by the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour). The suggestion was that the compensation, where an animal was slaughtered not in accordance with the provisions of the Act should be the full value of the animal. Therefore, I have remodelled this clause, and I propose to substitute the following for subsection 2 of section 12 :

Whenever the animal slaughtered is affected with infectious or contagious disease, the compensation, if any, shall be one-third of the value of the animal before it became so infected, but shall not exceed, in case of a grade animal, twenty dollars, or, in the case of full bred animals, sixty dollars. Whenever the animal is not thus infected but has been in contact with or in dangerous proximity to diseased animals, the compensation, if any, shall be three-quarters of the value of the animal, but shall not exceed, in the case of grade animals, fifty dollars, or in the case of pure bred animals one hundred and fifty dollars. Provided that when it is clearly shown that the animal has been slaughtered on insufficient grounds and that the slaughter was not in accordance with or justifiable under this Act, the owner shall be entitled to compensation in the full value of the animal so slaughtered. In all cases, the

value of the animal shall be determined by the minister or by some person appointed by him.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time, and passed.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I move to reconsider section 156. I find that it would be as well to indicate especially the superior court and the county court by a subsection having reference to matters of expropriation. I think on further study the effect of the change in the interpretation clause will be such that it will not be advisable to make the changes that we have made, naming the county court in the sub-clauses (f) and (m) of the interpretation section. I will ask in a moment the committee to restore the clauses. At present I move to add as sub-clause 2 of section 156 the following :

In this section and in the following sections of this Act, wherever the same occur down to section 175 inclusive, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'court' shall mean a superior court of the province or district, or a county court of a county where the lands lie, and the expression 'judge' shall mean a judge of such superior court or county court ; and any proceedings commenced in one court having proper jurisdiction shall be contained therein.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose this will have the effect the minister intends, though I am not quite sure, unless I know how the interpretation clause is going to be changed. But instead of saying that 'any proceedings commenced in one court having proper jurisdiction shall be continued therein,' would it not be better to say 'continued to completion ?'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They could not go to any other court. I move :—

That section 2 be reconsidered.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved :

That subsections 'f' and 'm' of section 2 be restored to their original state by striking out the words in each 'or county court.'

Motion agreed to.

On section 160,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved :

To amend section 160 by striking out the words 'but each party shall be held sufficiently notified through the arbitrator appointed by him, or whose appointment he required ;' and also to add the letters 'Am.' to the end of the section.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not know why the hon. minister wants these words left out, because I think there ought to be some sort of provision for notice to be received in these matters.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This notice only refers to the meeting of the arbitrators for making up their award after they have heard the parties.

Mr. LANCASTER. We have to rely on those particular words sometimes in order to fix the time for appealing. There will be appeals under this Act. The parties must have notice of the award before the time begins to run during which an appeal can be made. A prudent attorney or solicitor will give notice himself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What would you suggest to conserve your rights ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The section says :

That no such award shall be made, nor any official act be done, by such majority, except at a meeting held at a time and place of which the other arbitrator has had at least two clear days notice, or to which some meeting at which the third arbitrator was present had been adjourned ; and no notice to either of the parties shall be necessary.

Sometimes one of the arbitrators, for some reason best known to himself, refuses to agree with the other two as to some detail in the case. The arbitrators might want to view the premises and one of the arbitrators might get stubborn and he will not agree to do anything. These very words that the hon. minister proposes to strike out have always saved the situation. If there is anything done behind the back of one of the parties he will set aside the whole award and the whole of the expense will have been wasted and the trouble gone to for nothing. These words that the hon. minister proposes to strike out have averted that calamity which might otherwise arise.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What about the words :

And no notice to either of the parties shall be necessary ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I think they ought to be inserted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why ?

Mr. LANCASTER. No express notice is necessary, but if your arbitrator has notice it is sufficient; that is the way the lawyers have construed it. If you leave the words that you are striking out, the section will be construed as it has been heretofore done that the arbitrator is the only man who need know. If you leave these words out you will leave it baldly that no notice to either of the parties shall be necessary. I think there ought to be notice, but I agree

that the casual notice that the arbitrator receives ought to be sufficient.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I confess I do not see the difficulty that the hon. gentleman has pointed out. This clause has reference entirely to the action of the arbitrators in making up their award after they have heard the parties. If it does, and the meeting of the arbitrators was held, the section provides that the arbitrators must get notice, and when they get notice then no other notice will be required because each arbitrator will be taken to have notified his principal. There is no arbitrator to which this particular clause would be applicable. I do not see the applicability in any sense in the language which we are proposing to strike out.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the minister argue that it is because each party receives notice from the arbitrator that it is not necessary ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no notice necessary.

Mr. LANCASTER. But ought there not be ? The arbitrators ought not to do anything that the parties to the arbitration do not know anything about.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The preliminary business and the taking of evidence has been finished, and the arbitrators are left to dispose of the matter. They may meet but they shall not make any award except at a meeting of which they have had notice. The parties have nothing to do with the making up of the award, and so they have passed the stage at which the parties ought to be present.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is I suppose an old principle of the common law that the parties being principals they are presumed to be invited to the proceedings of the arbitrators. I think that should be preserved.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does this section mean that as a sole arbitrator he could proceed without giving the slightest notice to the parties.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only to make up his award. I move that the following words be struck out : 'And no notice to either of the parties shall be necessary, but each party shall be held sufficiently notified through the arbitator appointed by him, or whose appointment he required.'

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 169, subsection 2—appeal from award.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We left a blank for the amount subject to appeal. In the old Act it stood at anything over $400. The hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) proposed that the blank should be filled up by $1,000. I have considered that suggestion, and it seems to me that $1,000 would be a very large sum. I think it would be making a very material and radical departure from the existing law. The proportion of expropriations which exceed in value $500 is very inconsiderable. If we add fifty per cent to the present amount, and make it $600, I think we would be making a very careful and prudent departure from the existing law. In cases where the value exceeded that amount which would be very rare, the property-owner would be just as likely to complain of the award as the company.

Mr. LANCASTER. I still think that $1,000 is not too high. I should think that the appeals should be restricted if possible to questions where some principle is at stake, as for instance whatever a party is entitled or not to a certain kind of damage. That question of principle would be more likely to arise in cases where the amount was large. Where it is but a mere question of estimating the amount of actual damages, it seems to me that the arbitrators, who are on the spot and hear the evidence, are better able to come to a fair decision than would be the one judge who has not examined the locality or heard the witnesses. But there are questions where it is not so much a calculation of the amount of damages suffered as a question whether the damages are of such a character that they should be entertained at all. It is for that reason that I would ask the amount to be fixed at $1,000. It is a principle which is at issue, and the question of principle is more likely to arise where the amount exceeds $1,000 than where it is less.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It seems to me that the question of principle may be raised where the damages are small as where they are large. You are just as likely to have a question of principle at stake where the damages are $400 as where they are double that. I think that we would do well to make the amount $600, and I move that the blank be filled with the sum of $600.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 176, subsection 6,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that this subsection be struck out and the following be substituted:

Upon compliance with this section all provisions except section 123 and 124 of this Act shall be applicable to the compensation for the lands to be taken for such branch line.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose the hon. minister has considered the phraseology of this amendment and is satisfied that it will

cover all that is desired. I am a little nervous myself about its covering all the proceedings it is intended to cover.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It makes sections 123 and 124 inapplicable to branch lines.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is all right; but, is the minister sure that the phraseology is sufficient? Would it not be better to say from section so and so to section so and so inclusive?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) in mind?

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not say that this does not cover the point, but I am not sure that it does.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The moment a branch line becomes a part of the railway it is subject to the provisions of the Act. We wish to provide for these branch lines, and also to provide for making compensation.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would prefer to say 'and to all the proceedings applicable to, necessary for or arising out of compensation.' I do not say it is necessary, but I think it would be preferable.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved to strike out subsection 6 and to insert the following:

On compliance with this section, all the provisions excepting sections 123 and 124 of this Act, shall apply to the company and to the lands to be taken for such branch lines.

Amendment agreed to.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to introduce a new section dealing with a new matter before we take up section 177. I beg to move the following section be inserted:

Where the owner of any industry established, or intended to be established, within six miles of the railway, is desirous of obtaining railway facilities in connection therewith, but cannot agree with the company as to the construction and operation of a spur or branch line from the railway thereto, the board may, on the application of such owner, and upon being satisfied of the necessity for such spur or branch line in the interests of trade, order the company to construct, maintain and operate such branch line or spur, and may direct such owner to deposit in some chartered bank such sum or sums as may by the board be deemed sufficient, or may by it be found to be necessary to defray all expenses of constructing and completing the spur or branch line in good working order, including the cost of the right of way, incidental expenses and damages, and the amount so deposited shall, from time to time, be paid to the company upon the owner of the board, as the work progresses.

(2) The aggregate amount so paid by the owner in the construction and completion of the said spur or branch line shall be repaid or refunded to the owner by the company by way of rebate, to be determined and fixed by the board, out of, or in proportion to the tolls charged by the company in respect of the carriage of traffic for the owner over the said spur or branch line, and until so repaid or refunded, the owner shall have a special lien thereof, upon such branch line, to be reimbursed by rebate as aforesaid.

(3) Upon repayment by the company to such owner of all payments made by the owner upon such construction, the said spur or branch line, right of way, and equipment, shall be and become the absolute property of the company free from any such lien.

(4) The operation and maintenance of the said spur or branch line, by the company, shall be subject to and in accordance with such order as the board may make with respect thereto, having due regard to the requirements of the traffic thereon, and to the safety of the public and of the employees of the company.

(5) All the provisions of this Act respecting the construction of spur or branch lines shall apply to any spur or branch line constructed under this section.

I may say that while not constituting any part of the existing law this is at present the practice and usage amongst railways.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The whole cost of the construction is placed upon the owner of the factory or the person who will benefit by the line?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, he has to put up a deposit.

Mr. LANCASTER. I was not able to quite follow the last subsection, but, as I understand, it provides that the company after obtaining the use of the money shall return it to the owner.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If a person wants a spur line built in to his factory and the company are willing to build it they are only willing to build it upon having the owner put up a sufficient deposit to enable them to pay for such construction and to equip and furnish the line. That is the usage at present. Then, after they have built it, they are entitled, not to exact any direct payment of tolls for shunting over it or freights carried over it, but such amount as they are entitled to charge in respect thereto will be repaid to the person or company putting up the deposit until a sufficient amount has been repaid to recoup the person or company for the original outlay. The railway company then will become the complete and absolute owners of the spur line and they continue to operate it as if it had been constructed by them without being subject to any such conditions. It is very necessary to have something of this kind in the Act and these clauses have been very carefully compared. We have dealt with conditions by which a company that have

a spur line to a particular factory are unwilling to build a spur line to another factory. We want to have power to compel them to treat all fairly.

Mr. LANCASTER. What number will that be ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That will be No. 176, because there are one or two other sections which will have to be struck out.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It will come under the heading of the construction of branch lines ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

On section 177,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved :

That section 177, subsection 2, be amended by adding the following : And may determine the amount of damage or compensation, if any, to be paid for any property or land taken or injuriously affected by reason of the construction of such tracts.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that not interfering with the general principle of the Bill as to how compensation is to be ascertained ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are dealing with the case of where one railway wants a portion of the property of another, or where one wants a crossing over another line. This is now determined by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council if the parties do not agree.

On section 184,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The amendments proposed in this clause will make it read : The railway may be carried along or across the existing highway upon leave having been first obtained from the board as hereinafter provided; then the remainder of the clause is the same as in the old law.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it proposed to allow a railway to be constructed along or across the public highway of a city or a town without the permission of the municipality ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They must now get the leave of the Railway Committee, and under this Act they will have to get the leave of the board.

Mr. CLARKE. But the municipality has no power ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The municipality will be notified. No order of the board would be valid against any municipality unless it had received notice.

Mr. LANCASTER. It seems to me that some words should be inserted here providing for the consent of the municipality being first obtained. I question very much whether people, relying on this Act, might not get into serious difficulty if a municipality denied the right of the board under all circumstances to allow a railway to run on a highway in a city or town or incorporated village, or in fact any organized municipality. There might be some circumstances in which that would be absolutely necessary. I know the argument that is used, that when you charter a railway to go from one point to another point, and it is necessary to the purposes of the charter that the railway should pass over highways, the Dominion parliament has a prima facie right over the highways to that extent. But that is so only where it is absolutely necessary. There might be a hundred other ways of getting from the one point to the other point. I think we should be passing dangerous and unsafe legislation in providing that if the board saw fit, it could compel the municipality to let a railway be constructed on a highway. If the railway company could carry out the object of its charter by expropriating land beside the highway, no matter at what cost, even if it should be necessary to tear down buildings, to do so, I do not think this parliament can give it power over the public highways, and I do not think we ought to authorize any board of commissioners to do anything that it seems to me we have not the power to do ourselves. The prima facie power over the highways is vested in the local legislature, and through it is given to the municipalities, and under the British North America Act this parliament cannot use a highway wantonly. As we have power to charter a railway, we have power to authorize it to go through everything that is necessary for the purposes of the undertaking, but only when it is absolutely necessary. If it is not necessary, I doubt the power of this parliament to pass that section; I think it would be ultra vires. I do not think we ought to undertake to give this board the power to let a railway run upon or across a public highway without the consent of the municipality. If the board went on and undertook to compel the municipality to let the railway run on its highway, and if the municipality fought against the order of the board, I am of opinion that the clause would be held to be ultra vires, and I do not think we should pass it.

Mr. CLARKE. I presume that all the works which are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada will be works over which the commissioners to be appointed under this Bill will have jurisdiction ? Session after session we are declaring enterprises to be for the general advantage of Canada, which are practically one-horse tramways; and if this section remains as it is, these commissioners will have the power to compel municipalities to admit such lines, whether they desire to

do so or not. Surely our great municipalities, like Toronto, Montreal, Hamilton and others, have some rights that ought to be taken into consideration; and if they set their faces against lines coming in which they do not want, we should not give the commissioners power to compel them to give entrance to such lines. In the case of undertakings connecting one province with another, I can understand that no municipality should have the right to prevent their going through; but in the case of purely local enterprises, I think that the municipalities should have the right of compelling such enterprises to first obtain their consent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid that those gentlemen who express the decided opinion that this law is ultra vires the Parliament of Canada will find it somewhat difficult to establish their proposition. The law has been on the statute-book ever since the parliament of Canada was organized, and I think, a similar provision was contained in the Railway Act of the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada; and I have not yet heard—and I think it would be difficult to show—that in any single instance it was ever contended before any court that the parliament of Canada has not the power to legislate in these terms. The matter suggested by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) is worthy of consideration, but he must bear in mind that there must be some kind of authority to determine whether or not any public highway may be used by a railway. You cannot leave it in the hands of a municipality, to definitely determine that principle. When the parliament of Canada gives a charter to a corporation, under which the corporation has the right to go through a town, you cannot leave it to the municipality to say whether the charter power shall be exercised or not. You must leave it to some independent tribunal. Otherwise the municipal authorities might refuse to allow this power to be exercised, greatly to the public disadvantage. They might hold up a corporation and impose unreasonable exactions, and you would have no authority to pronounce upon the fairness or justice of the municipal demands. It has always been admitted by the parliament of Canada down to the present moment that such a power should reside in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. In all its decisions, the tendency of the Railway Committee has been to yield to the wishes of the municipal corporations. I know of no instance in which a different course has been pursued, and the result has been that, with this power in the hands of an independent tribunal, the municipal authorities have always been reasonable and willing to allow a thing to be done where it was unavoidable and where it would be for the general convenience. It is necessary often for the convenience of the public that railway stations be located in the centre of a city so as to be easily accessible for business and other purposes. There is not likely to be any serious controversy under this Bill any more than under the law as it exists, and therefore I cannot see that it would be well to repeal the law or change it materially. Experience has shown that no danger has arisen and no public injury has been done, or inconvenience suffered, and we may infer that the experience of the last forty years is likely to continue.

Mr. CLARKE. There is a good deal of force in the argument of the hon. minister as regards the experience of municipalities, but a new condition of things has arisen during the past two or three years. Applications are made every session to this parliament for the incorporation of companies declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, but which are purely provincial. The introduction of electricity has made a marked difference in the situation. Enterprises are being promoted to connect city with city, and these enterprises, if sanctioned by the parliament of Canada, and declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, will come under the authority of this commission. They are not, in the strict sense of the term, works for the general advantage of Canada, but simply for the benefit of some small section of one of the provinces. Regulations have been passed by the legislatures of some of the provinces dealing with such matters, and I think that the direction and control of such purely provincial enterprises should be left with the provinces and not be taken by the Dominion. In the case of purely provincial lines, the right of a municipality to prevent any such line coming into it, without its consent, should be respected. The hon. minister has declared what is well known, that the municipalities have been reasonable in the past and have obtained justice from the Privy Council. There is no reason to assume that they will be otherwise in the future or demand unreasonable conditions from any enterprise within municipal bounds. But by the clause as amended——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not different from the present law.

Mr. CLARKE. Now, a different condition of things has arisen——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not due to this amendment.

Mr. CLARKE. No, it is due to the application of electricity to railways and the granting of charters by this parliament to enterprises which it declares to be for the general benefit of Canada, but which are

purely local in their character. And this power to give a railway company the right to run along a highway should not be exercised unless the enterprise is inter-provincial in its character.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The argument which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) has addressed to the committee is inapplicable to the present Bill, but it would be applicable if the measure before the committee were to incorporate an electric tramway and declare it a work for the general benefit of Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. I asked the hon. minister if works and enterprises declared to be for the general advantage of Canada came under the purview of this commission, and he said they did. I am drawing his attention to the fact that we in this parliament are giving charters almost every day to railway companies that only intend to join one municipality with another, and declaring them to be works for the general advantage of Canada. In view of this and of the new conditions created by the changes in electric traction, I ask the hon. minister if he does not think that the municipalities ought to have their rights reserved to them? The Railway Committee of the Privy Council, as I understand it, has hitherto dealt with steam railways only. But a new order of things is being created because of the legislation sought to be obtained from this parliament. If this clause is permitted to go as the hon. minister has amended it, whatever rights the municipalities enjoy to keep out lines of electric cars that they do not wish to have running along their highways, will be taken away. I think that is a serious matter that I am drawing the hon. minister's attention to, and the attention of the committee at large, to the subject, in the hope that something will be done to afford protection to the municipalities.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And I am drawing the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Clarke) attention to the fact that we are not discussing and cannot be supposed to discuss under this Bill, conditions which are special and exceptional such as the hon. gentleman refers to. It is open to the hon. gentleman if he desires, to annex a condition to the granting of every charter of an electric railway, whether it is declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada or not—or to ask parliament to annex it—that these rights shall not be exercised through any city or town without the consent of the municipality. They would then be under the necessity of going to the municipality for any such power. But how does the hon. gentleman propose to amend this section? He says, that as I have amended it, it causes a difficulty. He is in error in that respect. If he were a lawyer, he would know that the verbal changes made in this clause from the words of the existing law do not create a new condition such as he says—they do not alter the tenor or spirit of the law at all. The old section says that so and so shall not be done unless so and so, and this says that it may be done if so and so. There is no difference, as a matter of fact, as any lawyer would say if he were to express his opinion on it.

Mr. CLARKE. When this parliament declares a work to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, it gives to the company carrying out that work certain powers. This is the time to make an amendment to the law, because the changes in regard to electricity as a motive power create a new order of things for which the law should provide.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What amendment would the hon. gentleman propose?

Mr. CLARKE. If I had the legal ability of the hon. minister—he has been good enough to remind me that I am not a lawyer—I could draft a clause. And if he will allow this section to stand I will see about a clause being drafted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has started a legal question, which he does not understand, I am sorry to say, and if he cannot propose an amendment——

Mr. CLARKE. I will be glad to submit an amendment if the hon. gentleman will allow the clause to stand.

Mr. WADE. This is a provision of great importance, and I think that any tampering with it might lead to great misfortune.

Mr. CLARKE. It is tampered with now.

Mr. WADE. As has been stated by the hon. minister the clause as now proposed is exactly the same in effect as the old clause. It does seem to me that it should be our object to retain every section of the old Act unless some good reason is advanced for changing it. No good reason could be given for changing this clause. If the amendment were passed which is suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke), I can see how small towns and municipalities might be put in a position where they could tie up great railway enterprises. Suppose a railway runs for five hundred miles, then in the course of the construction it comes to a village or small municipality which says. 'We will not permit you to cross our street.' And that street might be the only place where it could cross. Under the present law, before they can run along a street or cross a street they must get the sanction of the board. It seems to me that this is a sufficient safeguard. We are putting large powers in the hands of that board, necessarily, and we must as-

sume that they will exercise those powers wisely as each case arises. I would therefore urge that there should be no change in this section.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The proposition which my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) puts, as I understand it is this: Suppose a line runs from some town to the suburbs of a city and there connects with the city system of electric tramways, they would then have the right to run over the streets of the city. That, I take to be my hon. friend's contention. But as I understand the law, they could not do anything of the kind until they had received the sanction of the commission and of the civic authorities.

Mr. WADE. There is more than that in it. Under the general provisions of the law, an electric road must have the authority of the municipality to put up its poles.

Mr. LANCASTER. Take the case of one of these roads spoken of by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), it receives a charter and make a bargain with the municipality as to what streets it may run on. I am not talking now about crossing streets. This is even more dangerous; they can run along the street according to the Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Have they any different power from what they have had for forty years?

Mr. LANCASTER. The danger is greater because, as my hon. friend has stated, the conditions are changed. When this law was passed there were no electric railways, and railways did not run on one street where they run on a hundred to-day. I have no great regard for a law merely because it has been for many years in force, if it is not a law that applies to the conditions that actually exist. Here, let us say, is a concern with a charter from the Dominion parliament, and with the power under certain conditions, not merely to run across the street but to run along it, to use the highway for its right of way. Now, let me point out to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) that, even though it is arguable that this section as amended means the same thing as the old section, for some strange reason the phraseology is changed and changed in favour of the very view that my hon. friend from West Toronto and I are opposing. Now the section under the old Act starts out:

> The railway shall not be carried along an existing highway, but shall merely cross the same in the line of the railway.

Prima facie it shall not be carried along the highway but it shall cross it. Now how did they draw this section? This section makes no distinction between crossing and going along. The draughtsmen of the old section, when they did not have trouble with numerous electric roads wanting to cross highways, even then I saw a great distinction between a railway running across it. The legislature who passed that Act said:

> Shall not be carried along an existing highway but shall merely cross the same in the line of the railway, unless leave therefor has been obtained from the Railway Committee, and no obstruction of such highway with the works shall be made without turning the highway so as to leave an open and good passage for carriages and on completion of the works, replacing the highway; and every company which violates the provisions of this section shall incur a penalty of not less than $40.

I do not find that penalty carried out in the Bill which is now before us. Now, taking the section before us, the railway may be carried along or across an existing highway. As the minister drew this Bill which is before us, and which until a few minutes ago we supposed was to become law, it was not that way, it was that the railway shall not be carried along or upon. But for some reason, since this Act was printed, we are surprised to-night to find that he is going to amend and puts the presumption the other way, the railway may be carried upon or along upon leave therefor obtained from the board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only difference is between tweedledum and tweedledee.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then why did the minister make it tweedledee when he had it tweedledum? Why did he draw this section a second time and surprise the House with a new section, if it is so unimportant? I think the section is different. If there are decisions and judicial rules that have operated before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council under that old section, I can well understand where cases would arise where the same rule would not apply under this section. Prima facie, under the other section the railway could not be carried along or upon the highway. With all due deference to the minister's saying that there is no sense in contending this is ultra vires, I am still of the opinion that it is. The British North America Act has given the fullest power over highways for all general purposes to the municipalities through the provincial legislatures. As I have already said, I admit that in carrying out a work that the Dominion parliament has power to carry out, if it is necessary in order to carry a railway from one place to another to cross a highway, then parliament would have power to force its way through. But can there be a case where the Dominion parliament can say that it is absolutely necessary to run along a highway. There is land each side of a highway. True, it may be expensive. I am satisfied that my suspicions are correct, and that it is because it is going to be cheaper for a railway to go on the highway, if the board can be induced

to say that it may go there; the company may pay a little money to the municipality for paving or grading up the street a little, and then obstruct the highway for all time. Any large steam railway could run along the highway here if the board gave permission. Now, suppose the city of Toronto or the city of St. Catharines gives a charter, and have passed a by-law giving power to an electric railway to pass along a highway on certain terms only, and a steam railway wants to connect also on the highway. Suppose one of these lines is within the jurisdiction of this commission, this commission has power to force them to connect by this power it has of allowing a steam railway to run upon that same highway. The roads were not laid out for railway rights of way, they were laid out for highways in the ordinary sense of the word; and I still say that unless it is absolutely necessary to run along that highway this section would be ultra vires, if properly contested. This provision attempts to repeal the British North America Act in so far as it allows them to run along the highway, because I cannot conceive that it is absolutely necessary for any railway to run along the highway. There is land each side of the highway, otherwise there would not be a highway there, and that land can be used for the purposes of the railway and can be expropriated. Of course it will cost the railway some damages, and the object of this section is that when a company finds that it cannot build its road as cheaply as it thought it could be built without using the highway, the railway commission is to have power to allow them to use the streets of the city, town or village. This is an authority that ought not to be delegated to them without the consent of the municipality, and we have not the right to delegate it to them under the British North America Act. That is for the provincial legislature.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think there is the slightest foundation for the opinion which the hon. gentleman has expressed. I am sure, from the conversations that took place in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council since I have had the honour of being a member of that board, that if it had been possible to raise a contention of that kind it would have been raised in several instances. The hon. gentleman says that he does not understand why the language of this clause was changed from the affirmative to the negative form. I will tell the hon. gentleman why. It was for the sake of harmonious and consistent legislation. We have passed in section 118 of the new Bill clause (k) 'make or construct in, upon, across, under or over any railway, tramway, river, stream, water-course, canal or highway,' and so on. Now that power is identical with the power we conferred upon the railway company in the existing Act, when it was passed many years ago. You will find it in section 90 of the present railway law, which provides:

> The company may, subject to the provisions of this Act, and of the special Act contained——

Do certain things and among the rest:

> Make, or construct in, upon, across, under, or near any . . . . highway.

And so on. What sense is there in giving to the railway company the power, of course, subject to the condition that the railway commission must approve, and then go on and say that the railway shall not be carried along the highway unless local approval has been obtained? You have already said the company shall have that power. My hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) shakes his head.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not understand the hon. minister to read it in that way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Section 90 of the present Railway Act says that the company may, subject to the provisions of this Act do the following things, among others:

> Make, or construct in, upon, across, under or near any railway, canal, river, stream or highway.

Mr. CLANCY. May the road be placed along the highway without the consent of the municipality?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure the hon. gentleman will see that this is a very serious question. I listened a moment ago when he said that the question had never been raised in all his experience——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said that the contention which was made here to-night that this power was ultra vires of this parliament had never been raised to my knowledge.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see that this is an extraordinary power which can be used for the purpose of securing a right of way. I know nothing more serious than a railway constructed along the highway. I was going to say hundreds of accidents, but I will be safe in saying that the number reaches well up towards the hundreds, that I have known to occur as the result of a railway running alongside of a highway. Women and children may be driving alone, the horse becomes uncontrollable and a serious accident occurs. I do not say that in all cases there should be no departure from the rule that a railway should not go along the highway, but if it can possibly be avoided it should be avoided.

Mr. CLARKE. I will accept the suggestion or proposition of the hon. minister, and I will undertake to try to have a clause

provided to be added which will meet the case that I am referring to. It is very difficult for a layman to express himself sometimes in order to convey to legal minds his exact idea. I asked the hon. minister if enterprises and undertakings that were declared to be for the general advantage of Canada were to come under the purview of these railway commissioners and his answer was, yes. We are chartering tram car lines to run from one town to another in this province and they are declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada. We have these tram car lines surrounding cities and connecting with trunk lines. The conditions that are being created by this Bill are entirely different from those which have existed during the past forty or fifty years or since the Railway Act has been in operation. There is a new condition of things in existence, and I say that it is an intolerable outrage that these tram car railways shall be given permission to go into the city of Hamilton, or Toronto, or Montreal without the consent of the municipality. It is entirely unfair to the municipalities. Take the case of the city of Toronto, for instance: We have as complete a tram car system as can be found in any city in America. That system is operated by one company. The right to operate that surface line belongs to the city. The city has given that franchise for a number of years to a company. If the citizens of Toronto desire a more extended tram car service they are the best judges as to where these tram cars should come in and under what conditions, and they can acquire for them running rights over existing lines running through the streets of Toronto. But why should power be taken away from the municipalities to keep these roads out if they desire to do so? They are the best judges. These tram car lines that are getting incorporation from this parliament are not gift enterprises. They are not being established by philanthropists to put money into people's pockets. Surely the municipalities have some rights in the matter. They ought to have some opportunity of saying when and where these roads should come in and under what conditions. This parliament is surely not in the helpless condition that the hon. minister described it to be in, that it cannot make such an amendment to section 184 as will give the municipalities the right to state conditions under which a tram car line may come in, and not leave the matter entirely under the control of this board of commissioners. I am sure the hon. minister must understand the objection I am trying to present to this permission being given, in view of the new order of things which has been created by the introduction of electricity during the last four or five years.

Mr. CLARKE.

Mr. WADE. If the hon. gentleman will turn his attention to sections 192 and 193 he will see that the very thing in regard to which he is now objecting is amply provided for. It provides that the company shall not place any lines, wires or poles on the streets until they have first obtained the consent of the board and then until they have obtained the consent of the municipality.

Mr. CLARKE. What board?

Mr. WADE. Subsection 'f' of section 193 says that the work of the company upon the highway shall be subject to the supervision of the municipality.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is not wanting in apprehension, and yet I am surprised to hear him say that when a general law is passed for the management, control and regulation of railways, the proper exercise of these powers is impossible because there are some tramways which are brought within the control of this commission and which are declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada. My hon. friend talks about taking power away from the municipalities. Who is taking power away from the municipalities, if it is a proper power for the municipalities to exercise? My hon. friend is taking it away from the municipalities——

Mr. CLARKE. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, he is; he is taking it away from the municipalities in the Bills which are passed for the purpose of incorporating these railways, without any conditions saying that they shall not enter upon the streets of any municipality until they obtain the consent of the municipality for that purpose. Instead of destroying or mutilating this Bill, all he has to do is to put that clause in a special Act, and the special Act will govern, and until they have complied with the conditions that are to be found in that special Act they do not come within the general provisions of this Railway Act. That is a complete answer to the difficulty the hon. gentleman presents.

Mr. CLARKE. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say as a lawyer that is is.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is new doctrine.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. New doctrine; is it?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, the government are responsible.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Another Daniel come to judgment.

Mr. CLARKE. I may be lacking in legal knowledge, but I think that primarily the responsibility for legislation of this kind rests on the hon. gentleman who occupies the distinguished position of Minister of Railways and Canals. If any injustice is being done to municipalities, the responsibility for that injustice must be shared by the minister with other members of this House when he allows tram car outfits run by electricity to be declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada. The hon. gentleman sits in the Railway Committee and he cannot be blind to the attempts that are frequently made with the object of destroying municipal rights. I enter my protest as a member of this House against legislation of this class that is being enacted here from year to year. The minister will see that the end is not yet, and that this question is bound to come before the House sooner or later. I am sure that the minister has sufficient legal knowledge, if he desired to exercise it, to enable him to add a subclause to this section which would meet the cases that we are presenting to him and which would protect the municipalities in the rights which they have enjoyed up to the present time. If the minister will give me permission I will try to get a lawyer to prepare a subclause that will meet the case, if he allows this section to stand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let the section stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 185,

Mr. CLARKE. I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the words of this clause which say that the top of the rail may protrude an inch over the level of the surrounding street. Would not that be a serious impediment to traffic.

Mr. LANCASTER. In all the by-laws that I have seen drawn, allowing these tramways or electric roads to run, they have always been compelled to put the top of the rail flush with the street, and the street is usually macadamized or paved up to the rail on both sides. Serious accidents will happen, runaways be caused and vehicles broken, if you allow the rail to obtrude in this way. It is admitted to be a most dangerous thing to allow the rail to rise above the level of the street. This difficulty arises because this House of Commons to-night is undertaking to do the work which should be done by the municipal councils throughout the country.

Mr. CLARKE. It is the experience of gentlemen who live in cities, that there is very great danger to horses and vehicles from allowing the rails to protrude above the level of the street. I have seen the tram car tracks laid down in the leading cities of the old country, and they are so level that you cannot detect any movement of the wheels of your vehicle when you are crossing them. Why should we not make provision here that they should be level with the pavement ? It will not cost any more, and it will save a great deal of trouble. I am not an engineer, but I would suggest to the minister that it would be no hardship if we provided that the rails should be flush with the contiguous surface of the street.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are simply retaining the law as it is now and always has been.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why should that be an argument. That's a regular Tory doctrine and has been exploded long ago. If the law has allowed a dangerous thing in the past the law should be amended. That is all there is to it. The minister knows as well as any farmer that it is very dangerous to allow these rails to protrude above the level of the roadway. If the rail is one inch above the roadway the wheels are likely to sink an inch below, and then you have two inches to get over, which is a serious obstacle. I do not care if the law has been so for generations, it should be rectified if it is not proper legislation. What might be right twenty years ago may be all wrong now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You cannot always have the track just on the dead level with the highway. I am not talking about tramways, I am talking about railways, and we are legislating here for every railway in the Dominion. You make them liable to a penalty of I think $5,000, and if it is impossible to have the rail on a dead level, are you going to fine them, or are you going to wipe out the penalty altogether. That might be all right in reference to the streets of Toronto and some of the wealthy cities whose roadways are in fine condition, but you cannot make a law as stringent as that to apply to every railway crossing in Canada, because it is impossible to do it.

Mr. LANCASTER. Nearly all the by-laws of all the municipalities in Ontario compel the rail to be on the level, and they enforce those by-laws.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They cannot enforce that.

Mr. LANCASTER. The by-law says that if the rail is not placed in that way the work will be done at the expense of the town engineer and the town collects the cost from the railway. If we did not interfere with the rights of the municipalities here the thing could be worked out all right, and that very fact proves that we should not undertake such legislation without the consent of the municipality.

Mr. AVERY. I think it is very important that the roadway should be level with the track, especially in winter time. Our

teams, loaded with lumber, have often got stuck on the rails owing to the track being higher than the roadway. That is something that has happened in my observation several times. It is more dangerous to have the rails above than below the level. I think it would be in the interest of the railway company as well as of the public to have the roadway as high as the rails, if not higher.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What locality does the hon. gentleman refer to ?

Mr. AVERY. The township of Oso, in the county of Frontenac.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not think a stronger argument could be urged in favour of a modification of this clause than that presented by the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Avery). Why not provide that when the work is completed the top rail shall sink an inch below the highway ? Why allow the rail to obtrude an inch above the highway ? The damage is done by being above, not below.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the rail is below the level, the wheels of wagons will be liable to get twisted.

Mr. CLARKE. It is not unreasonable to expect the company to keep their rails level with the ground on either side. It is not safe to give them two inches of margin, because if they have it, they will take it. I would respectfully suggest to the minister that that clause ought to be modified in some way to make it more acceptable to the municipalities than it is as it stands now.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I may add that I have time and again seen teams stuck at crossings on country roads, and neighbouring teams have had to be got to help to pull them off. I myself got stuck at a railway crossing with a load of sawlogs, and I had to get another team to help to pull it off. As the law allows the rails to be an inch above the level, if a man's sleigh got stuck on it, the company could come along and smash it and he would have no remedy against them. I think in all country places the railway company should be compelled to keep their rails as low as the planks. That would save a great deal of trouble to the farmers and their teams. Then you often see a crossing where the railway does not cross the highway at right angles, but diagonally. Where it crosses at right angles, there is not so much difficulty with wheels, but where it crosses diagonally, a heavily loaded wagon or a sharp-tired buggy is liable to break an axle, by running along the rail. If the rails were below the level, that could not happen.

Mr. AVERY. If the minister has no objection to making this change, it would be a great benefit to the country at large. Last winter I had a dozen teams get stuck on the railway simply because the rails were higher than the roadway. To keep the rails down to the level or below the level of the roadway would not hurt the running of the railway, and it would keep the sleighs off the rails. It is very dangerous at present to cross with a heavy load if you have not an extra team to pull you off. The objection is not so great in summer as in winter, because a wheel will go over where a sleigh will not. I think the change proposed would be for the benefit of the railway company as well as the public.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am willing to have the section stand for further consideration.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 188,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that the section be so amended as to read as follows :—

The highway at any overhead railway crossing shall not at any time be narrowed by means of any abutment or structure to the extent of less than twenty feet, nor shall the clear headway from the surface of the highway to the centre be less than fourteen feet, unless otherwise directed or permitted by the board.

Mr. CLARKE. Twenty feet would not be wide enough for two lines of tram car track, but I suppose it will be in the discretion of that board to make the width greater ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have to leave the power somewhere and cannot provide for every case.

Mr. LENNOX. I perhaps did not correctly hear what the minister said. I venture to think that twenty feet is not wide enough. The minister says you cannot make provisions for every case, that subsequent arrangements can be made, and the power must be left somewhere. But I would submit what has been urged upon the minister before, that he should make the prima facie case in favour of the people. The general opening over highways should be wider than twenty feet. People driving have to pass others beneath these railways, and pretty wide loads must pass. Moreover, sometimes, ditches have to be constructed along the abutments to carry water along the highways, and I think the experience in the rural districts is that twenty feet is not sufficient. Then, as to the height, there is a necessity for providing not merely the height at a central point, but from side to side. I know the Minister of Railways, like the rest of us, is endeavouring to protect the public. This Bill is one that probably will not be amended for some time—I venture to say that it will not be amended in favour of the public at any rate. Therefore, I think that it should be made now as favourable to the public as is consistent with justice. A railway company can

easily carry a span of more than twenty feet. They can carry a span of thirty feet to-day more easily than they could one of fifteen feet a few years ago.

Mr. CLARKE. How would it do to make the clause read that the opening over a highway should not be less than thirty or thirty-five feet except with the permission of the board of commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that there is practically any difference. The Bill provides that before these structures can be put up plans and profiles must be submitted to the board. If the company proposed to run a double track they would be required to make a wider structure than for the purposes of a single track, and if running a single track twenty feet would be ample. I do not think we could very well change the section. I have had the opinion of our engineers and have gathered all the information that I could upon the subject, and have reached the conclusion that, so far as the width is concerned, the width that we have named here is all right. In the great majority of cases, a span of twenty feet would be covered by girders. But if you had thirty feet or over, you would compel them ordinarily, to arch, and you would be making a width which, I am assured by competent authorities, is quite unnecessary. This is a limitation upon the board; they are not in any case to allow a width of less than twenty feet; but they have power to make the width as great as the circumstances of the case call for. I do not think we can do better than leave the discretion there.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think I have succeeded in making clear to the minister what I have in view. If you make the normal width twenty-five feet, the railway company go on and construct the openings in that way, or else they will make an application to the board. It is a comparatively easy matter for the railway company to appear before the board and they can get an order, perhaps, for all highways along the whole line of a new piece of construction. But it is a serious matter for a municipality to be obliged to initiate these proceedings. Therefore, I think, the minister will see the importance and the justice of making this width ample in the first place, and leaving to the railways, if, in any case it is not necessary to make the opening so wide, to apply for a modification of the rule. In this case it is a railway carrying a road across the public highway. The people, have prima facie, the first right. That right should be guarded, and then let the railway company show from time to time the necessity for modification. I know this view will commend itself to the minister. He has taken a great deal of trouble to perfect this Bill and it will stand as a monument to him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have made inquiries into this matter. If the information I have gained had led me to believe that a greater width than twenty feet should be placed in this Bill, I should be very glad indeed to amend the Bill and make the width greater than I here propose. But I am advised that twenty feet is ample. How many turnpikes have you in the country with a width exceeding twenty feet ? Very few. I notice also that the bridges which the municipalities are building are not twenty feet wide as a rule. Most of them are sixteen to eighteen feet wide. Why then is it necessary to have a greater width for this class of structure than for the turnpikes or the bridges they carry ?

Mr. LENNOX. The minister asks, why have the opening under a railway of a greater width than the floor of the bridge. It seems to me the answer is obvious. You must provide width not merely for the wheels which rest upon the roadway, but for the load which often extends far outside the wheels.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). There may be some difficulties by making it read 'the centre of the bridge.' I can cite one instance that occurred in my township where a railway crosses a public road where there is not room for a load of hay to go through owing to the way the sides of the crossing are constructed. I think we should require that the crossing should be at least twenty feet square from the bottom to the top and fourteen feet at the top. It should be twenty feet from the bottom and not from the centre.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are placing upon this independent tribunal the responsibility of requiring plans to be submitted to them and the obligation of seeing that those plans when carried out, should be such as will ensure the public safety. We cannot frame our sections so as to meet every case that may arise, we can only state the maximum and the minimum and leave the rest to the commissioners. We may depend upon them to see that the structures shall be of such a character as will conform with the conditions which we require, that is to say, will ensure safety and protection to the public.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have not heard yet why the minister changed these words from 'the lowest portion' to 'the centre.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not changed them, that is the old Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the original Bill is better than the old Act. I have not seen any answer why the overhead structure should not be of the same height all the way along, because if it were right to

make it thirteen feet high in the middle, it is equally necessary to make it thirteen feet high all through.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman really see that he is fighting a mere shadow ? Is it to be supposed that this railway commission are going to sanction a structure which will be like the wigwam of an Indian ? The difficulty is this : The old Act used the expression of 'the centre,' the legislators perhaps not knowing the difficulties of the construction. Now it turns out from the experience of the engineers that that term is entirely inappropriate. No matter how wide they required the structure to be, no matter how large the circle was which constituted the arch, there would have to be that fourteen feet below where the arch commences to spring, and it would be difficult to define what the lowest portion was. I thought it was safer to go back to the original Act and let the board of commissioners determine each plan and say whether or not they approve it.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is not much room for a team of horses and a load of hay to pass through a space twenty feet wide and to have much play, especially if the horses are nervous and are frightened by a passing train. If we are going to pass the section at all we should make it a little more favourable to the people.

Mr. LENNOX. I thought the minister had concluded that he would alter the section so as to make it clear fourteen feet over the highway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Twenty feet wide and fourteen feet high.

Mr. LENNOX. In the majority of country roads they usually use a straight stringer, in some cases there are iron girders, and in some cases wooden. In only two or three instances have I seen stone arches. But what the minister has already said meets the whole difficulty. The board will have control, and except in isolated instances, the board need not require the railway company to carry out the full height of fourteen feet across a span of twenty feet. But the prima facie duty of the railway company and the prima facie right of the people should be a clear uninterrupted headway above the highway of a full width of twenty feet and of a height of fourteen feet. That is all important and I submit that that right should be guarded. It will occur in so few instances that the companies will be building stone or concrete arches that there will be very few occasions when the alteration will have to be made.

On section 191,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to the committee that we shall re-enact the old section with some little change in it. The more I think about it the better I think the old section was. I beg to move :

That the words 'stretching across, or projecting over' in the first line be struck out, and that the word 'at' be substituted in lieu thereof and that on the third, fourth and fifth lines the words 'at such height as to leave sixteen feet from the highway to the lower edge of the sign board' be struck out.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is the section as substituted practically the same as the section in the old Act ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is there any legislation as to what height these boards shall be from the ground ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not object to that. Before we leave this section, I would like to say that there was a section in the old Act—section 189—which provided very stringent penalties for delaying works ordered by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. We have the board substituted for the railway committee but we have not the penalties re-enacted. Section 189 of the old Act provides that the company incurs a penalty of $50 for each day's delay.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All these penalties are in the new Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. I see that section 191 of the new Bill provides a penalty of $40 for neglect to comply with the requirements of this section, but we have not the penalty of $50 a day which is a good thing to hurry the company up.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Section 293 of the new Bill provides :

Every company which shall erect, operate or maintain any bridge, approach, tunnel, viaduct, trestle, or any building, erection or structure, in violation of this Act, or of any order or regulation of the board, shall for each offence incur a penalty of fifty dollars.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is another thing. That is where a company violates an order of the board, but that does not say if it does not maintain or construct a work when it is ordered to do so, it will incur this penalty. I knew of this section and that is why I have asked the question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Look at section 294 of the Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. Section 294 says :

Every company, director or officer doing, causing or permitting to be done, any matter, act or thing contrary to the provisions of this or the special Act, or to the orders or directions of the Governor in Council, or of the board or minister made hereunder, or omitting to do any

matter, act or thing required to be done on the part of any such company, director or officer, is liable to any person injured thereby for the full amount of damages sustained by such Act or omission ; and if no other penalty is, in this or the special Act, provided for any such act or omission, is liable, for each offence, to a penalty of not less than twenty dollars, and not more than five thousand dollars, in the discretion of the court before which the same is recoverable.

This is not the same as the old Act. This does not provide a penalty for each day's delay and it is the delay that makes the trouble. The best way to make them hurry up is to fine them so much a day. The clause says that if there is anything they are required to do, and which they do not do they are liable to a penalty and to pay damages, but in common law they would be liable to pay damages if they did not do their duty even without this provision. If the railway neglects to carry out any order, they ought be under a stringent penalty of so much a day as in the old Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have a great many more penalties and more provisions in this new Bill than are in the old Act and there is the advantage of having them altogether here.

On section 192,

Mr. LANCASTER. This section says :

The company shall not erect, place or maintain any lines, wires or poles for telegraphs, telephones, or the conveyance of light, heat, power or electricity, upon or along any highway, square or other public place, except by leave of the board.

I propose to amend that section by adding at the end, the words :

And the consent of the local municipal authorities.

This is in principle the same question we were discussing in regard to highway crossings, although in practice it is of still greater importance. This is a new section which gives the company power to erect poles on any highway or square for a purpose not necessary for the undertaking of a railway company, and it enables the company to do that without the consent of the municipal authorities. The railway has its own right of way and it can erect poles along its own tracks, and when it comes to a highway crossing they can, under ordinary circumstances, string their wires across without placing a pole on the highway. But in an extreme case where there may be a sharp angle or a high building, surely the municipal authorities would allow them to meet such a case and surely the municipal authorities should have power to do so. This provision allows the railway commission to permit these railway companies to interfere with municipal rights without consulting the municipal authorities at all. I cannot see the necessity for this unless it be that it is intended to hold up the municipalities. A railway company could threaten that unless the municipality gave them rights with reference to the station grounds and other such things, they would go to the railway commission and get permission to do what they liked on the streets of that municipality. This is nothing else than a usurpation of the rights of municipalities. It is a deliberate attempt to deprive the municipalities of the rights they have now. I believe it is ultra vires of this parliament, but the minister does not agree with me, and whether it is ultra vires or not we should not do it. Even if we have the power we should not attempt to exercise it. Who can best look after the highways in a municipality and declare whether wires for the conveyance of light, heat and power should be erected or not ? Surely it is the municipalities who get their rights from the provincial legislatures. What in the world is this clause wanted here for, except it is to benefit the railways. What right has a railway to go into the light, heat, power business in a municipality without the consent of the municipality. What right has a railway to tear up the squares and public places of a municipality without obtaining the consent of the municipality. I wish the member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) were in his seat, because a while ago he was sure this section provided for the consent of the municipality, but as he now can see it does not, and I am sure we on this side of the House would have his support in defending the rights of the municipalities. The hon. gentleman referred to subsection (f) but if that subsection is meant to cause us to dream that this is giving the power to the municipality, I cannot help thinking that the wording of it is very imperfect if that is the meaning of it. Subsection (f) says :

(f) The opening up of any street, square, or other public place for the erection of poles, or for carrying wires under ground, shall be subject to the supervision of such person as the municipal council may appoint, and such street, square or other public place shall, without any unnecessary delay, be restored, as far as possible, to its former condition.

That means that if it is opened up by order of the board of commissioners who have sole power to do it by section 192, the work may be carried out under the supervision of an officer appointed by the municipality. But the municipal council has no power to say whether the work shall be done or not. That has been all ordered by the railway commission before the municipality is allowed to come on the scene and supervise the work. It is merely a direction to the municipality as to carrying out something which it cannot stop, and which the board are the only people who can say shall happen or not happen. I do not construe subsection (f) as giving control to the municipal council ; and that being so, we are here deliberately, by section 192, taking away from the municipality control of its own highways, and handing that control

over to a railway commission. Therefore, the amendment I move is the only proper thing to make the section not only intra vires, as I think it is not as drawn, but to make it what it should be, even if it were intra vires, so that this work should not be done without the consent of the local authorities.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member will see that I propose an amendment to this section so that his amendment will not be applicable. I propose to substitute for section 192 the following :

No lines or wires for telegraphs, telephones, or the conveyance of light, heat, power or electricity, shall be erected, placed or maintained across the railway without leave of the board.

I do not say anything about highways there at all. This is a matter relating to railways, and the use of telephone and telegraph lines, and the conducting of electricity in connection with railway undertakings, which are the only things with which we are concerned. Then, I propose the following as subsection 2 of section 192 :

2. Upon any application for such leave, the applicant shall submit to the board a plan and profile of the part of the railway proposed to be affected, showing the proposed location of such lines and wires and the works contemplated in connection therewith ; and the board may grant such application, and may order by whom, how, when, and on what terms and conditions and under what supervision such works shall be executed ; and upon such order being made such lines and works may be erected, placed and maintained across the railway, subject to and in accordance with such order.

Mr. CLARKE. As I understand, then, this actually prohibits the municipalities——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it has nothing to do with municipalities at all. It applies only to a railway line.

Mr. CLARKE. Suppose a railway runs through a city, and the city proposes to erect a telephone system crossing that railway. The city could be prevented completing its system unless it got the approval of this board.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Unless it got the board's permission to cross the railway.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that the municipality is to be prevented from carrying out a telephone system or a system of electric lighting, according to its own scheme, unless it gets the approval of a body constituted by this parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is not that a most extraordinary thing ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is a very proper thing.

Mr. CLARKE. That would take away the right of the municipality altogether. If the railway is coming in, it ought to be subsidiary to the right of the municipality.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so. I do not think any electric light or telephone or telegraph company should be allowed to carry its wires across a railway without being subject to the safe and proper running of the railway. There must be some control. That is all that this means, and it could not possibly be permitted to anybody, in the interest of a municipality, which had no concern as to the safe and proper running of trains, to carry a line of electric wires across the railway tracks without permission of the properly constituted authority.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not the duty of this parliament to make the railway provide for public safety in that case ? Why compel the municipalities to do all this ? I would like to record my vote against that clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not understand it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose this has no retroactive effect and will only apply to railways to be built after this comes into force.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am afraid it will affect railways already in existence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course it will. If a municipality wants to string wires across a railway track, it will have to do so according to the regulations and conditions imposed by the commission.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In every town and village there are hundreds of wires for telephonic and lighting purposes passing over railways at present.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They will only be allowed subject to conditions imposed by the railway commission just as they are imposed to-day by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. LANCASTER. Before we get through with this Bill, it will be found that there will be nothing left for anybody to do but to bow down to the railways, when these railways have the sanction of the commission. I entirely agree with my hon. friend for West Toronto. We do not want a municipality to prevent a railway from running but neither do we want the municipalities to give way to the railways in every thing. The railway need not go into the municipality, and if it does go into a town or village it goes there to make money and should be made subject to the rights of the municipality.

On section 193,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved that section 193 be amended by striking out the first and second subsections and inserting the following :—

When a company is empowered by a special Act of the parliament of Canada to construct, operate and maintain lines of telegraph, telephone or for the convenience of light, heat, power or electricity, the company may, with the consent of the municipal council or other authority having jurisdiction over any highway, square or other public place, enter thereon for the purpose of exercising the said power, and as often as the company think proper may break up or open any highway, square or other public place, subject however to the following provisions :

(a) The company shall not interfere with the public right of travel.

(b) Provided that where the company cannot obtain such consent from such municipal council or other authority, the company may apply to the board for leave to exercise such power ; and upon such application shall submit to the board a plan of such highway, square or other public place, showing the proposed location of such lines, wires and poles ; and the board may grant such application in whole or in part and may change or fix the route of such lines, wires or poles, and may by order impose any terms, conditions or limitations in respect thereof that it may deem expedient, having due regard to all proper interests ; and upon such order being made, the company may exercise such powers in accordance with such order and shall, in the performance and execution thereof or in the repairing, renewing or maintaining of such lines, wires or poles, conform to and be subject to the provisions in subsection one of this section provided, as if consent had been obtained from such municipal council or other authority, except in so far as the same may be so expressly varied by order of the board.

You will observe that they must first apply to the municipal council for consent, then if the council will not consent, they may appeal to the board. It will not be possible for the company to insist or the council absolutely and arbitrarily to refuse. This tribunal decides between the parties, as any independent tribunal would, as to whether or not this power ought to be given and under what condition.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand that this clause is intended to reaffirm practically the Act passed twenty years ago ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This Act as amended was passed in 1899. It is not twenty years old.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand there was some litigation arising out of the Act of 1899—out of some defect in the legislation with respect to the Bell Telephone Company's rights.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have nothing to do with the Bell Telephone Company; we are dealing with railway companies.

Mr. CLARKE. But I am dealing with the rights of municipalities. Do I understand the Minister of Railways to say that it will rest with the board of commissioners to say whether any railway company whose work has been declared a work for the general advantage of Canada may erect poles on the highways and squares of the city to carry on telephone business, lighting, heating or anything else ? Surely that cannot be the position of the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it does not do that.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, what does it do ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The railway company may be authorized, in connection with its own business to have telephones, electric wires for lighting and so on. But this must be sanctioned by the board of commissioners.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that perfectly clear ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It provides that the company may do what they are authorized by its special Act to do. But we restrict that to the exercise of their powers for the purpose of the railway and its undertaking.

Mr. LANCASTER. But that does not help us very much, whether the special Act restricts or does not restrict. We are providing that the railway commissioners can authorize the railway company to carry on telephones, lighting or heating. Suppose that some future parliament, in its good nature, does not impose such a restriction as the minister has suggested, does that make the legislation any more sensible ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it does not apply to that at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is the Act we are passing, and now is the time for us to make restrictions that we think should apply. You say the municipalities should give their consent and the minister evidently thinks they will give their consent. But I do not think that anything can be done in control of the streets without the consent of the municipality. And so this law would be not only inadvisable but ultra vires of this legislature. This parliament has power to give a charter for the carrying out of the undertaking and to do what may be necessary for that purpose. But the danger is that more than this will be done without the authority of the municipalities. The streets and highways are vested in the municipal authorities; that is the power that has control of them, and I do not think that this parliament can assist those powers or take them away. But I do not want to make legislation merely trusting to its being held to be ultra vires. I do not think we should authorize the board to undertake to force the municipalities to do with regard to the streets and public places of a municipality what they do not want to do, unless it is absolutely necessary for the purpose of the undertaking which we charter.

And I say that you have only the right to give the power to do what may be necessary to carry out the undertaking. But that cannot be so in the case the hon. minister put.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) to say that it is only the question of necessity which confers upon this parliament the right to legislate upon the subject ?

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman wants to put it that way, I say that it is ultra vires of this parliament to interfere with a municipality except for the carrying out of a purpose for which this parliament has a right to give a charter, and the only reason why railways can force their way across the highways and so on, is because you cannot make the railway otherwise. But where it is not necessary for the purpose of the undertaking to carry poles or wires, this should not be allowed. The company may carry these things along their own rights of way, but if they wish to extend they should buy another right of way. It is surely not right to say that we can authorize a board of commissioners to give a railway company the right to do other than railway business on the streets of a municipality simply because we have the power to allow the building of a railway along or across the streets, The railway commission does not care about the municipal rights, but is considering the general interest of Canada, and they might think it in the general interests of Canada to allow railways to run here and there wherever they please. They are not the protectors of the highways, but the municipal authorities are. Recognizing that, this power should be conditional upon the consent of the municipal authorities. Surely this is a case in which the municipal authorities ought to have something to say.

Mr. LENNOX. This involves, probably the most serious question we have had to face in connection with this Bill. We are confronted with the proposition of the minister to leave enormous power in the hands of the board. We virtually, as it seems to me, substitute, for what we contemplated before, the right of legislation by this board. The minister shakes his head, meaning, I suppose, that he does not agree with what I have said. We cannot expect the minister always to agree with us; but I can only submit it to his consideration in the hope that he may change his mind. The minister has taunted an hon. member on this side with having failed to protest with regard to some matter, I think connected with electric railways. Therefore I wish to state my position as emphatically as I can at this point though I do not know that it will have any effect so far as the minister is concerned. The hon. minister says that this only confers upon the railway company powers in connection with the undertaking of the railway company itself. I should not have so interpreted it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say that this proposed legislation does not give a railway company the right to go into the electric light business, or the power business, or the telephone business for any purpose outside of their own undertaking.

Mr. LENNOX. Although I have no desire to obstruct this Bill, yet I do submit that it is regretable that large amendments are proposed by the minister, often upon the spur of the moment, when we are not able to understand their effect. These amendments are virtually a recasting the section. I submit that in view of the importance of this legislation, and in order that the company may have an opportunity of judging the effect of these amendments, they should be submitted to us a sufficient time in advance to give us an opportunity of studying them. I confess that I am not sure that I grasp the full scope of the proposed amendment. I believe it is trenching seriously upon the rights of municipalities, and it has this additional bad element, that it transfers the matter to a tribunal which should never have the power to legislate for a municipality. If we are to divest ourselves of any power of control over railway companies, let us hand it to the municipalities rather than to this board.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That amendment will give to the company the power of generating electricity or generating power, and that which they do not use for the purpose of the railway, they can dispose of under their special Act. It gives them the power of going on to the streets of a municipality. If the municipality objects to letting them come upon their streets, then they can apply to the board and the board may give them the right of going anywhere. The clause does not restrict the power to the purpose of the railway company, but it gives them the general power to use these streets for the exercise of the powers they have under their special Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, if parliament were to pass an Act giving a railway company the power to run a telegraph business independently and outside the purposes of their undertaking, or an electric light or power business outside of its undertaking, then it would give them an unrestricted power. But parliament is not giving them that power. We have had a great many Acts passed during the present session, and with one exception, I think every railway enterprise going through a section of country where there is a water power upon which they would have to depend for their motive

power to generate electricity was allowed to dispose to the general public of any surplus power they might have over and above what they required for their own purpose. But the railways which have power to erect telegraph and telephone lines and works of that kind, have been strictly limited to the purposes of their undertaking.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is for telegraph lines and telephones. But this goes further, and gives a company power to generate electricity for lighting and heating and power purposes, for running factories or anything of that kind. They have that right under their charter, and when I was Minister of Railways and Canals and since then, a good many companies have been given that power, but they have no right to enter upon the streets of any municipality without the consent of the municipality. This gives them the power to go into a municipality and to dispose to the public of a portion of their electricity.

Mr. CLARKE. They could carry telegraph lines upon the streets of Toronto. If it is conceded that they have that right, surely the minister ought to make a provision that they should not go and dispose of the extra and unrequired light, heat and power without the consent of the municipality. Is not this the place to make that provision ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the special Act incorporating the company.

Mr. CLARKE. Then the contention of my hon. friend from Lanark is admitted by the minister to be correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I admit that if parliament does give them the power they could use it, but if they do not get the power, they cannot use it. We have incorporated here provisions which restrict the company as fully as we think it is proper for the company to be restricted. We say they shall procure consent if they can; if they cannot, and if they can make out a case to satisfy the board, then the board may override the decision of the municipal council. The municipal council will not have power absolutely to block an undertaking which has been chartered by this parliament. Then we say that the opening up any streets, square or other public place, is to be subject to the supervision of the municipal council.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister will see, of course, that a company might generate ten times as much power as it would require to operate its line of railway. It might generate ten times as much heat and light as it would require. According to our contention it has no right to tear up the streets, squares and public places of a municipality to dispose of the other nine-tenths that it does not require without the consent of the municipality. It has no right to go into such a business as that. I want to be recorded as very strongly against such a proposition.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Shall clause 193 as amended be adopted ?

Mr. CLARKE. I object to it.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 194,

Mr. COWAN. Before section 194 is taken up——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think we had better not enter into any question of drainage to-night. It is too late. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. Before this motion is adopted, will the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals give us the order of business for to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will take up the Railway Bill and supply.

Mr. MONK. What estimates will be taken up ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not yet finished the estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has appointed a special commissioner to make an inquiry into the cause of the accident at West Lorne one or two months ago, and that that commissioner has returned to Ottawa after having made an investigation. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the commissioner has submitted his report, and if so, if he will lay it on the Table of the House ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not heard from him for the last two or three days, but when the report is completed I will bring it down.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 16, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 202) to incorporate the Church Missionary Society of Canada.—Mr. Russell.

Bill (No. 203) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert—by Mr. Campbell.

FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, as requested by the hon. leader of the opposition, I may mention that the government have considered the two tenders for the fast Atlantic service which I laid on the Table the other day, but they do not see their way to accept either of them, although it is quite possible they may be of use as a basis of further negotiations.

THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask whether or not the personnel of the transportation commission has yet been settled ? I think the right hon. leader of the government mentioned some two weeks ago that it had been proposed to appoint three gentlemen whom he had named, but he was not quite certain whether all of them would accept. I would like to know whether he has any more definite information on that subject now ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The only change contemplated is that Mr. Fry is to take the place of Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would my right hon. friend say whether or not there are three gentlemen who have agreed to undertake the work and when the commission may be expected to begin its labour ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot give the information to-day, but I will take a note of my hon. friend's request and let him know.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I also inquire whether or not my right hon. friend can announce the names of the gentlemen who are to compose the commission for inquiry into certain matters connected with the Treadgold and other concessions in the Yukon, and whether or not the gentlemen who were named in the House some days ago have accepted, and when that commission may be expected to begin its work ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will give my hon. friend the information at the same time as the other.

Mr. LANCASTER. I desire to call attention to an order of the House made about three weeks ago for a return of papers with regard to the Macnee fishing license, which has not yet been brought down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are being prepared.

THE RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill No. 21 to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.—The Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair).. I allowed a section or two to stand aside at the request of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). Is my hon. friend prepared to submit an amendment ?

Mr. CLARKE. After the House adjourned I met the hon. minister and he asked me about the clause. I said that, as the Bill was not likely to get through to-day or to-morrow and as the solicitor and the mayor of the city of Toronto will be here to-morrow morning, I preferred to await their coming so as to have a clause drafted to meet their approval.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There are rural municipalities which ought to receive some consideration too.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope that my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) will possess his soul in patience until he sees the clause I propose to submit. I have not the slightest desire to place the city of Toronto in a better position than the other municipalities.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The interests of the city of Toronto have always been well looked after in Dominion and provincial legislation, but if any special power is to be given Toronto or any other city over rural municipalities, that must be watched very carefully.

Mr. MONK. As I understand my hon. friend from Toronto, he wished to have time to draft a clause which will protect not only the municipality of Toronto but municipalities generally.

On section 194,

Whenever any municipality desires to obtain means of drainage, or the right to lay water pipes, or other pipes, temporarily or permanently, through, along, upon, across or under the railway, or any works or lands of the company, such municipality may make application for leave therefor to the board, and upon such application, shall submit to the board a plan and profile of the portion of the railway to be affected, and the board may grant such application, and may order how, when, and on what terms and conditions such drainage may be effected, or pipes laid, and thereupon such municipality may construct the works necessary to carry out such order under the supervision of such official as the board designates, or, at the option of the company, if communicated to the board upon the hearing, the company may be

ordered by the board to construct such works, and carry out such directions, under the like supervision.

Mr. COWAN. Before that clause is adopted, I desire to draw attention to the fact that last year, as well as this year, I introduced Bill No. 19 respecting drainage on and across the property of railway companies. Neither clauses 194 nor 195 meets the requirements which that Bill is intended to meet. Under the law, as it now stands and as proposed by this measure, before you can effectually drain the lands of a municipality or an individual land owner, the parties must go before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or before the Board of Railway Commissioners. I venture to say that there are very few applications, either by a municipality or private land owner, made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for permission to drain across the lands of a railway company. In Essex and the western counties, an enormous amount of money has been invested in drains. I make the statement, and defy a successful contradiction, that in the county of Essex to-day there has been more money invested in private and public drains than in railways, and be it remembered that there is more money invested in railways in that county than in almost any other county in the entire province of Ontario. That county is cut east and west by the three great trunk lines, the Michigan Central, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, as well as by the Lake Erie, which is now a portion of the Père Marquette system. In addition there are two cross roads, one along the western and one along the eastern portion of the county. So that the county is cut by five railways. Yet there has been more money invested in public and private drains than in railway construction. The land in that section is thoroughly flat land. There are but a few acres in any township which are not under assessment for outlet in addition to their own private drains. In fact the county is checkboarded with ditches every twenty or thirty rods, and the assessment raised from seventy-five cents to $3 per acre for the drains to carry the water off to lake St. Clair or some other satisfactory outlet.

In addition to that, on account of the silt and natural accumulations that will get into a drain, these drains must be renewed once in from five to seven years, or ten years at the outside. The result is that the land of this county, at a fair average is under taxation of $1 per acre. If it were not for a most favourable climate and a prolific soil, it would be left an absolutely barren country to-day by reason of the immense amount of money that is levied on the farmers annually to pay the drainage taxes. Now, the fall of the land generally is toward the north and east. The great trunk lines of railway run along the northern border of the county. It may be said that the railways are not entitled to block up a natural watercourse. But you must remember that the railways went through that country many years ago before the land was cleared, and in addition to that, it is a flat country, in which the water-courses are miles and miles apart. You will travel fifteen miles, perhaps, and not find a natural water-course running into lake St. Clair, that is a natural water-course as defined by the courts of this province. The water flows gently over the land in depressions or swales, and when the land commenced to be cleared up and cultivated, these water-courses—what would then be called natural water-courses under the law—were wiped out of existence. Thus, when a municipality or farmer wants to find an outlet to the drain, he must come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I venture to say there are not fifty per cent even of the members of this House, or fifty per cent of the members of the legal profession in this province or any other province in the Dominion, who know the procedure necessary in order to come before that tribunal. I know of but very few applications that have been made from the counties I speak of to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for permission to drain under the lands of the railway companies. And, under section 195, it is only as an outlet for drainage works that application can even be made to that body by a landowner. So, where a man's farm is cut in two by a railway—the land everywhere in that section having a fall of from three to nine feet to the mile—it is absolutely impossible for him to drain under the line of railway without coming before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and no farmer, or, at all events very few, will make that application. The result is as I saw when coming down here a few weeks ago. All along the lines of these railways, almost as far southward as the eye could reach, the land was submerged because of the imperfect drainage under the lines of the railway companies. I do not desire to take up the time of the committee by multiplying examples, but I wish to make the statement that the person whose land is cut in two by a railway corporation stands in an entirely different position from the man who has made a sale of his land to an individual. The railway company expropriates a man's land; the man has no option, but is compelled to sell. And I can name instances in the county of Essex to-day in which, after a railway company had gone through the land of a farmer, and the farmer desired to get drainage under that railway, the amount demanded by the railway company to allow drainage of the upper half of the property was a greater amount than the company paid for the entire portion of the land they took. The result is that these men are taxed thousands and thousands of dollars to carry the water in

a lateral direction, east or west, whatever way the water tends to flow, until it strikes a natural water-course, which then passes under the railway. The effect is that, supposing the fall of the land is to the north, at say, six or seven feet to the mile, when you have to take the water in a lateral direction, you find the land almost a dead level, and, in case of a freshet or heavy fall of rain there is not sufficient fall to take the water off the crops before the crops are materially damaged. This is a matter of most vital importance to the western counties. There is no question of tariff, no question of railway bonus, no question of railway construction or government ownership that can commence to affect those parts equally with the question of drainage.

Now, I find, in looking over the laws of the different states of the Union, that their procedure is much more simple than ours. In nearly all these states they have what is called a county drainage commissioner, so that a person does not have to make application to the federal authorities, or the state legislature, or even the state railway commissioners, but the county commissioners generally have jurisdiction over matters of that kind. Now, I find in the laws of the states of Michigan, by Act 254, section 16, as follows :

Whenever it is necessary to run a drain across the right of way or road-bed of any railroad, the same proceeding shall be had throughout in all respects, as in all cases provided in this Act for obtaining private lands for the construction of drains except as hereinafter provided. It shall be the duty of the railroad company when notified by the county drain commissioner so to do, to make and maintain the necessary opening through said road-bed, and to build and maintain a suitable culvert. Notice in writing to make such opening, and to construct such culvert shall be served upon such company by leaving a copy thereof with the ticket or freight agent, or general officer of such railroad company, at least thirty days before such railroad company shall become liable.

And section 17 provides that if the railway company fails to comply with the provisions of section 16, it shall pay a fine of $10 for each day's refusal or neglect to make such opening and construct such culvert, and the prosecuting attorney shall prosecute the complaint. It will thus be seen that drains can be constructed across the land of a railway in the state of Michigan by the same procedure as is followed in making a drain across the land of a private citizen, and that the necessary culverts must be made by the railway companies at their own expense and for all time maintained by the railway company at their own expense. Now, I know of no state in the Union which affords a better comparison with the western counties of Ontario, so far as the lay of the land is concerned and so far as the quality of the land is concerned, than the state of Michigan. It lies contiguous to the western counties, and the very same conditions very largely prevail, at least in the southern portion of the state of Michigan as prevail in the western portion of Ontario.

Then, I find that in the great state of Illinois, the provision is even more drastic. The fifth subsection of the twentieth section of the statute respecting the incorporation of railways says :

Provided that in no case shall any railroad company construct a road-bed without first constructing the necessary culverts or sluices as the natural lay of the land requires for the necessary drainage thereof.

So that, in the state of Illinois in the construction of their road-bed the railroad companies are prohibited from completing the construction without first making the necessary openings or culverts for the proper drainage of the land such as the necessities of the case require.

Then, I find in the state of Minnesota that chapter 34, section 2697, is as follows :

That whenever a railroad is now laid out, opened or fenced through the farm lands of any such owner thereof, leaving a part of such farm lands on both sides of such railroad, such owner is authorized to construct a crossing under, over or across such railroad for the necessary passage of stock therein ; and whenever any owner of lands adjacent to the right of way of any railroad company finds it necessary to drain the same and to continue such drain or drains across the right of way of any railroad company, such owner is hereby authorized to construct such drain through the right of way and under the track or tracks of such company ; but said crossing and drains shall be constructed at said owners' expense, and after so constructed the said crossing or crossings shall be maintained and kept in good repair at the expense of the owners of such railroad. In all cases before constructing such crossing or drain, the owner of the land shall serve upon the railroad company a notice in the manner provided for serving a summons in a civil action, stating in detail the work which the owner desires to perform under the provisions of this Act. Within sixty days from the service of notice the railroad company may do such work at the expense of such owner.

So that in the state of Minnesota the law prevailing is that the culvert must be constructed by the railroad company, but at the owner's expense, within sixty days, and failing that, the owner of the land shall construct it, and the culvert or drain afterwards must be kept in repair by the railway company. The procedure is by serving a notice on the railway company the same as in a civil action. I find in the state of Missouri section 1110 is as follows :

It shall be the duty of every corporation, company or person owning or operating any railroad or branch thereof in this state, and of any corporation, company or person constructing any railroad in this state within three months after the completion of the same through any county in this state, to cause to be constructed and maintained suitable ditches and drains along each side of the roadbed of such railroad to connect with ditches, drains or watercourses, so as to afford sufficient outlet to drain and carry off the water along such railroad

whenever the draining of such water has been obstructed or rendered necessary by the construction of such railroad.

And if they fail an action shall be commenced in the court having jurisdiction to compel them. So that every railroad in the state of Missouri must, within three months from its construction, not only drain its own road-bed, but shall construct lateral drains affording sufficient outlet to drain and carry off the water along such railroad whenever the draining of the water has been obstructed or rendered necessary by the construction of such road-bed, and this must be done at the expense of the railroad company. Then I find in the state of Texas, under the heading 'Right of way' article 4436, is as follows :

In no case shall any railroad company construct a roadbed without first constructing the necessary culverts or sluices as the natural lay of the land requires for the necessary drainage thereof.

This is an exact copy, I may say, of the law of the state of Illinois, by which, when the lay of the land is such that the natural drainage is towards the line of the railroad, the company is compelled to construct and maintain all the necessary culverts and sluices to permit the water to pass through, and those culverts and sluices must be of sufficient dimensions and so constructed as properly to drain the lands.

Then, I find in the state of California that while there is no statute law there, the railroad companies exercise the same control and dominion which any other owner of land has a legal right to exercise. This precise question was decided by the Supreme Court of the State of California on the 2nd day of June, 1902, in the case of Sanguinetti vs. Bock, in which the court held that :

The owner of upper lands has an easement for the discharge of surface water caused by rainfall as it is accustomed naturally to flow over the surface of lower adjacent land, and the owner of the lower land has no right to interrupt such flow to the injury of the upper owner.

Thus in the state of California the railroad company, if they construct a roadbed preventing the natural flow of water, is liable to damages, and they are therefore compelled to provide proper drainage at their own expense, or pay damages to the farmer which he has sustained by reason of that construction. I may say in passing that this is what is known generally as the law of dominant and servient tenement. That does not prevail, even in the province of Ontario. The province of Ontario, therefore, is that much worse off than the state of California. In the state of California the owner of the upper lands is entitled to the unimpeded natural flow of the surface water across the land of the adjoining owner lying further down. In the province of Ontario no such law exists, as the hon. member for Hastings well knows, for in a late case decided by the Court of Appeals in 1897, Ostram vs. Sills, it was expressly held that no such law exists in this province. Then I find in the state of Iowa :

When any person who is the owner of any swamp, marsh or wet lands which, on account of its condition, may endanger the public health, or is not for that reason in a proper condition for cultivation, shall desire to construct any open ditch or other underground drain for the purpose of draining such swamp land through the land of another——

Then follows the procedure, which is a local procedure, and practiced by serving a summons as you would in a civil action, which is the cheapest and most effective kind. Then it goes on to state :

Whenever a railroad crosses the land of any person or persons who desire to drain their lands for any of the purposes set forth in this section, the party or parties desiring such drain or drains shall notify the railroad company by leaving a written notice with the nearest station agent, stating in such notice the starting point, route and termination of such drain or drains, and if the railroad company refuse or neglect for a space of thirty days to dig across their right of way a drain of equal depth and size of the one dug by the party who wishes to drain his land, the railroad company shall be liable for the cost of the construction of such drain, to be collected in any court having jurisdiction.

So that in the state of Iowa a railroad company must construct a drain across their lands the same as a private individual, but at their own expense, to connect with the drain on each side of the railroad, to allow for sufficient drainage to properly cultivate the land, even though that land may be marsh or swamp land, and the drain must be as large and as deep as the drain with which it connects. Then I find that in the state of West Virginia, while they have no statute law, the general law is that the railroad company must at all times leave the drainage as free as it was before the construction of the road, and if, by reason of the construction of the road through lands, they obstruct the drainage, they are liable to him who is damaged thereby.

Therefore, practically in the state of Virginia the law of dominant and servient tenement is in force. Then in the state of Colorado, under article 15, section 8, of the constitution, it is provided that no corporation has a right to conduct their business in such a manner as to infringe the equal rights of individuals, or the general well-being of the state. As the state commissioner of Colorado, in a letter to me says, the railroads were the pioneers in that country in putting in drainage crossings, and by section 3 of the article of the General Assembly of the state of Colorado, the charter of any railroad company can be revoked by the assembly in the event of their so conducting their business as to result in-

juriously to the proper development of the state and the proper development of the farming lands.

Now, in all the states a railroad company is prohibited from blocking up the water-courses. In a large number of the states there is special legislation compelling them, not only properly to drain the land under the roadbed, but to construct drains to connect with the drains on either side, and they must do it at their own expense and must subsequently maintain these drains at their own expense. In the United States there are a large number of states in which no drainage legislation is necessary, as in some provinces of Canada. Take, for instance, British Columbia, I venture to say that the drainage question does not affect probably a hundred acres of land in that large province. In the province of Quebec you hear little or nothing of it. There is no drainage in the province of Manitoba, or throughout the North-west Territories except for irrigation purposes. For instance, the states of Idaho, Utah and Montana, and some others, are arid states, and the only drains necessary to construct in those states are drains for the purpose, not of carrying water off, but for the purpose of carrying water on to the lands for the purpose of irrigating it. But, in every state in the American Union, wherever it is necessary to construct drainage works for the proper cultivation and tilling of the soil, the private landowner or the individual, has exactly the same rights as against the railway company which he has against any other landowner who seeks to block the flow of water, and if it is necessary for him to invoke the municipal or any other machinery in order to enforce that right, then, that machinery is of the simplest and most effective kind and he does not have to knock at the door of either the House of representatives or of any of the state legislatures, but he can take the same proceedings to carry drainage across the lands of railway companies as to carry drainage across a farm or other land the property of the private owner. Without taking up the time of the committee, the amendments which I propose are to be found very largely in Bill No. 19. Bill No. 19 is a Bill by which I proposed to amend the Railway Act, but as this general Railway Bill was coming before the House I thought it advisable not to press the matter before the railway commission, because, then, if my Bill did become law before this Bill of the hon. minister became law, it would only be law for a few days. I therefore thought the better course would be to seek to amend the Bill now under consideration. I propose to strike out sections 194 and 195 and to substitute the following sections which will be numbered 194, 195, 196, 197 and 198, as follows :

In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires :—

(a.) The expression 'engineer' includes a civil engineer, provincial land surveyor, and any person authorized by the law of the province to lay out, report upon or prepare plans, specifications or estimates of a drain or drainage work ;

(b.) The expression 'judge' means any judge of a court of record having jurisdiction in the county or district in which the proposed drainage work or any portion thereof is situated ;

(c.) The expression 'drain' or 'drainage work' means and includes every kind of ditch, drain, or sewer, open or covered wholly or in part, and whether in the channel of a natural stream, creek or water-course or not, and also the work and material necessary for bridges and culverts ;

(d.) The expression 'railway company' means a railway company subject to the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.

195. Subject to the provisions of section 195 to 198 of this Act, municipalities and landowners shall have the right of drainage on and across the property of any railway company to the same extent and by the same proceedings as they have by the law of the province in which the property is situated on and across the property of any other landholders.

196. Where no provision is made by law for hearing the parties interested——

That does not apply to the province of Ontario, because we have a very clearly defined ditches and water-courses Act and in this province notice is necessary.

Where no provision is made by law for hearing the parties before the laying out of the drainage work, and for an appeal to a judge or other officer, the engineer shall, before making his report or laying out the drain, notify, in writing, the railway company, by serving notice upon the agent of the company nearest to the proposed work, of a time and place convenient to the proposed drainage work to consider the location of the drain on the railway company's lands, the specifications and cost of the work to be done on the railway lands, and the proportion of the cost to be borne by the railway company.

2. Such notice to be given at least ten days before the time appointed for the meeting.

3. If the engineer and the representative of the railway company agree upon the matters aforesaid, they shall sign their agreement, and it shall be incorporated into the engineer's report and shall be given effect to in the construction of the work.

4. Should they fail to agree, they shall refer the matters in question to a judge, who shall, after such notice as he deems reasonable, determine the matters in question ; and the decision of the judge shall be final, and shall be incorporated into the engineer's report, and shall be given effect to in the construction of the work.

5. The costs occasioned by the meeting and by the reference to the judge shall be borne by the drainage work, or shall be apportioned between the drainage work and the railway company, as agreed upon or as decided by the judge.

6. The proportion of the cost of the drain across or upon the railway to be borne by the railway company shall be based upon the increase of cost of such work caused by the construction and operation of the railway.

7. In the event of no representative of the railway company attending pursuant to the engineer's notice, his decision shall be final and binding on the railway company.

197. Whenever any drainage work——

I quite recognize in section 197 that every Tom, Dick and Harry should not be permitted to trespass upon the land of a railway company to do work in the manner in which he himself may think fit and proper, but, that the railway company themselves are the persons who ought to do the work upon their own land because they are more familiar with it and the road-bed and the interests of the travelling public will be safer in their hands.

Whenever any drainage work is to be constructed across or upon the lands of a railway company, the railway company shall have the option of constructing the portion of the drain across or upon its own lands at the amount of the estimated cost thereof ; and, in the event of its not exercising this option, the work shall be constructed in the same manner as other portions of the work are provided to be constructed.

Section 198 which I propose, possibly needs explanation, and I may just say here that in the construction of drains in the part of the country from which I come, it is found necessary to use large dredges. These dredges enter by Lake St. Clair and dredge up through the country for miles, but these dredges cannot pass under the track or under the rails of the railway company. True, we are in a natural watercourse, true, the law of the land says that they shall not obstruct the free natural flow of the water through a natural watercourse, but they construct their girders and lay their rails overhead and a dredge cannot pass, and if the dredge wants to pass the railway companies say : You cannot pass under until you settle with us. I made the statement upon the floor of parliament last year, I have made it to the railway companies themselves, and it is not necessary for me to repeat it, but I say to this House and I am prepared to back it up by documentary evidence that a railway company charged a township contractor in the constituency of my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. Sutherland) at the rate of $31 per hour for the men employed in the raising of the girders in order to permit his dredge to pass that it took twelve men four hours, or forty-eight hours of one man's time, to do that work to whom the railway company paid twelve and a half cents an hour and they charged the contractor $1,500 to go through. When we appealed to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, we were met by the answer and the argument—and I am not saying it was not a good argument—that we had entered into a contract to pay that amount. The contractor said : I was there, they would not let me pass until I entered into a contract. I agreed to pay the money and they said it was only a deposit. That is how I understood it, but the railway company said : You entered into a contract to pay $750 to go in to complete your work. When he got his work completed and wanted to come out they said : You pay $750 more before you get out. When the township wanted to do the same thing they were required to pay $31 per hour and they paid it rather than go before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The word Privy Council is generally understood as indicating the highest court in the realm, and the moment you say to the reeve of a township, or to any municipal corporation, or to any farmer, you ought to go to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, then you can drown him out year after year before he will go into what he considers a lawsuit with an immense railway corporation, and which lawsuit is to be tried five or six hundred miles away from where he lives. Therefore I say that in order to provide the proper machinery so that these drains may be constructed in the cheapest and most effective manner, I beg to move as section 198 :

Whenever any drainage work or proposed drainage work passes across the lands of a railway company, in the construction or repair of which work a dredge or dredges or other machinery is used, the railroad company shall be compelled to remove any obstruction to the free passage of said dredge or dredges across their property and which has been erected or placed thereon by the said company ; charging only the actual cost for the removal of same, except in case of a natural water-course, when the entire cost of the removal of said obstruction to the free passsage of the dredge or dredges shall be borne by the railway company.

I do not desire to take up the time of the House longer than to refer to the fact that while they have no right to obstruct the natural water-courses, the swale or depressions in the soil through which the water flowed in the state of nature and which was the natural drainage of that country, within the law as laid down in the province of Ontario—which it is not necessary to quote but which I have in my hand—these are not natural water-courses as defined by the courts of that province. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) the amendments which I have read.

Mr. LENNOX. I hope that the Minister of Railways and Canals will see his way to adopt substantially the amendments proposed by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan). I am well aware that there is very great necessity for a change in the law in this matter. I know it from cases that have come within my own personal knowledge, and I know also that a strong feeling exists in the country in favour of a change in the law. I have had a great many letters urging this both last session and this session, and I do not know what the significance of it is, but the greater number of these letters were from supporters of the present government. I do not know that they are entitled to quite so much

weight on this account, but at all events, I replied to these gentlemen that the member for South Essex had brought the matter up ; that I had given his Bill some consideration, and that I believed it would bring about a very necessary change in the law. It is quite true that in the province of Ontario we have what I might call fair drainage laws. We have the ordinary drainage law, adapted to the larger drainage undertakings, and we have the Ditches and Water-courses Act, and, supplementing this, as applied to railways, we have what is called the Railway Ditches and Water-courses Act, which is to be read as part of the ordinary Ditches and Water-courses Act. The difficulty is that we have not been able to apply these Acts to railway companies incorporated by the Dominion parliament.

More than this, and increasing the difficulty, we have this circumstance, that from year to .year we have been declaring that other railway undertakings are 'works for the general advantage of Canada,' and wherever this has been done the provincial drainage laws have ceased to apply. Only a few months ago a municipality in my riding was confronted with a very serious difficulty in connection with the drainage of lands, having brought down its drainage works to the railway, and being prevented, without the permission of the railway company, from finding an outlet. I have no charge to make against the railway company in this instance, or against railway companies generally. They have a right to stand behind the statute laws which we give to them, and as long as they only do this, we have no right to complain ; but we were met with this difficulty, that we had to submit to the terms which the railway company saw fit to impose. Now, we have the proposition of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) that we shall place the government of this matter under the various provincial statutes. That, in the main, is, I think, the remedy required. There may be some need of improvement in provincial legislation ; but it is absolutely necessary, I think, that we should give landowners and municipalities the advantage of the provincial statutes in the various provinces. Instances have been given by the hon. member who introduced the amendment, and a great number of other instances may be given, of the disadvantages people have laboured under in this regard. In all cases where a railway passes through a rural section of the country, it is sure to pass over valleys where there is natural drainage from one part of a man's farm to another, which, by reason of the construction of the railway, becomes blocked. The law as quoted by the hon. member, as being applicable to several states of the American union, seems to be what should have been the law in force from the time we commenced to construct railways. I know, in connection with the pioneer railway of this country, the Northern Railway of Canada, now owned by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, that instances occurred as far back as 1851, in which the drainage of a man's property was so cut off that he was absolutely unable to cultivate sections of his land adjoining the railway property, and this difficulty in several instances exists to the present day. What is true in reference to that railway is true in reference to a great many others. What I submit is, that the true principle has been read from quotations this afternoon, that is, that the natural flow of the water, the natural drainage, whether this is what we regard as 'the common enemy,' namely, the surface water that falls on land adjoining the railway, or the ordinary streams of the country, should flow unimpeded by any works executed by the railway company. At the time the railway company carries through its works, the farmer has his lands, and the railway company comes in and occupies a certain portion of them. He has the means of drainage without impediment of any kind. When a railway is hereafter constructed, it should be constructed in such a way that it shall cause no impediment to the natural flow of water ; that wherever it is necessary, a culvert or other opening shall be in the first instance constructed by the railway company, and thereafter maintained at its expense ; that as regards a railway now in existence, it shall, as nearly as possible, be put upon the same basis ; that the provincial Act in force and such provincial legislation as may be from time to time enacted shall apply ; and that the railway companies shall be put on the same basis as other landowners in that regard. With reference to the amendment, it seems to me in the main to cover the ground. There is a provision however as to the expense of the work which as the mover pointed out, only applies where there is no provincial legislation. This provision should be, not of limited but of universal application. It is provided in subsection 6 of section 4 :

> The proportion of the cost of the drain across or upon the railway to be borne by the railway company shall be based upon the increase of cost of such work caused by the construction and operation of the railway.

I do not understand that the provincial Acts put it on this principle, because, in the main, they are not dealing with railway questions, and this is a phase of the question which I submit the hon. Minister of Railways will require to consider. In the provincial Acts the basis on which the expense is apportioned is mainly on the constructionof the benefit which each party will derive from the construction of the drainage work, and in this case it is perfectly manifest that this would not be a fair principle upon which to assess the cost. The railway com-

pany could very justly say, we derive no benefit from the construction of this work beneath our railway or to or from our railway lands, and therefore, as we are only to pay in proportion to the benefit we derive, we have not to pay at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not subsection 6 of section 4, as proposed by the hon. member for South Essex, cover that ?

Mr. LENNOX. That is the section I have just referred to. If that were of general application, of course it would cover the whole case as suggested by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but that is a provision which only applies in those cases where there is no provincial statute, and in Ontario, where we have provincial legislation, we have to refer to that legislation in order to ascertain our rights. In the province of Ontario we assess the parties in proportion to the benefit they derive. If you leave the legislation exactly as it is in that province, you will be apt to be met with this difficulty, that however we may view the amendment proposed, we will be in this position, that the railway company, as regards the most expensive part of the work, namely, carrying a drain under the railway property, will escape. Whereas the true principle is that the railway which causes the obstruction should pay a proportion of the cost of the drainage, based on the increased cost of the work caused by the construction and operation of the railway. Again I submit that what we require is not that we shall always have to go to the board of commissioners for redress, but that the principle of decentralization, or the local administration of these matters—the doing of the work at home as much as we possibly can—is the one that should be followed ; and I therefore argue that in adopting the amendment of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan), you not only introduce useful legislation, by incorporating the provincial laws governing railway drainage, but you bring these matters before a tribunal better adapted to deal with them than the one proposed by this Bill. In my opinion, it is not wise or necessary that parties who have grievances in this regard should be compelled to come to Ottawa and submit them to the railway commission. It is true, as the hon. member for South Essex says, that all the objections and all the difficulties which obtained with regard to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council would apply to the railway commission.

Mr. McCARTHY. In the greater part of what my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has said I entirely agree. There is no doubt that demands are being made very strongly by landowners whose properties are adjacent to railway lands for a remedy or a measure by which they can obtain the right to drain under railway lands. The machinery at present is too cumbersome for them to take advantage of it. That is proved by the fact that the rights now given them are so seldom exercised. It entails very serious expense to present a case before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council in respect of a drain which might only cost $100 or thereabouts. I do not say that the machinery is any more complicated than it should be, but the expense of coming to Ottawa and presenting the case before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is greater, in many cases, than the remedy sought would justify. In saying that, I wish to acknowledge that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has been very satisfactory as a whole, and the only reason why there is a demand for a railway commission is because the people living in distant parts of the different provinces find it too expensive to come to Ottawa. I understand that this commission will be an itinerary one, and it might be suggested that the commissioners should travel about from place to place and hear the different complaints. I fear, however, that that would not be a satisfactory solution, because the travelling expenses of the commissioners would not often be justified by the amount in dispute, and the landholder would be deprived of a remedy. Therefore, I am heartily in accord with the amendment suggested by my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan), namely, that the reference be made to the local judge of the county. That would be the easiest way of disposing of the matter. Both parties can be represented, and the machinery is simple and inexpensive. I quite agree with the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), if his conclusion with regard to the suggested amendment is correct. I have not had sufficient time to consider it, to say positively that it is incorrect, but I go this far with him, that I think section 6 ought to be made to apply to all drainage works on or across railways, and that if a railway company should only be assessed in proportion to the benefit it derived from the work, inasmuch as it would be practically of no benefit to a railway to have that drain underneath its line, the adjacent landowner would have to pay the whole expense. In most of the states of the Union, the railway companies have to bear the cost of such drainage works. The reason is plain. They are the cause of the obstructions which prevent the natural flow of water, and should bear the expense of carrying off the water they have obstructed. If that be admitted, then in the majority of cases the railway company should bear the largest proportion, if not the whole, of the expense. I do not think that I need further take up the time of the House, especially in view of the exhaustive speech made by my hon. friend from South Essex, who has so well represented the cause of the landown-

er. Suffice it to say that representing my constituency, a certain portion of which is aggrieved by reason of the obstruction caused by railways, I am heartily in agreement with the amendment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have followed the observations of my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) with a great deal of attention and interest and I recognize that there is a good deal of force in much that he has said in support of the amendments suggested by him to this Bill. The committee, however, I think, would not expect me to be prepared to express any definite opinion as to the advisability of incorporating these amendments either as a whole or in part or in the form or language which the hon. gentleman has chosen. The question is of very great importance indeed, and I think that every one of these sections would need to be thought over a good deal before we should be justified in reaching a conclusion upon them or making them the law of the land. I am sorry to know, from the remarks which have dropped from all the speakers, that there is such an unwillingness to utilize the machinery that has already been created by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to afford relief to the people in these cases. For I am very strongly of opinion that a more effective, simpler, less expensive and prompter means of affording relief cannot be devised. It is true that the people who wish to have drainage facilities under railways have not applied to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council in any considerable number. I believe that only in three or four instances have applications been made since we passed the last amending Act in 1900. But, though the applications have been few, the facility with which the people got just what they wanted without coming to Ottawa, without sending lawyers to Ottawa, and the satisfaction which they have had has been expressed to me in very strong terms by the people whose cases have been disposed of. The results have led me to conclude that if the people generally would only avail themselves of the means the existing law affords them, what they wanted done would be done satisfactorily and inexpensively. Now, we have provided —and we have acted upon the proviso— that if anybody communicated with the department stating that they desired to have drainage facilities under a railway, we would send an engineer immediately to the locality to verify the necessity. Then the two engineers get together, ascertain the facts and conditions and find out what can be done by agreement if possible. An agreement has been arrived at in every one of the cases we have had before us under our amendment Bill. The parties were able to settle and settle promptly. It is very simple indeed to send an engineer to investigate such matters. And, in cases of this kind, involving questions of the character of the structure of our great railways, the matter should be entrusted to a railway engineer. The road-bed of the railway must be maintained in all its solidity and strength if life and property are to be protected. My hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) proposes that a land surveyor shall determine what the character of these works shall be. We cannot realize, I think, the gravity of the responsibility we are assuming when we provide that a land surveyor shall be chosen to determine a matter of that kind. In fact, it need not be a land surveyor under my hon. friend's proposal, but any person authorized by the law of the province. So, it would be left to the law of the province to decide who was the proper person to prepare plans for the construction of drains under railways. We must seriously consider that before we make it the law of the land. It seems to me a matter of very great regret that it has become necessary in the opinion of so many people, as expressed by my hon. friend from Essex, that we should incorporate provincial machinery as a means of affording relief, when relief is so easily obtained under the machinery already provided. Suppose my hon. friend had a piece of land that he wished to drain under a railway. All he would have to do would be to write a letter stating the case and asking the attention of the department to it. An engineer would be sent at once. The expense could hardly be less, for it only requires a two cent postage stamp to pay for the letter,—in fact, it does not require even that, for you can write to the department for nothing. Can any one conceive of provincial machinery that will be more efficient or less expensive? When you have an engineer of knowledge and experience he can tell at once what kind of works can be adopted for the drainage of land under a railway without danger of weakening the road-bed.

Mr. COWAN. I would like to say at once to the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) that there is no intention on the part of myself or the people who seek drainage under railways to do anything that would lead to the impairment of the strength of the road-bed of any railway. The people are quite willing that plans and specifications for the construction, even of private drains shall be submitted to the Railway Department. But they want to be able to deal with the initial machinery at home and carry on the inspection and argument there, without being obliged to pay counsel to come four or five hundred miles to Ottawa. I admit that parliament has done all that lay in its power to simplify the machinery, consistent with maintaining the procedure and allowing the argument to take place before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. But, notwithstanding that they have done that, that procedure and these attempts have resulted in absolute failure. And I say that there

are thousands of acres of land that are at times inundated and will remain inundated to the end of time, if the owners must use the machinery of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for the simple purpose of securing the construction of a drain that may, perhaps cost fifty dollars. As long as that cumbrous machinery exists the people will lie under this injustice rather than travel here to Ottawa or ask counsel to come here to plead for special drainage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. While I have every desire to give effect to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) says, to understand it and to yield to his argument, I am at a loss to know what he means by talking about 'cumbrous machinery'. If there can be a machinery simple to a fault it is machinery provided by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The only trouble is that the people will not write, will not express a wish, will not even state what they desire. It is not that that any desire they have expressed has not been acted upon. There is no question of counsel being compelled to come to Ottawa.

Mr. COWAN. They know that the railway companies will be represented at Ottawa, and I venture to say that no lawyer will institute proceedings and take his chances before a tribunal where the other side is represented and his client is not represented. He will not start the proceedings unless he can carry them through. Speaking with the experience of some little drainage practice, I say I would not institute proceedings before any tribunal, even in a matter involving $25, and let the railway be represented before the tribunal and my client not be represented. I understand that, as the minister says, he has done all in his power, but, these people who will not take advantage of the door that the minister has sought to open. They will not seek in that way the drainage of their lands.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot understand what the hon. gentleman means by the railway being represented. An application made by any person for drainage facilities would be heard in the way such applications have always been heard; the application has been heard in the locality, when the engineer is there, and the persons interested were not asked to come to Ottawa.

Mr. COWAN. There is no provision of that kind in the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a general provision, and it will be carried out exactly in the same way, whereby the board is authorized to appoint anybody for any special purpose under the Act to report and decide upon questions, subject to the sanction of the board.

Mr. COWAN. What section is that?

Mr. HEYD. I would like that point to be more clearly defined. Where would the argument take place, in Ottawa or on the spot?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the few instances which have occurred where applications have been made to us for a drain under railways, there was no argument at all, and no contest. We sent one of our engineers to the locality, after notifying these people and the railway company that he would be down at such a date, and notifying all parties to be present. Two engineers met and looked the situation over, and came to a conclusion, and the railway company agreed to put the works through, the parties were satisfied, and we heard nothing more about it.

Mr. HEYD. Supposing they would not come to an agreement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If there was a difference of opinion between the engineers, we would get a report from our engineer, and after hearing the report of the company's engineer, as it would be largely an engineering question, it would be decided by the chief engineer, in all probability. The parties would not be called upon to appear and argue upon an engineering question. Sometimes a question arises as to the amount of the charge that ought to be imposed upon the respective parties; that would be a matter of controversy, but it would not be necessary to bring the parties to Ottawa to discuss that question either. An engineer could go down and hear what they had to say, and the Railway Committee would decide.

Mr. HEYD. Where do the lawyers come in in that case?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think there would be much opportunity for lawyers. They might appear on the ground locally if they wished. The hon. gentleman from Essex asked me to tell him where that section was. It is section 48 of the Bill.

Mr. COWAN. The minister will agree that if you have not got any application you never will get one. It may be right, but if these people do not think it is right, you cannot convince them. We have tried and failed. What we want to do is to try and relieve them from this trouble without doing injustice to any one. Surely we can get down to that point and still permit full supervision of the road-bed by the government engineer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I see my hon. friend proposes in his Bill that a judge shall determine these questions. I do not know what exceptional quality a judge may have to determine questions of engineering.

Mr. COWAN. The question can be easily settled so far as the question of costs is concerned, that were these people fail to agree they shall be borne by the railway company. So far as the plans or the manner in which the work is to be done are concerned, I am quite willing, and these people are willing, that they should be approved by the Railway Committee before the matter is submitted to a judge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That might be the only way of solving the alleged difficulty. But it strikes me that a judge is not endowed with the qualities of adjusting questions of that kind. I see that my hon. friend proposes :

The proportion of the cost of the drain across or upon the railway to be borne by the railway company shall be based upon the increase of cost of such work caused by the construction and operation of the railway.

Now in many instances where lands have been expropriated and damages have been awarded, they have been awarded having regard to the question of the cost of drainage, and compensation has been made upon that basis.

Mr. COWAN. So far as the Grand Trunk and the Michigan Central are concerned, they were built through that country when it was largely wild land, the question of drainage was not thought of. I can understand that where a road is going through an old settled country that question might be taken into consideration, and if that had been taken into consideration on the land proposed to be drained that would be considered by the judge.

Mr. BROCK. Where a railroad is built through wild lands of little value, and the building of the railroad made those lands valuable, do you mean to say that the railroad should bear the total expense of the drainage, and that the land should be free from it altogether ?—because this land has been made valuable by those who had the enterprise to build the railroad under these circumstances ?

Mr. COWAN. Not at all.

Mr. BROCK. I thought the whole argument of the hon. gentleman was that this drainage should be paid altogether by the railroad company and maintained by them. I think that would be most unfair when the lands have been made valuable, as the hon. member for Essex says, by the railroad being built through them when they were of little value.

Mr. COWAN. I want to set the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock) right. While I did state that the road was constructed through these lands when they were wild lands, I did not state that the railroad had made these lands valuable at all. It is the drainage which has made them valuable.

Hon. Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. BROCK. I did not say that, but I did say that had not the railways been built the land would not have been as valuable as it is.

Mr. COWAN. Prior to the perfecting of the Municipal Act which enabled corporations to drain land, to construct large tap drains, to borrow money and issue debentures extending over years against the land benefiting, these lands were absolutely unfit for cultivation. Prior to that law coming into force no one man could drain his own land, because he had no outlet. He was only dumping the water upon the land below him, and there was no natural water course. But, when they constructed large artificial drains on the same principle as they improve the sewage in a city, they were enabled to drain their lands, and that is what has made these lands valuable—the drainage which the railways obstruct.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think it is quite clear that the drainage laws, having regard to the way in which the railway companies interfere with the property of landowners, are not what they ought to be. I see that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals does not dispute the contention that some remedy is required, but as I understand the hon. minister, he thinks the present machinery is applicable for the purpose if properly applied. I am bound to say, after listening to what has been said, that, in my humble judgment, the amendments proposed by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) provide the best remedy. I think if he will make subsection 6 of section 4 in his original Bill—section 196 as it is proposed to be inserted in the Bill now under consideration—a separate section, it will carry out the effect which is intended better than if it is allowed to remain a subsection of section 4. That subsection, I think, might be held, perhaps, in construing the statute, to have relation to the beginning of section 4, and it might be said to be dependent upon that, which provides that :

Where no provision is made by law for hearing the parties interested.

And so on. There is provision in Ontario, and yet nothwitstanding, it is important that we should have an enactment such as this subsection applying. That is :

The proportion of the cost of the drain across or upon the railway to be borne by the railway company shall be based upon the increase of cost of such work caused by the construction and operation of the railway.

I think it is admitted by all parties who know ; at all events, it is my opinion, that as a rule tribunals decide these questions of cost in accordance with the benefits received by the parties, and as far as the railway receives no benefit, the railway can very well indeed say : We should not pay any portion of the cost, because we get no benefit. That argument might prevail in Ontario, because of there being a state of

affairs that is not quite within the meaning of section 4, of which subsection 6 is a part. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he make a special section of subsection 6, so that it will apply to all cases, irrespective of whether there is provision in the province for drainage or not. In regard to what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has said, I think the argument of the hon. gentleman shows that the proceedings before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council must be very cumbersome or they would have been used to a greater extent. There is no doubt that a grievance does exist in regard to this matter. When I was in the neighbourhood of the constituency of my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan), in speaking to the farmers in regard to another question of railway law which will come up in a day or two—I refer to the question of cattle-guards—I found that the farmers were greatly interested in it. They buttonholed me on several occasions and urged me to support the hon. member for South Essex in trying to do what he is trying to do here now. They impressed upon me the very views which my hon. friend has impressed upon the committee to-day, and they paid me the compliment of asking that I would do what I could to assist my hon. friend. I promised that I would do everything possible to assist him, and I am trying to carry out my pledge, not to my own constituents, but to my fellow countrymen, who, although they live in a far part of the province of Ontario, are equally as good Canadians. The procedure of which the hon. minister has spoken, must of necessity be so cumbersome that it cannot be used in such a way as to be efficacious, or to accomplish justice. The hon. gentleman admits in his argument that to carry out what he proposes it will be necessary to depute the duty to an engineer, or two or three engineers. These engineers would not live where the property is or near the situation which requires attending to. The county judge, to whom it is proposed to delegate this final power, is to be found in every county, and it is proposed by this amendment that a land surveyor or engineer shall make observations, inquiries, and report as to the question of cost, and if not finally agreed upon between the parties, it shall be left to the county judge. The hon. minister says that if they write a letter to the department it will be attended to. No doubt it will be attended to in some way, but I do not think it will be attended to in such a way as to accomplish justice. It will be impossible for the department, or for the railway commission, which will now take the place of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, to go to every locality and conduct an investigation upon the spot without incurring enormous expense. I do not think that the hon. minister contemplates that they should do that, but I think he contemplates that they should send an engineer. I do not think that is a proper delegation of authority in order to have these matters satisfactorily attended to. If the machinery provided by the hon. member for South Essex is adopted, it seems to me that the proceedings will not only be much cheaper, but the question will be much more satisfactorily and correctly inquired into, and the result will be more sound, just and quickly arrived at. The hon. minister says that the people have not taken advantage of the fact that they can appeal to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. I think it is very pertinent to ask why. It must be for some such reason as that suggested by the hon. member for South Essex that they do not think it will pay them to do so. They know that there will be railway lawyers to look after the railway side of the case, and they will feel that it will be hopeless to expect to cope with them unless their side is presented by counsel, and unless they have their evidence there. If the proposal of my hon. friend were adopted—the matter would be decided in the locality. If the railways were not satisfied with the report of the local engineer they would send their own engineer and he could give evidence before the county judge as to what he thinks the cost of the work should be. The county judge could hear the evidence of the railway engineer, and as the county judge is accustomed to dealing with questions of drainage, he could apply the same judicial mind to the question of railway drainage as to other questions of drainage under the Ditches and Watercourses Act, and I think if this procedure were adopted it would be found that the expense would be 25 or 50 per cent less than it would be if the procedure proposed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals were adopted, and that the judgment given would be many hundred per cent better and more satisfactory. More than that, when the county judge decides one or two of these cases the people will be apt to say: We know what he will do, and there will not be so many cases arising. I think if the hon. member for South Essex had two or three of these cases determined, if the railway engineer were present, and if the case of the railway were presented by counsel, if after reserving judgment for a day or two the county judge gave such a decision as the county judges are in the habit of giving, sound, and equitable, the railway company and the owners of property would be found agreeing much more frequently than they previously have done. The railway company would have their attention drawn to the fact by these two or three cases that they were not able to do as they liked. People do not get them to agree, and cannot force any decision upon them, and the very thing that the hon. minister wants to accomplish is an agreement between the parties, but it is not accomplished

now because the railways know that an individual cannot afford to make them come to an agreement. If the procedure proposed by the hon. member (Mr. Cowan) is adopted, the railway will be compelled to do it, and as the county judges will give reasonable and just decisions the railways will submit to them and there will be very little litigation of any kind.

Mr. STEPHENS. A portion of the county which I have the honour to represent is very deeply interested in this matter of drainage across railways. I quite agree with what has been said by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan), but I may say that the farmers have still more grievances than he has enumerated. When the Erie and Huron Railway was built in my riding, they put in culverts which were supposed to be large enough to drain the lands, but after the road had been in operation for a few years it was found that these culverts were not sufficient to carry off the water. I went to the railway company myself on one occasion and asked what it would cost to enlarge the culverts, and the answer I got from the manager of the company was, that they would not enlarge them at all unless they were compelled to do so by law, and that they would do just what the law compelled them and nothing more. The farmers in that county have suffered ever since that time, and great loss has been inflicted upon them. In the spring, and sometimes as late as June, when there is a freshet, the water backs through under these culverts into the fields and it will remain there for several days. When the water begins to fall the railway culverts are so small that it takes quite a number of days for it to run off the land, and the sun coming out in the meantime and heating the water, there is great damage done to the crops. There should be some law compelling the railway companies at their own expense to open up drains sufficient to carry away the water. When a farmer has gone to a great deal of labour and expense in cultivating his land, he finds himself subject to great loss and damage because of the water remaining in his fields on account of the railway being between him and the outlet. In days gone by the Grand Trunk Railway was willing to accede to the wishes of the farmers, and they frequently agreed to provide a remedy without a lawsuit, but of late they seem to have got it into their heads that they will give the farmers no relief whatever. The fact of the matter is, that in the counties of Kent and Essex the farmers have got to dread the idea of a railway coming through that part of the country, because they know that their lands will be drowned out for want of drainage, that the cattle-guards are insufficient to protect their cattle, and so they would sooner do without a railway altogether than put up with the nuisance that a railway causes. I think the members of this House should take the matter in hand and provide in this Bill now that some relief should be given to the farmers in this respect. There are not many members in the House who really know the great inconvenience and loss that farmers owning low-lying lands are put to because in the majority of ridings the land is rolling, and the farmers do not suffer to the same extent as we do in Western Ontario. I hope that the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) will be adopted.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). When the minister spoke of the simplicity of an appeal to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, he forgot that the farmers are accustomed to regard this as a matter of property and civil rights, to be dealt with by the provincial legislatures, and that they look to their own municipal and provincial laws to provide the remedy. But when they find that they have to come to Ottawa and embark on a procedure which is not familiar to them, the chances are that they will bear their wrongs rather than go to that trouble and expense. That is the reason why more appeals have not been made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council in relation to drainage. I believe that these amendments if adopted would be in the best interest of the people of the country. The trip to Ottawa alone would cost these farmers a comparatively large sum of money, and when you add to that the cost of a lawyer, the procedure is prohibitory.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). The opinion of many hon. gentlemen seems to be that we do not suffer from this grievance in the province of Quebec. It is quite the reverse. Our farmers are constantly complaining of the treatment they receive from the railway companies, and I have been obliged myself on many occasions to ask railway companies to provide drainage for farmers and they have always refused. It has been said that when the lands were expropriated, the farmers were compensated for this damage, but that is not so. If a farmer files a claim at the expropriation for damages by reason of his land being flooded, he will be answered that the law provides for drainage and that the companies are compelled to drain the land. But in order to oblige them to drain the land we must come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and that procedure is absolutely not available for the vast majority of farmers. These amendments should be supported by every member who represents a rural constituency.

Mr. STEPHENS. When they start to acquire the right of way for a railroad, they go up and down the country for miles trying to find a man who will sell his land cheaply. Then they get one after the other, and finally the remainder of the land own-

ers are obliged to sell out at a low price. I know that some men in my county did not get as much per acre for the land taken for railway purposes as they could sell their whole farm for, while they should practically get ten times as much. They have sold land for railway purposes as low as $60 or $70 an acre, when the whole farm has been sold at $80 an acre.

Mr. HEYD. It is singular to hear the Minister of Railways define how exceedingly simple it is for a man to get his grievance against a railway company redressed. He told us that all the farmer had to do was to write to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, when an engineer would be sent out to meet the railway engineer, the two would adjudicate upon the evidence, I suppose, and if they disagreed there would be a report to the chief engineer, who would make his award, and the whole thing is done. If the procedure is so simple it is rather a peculiar thing, that according to the statement of the minister, only three or four people have availed themselves of this simple remedy during the past three years. It strikes me that there must be an immense lot of ignorance throughout Canada, and amongst the farmers particularly, as to this means of redress which is so exceedingly simple. If the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) and the Minister of Railways would clear up this little darkness that rests upon that phase of the question, it would illuminate the minds of a great many of us who are not railway lawyers and who have not had drainage cases in court.

Mr. COWAN. I might just say, for the benefit of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) that no engineer sent by the Department of Railways and Canals has any power to settle the matter, but the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, on an application being made to them, can send an engineer, who can inspect the premises and make a report to the Committee. I have never known the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to decide a question of the right to cross a railroad without giving an opportunity to the parties to be heard; and I venture to say that no Railway Committee of the Privy Council that has ever sat or ever will sit, will ever say to a railway corporation on the one hand or to a farmer on the other, our engineer has been on the ground, and we will take his report and swallow it holus-bolus, and you will not be heard. When that is the case, the railway company will be heard every time; its lawyers will be on hand; but where does the poor farmer come in? As long as I practice at the bar I will never advise any client of mine to submit his case in that way, unless he is prepared to back it up by facing the corporation lawyers. So that while the present procedure is simple, it is just as complicated as any other legal process.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (North Essex). The Bill submitted last session by the hon. member for South Essex, and again this session, meets a crying want of the community, as must be evident from the fact that both last year and this year, in the press, by petition, and by letters to members, we have all been apprised of grievances existing. The minister seems to think that the present mode of procedure is a simple one; but the fact is that, far from considering it simple, the community believe it to be complex, dilatory, and expensive. These are the things they seek to rectify, and I believe the amendment introduced by the hon. member for South Essex will go a long way to rectify them. They desire a remedy which will be simpler, speedier and less expensive, and I believe there has been no amendment introduced during the long discussion which has taken place on this Railway Committee Bill, which will meet with greater approbation particularly on the part of the people of the province of Ontario, and the western section thereof, than the amendments proposed by the hon. member for South Essex. I have heard no valid objections to those amendments on the part of the minister or anybody else, and the whole trend of the argument is entirely in favour of it.

Mr. SCHELL. With reference to the question of easy decisions by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, I will just take time enough to instance a case in my own riding. Any person travelling past the village of Glen Robertson may notice that to the south there is a range of hills, and that the railway embankment makes another obstacle to the north. As it passes the village the road curves to the right into the bank, making an artificial dam, and it is impossible to drain the land, because there is no culvert under the track at the foot of the valley. The result is that there is not a cellar in the lower part of the village, simply because the water is on a level with the top of the land. I have been told—I cannot give this as a fact—that some years ago application was made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council through counsel for a remedy and that an engineer was sent to Glen Robertson to inquire into the matter, but no further action was taken. The people were not able to invoke the provincial drainage Act, because the railway is a work for the general advantage of Canada. The result is that for the last ten or fifteen years, although there are several hundred people living in that village, it has been impossible to have a cellar in the lower part of the village, owing to there being no means of draining the lower end of the valley; and having applied to the Railway Committee

of the Privy Council, and having received no redress, the people do not feel like applying again. I propose to support the proposition of the hon. member for South Essex simply on the ground that the people in this instance tried that very simple process of appealing to Ottawa, and were not successful.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member for South Brant seems to think that the plan which I intimated was so simple and so easy is scarcely consistent with the facts presented by the hon. member for South Essex, who does not understand just what the foundation of my statement is. I am afraid that I cannot make it any clearer than I have to the hon. gentleman. All I will say is that neither of the hon. gentlemen will say that they have heard or known of any instance in which an application has been made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to drain under the road-bed of a railway, and the application has not received attention or been satisfactorily dealt with.

Mr. HEYD. How does the minister account for the fact that notwithstanding this exceeding simplicity and these grievances that we have heard of, there have been only three or four applications for redress to the Privy Council in four years ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not profess to account for it. I say, however, as a fact, that the applications have not been made, and therefore nobody can claim that they are not entertained.

Mr. HEYD. Is it the lawyers they are afraid of, and not the committee ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It must be. It is very evident that the general sense of the House is decidedly in favour of the adoption of some such local plan as has been proposed here, and that the reasons which I have assigned for continuing to vest the jurisdiction in the Railway Committee or in the Railway Commission under this Bill, do not appear to have impressed themselves strongly on the gentlemen who are representing these districts. It will therefore be necessary, I take it, that we should consider and make any proper and necessary alterations in the proposed amendments, to make them workable. I shall give the very best attention I can to the whole subject, and I hope that, not at the next meeting of the committee, but an early meeting, I may be able to suggest some substantive sections, or these sections somewhat improved, to the consideration of the committee. I would like, however, to have the sense of the committee on the proposition contained in the sixth clause. It looks to me at first blush to be a very drastic proposition to say that 'the proportion of the cost of the drain across or upon the railway to be borne by the railway company shall be based upon the increase of cost of such work caused by the construction and operation of the railway.'

It simply means that the railway companies shall pay a very much larger portion, perhaps five-sixths or four-fifths of the cost of the works. The excavation under the road-bed will necessitate an arch or some other solid support for the road-bed above, and that will be certainly a very large portion of the cost of a proper arch under the roadway sufficiently strong to carry the weight of the embankment above. Is the committee of opinion that it would be well for parliament to make a flat-footed declaration that all the extra cost should be borne by the railway. It may be that the ditch could be just as well made in some other direction and that the fact that the railway company have to bear the greater portion of the cost might stimulate unnecessary demands by land-owners to have these drains made under the road-beds when they might just as well be made elsewhere. We are desirous of being just and fair to the farmers, but at the same time we owe a duty to even a railway company, and should see that it is not going to be unduly penalized. We should only exact from railway companies what would be fair. I do not know myself just what to suggest to the committee at present. If you had a tribunal like the railway committee, which would have knowledge of the peculiar facts and conditions and have acquired a good deal of training, as it would be bound to do in a little while, and experience in these matters, it seems to me that you could very safely trust such a tribunal to evolve some principle and act upon it in the settlement of questions of this kind. I am not prepared to make any proposition to the committee now, but I think it is a matter which calls for serious reflection before we declare what principle should guide us in determining the proportion of these costs that should be borne by the railway companies. If the other members of the committee have any suggestions to offer I shall be very glad to receive them.

Mr. COCHRANE. I can tell the hon. minister my opinion as a farmer. Why should not a railway company bear the expense of draining the lands adjoining its line ? In the section of the country from which I come, most valuable land for pasturage is very seriously affected by improper drainage. The clearing away of the woods has had this effect, that there is nothing to control or contain the water in the woods and swamps. The water rushes down in greater volume in the spring and floods these lands adjacent to the railway. I cannot see why a county court judge, who is competent to deal with questions of drainage in the province of Ontario, would not be competent to deal with the same questions

under this Bill. The hon. minister, who knows all about it, says that the methods of dealing with these matters in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council are very simple, but they are not so simple to our rural population. These questions get mixed up with politics, and the people in the province I come from do not think that any private individual can get any justice from the Railway Committee of the Privy Council sitting in Ottawa. Whether that opinion be well founded or not, it prevails. Besides the expense is enormous.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had no idea there was such widespread ignorance.

Mr. COCHRANE. Perhaps the people are not so ignorant as the hon. gentleman thinks. The hon. gentleman must see it illustrated in the Railway Committee every day that there is the opinion in the public mind that the minister himself is not free from the influence of railway corporations. Whether it be due to ignorance or not, that opinion prevails. I do not see why a judge, who has to do with such cases all through the province of Ontario, is not competent to deal with similar questions between railway corporations and private individuals. No man is in doubt when a judgment is good. Some cranks may feel aggrieved, but the people of Ontario are well satisfied with the decisions given by their county court judges. Speaking for the county I represent, the people and the municipality are perfectly satisfied with the decisions rendered by the county court judge, and that court is much less expensive than either the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or this board of commissioners. If, as the hon. minister says, people do not go before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, it is because of the expense. A farmer coming to Ottawa must have a lawyer and witnesses and the cost of these are out of proportion to the amount at issue.

Mr. STEPHENS. Since the hon. minister has asked for the sense of the members on this question, I have no hesitation in saying that the railway companies should pay the extra expense of putting drains under their railway lines. These railway companies are given the privilege of building railways, and in many cases, if they took the precaution of making culverts or outlets for drains, when they built the line, sufficient to do for all time, there would be no dispute. It is not the fault of the farmer if the railway is there.

Mr. HEYD. In the settlement of this particular phase of the question, we do not need to be drainage lawyers. An element of justice comes in here which all are equally competent to decide. Should a railway company be called upon to pay for benefits that are conferred upon other people and not upon themselves? I have a particular case in which I am interested to a considerable extent. In the city of Brantford, in which I live, there is a piece of ground crossed by the railway. The railway bought the right of way through a swale forty years ago. They paid the owners of the land compensation and took over the property they required, and I presume that involved all conflict or troubles that thereafter might ensue. Since then that swale has become part of the city of Brantford. The drain that the railway put through that land answered the purposes of that time, and it still answers all the purposes of the railway. But there are hundreds of acres of land that could be used for building sites if the drain were deepened. Upon whom should the cost fall? Upon the property benefited by the improvement or upon the railway company, which has no earthly interest in it? If I understand the proposition of my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Cowan), under such circumstances the railway company will pay all the cost, while the other people will reap all the benefit. I think there is an element of injustice there. It seems to me that, under such circumstances, the property that is to be benefited should bear a fair proportion of the cost, to the extent that it is benefited, and the railways should not be called upon to bear all the expense involved in putting a stone drain underneath the railway.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). This question is one that affects other portions of the Dominion besides the province of Ontario. I am very glad that my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) spoke on the subject, and I also would like to say a few words, for two reasons. In the first place, I do not want the world to think that all the grumblers came from Ontario. And, in the second place, the people of my own county are deeply interested in the subject. In my own county of Huntingdon we have two railways, one crossing the northern part of the county throughout its entire length, about thirty miles, and another angling across. The first railway was built in the year 1880. It runs in a peculiar way and cuts off the drainage of the whole back part of the county from the rivers Chateauguay and Trout river, which afford the natural outlet for the drainage for that part of the country. When the road was built by the Grand Trunk Railway they put in such culverts as were necessary at that time, that is wherever there were ditches or water-courses. And here I might say that I have heard it said by those who have knowledge of such matters, that we in the province of Quebec have the simplest drainage laws of any province of the Dominion. If the committee will allow me, I might state the procedure. In the first place, a petition is presented to the municipal council by those requiring drainage of their land. The municipal council appoint a special superintendent. The superinten-

dent calls a meeting of the parties interested and hears what they have to say, and prepares his proces verbal. The parties are given notice and are invited to come before the council to have it holomogated. Of course, there is a right of appeal from the decision of the council to the Circuit Court. Our trouble is that we cannot get at the railway companies in the same manner. I do not see why a railway company, building a road through a county should not be treated the same as any other owner of land. In other cases notices are posted up in certain places fixed by the council, and the interested parties are invited to appear on a certain date before the superintendent. And the superintendent, by the way, is not necessarily or even usually an engineer. He is very often a farmer who has had a good deal to do with drainage matters. I must say that, so far as the railways are concerned, the question of compensation has never come up with us. Any work requiring to be done that has been done by the railway has been paid for by the railway. Our trouble is to get the railway to do the work. Another difficulty which has arisen in our county is that, as the country is opened up, we find it necessary to deepen the water-courses which cross the railway track. They have built, in the first place, wooden culverts, in which they have what they call mud-sills ; and, when we try to deepen the drain, we find these culverts not deep enough. We do not want to interfere with the work of the railway, yet we have found great difficulty in getting the railway companies to do that work. But when they do it, they pay for it themselves. I think that is fair. I do not see why a company should build a bank across a county to interfere with the drainage ; and when it is necessary in order to drain the land behind them to put a drain across their track. I do not see why it should not do it at its own expense. This interferes with the drainage of Huntingdon very much, because, as I said, our natural drainage for several concessions north of the Grand Trunk Railway has been to the Chateauguay and Trout rivers, these flowing into the St. Lawrence. We find it necessary sometimes, as the country is cleared up, to change the line of the water-course, and then the difficulty arises with the railway company. It becomes necessary to apply to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. We in our county have much the same feeling with regard to that body as has been expressed by hon. members here. The fact that it is so far away, that it is such an important body, and that it has such a big name as 'The Railway Committee of the Privy Council,' have a tendency to make people feel that they do not want to have anything to do with it. And so, through time and patience—waiting, and waiting, and waiting—we have been able, so far as I know, to get our difficulties remedied one by one. It would be a great benefit to the province of Quebec, as well as to the province of Ontario, if some simpler way was provided. And I do think it should be by some person on the ground. In the province of Quebec we must have drainage, we cannot raise crops otherwise. If the drains are stopped the people suffer. We have the valley of the Chateauguay, the valley of the St. Lawrence and the valley of the Richelieu. All these have to be drained, and if the farmers do not drain them they cannot raise crops. We would like to have some simpler process by which we could deal with the railway companies as easily as we can deal with other persons owning land. As to the question of compensation, I am clear in my own mind that whatever obstruction to the drainage of the country has been caused by the railway, when an opening has been made through the railway to provide drains, it should be at the expense of the railway whose works have caused the obstruction.

Mr. BROCK. I think that we all agree that we need only consider in this matter what is fair and just. I do not think that the railway company should be allowed to build a line like that in the county of Huntingdon or any other county against the will of the people. But if the farmers want the road built, give bonuses towards it and do everything they can to secure the construction of it——

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) allow me to ask him a question ? Is it not a fact that the railway can push the line through by expropriation without asking the consent of the landowners ?

Mr. BROCK. Quite true, but if the drainage is required, the time to get it is at the time when the road is built.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) will excuse me. There were areas of land not cleared that did not require to be drained when the railway was built. But as the country is developed these swamps require to be drained.

Mr. BROCK. All that is wanted is what is fair and just. The railway is built through a province or through a country, through waste land that is of little or no value, and the building of it benefits the land and increases its value. As the hon. member has said the land in Huntingdon is no good unless it is drained. But that country has been opened and settled for the last fifty or sixty years. The proper time to apply for drainage is when the road is built. As they neglected to do it, and their lands have been benefited by the building of a railway, the question is : What is a fair compensation ? Who should build the drain ? At whose expense ? I agree with those gentlemen who say that

the county judge is, in most cases, the best man to refer cases of that kind to. He would give the greatest satisfaction in most cases. A case might arise of such importance that the judge would prefer to refer it to the Committee of the Privy Council. But we are told that would entail expense. I think a great deal too much has been made of the expense of going to the Privy Council. They are a body appointed to settle matters of this kind, and they are doing it every day, they are very approachable, they are responsible for settling matters of this kind, and should be held responsible. Under these circumstances I think we should take as little out of their hands as we possibly can. This creating courts all through the country for settling these trivial matters, hon. members will find a very expensive piece of business. The government are here, these matters could be brought before them at no expense, or if the government chose to delegate their power to an engineer and send him to examine the line of road, and the circumstances, they can get a report from him and act upon it at very little expense. But certainly I think that land which has been largely improved by the building of the railroad on it, land which was worth nothing before the railroad was built, should bear the expense afterwards of improving its own drainage, particularly when the railroad company has paid for the right of way through that land. Under these circumstances I think it would be a great injustice to penalize a railroad company. It is so easy to get up a feeling against a railroad, that is a popular thing all through the country, particularly when people expect an election. Hon. members can go back and say: See what great things we attempted to do for you. Let us be fair, we can afford to be fair and do what is right. The right thing to decide is who shall bear the expense of these drains. I think that can be done to a large extent by referring the question to the judges in the counties which the railroads run through. I do not think there need be much discussion on this question beyond making it clear that the aim is to do what is fair, and not penalize the railroads more than they deserve.

Mr. COWAN. I feel sure that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) did not refer to me when he spoke about trying to make political capital by waving the red right hand against the railroad companies and rousing up the people. I quite agree with a great deal of what he has said. I quite agree that there is a feeling in the country against railway corporations. I can tell the hon. member for Toronto that if he lived in the county of Essex he would say that his neighbours were the most patient and the most long-suffering people on the face of the earth, and he would be surprised that their animosity against railway corporations is not greater than it is. I admit that certain agitators may try to work up a feeling against railway corporations, but so far as the county of Essex is concerned, no agitator or any one else has been quite as responsible for working up a feeling against railway corporations as the railway corporations themselves. I say here with a knowledge of the county of Essex, and as having been engaged in these drainage questions for ten or twelve years, I never asked a railway company to make an opening underneath their road for the drainage of land, even after they had double-tracked the line and stopped up the ditches the farmers already had, that I did not have to fight it to the last ditch in order to get even meagre justice at the hands of railway corporations. Further than that, I say my own opinion is that the farmer ought to pay for the cost of the construction of a drain across the lands of the railway company, that is the lands in the shape in which the company found them, because if there had been no railway they would still have had to construct that ditch across the lands now covered by the railway. But where a railway company comes upon my farm and says, I will take a portion of your land, peaceably if you like, forcibly if I must, then upon that land which they compel you to sell they erect an embankment, thereby increasing the cost of the drainage of the land lying above the railway and which to properly drain I must cross the railway, then I think in all justice, at least as far as agricultural lands are concerned, the increased cost occasioned by the construction of that roadbed ought to be borne by the railway company that constructed it, under the power which parliament gave them to construct it against my will. That is only fair and just. As I have already stated in my opening remarks on this section, I can point to you farmer after farmer in the county of Essex whose lands the railway has gone through. Supposing they only take an acre or two worth from $40 to $100 an acre. The farmer does not want to go to an arbitration for expropriation, and the result is that damages for obstructing the drainage of the lands is not taken into consideration, it never has been in any case I have known in that country. But the company has power to take his land without his permission. I can name one whose name has appeared in the newspapers, Mr. Thomas Dunmore, of the township of Tilbury. The Michigan Central Railway went through his farm about 1885, and to-day the company want more money from Mr. Dunmore to put an ordinary sewer under the railway than they paid for the land that they took from him. When he goes to a lawyer about it he is told that he must go to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. That settles it. One word in answer to the Minister of Railways

and my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Heyd). When a farmer comes to you and you tell him that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council will send on an engineer to make a report, he then wants to know what becomes of the report. You tell him that it goes back to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to be there adjudicated upon, and that the railway lawyers can appear and be heard. He thinks he has got a mighty slim chance with the lawyers of a railway corporation before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council five hundred miles away, and he ploughing in the field.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock) has introduced a new element into this question, that is, its bearing politically. Now I am of opinion that railway companies exert a more powerful influence at the time of election than any other corporate body in the Dominion of Canada. I think if we consulted our own interest we would be careful not to say anything contrary to the views of the railway companies. But there are great interests at stake, and the Minister of Railways has asked us to give this question consideration this afternoon. He wants to know what our feeling is with regard to making the railway company liable for all the expense of putting through a ditch, beyond what would have been incurred if there had been no railway there. Now speaking for myself and endeavouring to look upon this matter in a fair way, recognizing the wrongs the farmers have had to so suffer, recognizing too that we must have railways, that they serve a useful purpose, and that their interest must be protected as well as the interest of other people, I think the provision that we have in subsection 6 is such as will give substantial justice in this matter. It may be that a word or two might be introduced to the effect that, subject to any special circumstances affecting the same, the cost occasioned by the railway being there should be borne by the company. If there are any special or peculiar circumstances such as the hon. minister suggests that, for instance, the cheapest line for the ditch has not been selected, but one that will impose a very large amount of expense upon the railway company where a cheaper course could have been selected, it seems to me that this would be a fair element to take into consideration, and that if we frame it in some such way as this :

> Subject to any special circumstances affecting the same the proportion of the cost of the drain across or upon the railway to be borne by the railway company shall be based upon the increase of cost of such work caused by the construction and operation of the railway——

We will have an equitable provision all around. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) said that this was probably a matter that was taken into consideration at the time the railway was constructed. I venture to say it has not been so in the majority of instances. I venture to say that almost universally the opposite rule prevailed. There may be some instances where this principle was adopted and where the increased compensation was given at the time, and if it can be established that it was given that would be one of the special circumstances to which I have referred. But, if hon. gentlemen will take into consideration the circumstances attending the expropriation and valuation of property at the time they will come to the conclusion very readily that this is not likely to be the case. At the time the land is expropriated the line is merely located and no work has been done on the ground. The farmer has no idea at the time that there is to be an immense embankment built across his property. All he knows is that there is to be a railway run through his property. He has no anticipation that there will probably be a frog pond created, as there have been in several instances to my knowledge in the riding of South Simcoe, to the prejudice of the health of the farmer and his family, and the destruction of his land.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Even the surveys are not made then.

Mr. LENNOX. As my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) says, in instances the surveys are not made at the time the settlement is made for the land. So that, what I submit as to the hon. member from South Brant is that his argument is not a matter that stands in the way of our arriving at a fair conclusion upon this question. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has spoken this afternoon, as it is his duty to speak, in reference to the question of the safety of the public. That is a matter, that, of course, must not be lost sight of. It would not be right that the strength of the railway should be impaired by the reckless putting through of any ditch or culvert or anything of that kind, but, the Ditches and Water-courses Act, and the General Drainage Act of Ontario, and I presume, the drainage Acts of other provinces, provide that the railway companies shall have the first right to construct the drainage work if they think fit.

Mr. COWAN. This amendment makes special provision for that.

Mr. LENNOX. And as my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) states this amendment makes special provision in reference to that. These are matters of final adjustment that we can deal with after settling the broad principle. There will be no objection, I presume, to leaving the matter of the class of structure that would be put under a railway altogether to be determined by the railway engineer. All that the municipality or the individual is interested in is that it shall be sufficiently large to give a free

flow of water beneath the railway property. Whether it shall be an extra substantial work or not is a matter that may be left to the railway engineer. General jurisdiction in the matter of determining the proportion of cost and the cost of the proceedings is a matter which eminently comes within the jurisdiction of the county judge. Now, I followed the remarks of the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. MacLaren), who outlined the procedure in the province of Quebec, and who emphasized the fact that in the province of Quebec they have an exceedingly simple and satisfactory procedure, a procedure which the hon. gentleman ventured to think was probably more simple and satisfactory than that in the any other province. I am glad to be able to tell the committee that the procedure outlined by the hon. member for Huntingdon is identical with the procedure under the general drainage law, not the Ditches and Water-courses Act, of the province of Ontario with the exception, that, of course, we have different names for the officials, but, it is exactly upon the same principle and I can certify that it has been exceedingly satisfactory, inexpensive and expeditious. So that, the hon. minister in taking this matter in consideration and framing provisions upon the lines that have been moved in the amendment by the hon. member for South Essex will be able to introduce some most valuable amendments in reference to this drainage question. There is just one matter that I intended to speak of when I said that in the main I agreed with the propositions of the hon. member for South Essex, and that is the last section of the amendments that he introduced. In dealing with railway companies I recognize, as has been suggested by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock), that probably we are liable, because there is a great deal of agitation, to adopt extreme views. I am not at all sure, as far as that last section is concerned, that a special provision for a dredge is required to be enacted in this legislation. That, of course, would naturally come from the hon. member for South Essex in his desire to help his constituents, but, we must submit ourselves to some inconvenience for the benefit of having railways traversing different parts of the country, and as regards that I would be glad enough to see that provision omitted. I would like to see the other provisions substantially carried out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will have these matters gone into very carefully and we will defer further consideration of these clauses relating to drainage until a later meeting of the committee.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

SUPPLY—DUTY ON GARDEN PRODUCTS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. J. E. E. LEONARD (Laval). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I move in amendment that all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

It is greatly in the interest of the market gardeners and the farmers, that the duties on the products of our Canadian gardeners be so readjusted as to assure to the Canadian farmer an adequate protection against foreign competition.

I do not propose to revive the discussion which took place last year in the House on this subject. Some hon. members on the other side stated at the time that I had postponed moving a resolution to the same effect as this amendment, in order to embarrass the government and make political capital out of the question. That was so far from my thoughts that I offered to withdraw my resolution if some one on the government side should rise and declare that the government would undertake to have it passed.

This year again, I delayed answering the speech made during last session by the hon. member for West York until the last moment, until the latter part of this session, in order to enable him to keep the numerous promises he made on the hustings in the course of the last electoral campaign and to redeem the pledge he took when, at the head of a numerous delegation of gardeners from the province of Ontario, he urged the hon. Minister of Finance to revise the tariff in the sense he had pointed out.

If I remember rightly what he said last year to argue himself into voting as he was told and setting aside his promises to his electors and to the gardeners throughout the country, he claimed that having put the resolution on the Order paper at the very beginning of the session, I then delayed bringing the matter up for discussion until the government had made known their decision not to change the tariff.

Well, I hope that this year the hon. member for West York will support the amendment, to be consistent with himself and to show his electors that he is willing at least when an opportunity offers, to make good the promises made in election time.

Last year several hon. members took part in the debate on that question. Those who spoke in favour of my motion took the view more especially that the gardeners in the vicinity of Montreal should be more highly protected. I admit that in a question of that kind, both sides should be considered, the interests of the producers as well as those of the consumers. I remember an hon. member saying that for one he was in

favour of the consumer and would remain so, so long as some means had not been devised of increasing the production of our gardens in winter time; so long as the course of the stars had not been changed and a warmer sun given to Canada towards the close of winter.

Mr. Speaker, the number of gardeners in the vicinity of large cities, such as Montreal and Toronto, is larger than is imagined. In the census bulletins, these gardeners do not appear as such; they are entered as ordinary farmers. In the neighbourhood of Montreal, there are between two and three hundred gardeners, each one of whom employs between five and thirty people. I may say that there are at least five or six hundred families who subsist on gardening in the counties of Laval and Jacques Cartier alone. I am told that about Toronto there are at least two or three thousand people who support themselves on gardening.

All these farmers and market gardeners, have to pay heavy duties on everything they consume. They pay duty on the tools they use; on the clothes they wear. Why should they not in turn be protected like others, as stated in their petition forwarded to the Customs Department? All they ask for, is that their industry, their business, their labour should be protected as those of other producers. It seems to me they have a right to be heard and to obtain protection from the government.

Last year (April 28, 1902), the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) made a similar statement. On page 3659 of 'Hansard,' I find him quoted as follows:—

> Now, I say, that to my mind is a hardship, and I believe it would be wise for the government carefully to consider this question. I would like to see them increase the duty a little. I don't think we need go very far, because if the effect of the increase in that duty is to advance the price of these vegetables in the early spring, it is only the well-to-do people who consume them. If you pay a cent, or two cents more for your cabbages to get them in April or May, it is only the wealthy classes that use those goods at that season, it is not the poor people that consume them. Then when our own vegetables come into the market our people will be able to supply the market of Canada with all the goods the consumers require and there is sufficient competition among the market gardeners in Canada themselves to keep the prices right.

These few words suffice to meet the objections raised against my amendment by the hon. members on the other side who are free traders. What do the gardeners ask by their petition, which I have looked into? They request that a specific duty be put on foreign products similar to theirs. At present there is an *ad valorem* duty; 25 per cent is paid on the value of vegetables imported from the United States, and in most cases these vegetables are entered as damaged products, and instead of the government getting the full revenue from the duty, an insignificant amount only is collected therefrom. Market gardeners request that asparagus be submitted to a duty of three cents per pound; cucumbers, 20 cents per dozen; lettuce, 25 cents per dozen; cauliflowers, 3 cents a piece; spinach, 25 cents per bushel; potatoes, 25 cents per bushel; cabbage, 3 cents a piece, and so forth. I submit to the House this request of the market gardeners, because it appears to me to be fair and reasonable, and because under the United States tariff, which specially provides for the protection of their farmers against foreign or Canadian competitors, the rates are about as high as those I have mentioned.

As already stated, every feature of this question was discussed in the course of the session. If I remember aright, the hon. Minister of Finance did not say at the time that he was adverse to an increase of duty on these products. He was content with informing the House that the government had not as yet made up their minds as to changing the tariff, and thereupon he moved the adjournment of the debate. Since last session, the hon. Minister of Finance has had plenty of time to study the question, and make inquiry from parties interested and even members who are in favour of an increase in the duties; and I trust that this year he will comply with the request of the gentlemen I have the honour to represent to-night. My hon. friend, the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is nodding to me just now, and I infer from his action that he does not agree with me. However, I was pleased to hear him last week in this House state over and over again that he was a protectionist.

The SPEAKER. I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he is not allowed to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. LEONARD. At all events, Mr. Speaker, I know of a good many members who, though unwilling to give themselves out publicly as protectionists, admit as soon as they are outside this House, that they are in favour of protection, and I have heard an hon. member on the other side proclaim himself in this House a protectionist, though he considered he was bound for party reasons to vote in favour of free trade. However, it is likely that the hon. member to whom I have referred a moment ago will once more follow his leaders and vote against his principles.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to join in the debate on the motion of the hon. member for Laval, and I would not have done so, had he not thought proper to mention my name and to recall my views in favour of protection. I may repeat to the hon. member what I have already said, that actually I am a protectionist; but for the very reason that I believe in protection,

I do not think it a good plan to convert our fiscal policy into a system of political speculation. I do not wish to question the hon. member's good faith. I am willing to admit that he has an absolute confidence in the efficiency of the proposal he submits. But I think that had he considered the question from the standpoint of political economy rather than from the point of view of the member for Laval, he would have come to another conclusion. He would have realized that even if the government were to adopt his views, the condition of the farmers in his country as well as that of the gardeners in the vicinity of Montreal and other parts of the country, would in no way be changed. In fact, under what conditions would an increase of the duty on garden truck from the United States have the effect of shutting off these products from our markets ? It would at the time of the year when our own products not being as yet available, early vegetables from the United States come in naturally, because consumers require them. But as soon as the natural products of the counties of Laval and Jacques Cartier, or of any county in the vicinity of Montreal, can be taken to the markets of that city, at no great expense for transportation or production, the competition of United States producers is no longer an impediment. In other words, as far as local consumption goes, competition on the part of United States producers does not count ; in fact, if we go back to the original meaning of the word, it can be hardly termed competition at all. Consequently, the motion of my hon. friend, however good his intentions, does not attain the object he has in view. He certainly cannot, at certain seasons, as in winter, prevent the people of Montreal from buying cabbage or asparagus when they are so inclined, and his 'intelligent and faithful' electors are not in a position to produce them.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Does the hon. member know at what time of the year vegetables from the United States arrive in Montreal and Toronto.

Mr. BOURASSA. (Translation.) United States vegetables may reach Montreal at all seasons ; but from the standpoint of the market gardener, such competition affects him only during our own season of production and during our season of production in Canada, vegetables from the United States are not forthcoming, for the very good reason that our own production is superabundant, and that competition on the part of the former is not to be feared. The same thing happens the world over, as a consequence of differences in climate.

There are market gardeners in the vicinity of large cities in the United States. At certain seasons of the year, the cities of Boston and New York, for instance, receive vegetables and fruit from California. Do gardeners in the vicinity of those cities complain of the competition they are subjected to ? Not at all. Large quantities of fruit are also received from Florida, Havana and Mexico. But as soon as local production is abundant enough to meet the requirements of consumers, that competition necessarily ceases. So that I do not see any good reason in support of this motion ; and I must admit that it seems preposterous that we should be asked to pay a higher price for these commodities when our market gardeners are not in a position to supply the needs of the market.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Would my hon. friend be disposed to support a resolution providing for an increase of the duty during that period of time only when our Canadian gardeners are in a position to supply the market ?

Mr. BOURASSA. (Translation.) No ; as I think such a measure would not be workable, and moreover would be of the kind I have referred to, calculated to mislead the public.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). I sympathize, as do a great many members on both sides of the House, with the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard). I have noticed that whenever a motion of this kind is proposed asking for increased protection there are always some members on the other side of the House of high protectionist views who like the hon. gentleman for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) try to argue themselves into not voting for such a resolution. Sometimes it takes time to do it, but they generally wind up by convincing themselves. The market gardeners of Canada are a class of men who are particularly in need of whatever assistance the government can give them in the way of protection. Their calling requires a great deal of industry, a considerable amount of skill, and a market gardener with four or five acres will employ almost as many hands as a farmer with 200 acres. It is such a labour employing industry as this that we ought to protect. There is invested in this market gardening industry many thousands of dollars in greenhouses and other necessaries to the enterprise, and I am quite sure that that investment would be doubled if legitimate and reasonable protection were given to the products of the market gardeners. It is contended that the price will be advanced to the consumer by a duty on these articles. It is possible that for a short time, until the industry gets well on its feet, that will be the case, but it is also a fact that it is only the rich who indulge in these high priced early vegetables and the consumers consequently are well able to pay a little money into the treasury. The Minister of Finance has always a place for any extra revenue he can get, and if protection in this case should result in a slightly increased price I am sure that no one, not even the

rich consumer of vegetables will object. The tax will be but a trifle compared with the benefits it would confer on the market gardeners of Canada. Time and again the government had been petitioned to grant this protection. Two years ago a large deputation was headed by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the member for West York (Mr. Campbell) and I expect to see the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) speak and vote in favour of this resolution to-night. I know that last year he argued himself into the belief that he was obliged to vote against the resolution, because the conference of the premiers in England interfered with the granting of a duty on vegetables, but now that that difficulty has been removed, and now that the government has doubtless taken the matter into their serious consideration, I have hopes that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) will give us his support. I take it for granted that the result of the consideration of the government is, that they have absolutely refused to grant the request of the market gardeners of this country. It is a mistaken policy, because there is no valid reason why some assistance should not be given to this industry which would in no way hurt anybody, and which would be of very great assistance to the market gardeners. In the neighbourhood of Hamilton there must be 200 or 300 men engaged in the industry and supplying not only the city of Hamilton but the northern part of the province as well. The importation of American vegetables in the early part of the season hampers their industry, and if they were protected even only for a short time at the beginning of each season, it would be of great benefit to them. The practice is to start these vegetables under glass and then grow them in the open air, and our market gardeners are not able to compete with the cheap labour of the southern states. Indeed when our early vegetables are about being transplanted the vegetables in Delaware and the Carolinas, grown in the open season are fit for market, so that our farmers could not even compete with these. There should be a duty on these vegetables in the early part of the season at all events, so that the keen edge of the first taste for vegetables may not be dissipated before our early vegetables are ready to be placed on the market. I am sure that if the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) would appeal to the government once more, they will even at this late date reconsider their determination and give the market gardeners some assistance.

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). While this is a resolution that most largely affects the cities, there is a principle underlying it that ought not to be overlooked. Judging by what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) said one would think there is no duty on vegetables imported from the United States. Even if that were so, I do not know that it would be a good reason for imposing a duty on these vegetables, but nobody knows better than the hon. member for Wentworth that the American market is availed of by the market gardeners and fruit growers of the Niagara district which the hon. gentleman has the honour to represent, and while he is attempting to shut out the importation of vegetables from the United States, I presume he wants to retain the American market for himself. I have here a letter from the wholesale fruit and vegetable dealers of Toronto which was published in the newspapers some time ago, and which I understand was sent to the Minister of Finance.

I find that there is at the present time a duty of 25 per cent on cucumbers, 25 per cent on asparagus, two cents per pound on strawberries, which is equal to $486 per car; one cent per pound on peaches, or $240 per car; 25 per cent on lettuce, onions, and radishes; 25 per cent, or from $75 to $100 per car, on celery; and $125 per car on tomatoes. It seems to me that a duty of 25 per cent ought to be enough to protect the growers of vegetables in Canada. If the gardeners in the neighbourhood of the cities are not satisfied with that amount of protection, it is pretty hard to know what will satisfy them. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) admit that there would be any increase of price if the duties were put on, but he was candid enough to make that admission. I do not see why the people of Canada, in the spring, when it is impossible to obtain Canadian vegetables, should be compelled to pay more for the early vegetables which come from the south than ordinarily; and we must remember that the poorer people in the city households appreciate the advantage of replenishing their tables with early vegetables as well as the wealthier citizens. This letter, which purports to be signed by all the wholesalers in Toronto, as well as by retailers, claims that the introduction of American vegetables and fruits does not interfere with the sale of Canadian products, because they come in early in the season when the Canadian products are not available. I think it would be wise on the part of this House to refuse to increase the duty on vegetables. I think 25 per cent is high enough.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I may recall the fact that at the time my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Leonard) was elected a member of this House, he pledged himself to do all in his power to forward the idea that gardeners should be put on the same footing at least as are manufacturers in this country. Indeed he has made good his promise; for, besides joining, with all who have that cause at heart, in the move-

ment which went on outside this House, he introduced, at every session, in a constitutional and judicious way this motion which is of the greatest interest for the electors of his county and of several other counties, not only in the vicinity of Montreal and Toronto, but I may say in the vicinity of all large cities in the Dominion.

The hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Holmes) read a kind of certificate, from which we may surmise what is the real nature of the war continually waged in this House against a policy which, to my mind, should commend itself to the attention of the government. The document he read comes from a few individuals, worthy of respect, I admit,—I mean the dealers in vegetables from the United States, and there are some in Montreal—who realize enormous profits, while our farmers suffer from an unfair competition ; and that document purported to show that we are not in a position to grow these vegetables in winter time.

My hon. friend, the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) also addressed the House, this evening. He started out by saying that he had not studied the question. It is only proper, therefore, that we should excuse him for the ignorance he showed in regard to gardeners. It may be that in the county of Labelle—which is not in the vicinity of a large city such as Montreal—the need of protection such as my hon. friend from Laval asks for, is not so keenly felt. However, Labelle has fairly good transportation facilities to Montreal, and is close enough to Ottawa where quantities of vegetables from the United States are sold. So that, with some thought and study, my hon. friend would readily have come to the conclusion that even his county would be benefited by the adoption of the thoroughly national policy which this motion sets forth.

The hon. member stated, however, that the United States garden truck came to this country at a time when Canadian truck could not be found on our markets. Why, has my hon. friend not followed the discussion which went on for weeks in the Montreal papers, whereby it was shown, not from the statements of lawyers or professional men, but from those of gardeners and agriculturists, that the production of vegetables in the United States was at a certain time in the spring of the year concurrent with ours, and consequently interfered with the sale of our home grown vegetables ? Is it not to the knowledge of my hon. friend from Labelle that two or three delegations discussed that important point with the hon. Minister of Finance and showed to his satisfaction and that of some of his colleagues, by the testimony of competent men representing the Gardeners' Association of Ontario and Quebec, that this theory, lightly put forward, I must say, by my hon. friend from Labelle, has no foundation? It was shown that we are successful in raising early vegetables and that this competition on the part of United States products is very harmful to us.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak of Toronto, as there are in this House several members who are acquainted with the situation there ; but within twenty-five miles of Montreal, there are large numbers of market gardeners interested in this policy. It will enable our farmers, producers of grain over large areas, to improve their condition by taking to market gardening. That policy is of interest also to the county of Laprairie-Napierville, so well represented here by my hon. friend (Mr. Monet). It interests the county of Verchères, and the county of L'Assomption, although somewhat distant from Montreal ; but I am sure that my hon. friend who represents that county would rejoice should the government at last adopt a wise policy on that question.

The counties of Chambly-Verchères and Terrebonne are also greatly interested. Today the county of Terrebonne is in close communication with Montreal ; and I heard it stated in that county, last winter, that should market gardening be protected, the people there would be in a position to provide for Montreal's enormous consumption of vegetables. The county of Vaudreuil, which adjoins my own, is also greatly interested, as well as the county of Hochelaga, worthily represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Madore), whom I notice just now at his seat. The county of Hochelaga stands high as regards this specialty, and supplies the Montreal market with a large quantity of the early vegetables for which the gardeners claim from the government as much protection as is granted to other industries, and no more. A great deal was said last year concerning protection for the farmers ; my hon. friends who are seated on your right, Mr. Speaker, had much to say on the subject. Well, here is a proposal thoroughly in the interest of the farmers, a most favourable opportunity is offered for granting them some measure of protection. We will find out who are the farmer's friends. The market gardeners in this country are those who go in for extensive farming, to which very little attention has been given heretofore. But to-day, through the efforts of noted agriculturists, that type of farming, particularly in the province of Quebec, and more particularly in the district of Montreal, at the hands of the descendants of the first settlers of the country, is being remarkably developed.

I did not mention just now the county of Laval, and my reason for omitting to do so was that my hon. friend (Mr. Leonard) had, this evening, very well spoken on behalf of that county. Laval, which extends even over a small part of the island of Montreal, is very highly interested in this question. The county of Jacques Cartier, whose representative I have the honour to be, has never ceased since I have been a

member of this House, to claim that protection, which is so necessary to its welfare. My hon. friend from Laval spoke of the development of that industry ; he said that in his county, that agricultural specialty was carried on a large scale. I may say without exaggerating that the capital invested in the production of early vegetables amounts at least to $150,000. We showed all that to the satisfaction of the members of the government, and among others, the hon. Minister of Finance, when we called on them with the joint delegation of the gardeners of Ontario and Quebec representing the interests of that class of gardeners which is so important and so worthy of our solicitude.

Mr. Speaker, should you fancy the notion, some day, it might be well to visit Côte des Neiges, Notre Dame de Grâce, or some others of our important parishes in the vicinity of Montreal. You would be surprised, I am assured, at witnessing what our gardeners have accomplished in the way of hot-beds, in order to supply Montreal, in the months of March and April, with the products required for consumption, and to use the words of Mr. Légaré, with an abundance of all that the city requires, at reasonable prices. Yourself, Mr. Speaker, were it possible for you to vote on this motion, you would be the first to do so, as the county of Rouville is close enough to Montreal as to be in a position to take advantage of such a measure of protection. Early vegetables are raised in that county on a large scale, and I believe that if a policy of protection were to be applied to that industry, the county of Rouville, which may be reached from Montreal in an hour's time, would take due advantage of it.

Two important delegations interviewed the government and submitted petitions to which my hon. friend from Laval referred. These two delegations consisted of gardeners from Ontario and Quebec who were unable to understand one another, as they did not speak the same language ; but a strange and very noticeable fact was that they all agreed as to the proper course to follow. They all agreed as to the rates of duty to be levied ; they all agreed in the answers to questions put by the ministers. On two occasions, then, did these gentlemen submit their representations to the government, and in each case, did the government promise to take their requests into serious consideration.

After waiting two years, is it not fair, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend from Laval, who takes such a lively interest in this question, should have recourse to the simple and constitutional means which he is taking this evening in order to obtain from this House an expression of opinion as a guide to the government in any action they may think fit to take regarding that policy which appeals to us so strongly ?

That class of men, the gardeners, have to pay duty on all that they use in the pursuit of their calling : agricultural implements, harness, wagons; even the clothes they wear to do their work are subjected to a duty by the government. Why should not the latter afford some protection to the products which through their arduous labours are extracted from the soil ?

The hon. member for Labelle stated that we paid duty on vegetables from the United States at a time when our people were not in a position to grow them. My hon. friend loses sight of an important point : even if his statement were correct—and the contrary has been proven—even if it were so, we should through respect for ourselves and for our benefit, retaliate against the people of the United States. We should not submit to paying the high duties they impose, and not levy any ourselves.

Had my hon. friend studied the question, he would be well aware that formerly, previous to the enactment of the United States tariff, we exported across the line, during autumn and winter, cabbages, celery and several other kinds of vegetables, which to-day we cannot sell there on account of the prohibitive duty which has been enacted.

That is the evil which we wish to have corrected through the imposition of duties on products from the United States, in the same way that our products are taxed by them. By that means, that is by holding up our heads to our neighbours who wish to exclude our products from their markets, will we succeed in having the evil remedied. In this respect again, the motion now before us is eminently wise.

This is not a party question. It may be stated that under previous governments the duty was the same. That is possible ; similarly, under previous governments other things have happened which should not have happened. Had it been otherwise, these governments might have remained in power and would not have undergone the fate of all governments which deteriorate and perish through wrong doing. The evil I have referred to is undoubted. In the spring and until July 15, our gardeners are deprived of the profit which would be ensured by a fair and reasonable rate of duty.

When the delegation of farmers from Ontario and Quebec submitted their views to the government, the following question was put : Do you intend to raise the prices of vegetables which we buy on the markets in our cities ? What was the answer to that question ? The president of the Gardeners' Association of the province of Quebec—and his testimony is worthy of consideration—answered at once : Give us a fair measure of protection and we guarantee that the products we shall offer for sale will not be dearer than those we have now to compete against.

While my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) was speaking, the member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) asked him a question regarding which I deem it incumbent on me to say a few words. On two occasions it was suggested to the government by the delegations which came to Ottawa, in case it was not thought advisable to grant absolute protection throughout the year, to establish a sliding scale of duties. That was certainly a wise suggestion, and the Minister of Finance remembers, no doubt, that the question was discussed at the time. That suggestion is a practical one, and I think a sliding scale of duties could be worked in such a way as to offer sufficient protection to our gardeners. In the opinion of the delegates, there was no question as to the practicability of such a suggestion. I believe it would be possible to lower the duties during the months of November, December and January, and subsequently to increase them to the proposed amount in the spring as soon as our products come in again, that is at the time when these protective duties would benefit the growers. Such a system could be applied here as it has been elsewhere. In the spring, our gardeners could produce abundantly and at reasonable prices the vegetables we require; but it is not fair to abandon them without protection to the competition of the negroes and the Chinese who till the lands in Carolina and Virginia.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Finance, seconded by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, moved, a little while ago, that the House go into Committee of Supply, and the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) moved in amendment:

That it is greatly in the interest of the market gardeners and the farmers, that the duties on our Canadian garden products be so adjusted as to guarantee the Canadian farmer an effective protection against foreign competition.

I must say, at the outset, that although I had the privilege of listening to the remarks offered by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard), I could not catch the meaning of the last portion of his argument. It was also my privilege to hear what I may call the political harangue of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who has just resumed his seat, and who is the recognized leader of the opposition in the province of Quebec. It is not my intention, however, to say anything as to the merits of his remarks, as I must admit that I have not the necessary knowledge and information to deal properly with the matter. I had occasion to meet the hon. gentleman at several public assemblies in the rural constituencies of the province of Quebec, which he has just referred to, namely, Hochelaga, Laval, Chambly and Verchères and Terrebonne. I may add that I also met him in February last at St. Eustache, in the county of Two Mountains and at Ste. Scholastique, the chief town of the Terrebonne district. Upon those several occasions, he stated that the greatest agricultural county in the province of Quebec was that which I have the honour of representing here, and which I won for the party, in spite of all the efforts put forth by my opponents. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, this evening, failed to mention the county of Two Mountains as an agricultural county, and I hope the electors of my constituency will not forget it. The hon. gentleman thinks that the county of Two Mountains is not an agricultural constituency, and that in the province of Quebec, the only agricultural counties are those of Hochelaga, Terrebonne and Laval, the last of which is represented here by the mover of this resolution.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). Let my hon. friend allow me to tell him that I was well aware that he was here to represent his county.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation). My hon. friend knew very well that the other members referred to were also here. He knew that the hon. member for Terrebonne was in his seat. Why did he omit mentioning the county of Two Mountains? It is because he knows that the electors of that county voted, in 1900 and on the occasion of the by-election held in February last, against the policy which is now being advocated by the hon. member for Laval and himself. They were also well aware that, on the 28th of April, 1902, a similar motion to the one now before the House was voted down by a majority of 38.

The House remembers, no doubt, that last session, on the 28th of April——

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation). Is the hon. gentleman warranted in stating that the electors of the county of Two Mountains declared against my amendment, at the election of 1902? My hon. friend did not vote on that motion.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation). My hon. friend wants to know whether the electors of the county of Two Mountains declared against his amendment, at the election of 1902. He ought to know that, when that by-election took place, I had not the honour of representing here that county, as I had resigned my seat.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation). On the 28th of April, you were the member for Two Mountains, and you did not vote.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation). I would certainly have voted against the motion, and if I did not do so, it is because I was absent from my seat in this House. But had the hon. gentleman been in his seat, his vote would have helped to swell the majority of thirty-eight, which was recorded against the motion brought down by the

hon. member for Laval. Now, this motion comes up again, after having gone through many changes. I think the mover of this resolution, if he had been sincere and had the interests of the market gardeners at heart, would not have pursued such a course. I presume he took that course, lest the resolution which he had put on the Order Paper should meet with a similar treatment to that meted out to the motion brought down by him last session, which was voted down by a majority of thirty-eight. My hon. friend from Laval put his motion on the Order Paper, this year, and it was allowed to stand for three months through his being absent, although it was called over and over again. Now, as the hon. gentleman has thought it fit to rebuke me for being absent from my seat in this House during the electoral contest in my constituency, let me ask him why he did not proceed with his resolution, although it was called over fifteen times by you, Mr. Speaker, and why he did finally withdraw it? If my hon. friend had been sincere and anxious to advance the interests of the farming community, he would not have withdrawn his resolution.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may tell him that if I withdrew the resolution which I had placed upon the Order Paper, it is because I was anxious that the House should deal with it on its merits, so that an adequate expression of the House should be had upon it, and further to prevent it from being shelved by the government and their followers, through their proposing the adjournment of the debate, as was done last session. I am sure the hon. gentleman will record his vote in favour of my amendment, if he wishes to voice the opinion of his faithful and intelligent constituents.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation). The faithful and intelligent electors of the county of Two Mountains have rendered their verdict in the by-election, as you are aware.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation). I may remind the hon. gentleman that he should address himself to the Chair and not to one of his colleagues.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation). What I blame the hon. gentleman for is that, after having placed his motion on the Order Paper, he deliberately allowed it to remain on the motion paper for two months, and then withdrew it. Now he comes forward and presents it in the form of a non-confidence motion, in amendment to the usual motion presented by the government for the House to resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). Let the hon. gentleman deal with the resolution before the House on its merits.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation). My hon. friend seems to take exception to my remarks, just as he took exception to what I said at the time of the election in Valleyfield. But as I stated at the outset, I do not wish to pay to his high-flown rhetorical efforts more attention than they deserve, and than I paid to them during the election contest in Valleyfield. Let me only remind him that, upon that occasion, he entered the lists with an hon. member who now sits alongside of him in the cold shades of the opposition, and who, on the 28th of April, 1902, did administer to him a well deserved castigation.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). You are not in favour of vegetables?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation). My hon. friend should not forget that the hon. gentleman whom he is now extolling to the skies from one end of the county to the other, did, upon that occasion, administer to him a well deserved rebuke, as I am going to show. In reply to the hon. member for Laval, the hon. Mr. Tarte made the following statement, which will be found on page 3642 of 'Hansard':

> We should bear in mind that the present tariff is the same as was in force in former years.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation). Which is right, the minister or the tariff?

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation). In those days the tariff was no good, and the minister was wrong. Now, the ex-minister is right, but the tariff is all wrong.

> Then it should not be forgotten that the articles on which they want us to impose higher duties are the very same products which we cannot grow all the year round.

The ex-minister was right then. I do not know whether he would still express the same views, if he were in his seat to-day. At any rate, his remarks were sound. One would be led to believe, from what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) said, that in the whole Dominion there are only four counties in which vegetables are grown, namely, Hochelaga, Laval, Chambly and Verchères and Terrebonne. He did not mention that of Jacques Cartier.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). You forgot to mention two counties, and I must protest against such an omission.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation). The hon. members for Jacques Cartier and Laval know very well that the hon. member for Labelle, in his remarks, gave due credit to the market gardeners of the counties referred to. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has also referred to the deputations that had waited upon the Minister of Finance. Now, my hon. friend knows very well that he did not state the case fairly. I affirm that he did not say the whole truth. He did not say that certain deputations which he had organized and which consisted of several prominent market garden-

ers—I may mention here that Mr. DesRosiers, one of the leading market gardeners in the district of Montreal, was one of them, and that I was also present—did wait upon the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier), and that they obtained from him a satisfactory reply.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I must protest against the language used by the hon. gentleman. He states that I did not say the whole truth. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Finance whether I did not have, last year, a long interview with him on that very matter. I am now referring to the two deputations that waited upon the government. We first had a delegation which waited upon the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, and later on another delegation which waited upon the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Postmaster General. If my hon. friend was not there, he has no right to use such language, and I appeal to you, Sir, for protection.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation). I do not think I have denied the hon. gentleman the right of saying that he had interviews with the Finance Minister; but I did state that, prior to that latter interview, he had two other interviews with the Minister of Inland Revenue, in which I had the honour of participating, and that we were accompanied by Mr. DesRosiers, of the Côté des Neiges.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). I rise to a point of order. A year ago, we had the interview referred to by my hon. friend, and it was only later on that we waited upon the Finance Minister. My hon. friend ought to have sense enough to admit that those interviews took place in that way.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation). Whether those interviews referred to by my hon. friend did really take place in that way, matters very little; but the fact is that, in his previous remarks, he did not mention the delegations which had waited upon the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier).

As I said at the outset, it was not my intention to deal with the merits of the remarks offered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and the hon. member for Laval. In my opinion, our market gardeners do not suffer from the competition of the American market gardeners. Therefore, I think the position taken by the hon. member from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is the right one, as I also approve of the course pursued by the hon. Minister of Finance. To my mind, that attitude is perfectly fair and reasonable. Let me tell my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that we are perfectly satisfied with the policy adopted by the government on that matter, and that I feel bound to vote against the amendment brought down by the hon. member for Laval.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I regret that I am unable to reply to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ethier). not being able to follow the discussion of the question in French. I have no doubt, however, that the hon. gentleman has satisfied himself that the gardeners in the neighbourhood of the city of Montreal are not entitled to protection. The question raised by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) is, I have no doubt, one of deep interest to his constituents, as it is to mine, as well as to many other people throughout the province of Ontario. During the present session a large deputation, introduced by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell), waited upon the hon. Minister of Finance and I think the hon. Postmaster General in the room of the Minister of Finance, in regard to this question, and on that occasion the hon. member for West York stated that there were upwards of 4,000 people engaged in this industry in the neighbourhood of Toronto. If I have misstated or overstated the figure, I am quite sure the hon. gentleman will correct me. His statement on that occasion deeply impressed me with the importance of the industry in and about the city of Toronto. If that number of people are engaged in it, it is certainly something that should command the attention of the government, and these people should be put in the position of securing that market and thus receive a fair return for their labour and for the money they have invested in lands in and about the city of Toronto, which are very costly indeed; and the same may be said with regard to Montreal and all the other large cities of Canada. The hon. member for West York appears to have given this question a considerable study. In fact, when he appeared before the electorate on the occasion of his election in West York, it was largely on the line of increased protection to the market gardeners in and about the city of Toronto. What he says on that question, therefore, I take to be pretty well thought out and perfectly reliable. When he introduced this deputation to the ministers, I understood him to say that the increased cost of the vegetables to the consumers resulting from increased duties would be a mere trifle, amounting to not more than five or ten cents per family per week, which he regarded as a very insignificant matter compared with the great advantage of having this industry fostered and protected in such a way as to give to that large number of people a profitable return for their labour. The ordinary objection has been raised tonight to an increase in the duty on vegetables—an objection which I regret to say is often raised by the hon. Minister of Finance when proposals are made to increase the tariff—that an increased duty would enhance the price to the consumer. As I have said, the hon. member for West York treated that suggestion as a very insignifi-

cant matter. But if the hon. Minister of Finance would regulate his tariff in such a way as to foster the industries of this country, I see no reason why any family should be called upon to pay any more if the duty on vegetables were increased. It would be a very easy matter for the Minister of Finance to materially increase the duty on vegetables, even if it did add something to the price, if at the same time he reduced the duties on some things which we cannot produce in the country, such as raisins, currants, figs, and other dried fruits. We do not and cannot produce these dried fruits in Canada, and any taxes imposed upon them are direct taxes for revenue only, and not for the purpose of fostering any industry. The Minister of Finance could take the duty or part of the duty off these articles, and enable the various families throughout the country to get them at less cost, and at the same time he could put an increased duty on vegetables, and give the people who are engaged in that industry a larger market and a better chance of making their livelihood, while the consumers would not have to pay out any more for their living during the year.

I notice that the total duty on vegetables—and these do not include potatoes which we do not propose to interfere with at present—was $86,074 but the total duty which we pay on prunes, raisins and other dried fruits amounted to $304,640, making a slight reduction in the duty on dried fruits would very readily make up for the increased duty on our vegetables. The same may be said of small fruit. The hon. gentlemen who preceded me, having spoken in French, I am not sure whether they included small fruit in their proposition, but I would like to see the duty increased on small fruits, such as raspberries, strawberries and gooseberries, which are grown largely in the county I have the honour to represent. I do not consider that it would hurt the people if we increased the duty, because we might at the same time reduce the duty on sugar. In this way we would encourage an industry which employs a great deal more labour than people imagine, and by reducing the duty on raw sugar produced in Germany, you would not hurt any one. I do not therefore see that it would enhance the cost of living to the families of this country if we should increase the duty on vegetables and give our market gardeners that protection which is so desirable, as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) has pointed out. We were told a short time ago that the Americans wanted our markets for their small fruits, but as they do not take any small fruits from us, or scarcely any, we gain nothing by the exchange, and it would be quite immaterial, as far as our people are concerned, whether they raise the duties on these articles or not. With reference to the duty on vegetables going to the United States, as compared with the duties on vegetables coming to Canada, I think we might well come somewhat nearer what the Americans charge us when we endeavour to send them vegetables. I shall only take one article as an illustration of how unfairly our market gardeners are treated. We have to meet keen competition from the other side at a low rate of duty, because I think that 25 per cent on a low priced article is a very low rate. It can scarcely be said to be a revenue producing duty and it certainly cannot be called a high protective duty, whereas the Americans, on the other hand, make their duty practically prohibitive. Take the article of cabbage, at three cents per head, the duty on cabbage going into the United States from Canada is practically 100 per cent, and we admit it at 25 per cent. Why should we not mete out to the Americans the same kind of treatment that they do to us? If they want our market, let them treat us fairly. If they want to come in here in the early season with their vegetables before ours are ready, surely they ought in return to give us similar access to their markets in the later season. A 100 per cent against a 25 per cent is altogether unfair, and the Minister of Finance would be perfectly justified in acceding to the request of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) by giving adequate protection to the market gardeners around the city of Montreal, Toronto and elsewhere, so as to enable them to make more profit out of their calling, and I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is a larger number of people employed in the production of vegetables and small fruits than any of us imagine. If the hon. Minister of Finance could see his way clear in granting relief to these people, he could do so without imposing any burden on the country in the shape of increased taxation, because, whilst increasing the duty on the articles we can produce, he could take off a certain amount of duty from articles which we cannot produce and thereby maintain a level of taxation. I hope therefore that he will not turn a deaf ear to our appeal but will see his way to granting some relief to this hard-working section of our community.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word or two in reply to a remark by the hon. member from Jacques Cartier. He first vouchsafed to inform the House that in bringing forward this amendment, the hon. member for Laval was redeeming a pledge given to his constituents during the election campaign in his constituency. The hon. gentleman forgets, no doubt, that another election was taking place at the same time in the division of St. James, of Montreal. Those two counties are almost adjacent to each other, and in the division of St. James, of Montreal, there was nothing said about garden products, while in

the county of Laval, it was the great election cry. The reason is, indeed, that the market gardeners are not the only class concerned. I doubt very much whether the majority of the Laval electors are interested in market gardening. Besides, I think the hon. member for Laval has failed to show that the market gardeners were in as desperate a position as he would have us believe.

I have always been of the opinion that the market gardeners in and around the city of Montreal were among the most prosperous people in the country. I believe that the market gardeners in Montreal are the class of people who have made most money within the last few years. Under the circumstances, with a tariff of 25 per cent on their products, is it fair for them to come to parliament and ask for an increase in the customs duties, when they are enjoying a prosperity of such an exceptional character ? It ill becomes them to come come down here and ask for an increase of from 30 to 100 per cent in the duties. They have grown rich under protection, and the least they could decently do, would be to show that their position warrants them in asking for such an increase.

When I go to the market in Montreal and I have to pay twenty-five cents for three small tomatoes which I can hold in the hollow of my hand, it strikes me that the price charged is high enough.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). Those are American tomatoes.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation). I agree that those tomatoes come from across the line, because there are no Canadian tomatoes for sale in that season of the year. So with cucumbers. We have to buy cucumbers imported from the United States, because our market gardeners cannot grow any in that season.

Although the county of St. John and Iberville be twenty-five miles distant from the zone referred to by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, if it could be impressed upon the farmers of that county that the produce grown by them could fetch such a price, I am sure they would engage in that industry.

If our markets were flooded with American products, which were sold at a low price, the hon. gentleman would be justifiable in claiming some measure of protection, on the ground that the Canadian market gardeners were unable to enter into competition with the Americans, owing to the demoralized state of the market. As I said, the prosperity enjoyed by the market gardeners in the vicinity of Montreal is such that it ill becomes them to complain about the prices of the market. For these reasons, I cannot support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Laval.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Whatever else the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) expects in bringing forward his present motion, at least he cannot expect to win the favour of that class of hon. gentlemen who usually differ from him. Of course, it would have been possible for the hon. gentleman to present his motion in a different form, and at one stage of the affairs of this session it seemed that he desired to present it in a different form. I have on another occasion called the attention of the House to what may be called the advantages and disadvantages of proceeding in this particular way in dealing with tariff matters—I mean by a motion in amendment to the usual motion presented by the government for the House to resolve itself into committee of supply. One of the advantages of this form is that it enables the hon. gentlemen who move the motion to have a direct vote on certain matters on which they wish to have a vote, and I cannot blame them for using that form. On the other hand, one of the disadvantages is that it prevents that free and open discussion of the question hon. gentlemen ordinarily desire to have. Now, at an early stage of this session, on the 3rd of April, my hon. friend from Laval placed upon the notice paper a motion in substance the same as this which he presented to-day. That motion, if presented to the House, might have been dealt with as an open question, for it did not take the form of a non-confidence motion. But my hon. friend, for his own purposes—and I do not at all question his right ; he is the best judge of the method to be used—deliberately allowed that motion to remain on the notice paper for five or six weeks without moving it. Ultimately he dropped that motion, and now he comes forward and presents what is in effect the same motion, but he presents it in the form which is the most obnoxious form in which it could be presented to the government and to those hon. gentlemen who are good enough to favour us with their support. I cannot suppose that the hon. gentleman expects the motion to pass, or even to win many votes. He has, by following this method and putting the motion in this form, done his utmost to prevent hon. gentlemen on this side from voting for the motion. The question which the hon. gentleman raised is not new. It was dealt with in a general debate that took place this session, and it was also dealt with last year. Whatever may be said as to the merits of the motion if it arose in connection with a general, or even considerable, revision of the tariff, it has no merits if it is to be selected as one class of imports to be dealt with by the hon. gentleman to-night. If we were dealing with various items of the tariff, making either an extensive or a general revision, the hon. gentleman's views would be entitled to more consideration than we feel we are able to give them now. He has referred to the fact that my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell) introduced

a large deputation to me early in the session, who urged that some increase be made on the duties on vegetables. I must say, in justice to my hon. friend from West York, that, if we have not made this change, it is through no fault of his, for he has been most zealous in presenting the matter to us, both by the deputation and otherwise. But we have not thought that, at a time when we are not dealing with the tariff, there is any special reason for selecting this particular branch of industry as the subject of special legislation. I think it would not be too much to say that this branch of industry, important as it is, is not likely to be suffering to any large extent. I will not go so far as to say that there is nothing in the contentions of the hon. gentleman, for all these matters are fair subjects for consideration; but I think that those hon. members who live in large cities and have the pleasure of seeing the market gardeners coming in to the market will agree with me when I say that the market gardeners living near large cities are probably amongst the most prosperous farmers in Canada. They have advantages and opportunities which are not given to many of those in distant rural districts; and my observation is that the market gardener near a large city is, as a rule, a very comfortable and prosperous person. That is one reason why we do not now select the market gardeners as objects of our special consideration or regard.

My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) has referred to the small amount of duty we have collected on vegetables. And very properly so. Why is the duty so collected such a comparatively small amount? Because the importations are comparatively small. These goods only come in at certain seasons of the year, when our farmers are not producing the goods. If there are seasons when people in more southern climes can produce these things by the hand of nature on more favourable conditions than we, I do not think we should endeavour to shut them out altogether. I venture to think that, even if we increased the duty we should not shut them out altogether; and I doubt if the market gardeners would be substantially benefited, even if the duties were increased. I will say for the hon. member for Halton that, when he discusses matters of this character, he does not fall into the error into which so many hon. members on his own side of the House do, of thinking that increased duties do not increase the tax and the burden. He accepts the conclusion of his own logic and admits that there will be an increase. But, he says, I will show you how to lessen the burden in some other direction; you may have to pay more for your vegetables, but you can square the account by getting cheaper grapes and figs. These are commonly regarded as luxuries; and I am inclined to think that the working man will hardly agree to make his vegetables more expensive that he may get his compensation in buying his grapes and figs at cheaper rates.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has never been in the grocery business, or he would know differently.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) has been in the grocery business, I infer from what he says. But, in spite of his superior knowledge, I venture to say that for one man who buys figs and grapes, there are ten men who buy the common articles of vegetables. Therefore, any attempt to increase the price of vegetables and square the account by making the price of figs and grapes cheaper will, I think, hardly be the popular policy that he believes it to be. There is another point in which the hon. gentleman is ready to make a reduction—and I would like to hear the hon. gentleman on these matters, for he is always ready with proposals. He is not lacking in fairness. He says: I want to do this, and if there is a disadvantage in it, I will show you how to make it up. Well, he is going to cheapen figs and grapes—

Mr. HENDERSON. Currants and raisins.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, in justice to the workingman, I must put in currants and raisins; I certainly would not keep them out of his cake even if I could. The hon. gentleman says: There is another duty you can reduce. In proposing it, he wants to get even with the people of the United States and put a check on something that they send us. But what he proposes is to reduce the duty on German sugar. At the very moment when this country is ringing with admiration for the policy of this government in increasing the tax on German goods, the hon. gentleman coolly comes in and makes the proposal that we shall reduce the duty on German sugar. Apart altogether from the lack of logic in the hon. gentleman's position, apart from his failure to appreciate the national sentiment in the policy of this government, apart from his failure to appreciate the policy which has not only won the admiration of the people of Canada, but has won the admiration of the people of the whole empire, for we have asserted our right to be a portion of the empire free from any action that Germany may take; apart from all this, there is another question which the hon. gentleman has forgotten. At the moment when he is pressing us to reduce the duty on German sugar, deputations from his own province of Ontario, consisting of those interested in the beet-root industry, are asking us to increase the duty on German sugar.

Mr. HENDERSON. Give them a bounty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am bound to tell the hon. gentleman that they have asked not only a bounty but an increase of duty also, and, of the two they would prefer the increased duty. So, my hon. friend in his proposal—and I give him credit for readiness in replying—met the difficulty arising out of giving the workingman dear vegetables by saying that he would give him cheap figs——

Mr. HENDERSON. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, and at the moment when we are bound, in the interests of the country to resent the action of Germany, he comes forward and proposes that we go back on that policy and reduce the duty on German goods. At the very time when the beet growers of his own province are coming and asking us for increased duty on sugar, my hon. friend, who thought he was a high protectionist, comes and asks us to reduce the duty on German sugar. However, I do not wish to go into a general discussion of the tarif. Be it wise or be it unwise, the government have said that they do not regard it as expedient for the present session that we should enter into any extensive tariff changes; and unless we were entering upon general or extensive tariff changes there is no good reason for selecting this particular item as the subject of special consideration. If it were necessary to make comparison, there are other interests in Canada, probably not so well off as our friends the market gardeners, who, I think, as a rule, are by no means the least prosperous of Canadian citizens. However, since the hon. gentleman from Laval has withdrawn his original motion which would have allowed a general discussion of the question and has brought it forward as a vote of want of confidence, he will hardly expect any hon. gentleman on this side to vote for it. At all events, with every desire to appreciate the position of the market gardeners of Canada, I am bound to tell the hon. gentleman that I am unable to vote for his motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). It is becoming difficult for my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to keep his followers in line. The only way he has been able to do it for some weeks past is by appealing to them to vote down motions of want of confidence. Yet, only three years ago, there was a motion introduced by my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Russell) with regard to the British preference which was not regarded as a vote of want of confidence, though it possessed every element in that respect of the motion of my hon. friend the member for Laval (Mr. Léonard). It is very difficult indeed to please the hon. Minister of Finance. Introduce a general motion with regard to the tariff, and he tells you it is too general; he may even tell you that he does not know what it means; he cannot understand it. Speak, for instance, of adequate protection, and the hon. gentleman cannot understand it; it is a meaningless phrase to him. But he has no trouble whatever in understanding legitimate protection when that expression is used by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Prefontaine). And a few years ago, he assailed a former Conservative government because it had not given to the coal mines of Nova Scotia anything that could be regarded as adequate protection.

Well, he is not satisfied with a general motion, and you would think you might satisfy him with a specific motion, but when you come with a specific motion it satisfies him too well, it is too specific, and because it is not general, because it does not deal with every article in the tariff, he calls upon his followers to vote it down. In what way is this motion of my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Léonard) inopportune ?—I think that is the proper expression, every one of these specific motions is inopportune. If it is a motion of a general character it is vague and indefinite ; if it is a motion of a specific character it is inopportune. Why, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that every hon. gentleman in this House, every one who looks over the history of this country during the past twenty-five or thirty years, knows that motions with regard to the tariff have been introduced almost invariably as amendments to motions to go into Committee of Supply. If I am not mistaken, the policy of the Conservative party in the time of Sir John A. Macdonald between 1874 and 1878, was presented to the country by a motion in exactly the same way in which the hon. member for Laval has presented this motion to-night.

But there is another very curious thing in connection with this. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says : Why did you not put this motion on the Order Paper in the ordinary course ? He says that my hon. friend from Laval had such a motion on the Order Paper. Well, it is true he had that motion on the Order Paper, and he also had one of a similar kind last year. But what became of that motion ? Why, the Minister of Finance shelved it himself by a motion to adjourn the debate, knowing it would never come up again, in order that certain followers of his who did not care particularly to vote against that motion, might not be put in an awkward position by having a vote taken upon it in the House. To-night he calls upon them to vote this motion down because it is a motion of want of confidence, and because, I suppose, it is inopportune. Well, the Minister of Finance does not put himself in a very good light, it seems to me. If my hon. friend from Laval had proceeded with his motion this year, the Minister of Finance, after a certain amount of debate had gone on, would have risen again and moved the adjourn-

ment of the debate, and the motion of my hon. friend might have been shelved. That would have been his procedure, and I challenge him to say that he would not have done exactly what he did last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very likely I would.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And yet he complains.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not complain.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what you would call complaining. It is something very much like it. He seemed to find fault—let us put it in that way—he seemd to find fault with my hon. friend from Laval because he has put this motion before the House in the only way in which he could do it for the purpose of obtaining and having recorded the votes of hon. gentlemen in this House on the merits of that motion. Now the motion is specific, it is true. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have been shouting for specific motions, have been declaiming against the so-called vague motions that have been made in the House with regard to the tariff, they have been clamouring and thirsting for these various specific motions which are being presented to them during this session. When they get these specific motions for which they have been thirsting so much during the past two or three years, they do not seem to be any better satisfied with them than they were with the motions couched in more general terms which have been presented to the House during the past two or three sessions.

The Minister of Finance seems to think that no labouring man in this country has a right to be in a position to use figs or grapes; he seems to think these articles of food should be reserved for gentlemen in the position of cabinet ministers, or in a similar high scale of life. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that I think the labouring man of this country for the most part have a right to aspire occasionally to buy a basket of grapes containing ten pounds for twenty-five cents, and I think as I am reminded by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) that those grapes which are grown in Canada and sold at a very small price, are a very good article indeed. I do not know that there is any reason why these articles should not be protected in accordance with the terms of the motion presented by my hon. friend from Laval. The Minister of Finance, although he thinks the labouring man has no right to aspire to grapes or figs, seems to think that he may aspire to the luxury of early vegetables, or strawberries in February, and tomatoes in February or March. Well, I should be very glad indeed to see the labouring men of this country in a position to have these articles, but for the most part these articles, at that season of the year, are in every sense of the term luxuries, and are only used by people in this country who are in a position to command luxuries. A tax such as that proposed by the hon. member for Laval to-night would not bear upon the working people of this country, because these articles at that season of the year when they cannot be produced in Canada, are not used to any extent by labouring people.

There was not anything else in the remarks of the Minister of Finance, as I recollect them at this moment, which are deserving of any answer. I can only say that my hon. friend from Laval is perfectly justified in placing this motion before the House in the way which he has done to-night, by reason of the tactics employed by the Minister of Finance in this House last year to avoid the taking of a vote upon this very question, and if he had taken the course suggested by the Minister of Finance, that gentleman, according to his own very candid avowal to-night, would have adopted the same tactics to prevent a vote being taken upon this motion to-night. Therefore there can be no possible excuse for the government complaining of the conduct of my hon. friend, or saying that this motion calling for a certain reform in the tariff should necessarily be regarded as a motion of want of confidence.

Mr. ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL (West York). Before the vote is taken I would like to say a word on this subject. The leader of the opposition complains of the course taken by the Minister of Finance, in reference to the motion which was presented last year, in moving the adjournment of the debate and thus shutting off a vote on the original motion. Now it will be remembered that last year the hon. member for Laval put his notice on the motion paper, I think on the second day of the session. It was called week after week and month after month, and either he was not here, or it was allowed to stand for two months and a half before he brought it up. In the meantime the budget speech had been delivered and the government had come to the conclusion, and parliament had agreed with them, that there should be no changes in the tariff last session. Then during the last days of that session, when no possible good could come from the motion at all, the hon. member for Laval brings it forward, not with the hope of benefiting the market gardeners at all, but with the hope of making a little cheap popularity for himself at the expense of some of those politically opposed to him. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) and some other members during the recess had a good deal to say about the course pursued by me last year in voting for the adjournment of the debate. I approved of that course, and I am prepared now to justify my course, and will be prepared to justify it at any time the hon. member for Peel or

any other hon. gentleman on that side chooses to come and debate the question with me. I justified the course I took then, and I am satisfied that the electors of West York sustained me in the course I took. Not only that, but there is not an hon. gentleman in this House who has advocated the cause of the market gardener more earnestly and more sincerely than I have done. I did it at the right time and in the right place. It is true that so far I have not been successful, but the time is short. This is only the second session that I have had the honour of representing any of the market gardeners of this country and this session is not over yet. There will be plenty of time, and I still hope that some justice will be done to the market gardeners. What do we see now? Here, we find, as the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) says, the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) comes forward again with precisely the same motion that he put upon the Order paper on the 3rd of April. This motion was called over and over again. Where was the hon. member for Laval? Absent from his place in this House before the budget speech was delivered at a time when he could have impressed upon the government the justice of his cause, when he could have given sufficient reasons and perhaps could have influenced the government to grant the redress which he now so earnestly advocates. He allows three months to pass by from the time that he put his motion on the Order paper on the 3rd of April. He drops his motion and now he brings it forward at a time when no amendment can be moved and when no adequate expression of the House can be had upon it. If he had brought it forward in the ordinary way, if he had proceeded with his motion it would have been open for every hon. member in the House to vote as he saw fit. But, now, what does it mean? No matter how friendly a member may be to the market gardeners, no matter how anxious he is to see their condition improved it involves voting for this motion of want of confidence in the government, and putting the government out and putting whom in their places? —that outfit over yonder. From the market gardeners standpoint how would their position be improved? To whom do the market gardeners owe their present condition? To the Liberal party? No, the Liberal party came into power in 1896. They revised the tariff but they left the tariff exactly as it was before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. So far as vegetables are concerned they left the tariff exactly as it was before. They made no change at all. The tariff was higher on vegetables. Who reduced it? The Conservative party in 1894. When they revised the tariff, and it was the very last revision they made, they reduced the duty on vegetables. Did the hon. member for Halton raise his voice in protest against it then? Did the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane)?

Mr. COCHRANE. No, did you?

Mr. CAMPBELL. They were in power, and they supported the reduction of the tariff in 1894.

Mr. COCHRANE. Did you not?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was not here then, but, I suppose, if he had been here he would have supported his party too. The hon. member for Laval was not here then. But, I say that if the market gardeners are suffering in any particular they owe it to the Conservative party and not to the Liberal party. I believe that a readjustment of the duty should be made. I think it would be in the interest of the people of this country if the duty on vegetables was raised somewhat.

Mr. BROCK. Why not vote for it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I believe that the benefit that the market gardeners are to this country is very great indeed. I have no fault to find with the argument that has been advanced by the hon. member for Halton with which I largely agree. There is no doubt that the market gardeners are helping to build up this country. We are endeavouring to get immigrants to come to this country, we are offering inducements to people to come and take up land and settle and build up the country. It is a fact that a market gardener with four or five acres will employ perhaps more help than a man will on 100 or 200 acres of land. They are a very industrious, economical and hard working people. Their remuneration is not very great to-day, and I believe that we can increase their prosperity without, as I said before, increasing the price. It may be that certain times in the year, particularly in the early spring when vegetables are scarce, that the price would be a little advanced if the duty were raised, but, as I pointed out before, at that season of the year it is very largely the wealthy classes who use vegetables and a little advance in the price would not signify very much. But, the trouble is that when our own market gardeners are able to supply the market they find it flooded with foreign products, and therefore they are deprived of a market they should enjoy. They do not complain so much about the price as that they have not the market. I think if we could increase their market by shutting out the large quantity of vegetables that come in from the United States, it would be better for them. Another point is that the inspection and appraisement of vegetables are not as they should be. Indeed, it is a very difficult thing to arrive at just what the proper value of some of these vegetables

is, and I would ask the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) particularly to see that in the appraisement of vegetables coming into the city of Toronto the importers are compelled to pay the proper duty upon the real value of the article introduced. I had the honour in the early part of the session of introducing a large deputation to the hon. Minister of Finance and some other members of the government, and I thought that we made out a very strong case. We presented the arguments in favour of an increase in the tariff as strongly as we possibly could. We pointed out many things wherein there seemed to be an anomaly. For instance, we pointed out to the government that the American duty on beans was forty-five cents a bushel, while our duty was only fifteen cents a bushel. We pointed out that on prepared pease the Americans have a duty of two and a half cents a pound, on cabbages, three cents per head; hops, twelve cents per pound, onions, forty cents per bushel; pease, forty cents per bushel dried; pease, thirty cents per bushel, split pease, forty cents per bushel; potatoes, twenty-five cents per bushel and on many other things we find that the duty imposed by the United States is very much larger than the duty imposed upon these articles when imported into Canada. Our market gardeners, especially those in West York, hold that if the United States duties were as low as the Canadian duties they could send a good deal of their fruits into the cities of the State of New York, and they complain, and with reason, that they are unable to send any of their products to the United States, while the American gardeners are able to take advantage of the Canadian market. I have strongly pressed, not only upon the Minister of Finance but on other ministers, the advisability of increasing the duty. I believe that if the government, as was stated by the Minister of Finance to-night, had gone into a general revision of the tariff our representations would have had effect, but whether wisely or unwisely they decided they would not make any changes in the tariff this year and we had to abide by the decision they arrived at. I am still in hopes that the tariff will be increased on these articles. I am not going to give up yet; I am going to continue, and I warn the Finance Minister now that I shall be after him again and again. I believe the duty should be increased to help the market gardeners. It would be a grand thing for the country, it will be a grand thing for all those engaged in that trade when the duty is increased. So far as I am concerned, I am not going to vote for this motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not going to vote against this government.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not going to vote against this government and put the Conservatives into power.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have no confidence in these gentlemen opposite; I do not think they possess the instinct of government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They made a very bad mess of it when they were in power. They were in power too long and the people of Canada spewed them out of their mouths.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They will be in opposition a good many years yet before they get the reins of government. When I look around and see the enormous progress that has been made in this country for the last six years—our manufacturing establishments going forward by leaps and bounds, our Great North-west filling up with hundreds of thousands of settlers; the Order Paper of the Railway Committee loaded down with applications for charters to build railways; no country in the world, no British possession making such progress; when I see all this occurring under the wise administration of this government and under the business ability and statesmanship they have shown, I would be foolish indeed to vote to put this government out and to put in power a set of men who have shown that they were incompetent to manage the affairs of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And so, Sir, while I believe in increased protection for the market gardeners and will support their claims in season and out of season, I do not believe I would benefit them by voting against the government. I hope, Sir, that I will be able before long to impress upon the government the necessity for taking some action in that regard. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Léonard) put a motion on the Order Paper on the 3rd of April, and he has allowed it to lapse for two and a half months through his being absent, although it was called over and over again; if he had gone forward with that motion I would have supported it, but he has placed me in a position to-night, so that I cannot support him, much as I believe the market gardeners should get protection.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Campbell) has taunted my hon. friend (Mr. Léonard) with trying to make political capital out of this, but if there is any man in this House who has benefited by political capital more than another, it is my hon. friend from

West York (Mr. Campbell). It is known all over Canada that in the by-election in West York he made a direct promise to the market gardeners that if he came to this House they would get protection, and the reason he gave for that was that he was a friend of the government. I question if he would ever have been returned but for that promise. But the government have turned him down, and turned him down frequently, and still he eulogizes them. Well, that is the kind of man the government will turn down and that is the kind of man whose representations will have very little weight with the government. He is a much smaller man to-night than when he came to this House several years ago. What apology does he make to-night for going back on his promise ? He says that if this motion were in proper form he would vote for it. Well, there is nothing to hinder him from implementing his promise—sincere promise supposed to have been—to the market gardeners of West York, and moving a resolution in any form he pleases.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) tells us that if this motion had been moved on the 3rd day of April he would have voted for it—if it were moved on the first of April it would have suited him better.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. The hon. gentleman says that the miserable set of Conservatives that were spewed out of the mouths of the people in 1896, left the tariff so that the Liberal government could not improve it. Well, Sir, the Minister of Finance has stated to-night that the market gardeners are among the most prosperous people in the country, and if they are prosperous they are prosperous under the tariff that was adopted by the Conservative government, to whom the member for West York has referred in such undignified language. Any sensible man knows—I do not know whether the member for West York does or not—that the tariff on these garden products should be high, for the reason that the market gardener does not know but that the market which he meets in the morning will be demoralized before ten o'clock in the day by a large importation of American products. The market gardeners of Canada are willing to accept the same tariff that protects the American gardeners, and if the government acceded to that demand, then the radius of market gardening around the cities would extend from twenty miles to thirty miles and even greater, because of the facilities which the railways afford for shipping this produce to market. But what do we find ? We find that when there is a surplus of these articles on the market, they virtually become worthless, because they are perishable articles and must be sold ; and that is why this class of people should get greater protection than others. The people engaged in this business are willing to invest their capital for the purpose of putting on the market earlier in the spring such articles as lettuce, celery and radishes, if you will secure to them the market against the American product. There is nothing to hinder them raising these articles under glass and putting them on the market at a comparatively low price, except the fact that you allow the American producer to come in with his southern stuff, to a certain extent decomposed—and I question whether it is wise to let much of that class of articles come in at that period of the year. The hon. member for West York says : These people ought to have more protection, but I cannot vote for it ; I cannot do my duty to my constituents—oh, no ; I would rather support hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches than do my duty to my electors. So long as we have a sentiment of that kind guiding members of this House, this country will suffer ; and I am afraid, from what we see here, and from what has been thrown out by the Finance Minister, that is the kind of stuff most of them are made of. Well, we will have to put up with it—their principles are nowhere.

An hon. MEMBER. For a long time.

Mr. BRODER. Do not be so sure. There are a good many of you uneasy to-night. You are more afraid of lettuce, carrots, mangolds and cabbages, than you may think you are. Every mother's son of you is a little afraid that the radish will be too hot. With all the prosperity we talk about, our hon. friend could not show that the cabbages of West York grow a bit bigger than they did before he represented them. The hon. member for West York says he would vote for this motion if it came at the proper time. If the hon. gentleman put himself right with his constituents, I suppose he would not be sure whether the market gardeners of West York would be left out of the redistribution or not ; and he throws out this sprat to these people, and says : We will perhaps do right by you at another time. The hon. gentleman should be prepared to stand up and carry out his promise to his constituents. He has been here ever since the by-election in the last parliament, and he has never yet moved a resolution to carry out that promise, and it is quite time that he put something on the Order Paper along that line, or cease eulogizing the men he supports.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would like to ask the hon. member for Dundas if he would be willing to allow the same kind of protection to the market gardeners of British Columbia, to those around my own city, for instance, as he would to the market gardeners around Ottawa and Montreal ?

Mr. BRODER. My hon. friend is altogether too provincial. I am speaking for

Canada, not for British Columbia or Montreal.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. gentleman specified Toronto and Montreal. The hon. gentleman has not answered the question entirely to my satisfaction. I think he should answer it.

Mr. BRODER. I can easily put the hon. gentleman's conscience at rest, if it is troubling him. We are advocating a law that will affect all Canada. That ought to cover British Columbia.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I accept the hon. gentleman's answer. As he is quite in favour of protecting the market gardeners of British Columbia, I may say that our market gardeners are Chinamen. We have practically no white men in our country engaged in that business. I only wanted to know the hon. gentleman's policy on the Chinese question.

Mr. BRODER. I think I ought to say in reply to our hon. friend that it is a pity that the people he speaks of have not a representative here.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Léonard.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Kidd,
Avery,	Lancaster,
Barker,	LaRivière,
Bell,	Lavell,
Bennett,	Lennox,
Birkett,	Léonard,
Elain,	MacLaren (Perth),
Borden (Halifax),	McIntosh,
Brock,	Monk,
Broder,	Morin,
Bruce,	Northrup,
Cargill,	Osler,
Carscallen,	Pringle,
Clancy,	Reid (Grenville),
Clarke,	Richardson,
Cochrane,	Roche (Marquette),
Culbert,	Sherritt,
Earle,	Simmons,
Fowler,	Smith (Wentworth),
Gilmour,	Taylor,
Gourley,	Thomson (Grey),
Hackett,	Vrooman,
Henderson,	Ward,
Hughes (Victoria),	Wilmot,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Wilson—51.
Kendall,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Lavergne,
Beith,	Law,
Belcourt,	LeBlanc,
Blair,	Loy,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Mackie,
Bourassa,	MacKinnon,
Bourbonnais,	MacLaren (Huntingdon)
Brown,	Macpherson,
Bruneau,	McCarthy,
Bureau,	McColl,
Calvert,	McCool,
Campbell,	McEwan,
Carbonneau,	McGugan,
Champagne,	McIsaac,
Christie,	McLennan,
Copp,	Madore,
Costigan,	Malouin,
Cowan,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Davis,	Martineau,
Delisle,	Matheson,
Demers (Lévis),	Mayrand,
Demers (St. John),	Meigs,
Desjardins,	Mignault,
Douglas,	Morrison,
Dugas,	Mulock (Sir William),
Emmerson,	Oliver,
Erb,	Paterson,
Ethier,	Préfontaine,
Fielding,	Proulx,
Fisher,	Puttee,
Fitzpatrick,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Roche (Halifax),
Fraser,	Ross (Ontario),
Gallery,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Geoffrion,	Rousseau,
German,	Russell,
Gibson,	Schell,
Girard,	Scott,
Gould,	Stephens,
Harty,	Stewart,
Harwood,	Sutherland (Essex),
Heyd,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Holmes,	Talbot,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.)	Tucker,
Hyman,	Turcot,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Turgeon,
Johnston (Lambton),	Wade,
Lang,	Wallace,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Wright—100.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Thompson (Haldimand and Monck),	Ingram,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Tobin,	Ball,
Parmelee,	Pope,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Casgrain,
Tolmie,	Halliday,
Ross (Yukon),	Sproule,
Power,	Kaulbach,
Lemieux,	Rosamond,
Lewis,	Hale,
Bernier,	McGowan,
Carroll,	Calvin,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Guthrie,	Porter,
McCreary,	Boyd,
Sifton,	Haggart,
Kendall,	Ganong,
Grant,	Clare,
Farquharson,	Maclean,
Bickerdike,	Roddick,
Lovell,	Kemp,
Archambault,	Seagram,
Smith (Vancouver),	Tolton,
Riley,	Robinson (North'd.),

Amendment (Mr. Léonard) negatived.

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

Census, $35,000.

Mr. CLANCY. The item with regard to creamery and cold storage was passed on the understanding that it would be dis-

cussed again if desired, and I think it would be necessary to discuss that item first. I would therefore ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture to explain the work of the creameries in the North-west during last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Whatever understanding there was, we shall carry out, but it should not interfere with this item. There are other items on which we can discuss the cold storage question, but I think it would be better to deal now with the census.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no objection provided we may discuss it on any other item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am quite willing, but in the meantime I would ask that we get through with the census.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is not the slightest doubt about the understanding. The arrangement was that anything which would be open for discussion on the item we consented to pass, should be open for discussion on the census or any other convenient item.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the hon. minister had any correspondence with any person in New Brunswick with respect to the census as it relates to the different religious denominations in that province.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I have had one or two letters on that subject. The other day I received a letter from the Rev. Mr. McLeod of Fredericton, in which he says that he had proved certain mistakes in the census with regard to the Baptist denomination in New Brunswick, and asked whether any steps would be taken to investigate. I have not yet been able to answer that letter.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there not considerable correspondence between the Rev. Mr. McLeod and Mr. Blue, with respect to that particular denomination ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, Mr. McLeod had quite an extensive correspondence with Mr. Blue, and Mr. Blue showed successfully that the census was exactly in accord with the information given the enumerators by the people. He also pointed out that in certain comparisons which were made between the returns of the Baptist community in the census of 1891 and 1901, the grouping of that denomination in the census of 1891 comprised other branches than were comprised in the grouping in the census of 1901. Consequently the apparent decrease in numbers of the branch which Doctor McLeod referred to was not due to any difference in the figures of the two censuses.

Mr. FOWLER. The denomination of Free Baptists is a very considerable denomination in New Brunswick and the other maritime provinces as well. In the county I have the honour to represent it is a very considerable body, yet according to the census its numbers are very inconsiderable. There was a considerable amount of correspondence between Doctor McLeod and Mr. Blue in connection with the parish of Kars, where a very small number of persons were given as belonging to this denomination, whereas, as a matter of fact, the larger portion of that parish belongs to it. The enumerator for that parish admits that he did not put those people down as he should. Doctor McLeod asked that the census be remedied in that respect but could get no satisfaction from Mr. Blue. In the city of St. John, this same religious denomination has a large number of adherents, and so dissatisfied were the ministers of that denomination in that city with the census returns that they numbered their congregations themselves and I have here a statement which shows what little reliance we can place on the census.

Commissioner Blue could find only 410 Free Baptists in St. John city. The Sunday school census takers found 1,826. In the north end where the census reported 139, Rev. D. Long, pastor of the Victoria street church, has discovered over 700. On the west side, where the census returns report 95 Free Baptists, Rev. Mr. Ferguson has a list of 597. In St. John, south, Rev. C. T. Phillips finds 529, whereas Mr. Blue refuses to allow more than 176. The two-priced census would seem to be a rather poor affair, even at half price.

If this census of Mr. Blue's is not more correct with respect to other matters, it is rather a blue affair. It does seem to me that this is a matter of some importance. It is of importance to a very considerable number of people throughout the province of New Brunswick at least. I do not know whether the same defects occur in other provinces, but, it seems to me that these people have rights that this government is bound to respect. And if this denomination has lost so much ground by the census of 1901 as compared with the census of 1891, I think it is incumbent upon the minister to show how this has occurred, and also to have another census, even at the very expensive rate of the one he has taken.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say, in general terms, without going into the details, that the Rev. Mr. McLeod wrote to Mr. Blue and was replied to. He drew attention to certain apparent discrepancies in the returns of the two censuses. It was pointed out, however, to the Rev. Mr. McLeod that, in the census of 1891 the term 'Free Will Baptist' was used. The section or branch of the denomination to which Mr. McLeod referred, and to which, I believe, he belongs, used to be called the 'Free Christian Baptist,' but they are now called 'Free Baptist.' In the census of 1891 'Free Will Baptist' and 'Free Baptist' were used as well as the term

'Baptist.' Certain portions of the Baptist denomination were placed under the heading 'Free Will Baptist,' but others were placed under the heading 'Baptist,' without any further designation. In the census of 1901, the same course was pursued. But in the census of 1891, as I understand it, there were five different branches of the Baptist denomination placed under the head of 'Free Will Baptist'; but in the census of 1891 only three branches were placed under the head 'Free Will Baptist' or 'Free Baptist'; and the discrepancy which appears so great in the number of Free Baptists in the province of New Brunswick is entirely due to that fact. In the explanation sent to the Rev. Mr. McLeod, Mr. Blue drew attention to this fact, and gave figures which showed clearly, that not only had there been no decrease in the numbers of the branch of the denomination to which Mr. McLeod belonged, but, as a matter of fact, there had been an increase of fifty per cent, and that the complaints made of discrepancies which showed a discrimination against that particular branch were not justified by the facts. I merely reply in these general terms, but I have all the details of the correspondence under my hand and could give them to the House if hon. gentlemen desire it. But, of course, it would take a little time.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the hon. minister is wrong in his statement. In the first place, though I do not profess to be well posted theologically, I think I am safe in saying that there are not five branches of the Free Baptist Church. I do not know that there are any branches of that particular church; it is a church by itself known as the Free Baptist Church. There is also the Baptist Church. If the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) were here, he could give more definite information with respect to the denomination. But the Free Baptist Church is as distinct from the Baptist, as is the Methodist, the Congregational, the Presbyterian, or any other branch of the Christian Church. So, the explanation that the hon. minister gives is not an explanation that at all fits the case. As I understand it, in this correspondence that took place between the Rev. Dr. McLeod, who is chief editor of the newspaper organ of this church, and Mr. Blue, Dr. McLeod's complaints were treated rather curtly, and I do not think that Mr. Blue used him with the courtesy which his position and the cause he was championing called for. I think the correspondence between Dr. McLeod and Mr. Blue should be laid upon the Table, so that we may have the advantage of what was set forth on either side.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I assure the hon. gentleman I shall be very glad indeed to lay the correspondence on the Table, and even to have it printed, if necessary. Unfortunately this controversy arose, and the statements concerning it which appeared in the paper of which Rev. Mr. McLeod is the editor, were accompanied with only meagre extracts from that correspondence, the effect of which was to misrepresent the actual facts. I do not say that this was the design, but that was the result, as shown by perusal of the articles which appeared in the newspapers, which certainly gives a false impression of the correspondence and of the facts of the case. But, for the information of the hon. gentleman, I think it is perhaps just as well that I should read the statement which was sent to Rev. Mr. McLeod, which will show, I think, pretty clearly the facts of the case.

Mr. FOWLER. If the hon. gentleman is to read that, perhaps he had better read also Mr. McLeod's side of the correspondence, so that we may have both sides together.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can read Mr. McLeod's letter, to which this is an answer, and, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) wishes, I can have copies of the whole correspondence laid on the Table.

Mr. FOWLER. That would be better.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To place the matter before the House, I think it well that I should read this statement. Mr. McLeod wrote the following letter, and in it raised this whole question. There were several letters between it and the one I have just offered to read, but the one I have just offered to read is in reality a summing up of the case. He drew the attention of the Census Bureau to the matter in these terms:

Census Bulletin No. 5, dealing with the religions of the people is before me.

In the classifications of nominations I find 'Baptists (free will),' 24,229—a falling off of 20,887 since 1891.

Permit me to call your attention to two or three things:

1. There is no body of Christians in Canada whose name is Free Will Baptists.

2. There is a denomination whose corporate name is Free Baptists, and of this body there is a conference in New Brunswick and one in Nova Scotia.

3. I speak especially for the Free Baptist Conference of New Brunswick, of which I am the corresponding secretary.

4. The figures you announce for New Brunswick Free Baptists are certainly wrong. The reports from churches in 1890—the last year of the decade with which the census deals—gives us a church membership of 12,352 in this province. Yet the census gives us only 15,502 adherents in the province—3,150 more than we have church members reported. A fair estimate (two and a half times as many adherents as church members) would give us over 30,000, instead of the 15,502 with which the census credits us.

5. Is there a way by which we can get a more correct showing in the census returns?

6. Will you kindly furnish me with a copy of the form on which the facts about the religions of the people were taken by the enumerators ?

There was an answer to that on June 3rd from Mr. Blue, and in that he sends back the instructions Mr. McLeod asked for, Mr. McLeod wrote again on June 5th, and Mr. Blue replied on June 15th. Mr. McLeod wrote again on January 16th, 1903, and Mr. Blue replied on February 5th. Then Mr. McLeod wrote again on February 7th, and Mr. Blue on March 21. Mr. Blue writes to Mr. McLeod on March 21, 1903 :

I have spent some time in an investigation of the records with the object of ascertaining as accurately as possible the cause of the apparent discrepancy in the number of Free Will Baptists and Free Baptists in the Censuses of 1891 and 1901.

Our schedules and compilation sheets of the 1901 census have been very carefully revised and the result is the discovery of two mistakes made by one of our clerks in preparing the final table from the compilation sheets. In one case 472 persons recorded as Free Calvinistic Baptists in the town of Marysville, were added to Calvinistic Baptists and grouped in the table with Baptists. In another case, in King's county, twenty-nine persons recorded as Calvinistic Baptists (presumably Cresrite) and one Old Baptist were added to Free Baptists instead of to Baptists. These corrections would give the total number of Free Baptists in New Brunswick, in 1901, as 16,116, of whom eleven are recorded in the schedules as Free Will Baptists.

In your letter to myself, as well as in your contribution to Dr. Saunder's History of Maritime Baptists, you have claimed that the total Free Baptists in New Brunswick, according to the recent census, shows a falling off in the number of about 10,000 and for the whole Dominion about 20,000 since 1891, and it is only reasonable that you should seek to ascertain the cause of this change. In your letter of June 5, 1902, you wrote :

'We are very anxious to discover the cause of the falling off which appears on the face of the returns, but which we do not believe exists in fact. Kindly let me know if there is not some way of having the schedules which show the strange state of things which you mention pass under the eye of some one who knows the people as classified.'

I sympathized with you in your desire in this matter and although I could not under the regulations governing the census office allow the schedules to go into other hands, I took all reasonable means to investigate the cause of the discrepancy in the number of your people for the two census years. But before proceeding to state the result, I think it is proper to mention a few facts which bear upon it.

1. An examination of the schedules showed that there were many kinds of Baptists in the maritime provinces and in the other provinces of Canada, and for publication purposes it was necessary to resort to grouping. Referring to the previous census reports since confederation we found that Baptists were classed under two general heads, namely, Baptists and Free Will Baptists. A few of the names of Baptist sects were unfamiliar to myself, as are indeed many of the 160 odd religious sects described in the schedules. For the bulletin on religions we followed the old headings, and I have to thank yourself for calling attention to the fact that in the maritime provinces Free Baptist is the proper designation of the body formerly classed as Free Will. In Ontario, where I have always lived, persons of that belief have been known as Free Will Baptists, and I have known of them from my earliest years. Your letter, however, led me to make careful inquiry.

2. I have found that in Nova Scotia the Free Will Baptists and the Free Christian Baptists agreed to unite into one body under the name of Free Baptists in 1867, and that in 1870 they were incorporated as one body under that name by an Act of the legislature.

3. I found that the body known as Free Christian Baptists in New Brunswick was incorporated in 1854 under that name by the legislature of the province and that the name continued down to 1898, when by an amending Act it was changed to Free Baptists.

4. I found that about the year 1874, under the leadership of Rev. G. W. Orser, a number of churches of Free Christian Baptists in New Brunswick separated from the parent body and assumed the name of Free Baptists, but commonly known as Orserites. This body applied for incorporation also in 1898 under the name of the Free Baptist denomination, and in their petition to the legislature they represented that they had existed separate and apart from the Free Christian Baptist General Conference for the previous twenty-three years as an organized body under the name of the Free Baptist denomination. But the legislature saw fit to deny them this title and incorporated them under the name of Primitive Baptists. In their treaties of faith published in 1886, they are described as the Free Baptists of New Brunswick, Maine and Nova Scotia.

5. I found also that another body had been formed out of the Free Christian Baptists under the name of Reformed Baptists, whose leading doctrine was belief in entire instantaneous sanctification, that they had been expelled from the Free Christian Baptist Conference of New Brunswick, and had been joined by a number of Free Baptists in Nova Scotia, and that in 1894 they secured incorporation from the parliament of Canada under the name of the Alliance of the Reform Baptist Church of Canada.

These facts must be familiar to you from your position as a leader in the body now known as the Free Baptists of New Brunswick, and no doubt it has often occurred to you as strange that in the successive censuses of Canada prior to 1891, the name Free Will Baptist was used to designate all Baptists of Armenian faith in the maritime provinces, although the large majority in the bodies there have for many years been known either as Free Baptists or Free Christian Baptists, but what does not appear to have occurred to you is the probability that all these bodies were grouped together as Free Will Baptists including the two which had separated from your own conference, one by voluntary act and the other by expulsion. This probably did not occur to myself until recently, and then I proceeded to revise the census of Baptists in New Brunswick as taken in 1891. The work has been completed, and I will give you the results insofar as they concern your own body.

The schedules of the census of 1891 show for New Brunswick fifteen bodies of Baptists according to their descriptive names, and in the census volume they were grouped under the common heads of Baptists and Free Will Baptists, in our revised compilation we have separated these several bodies and the table which follows gives by census districts the number of Free Christian

Baptists and of free Baptists. (The new name of the body given by the Act of 1898) with the object of showing exactly the relative strength of this body in the two census years.

Now, this is taken from the schedule of the two censuses of 1891 and 1901, the exact statement of the people given to the enumerators of the church to which they belonged. In 1891 there were 10,672 who told the enumerators they belonged to the Free Christian Baptists in 1891, and in 1901 there were 16,105 who told the enumerators that they were Free Baptists. This shows therefore that in the particular branch about which Mr. McLeod is corresponding, there was an increase from 10,672 to 16,105, though by the grouping of other branches with the Free Christian Baptists of 1891, there appeared to be in that branch of Baptists, 24,000.

We have discovered two errors in the tabulation of 1901 (as I have already stated), both due to the carelessness of a clerk in making up the table from the compilation sheets. The first is in King's county, where 290 (Orserite) Baptists and one Old Baptist were added to Free Baptists instead of two Baptists. The second is in York county where 472 Free Christian Baptists were added to Calvinistic Baptists and grouped in the table with Baptists. These last are in the town of Marysville. Eleven persons were recorded in the schedule as Free Will Baptists and were added to Free Baptists in a printed volume. But they are not included in the foregoing table.

In the census of 1891, the number of Free Will Baptists in the province as shown by the revised compilation of the schedules was 8,549, and all but eleven have disappeared by the showing of the recent census. We have, of course, no means of ascertaining what has become of them, but the probability is that they have been merged with other Baptist bodies in the province. In the province of Ontario in 1891 there were 7,869 Free Will Baptists, and in the census of 1901, there were only thirty-nine.

I think, Sir, it must be obvious from these statements that you have no just cause of complaint. You are certainly mistaken in assuming that the Free Baptist body of New Brunswick (formerly the Free Christian Baptist body) numbered 24,674 in 1891, and consequently you are mistaken in stating, as you have done in the letter to myself of May 3, 1902, and later in a chapter contributed to the Rev. Dr. Saunders' History, that in our census they are made to lose about 10,000 in New Brunswick and in the Dominion at large about 20,000 in the ten years. The table I have given shows that in New Brunswick your body has made a gain of 5,433 instead of a large loss.

We had no other object than to give the numbers as they were collected by enumerators, and the instructions to enumerators for taking the religious census of the people were so clear and definite that I think it could not be misread or misunderstood.

Letters received from many enumerators state that great care was taken by them to record the religions of the people as they were given, and if mistakes have been made the strong probability is that the people themselves are to blame. One fact deserving of special mention is that 1,338 persons counted in our volume as Free Baptists were recorded in the schedules as Free Christian Baptists, although the Act which changed the name of that body was passed three years before the census was taken.

That is, I think, a complete explanation of the situation, and accounts fully for the apparent discrepancy which the Reverend Mr. McLeod complained of.

Mr. FOWLER. One of the results, evidently, of this trouble is that the theological knowledge of Mr. Blue seems to be considerably extended. He has evidently made some study of the Baptist denomination. I do not think that this statement at all answers the case that Mr. McLeod has made out. Take the parish of Kars, in the county of King's, N.B. In that parish there are no persons given as Free Baptists in the census, although there are two churches of that denomination in the parish. There are 100 communicants, and as the communicants are, as a rule, the heads of families, it would mean a population of at least 300 people professing that faith or belonging to that denomination. Yet, according to the census returns, there are no persons of that denomination in the parish. It seems that something should be done to remedy this defect. What right has the census commissioner to group these different denominations under one heading, no matter how small a denomination may be ? That denomination in the province of New Brunswick comprises some 20,000 souls, and I do not think it is so very insignificant that it does not deserve to be mentioned in the census returns. It seems to me that these people have not been treated with that justice which they should have received at the hands of the census commissioner. If he has made a mistake, and if his enumerators have not done their duty, it is his duty to remedy that mistake. It casts a certain amount of suspicion upon the genuineness of the whole census when we find such a glaring error as this cropping up, and it accentuates still more the errors that have been made in the taking of this census, for which we have paid over a million dollars, and the end is not yet.

Mr. COCHRANE. They have not got through with the census yet.

Mr. FOWLER. No ; and if they undertake to correct the errors which have been made, it will take them until the time for a new census arrives before they get through with it. I think it is the duty of the hon. minister to go into this matter. Now that he has returned from foreign parts and is once more with us, I think he should devote his great mind to the straightening out of this affair. Evidently the commissioner is not equal to the task, and I think the hon. minister should take a hand in it, and see that this province down by the sea gets justice.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no desire to obtain anything except the truth in regard to these census returns. When the instructions were sent out

the enumerators were asked to study them carefuly and to carry out their requirements. When the compilation was made in the bureau at Ottawa the information supplied was the information contained in the schedules. That information was acted upon, and the compilation was made strictly upon the information supplied by the enumerators. If, when an enumerator went to a person in New Brunswick and asked him the religious denomination to which he belonged and he replied that he was a Baptist, he would be put down as a Baptist ; if he replied that he was a Free Will Baptist, he would be put down as a Free Will Baptist, and if he replied that he was a Free Baptist, he would be put down as a Free Baptist.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the hon. minister suppose that these people in the parish of Kars, who are very intelligent people, gave their religious denomination as Baptists, knowing that they belonged to the Free Baptist denomination ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only suppose that the people gave the answer to the census enumerator which they considered to be correct, and if they gave themselves as Baptists, the enumerator would put them down as Baptists.

Mr. FOWLER. These people know the sharp distinction there is between the Free Baptist denomination and the Baptist denomination, and that the only thing they have in common, as I understand, denominationally, is the general belief that all Christians have. So far as church government is concerned, and except so far as the ordinance of baptism by immersion is concerned, they are as distinct from the Baptists as the Methodists are from the Presbyterians, and that these people would give themselves as Baptists is an absurd contention. The difficulty arose out of the ignorance of the enumerators that were appointed. These people, of course, gave themselves as Free Baptists, but the enumerators did not think it made any difference, and they put them down as Baptists.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is an explanation which, I confess, I never believed possible. I never believed that when one person said that he was a Free Baptist and another person said that he was a Baptist, the enumerator would ignorantly put down the person who said that he was a Free Baptist as a Baptist.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it not more reasonable to suppose that than that these people were so ignorant that they did not know the denomination to which they belonged ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am just informed of what I did not know before, that, as a matter of fact, in the census return there is not one single Free Baptist put down in Kars.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) stated that.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, that is what I have stated.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot explain that, except upon the supposition that the people there who call themselves Free Baptists called themselves merely Baptists to the enumerator without putting in the adjective.

Mr. FOWLER. No ; the two denominations exist there, and those people who are Free Baptists would not call themselves Baptists.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) know that they are what are called Free Baptists now, because, as the hon. Minister of Agriculture pointed out, there were a number of divisions of the Baptist body and it occurred to me that perhaps one of these divisions did not amalgamate with the body now known as Free Baptists ? It does seem a most extraordinary thing that if there were two churches known to belong to the Free Baptist body, the enumerator failed to find a single Baptist in that district, That is beyond understanding. It occurs to me that perhaps these churches were attached to other bodies that did not amalgamate, but of course I do not know the facts.

Mr. FOWLER. I had the honour of a seat in the New Brunswick legislature at the time the Act was passed, and there was a Free Baptist body and this body that the minister has spoken of calling themselves Orserites, a sort of off shoot from the Free Christian Baptist body which was the old name. By the Act of the legislature in 1898 the name was changed to Free Baptist, and I think the Orserites went under the name of Christian Baptists. These two churches belonged to the Free Baptist body having one clergyman for the two churches, and he is a clergyman of the Free Baptist denomination. The census of Kars was taken by a man named Jenkins and knowing Mr. Jenkins as well as I do, I am satisfied that he is the man who made the blunder and put these people down as Baptists although they told him they belonged to the Free Baptist denomination. As I understand, Mr. Blue was written to especially about this case and he said he would call the attention of Mr. Jenkins to this, and that there was going to be a revision of the whole census relating to the religion of the people of New Brunswick. The Rev. Dr. McLeod wrote afterwards to this man Jenkins and Jenkins refused to make any change.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Jenkins was perfectly justified in that because under his oath of office he is forbidden to divulge any information he got. I am informed that Mr. Blue received no letter from the Rev. Mr. McLeod in relation

to this particular parish of Kars, and that there is no letter in relation to this particular matter in the department at all. There have been references to it in a paper which is edited by Mr. McLeod, but neither Mr. McLeod, nor any one else drew Mr. Blue's attention to this particular case.

Mr. FOWLER. I will read from a letter which I have received from Mr. McLeod.

In the parish of Kars, King's county, there are two Free Baptist congregations. The communicants in the churches number over one hundred, and the adherents number probably three hundred, or more.

The census fails to record a single one of them. Mr. Blue's attention was called to the matter some months ago. He professes to have made a revision of the whole census relating to the religions of the people in New Brunswick, but has made no change in the Kars enumeration.

Since Mr. Blue reported the result of his so-called revision, I have had correspondence with Mr. M. Jenkins, the Kars enumerator and he tells me he entered all Free Baptists as Baptists. I concluded, therefrom that Mr. Blue did not, as he pretends, ask Mr. Jenkins to revise his enumeration. Either Blue did not ask Jenkins to correct his returns, or Jenkins refused to do it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. McLeod possibly refers to what has appeared in the 'Religious Intelligencer,' but I can state possitively that Mr. McLeod did not draw Mr. Blue's attention to the parish of Kars in a letter. He did draw Mr. Blue's attention to the general question of the Baptist denomination in New Brunswick, but he gave no details with regard to Kars. He made general statements the substance of which is in the letter which I read.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you published the revised statement ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will explain that. Mr. Blue went to work to revise the compilation, and the revision that Mr. McLeod refers to in the letter was a revision of the compilation. Mr. Blue did not undertake to make inquiries from every enumerator in every instance. He did in several instances, and the replies were that the information contained in the schedules was exactly what the people gave them. It would be an entirely different thing to go to the people and take a new enumeration, and I confess that I am not prepared to say that ought to be done in any case. If the people did give information to the enumerators which they wished to change afterwards, or which other people wished to pursuade them to change, it is not the duty of the census bureau to get the whole work done over again by the enumerators. If the information given is not correctly set down by the enumerators then there would be a case for investigation. If the people called themselves Free Baptists, and were entered as Baptists then the enumerators did not do their duty and the schedules being incorrect the compilation would also be incorrect. What investigation we have made would go to show that the enumerators did actually put down what the people told them. Nothing has been brought to the attention of the department, beyond the general statement by Mr. McLeod, that indicated that the people had been misrepresented in the schedules.

Mr. FOWLER. The people do not see the schedules and consequently they could not tell that they were misrepresented. In the city of St. John the Free Baptist denomination has two large churches, and some of the members of that denomination occupy foremost positions. They are a very intelligent and cultured people—one of the judges of the Supreme Court belongs to that denomination, and they are not ashamed of belonging to the denomination and St. John being the centre of culture and of light and learning in our province, it is clear that they would tell the enumerators to what denomination they belonged. Nevertheless we find there are only 410 Free Baptists in St. John according to the census. Yet the actual population as taken by the clergymen amounts to 1,826, or about one twenty-fifth of the whole population of the city. So that there is clearly some error.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am perfectly prepared to say, in consequence of what the hon. gentleman has said to-night about the parish of Kars, that I shall certainly see that a thorough investigation of the condition of affairs there is made, and shall try to get at the actual truth. If the enumerator has done as the hon. gentleman states, misrepresented the statements as given by the people themselves, he certainly has not fulfilled his duty as an enumerator, and has done a wrong to the people there. I shall try to find out the facts of the case.

Mr. FOWLER. As a matter of fact this letter states :

I have had correspondence with Mr. M. Jenkins, the Kars enumerator, and he tells me that he entered all Free Baptists as Baptists.

He does not claim that these people represented themselves as Baptists, but he says he entered all Free Baptists as Baptists, which was clearly a wrong, because it was his duty to enter these people as they called themselves. I have no doubt the enumerators in the city of St. John have done exactly the same thing.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I say I am perfectly prepared to make an investigation into any matter, which comes before the department, in the form in which the hon. gentleman brings it up, for the first time to-night. The statement made in

that letter that Mr. McLeod had drawn Mr. Blue's attention to this particular parish is not correct. I have looked over a file of the 'Religious Intelligencer,' and the first reference I find in it to the parish of Kars is on May 13th. It was only yesterday that I first saw that. But the statement that Mr. McLeod had himself drawn the attention of Mr. Blue to that particular parish is not correct. There is nothing in the correspondence between Mr. McLeod and Mr. Blue with reference to the parish of Kars at all.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps you have not seen that part of the correspondence. Perhaps Mr. Blue has not called your attention to that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have seen the whole of the correspondence.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. McLeod, in his letter to me, says :

The census fails to record a single one of them. Mr. Blue's attention was called to the matter some months ago.

I take that to mean the parish of Kars. The context would seem to make it mean that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But that does not accord with the facts.

Mr. FOWLER. What steps does the minister intend to take to remedy this ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall have to look into the matter. I shall take that particular parish, find what the enumerator's statement is in regard to it, and examine him and see whether he put down the people under the name of the Christian denomination which they gave him. If, as that letter states he says, he entered them as Baptists when as a matter of fact they called themselves Free Baptists, he will show that he did not fulfil his duty as an enumerator.

Mr. FOWLER. Suppose you find that he did that, what will you do with him ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not quite know what I will do with him. I shall have to look into the matter, and if I find that to be the case, have the census return corrected. Of course, the census volumes the past year have already been published.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the census complete now ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That portion of it is completed, and is published. I may have to issue a supplementary report.

Mr. FOWLER. The same thing occurred in St. John.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will do the same with reference to St. John, and in any other case in which a definite statement is made in regard to the conduct of the enumerators. I am going to defend my officers, but if any accusation is made against them, I will investigate it, and if they are proved to have done wrong, they will have to suffer the consequences. I propose to have the census made as correct as I can.

Mr. FOWLER. Of course, it is important that we should have a correct census. If it was considered important to have a question asked as to the religious denomination of a person, it is important that the answer recorded should be the correct one. That is even more important than that the hon. minister should defend his officers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly. What I mean is that I do not want my officers to lie under an imputation, and for that reason alone I will make an investigation.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister will see that somebody has blundered, and I would suggest that when he comes to make a thorough investigation into this matter, if his officer states that he has done right, and has actually put down in the schedules the religious denomination given by the people themselves, he should give the people who complain an opportunity of proving that officer is now making a wrong statement to the department. You must not take the statement of your officer, in whom you have explicit confidence—and rightly so until you find that he is wrong—you must not take his statement as being correct without giving the other party a chance to show that the officer is making a misstatement.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of course, if my officer stands in the position of the accused party, I am not going to take his statement as conclusive.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I take a deep interest in this matter because, in the first place, in common with all the members, I desire that we should have an accurate census, and in the second place because I represent a greater number of Free Baptists than any other member from the maritime provinces.

An hon. MEMBER. Do they vote for you ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are a very intelligent body of men, and I think they vote right. They are the second largest religious body in my constituency, and I am glad to know that I have heard no complaint whatever from them about any difficulty in connection with the census. I did have a letter from one who said that there was some complaint in New Brunswick, and hoped that it would be made right. There is another reason why I should feel much

interested in this matter. A portion of this correspondence occurred while I was acting for the Minister of Agriculture during his absence, and I took occasion to look over it, and I certainly had the impression, not that Mr. Blue was curt towards the reverend gentleman, but that he endeavoured to meet his views and give him all the information possible. It is quite evident that in the census of 1891, a number of religious bodies were grouped together, thereby giving a larger number than should have been given under one head. Therefore I am afraid that a comparison with the census of 1891 does not help us. Our concern is not with the census of 1891, but with the census of 1901. The statement with regard to the parish of Kars is new to me, and if there are two churches of that body there and the census enumerator does not return a single member, I cannot conceive of any explanation of the matter. I quite agree that the minister should look into that and try to ascertain the cause of complaint. It would be very strange indeed if the enumerators scattered over New Brunswick should particularly err with regard to that body. The case of Kars needs investigation and also St. John, but I think that the hon. gentleman will find that the general reduction which caused the correspondence must be due to the fact that in 1891 there were grouped under that head a number of people who did not call themselves Free Baptists.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think that this grouping business will account for the falling off, because the people who are called Free Christian Baptists in 1891 and are now Reformed Baptists, represent seventy-five or eighty per cent of the whole. I trust that the hon. minister will have this matter looked into and a correction made.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As regards those other bodies being inconsiderable, they were fully one-third of the whole number of 24,000 odd. A little over one-third were reported as Free Will Baptists in 1891. The Reformed Baptists and Alliance Baptists bodies were not included under the head of Free Will Baptists in 1901. In making this investigation, Mr. Blue took the evidence he had under his hand in the schedules of 1891 and 1901. When he investigated the schedules of 1891, he found 24,000 under the head of Free Will Baptists, and he found that the two denominations of Baptists, which were not included in that same heading of 1901, comprised just a little over one-third of the whole number. In the complaint made by Mr. McLeod to Mr. Blue, there is nothing to show that the enumerators had not correctly entered the people they enumerated. Mr. McLeod drew attention to the extraordinary apparent decrease of that particular branch of the Baptist denomination in ten years, but in the investigation which Mr. Blue carried on, that decrease was entirely accounted for and the Census Bureau did not deem it necessary to go further.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the census of 1901 show this Reformed Baptist body ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, they put it under the head of Baptists and not Free Will Baptists. They are grouped with the other Baptist denominations and not with the Free Will Baptists.

Mr. BENNETT. On looking over the cost of taking the census in the county of Simcoe in the year 1891, as compared with the year 1901, I find the following figures :

	1891.	1901.
North Simcoe..	$1,728	$2,890
South Simcoe..	1,341	2,794
East Simcoe..	2,304	4,465
Total..	$5,423	$10,149
North Ontario..	$1,614	$3,463

I find that in the riding of East Simcoe there was in 1891 only one so-called commissioner, whose fees were about half the fees of the two commissioners in 1901, and in North Ontario we find also two commissioners in 1901 as against one in 1891. Can the hon. minister explain why there is this enormous difference in this one county of nearly $5,000, and will he assure the House that the census of 1901 will have information which will justify this increased expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think that my hon. friend was answered already on several occasions in connection with the census. I am satisfied that the mass of information we have received in this census is quite sufficient to justify the difference in the cost. I have explained the reasons and am afraid I cannot add very much to them now. The first reason applies to almost every county in the Dominion.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman state any particularly valuable information in the census of 1901 which is not in the census of 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can give one instance on the spur of the moment. We have in the census of 1901 the value of all our agricultural products and that was not in the census of 1891.

Mr. FOWLER. What proportion of the increase would that account for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is difficult to say what proportion. The number of questions was largely increased by that fact as well as by a large number of other facts. I have already explained to the House over and over again the much greater number of questions that we asked, and these are some of them. There are other things on which the number of questions was largely increased. That accounts for the large proportion of the increased

expense, for it took the enumerators more time, and caused them greater labour to get the answers to these questions, and they had to be paid on a larger scale. The other details I have given. While I am on my feet I would like to answer the question asked by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor). In 1891 there were 79,634 of all Baptists in the province of New Brunswick, and in 1901 there were 80,874, a trifling increase in the whole Baptist denomination in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. COCHRANE. Were the enumerators paid by the day or by the questions they asked ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Neither, but by a schedule of rates, which rates were increased because of the number of questions.

Mr. COCHRANE. A schedule of what ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A schedule of rates for the names they took, the houses, farms, factories, and so on.

Mr. COCHRANE. If they were not paid by the questions they asked, how was it they got more ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The schedule of rates was higher in consequence of the number of questions asked.

Mr. COCHRANE. Exactly what I say—they were paid by the number of questions they asked. Was there a rate for horse-hire or were the enumerators allowed to charge as they liked ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was a rate.

Mr. COCHRANE. Was the same rate allowed in all the towns and villages ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, wherever the rate was allowed at all.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are we to understand by that ? I asked the minister a plain question—was the same rate allowed in all the villages and towns ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot answer that question, because, as a general rule there was not a rate allowed in the towns or villages.

Mr. COCHRANE. Here is an illustration of how the country is being fleeced by some of the enumerators. What check was there on unscrupulous men charging nearly as much for horse-hire as for their own wages ? Take the village of Brighton. We have three enumerators there. One of them, whose wages amounted to $24.65, charged for horse-hire, $22.50.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Will the hon. gentleman give me the page from which he has quoted ?

Mr. COCHRANE. The Auditor General's Report, page D—183. In the village of Brighton there are only about 1,300 people. Then we have the village of Campbellford, a much larger place, with a large enough population in fact, to be incorporated as a town, and you find that only one enumerator was allowed horse-hire, and that one was allowed $1.50. Go through the Auditor General's Report and you will find the same thing—you will find some charging as much for horse-hire as for taking the census, while others are allowed nothing. Why should a man be allowed horse-hire for taking the census in a little village ? I am satisfied that thousands of dollars have been spent in this way for the benefit of Grit heelers. I know this man well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Is he a good Grit ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, if there are any good Grits. I know a good many Reformers, and I respect them; but when you call a man a Grit, I do not think there are any good ones. They are good at fleecing the public, that is all they are good for. Mr. Smith, to whom this allowance was made, is a farmer in the township of Brighton, and he was appointed to take the census in the village of Brighton. Why ? There are intelligent men in the village of Brighton who could have taken the census, but, instead, this man is taken out of the township to take the census of Brighton village, and I suppose he had to drive in and put up his horse in the stable and the people of Canada pay for it. We see the same kind of thing in many other cases, and this, to my mind, is the real reason why the expense of taking the census is so great.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not under my hand the account rereferred to by the hon. gentleman. Horse-hire was allowed to enumerators who had to leave their homes in order to take the census. As a rule there was an enumerator for each polling subdivision, and the rule was to appoint a man for the polling subdivision in which he lived. The polling division in a village might extend into the country, or a part of the division be in the village and the enumerator live in the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) said that this enumerator lived out in the country.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, and why did the hon. minister appoint a man who lived out in the country to take the census in the village ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, what does the hon. minister suppose the inference will be ? It looks very much as if this man were a Grit heeler. Among the people of Brighton are men quite competent to take the census, far more intelligent than this man who was appointed, no doubt to reward him for

some of the dirty work he had done for the party.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was not the purpose, certainly, whatever he may be. The rule laid down was—

Mr. COCHRANE. Why did you not carry it out? What is the good of a rule if you do not carry it out?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My information is that it was carried out. The commissioners had to pass upon the accounts after they had been submitted with a declaration by the people who made them, and they had to be passed upon by the commissioners for the riding, who knew all the circumstances. When they were sent in approved in this way they were gone over by the accountant of the department, before being paid. Then they were sent over by the Auditor General to be further scrutinized. And, so far as I know, no fault has been found with these accounts.

Mr. FOWLER. Did they make sworn returns?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They took an oath that all their returns would be in accordance with the facts. That general oath would cover their accounts.

Mr. FOWLER. That was their oath of office?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Did they submit their statements under oath?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They made a declaration as to the truth of their accounts and that declaration is attached to the account. It was sent to the commissioner for the riding, who made a declaration and sent it to the accountant.

Mr. COCHRANE. How does the hon. gentleman account for there being this high charge for horse-hire in the village of Brighton? The other men living in the village, men that I know well, got only $7.50. How could there be any scrutiny of the accounts at all, or any rule, when we see that discrepancy in two villages in the one riding, and the little village of Hastings, with less than 1,000 inhabitants, where these gentlemen get horse-hire? They did not get any more information in Campbellford than they did in Brighton, or any more in Brighton than they did in Campbellford. Yet we find that $22.50 is paid for horse-hire in Brighton and none at all in Campbellford.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In addition to their work as enumerators, they were allowed horse-hire when they went to receive their instructions from the commissioner of the county.

Mr. COCHRANE.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is a uniform rate all through the census, $9.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were allowed $3 a day and their travelling expenses, and if they travelled with a horse they were allowed $1.50 for the horse. They were also allowed travelling expenses in going to make their returns to the census commissioner.

Mr. COCHRANE. The special allowance all through this volume is $9.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, the uniform allowance is $3 a day, but sometimes they charged for three days where they were entitled to do so.

Mr. COCHRANE. On both pages here I find it is $9 for expenses in East Northumberland and West Northumberland—it is uniform.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why were they paid $9 in some places and $6 in others?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In some cases they took three days to receive their instructions and in some cases two days.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In the county of Frontenac $6 is the uniform allowance paid, while in my county $9 was paid.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is evident the enumerator took two days to get his instructions in Frontenac and three days in the hon. gentleman's county.

Mr. BLAIN. I see an item on page D—282, 'Investigating census of 1891, $1,486. D. F. Macpherson, Clinton, Ont., expenses of trip to Ottawa to receive instructions, and in riding obtaining information, including payment to persons consulted, $73.95; 57 days time at $5, $358.95.' I would like the minister to give us an explanation why a gentleman was invited down from Clinton, Ont., to Ottawa, and how it comes that he was allowed to pay people in his county for information they were asked to give him.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was brought down to Ottawa to be given instructions as to what he should do, and for the purpose of going over the schedules that were in the department here, which would be a guide to him in his investigations.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the nature of these investigations?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To see whether the census returns of 1891 included the names of people who were not in the country, but who were permanently away.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the object of that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because statements were made very generally that the census of 1901 showed that the census of 1891 could not have been correct, therefore it was necessary to investigate the census of 1891 to see whether the error was made then or in 1901.

Mr. CLANCY. In how many counties did Mr. Macpherson make the investigation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think in four or five ridings in Ontario. There was a report laid on the Table last session.

Mr. WILMOT. The hon. gentleman said that he proposed to revise the census of the religious denominations in some parishes of New Brunswick. I would like to know if he is going to apply that revision to the province of New Brunswick generally, or only to the parishes indicated to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler). I may say that in the parish of Lincoln, where I reside, I believe that nearly 70 per cent of the population belong to the Free Baptist denomination. From the best authority I can get, they have not been classified as Free Baptists. As the hon. member for King's has stated, they are an important denomination, there being 20,000 of them in that province, and I think they should have some recognition in the census. I do not think there has been any wilful wrong done in the matter, but a mistake has evidently been committed. In the case of so important a denomination, the enumerators should have been instructed to classify them. From the information I can gather, the enumerators went through their districts and asked the religious denomination of the people, whether they were Free Baptists, or Close Communion Baptists, or any other kind of Baptists, but they did not classify them, and they put them all down as Baptists. I think the department, in view of the standing of that denomination, should have provided a distinct classification for them. The Finance Minister has stated that he also has a large portion of that denomination in his constituency.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are both very fortunate.

Mr. WILMOT. I think I can vie with the minister in that distinction as a very large portion of my constituency belong to that denomination, and in the county of Sunbury a large portion of the people are Free Baptists. As I said before, in the parish of Lincoln, I venture to say 70 per cent of the people belong to the Free Baptist denomination. I will add that when the minister revises his list he had better include the county of Sunbury and Queen's, and indeed I would recommend him to extend his investigations over the whole province.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am ready to investigate any place where a definite statement is made that there has been an inaccurate return.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would draw the attention of the minister to the township of Haldimand, West Northumberland, containing twelve polling subdivisions.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What page ?

Mr. COCHRANE. D—184. The polling subdivisions are very small. In the township of Haldimand it is not much larger than Seymour, and there are items here of $26.65 for services, and $44.50 for horse-hire. There was no supervision of these charges at all. They put in their bills and got their money. The polling subdivisions are no larger than they are in the township of Seymour. There are 12 in Haldimand and in Seymour there are 5 or 6. There are no such charges in Seymour as there are in the township of Haldimand.

Mr. FOWLER. I was going to say that I do not quite agree with my hon. friend from Sunbury and Queen's (Mr. Wilmot) that this was not deliberate and wilful. It is my opinion that the error on the part of the enumerators was both deliberate and wilful and that they should be very severely reprimanded by the hon. minister. If there is any punishment or reprimand in the power of the hon. minister I think these enumerators should be punished. I understand that the hon. minister proposes to extend the examination to the whole province of New Brunswick. Rev. Dr. McLeod is the editor of the organ of that denomination in New Brunswick, and I would suggest that the hon. minister communicate with him and get a statement from him as to the portion of the province which he thinks has not been properly enumerated, as regards the denomination which he represents and that he should extend his investigation into every portion of the province.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to hear from the hon. minister if he has found that item ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I see it here.

Mr. COCHRANE. How does he account for that ? Did the horse get more information than the enumerator ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only account for it by the fact that the enumerator must have gone over a very sparsely settled part of the country. I do not know the country as I never was there.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Then the hon. gentleman can account for it better than I can.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, I cannot account for it except upon lines upon which I accounted for this other. The township is

thickly populated. This house did not travel any farther than any other horse in the township. The polling subdivisions are as equal in regard to size as they can be made by the municipal council. If the expense is to be judged by the information, and this is the reason the census costs nearly double the census of 1891, then, the only explanation is that the horse got more information than the enumerator did.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the township has 81,000 acres of land and that it only has a population of 3,900.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is a mistake.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is the result of the census.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it goes to prove that the census returns are not correct. I drew the hon. minister's attention to the fact last session that in the town of Gananoque where we had the town assessor doing his work at the same time as the enumerators were taking the census, the assessor made the population 178 larger than the enumerators did and every person knows that the town assessor does not take the total of the residents.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the town of Gananoque in 1901 the assessors made the population what ?

Mr. TAYLOR. 178. The hon. minister will find by reference to 'Hansard' of last session that I read certified statements from the town clerk that the assessment roll showed 178 more population than the enumerators' returns showed, and the count was taken practically on the same day. What I rose particularly for was to draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact that I think he should take a new census not only for New Brunswick but for the whole Dominion, because, comparing the returns of the Free Baptists and the different branches of the Baptist denomination in New Brunswick for 1891 and for 1901, he shows a very slight increase in the membership of that important church in the province of New Brunswick. The church must in the last ten years have made progress and it must have added some thousands of adherents. These additions are not in the census. This proves conclusively to my mind that the census in New Brunswick is not correct in regard to these religious denominations and in regard to the total population. It is patent to any person, and and I think the hon. Minister of Finance, himself, will surely admit, that the Baptists have made some progress within the last ten years. Surely the church is not labouring there without making some progress. Ask the Rev. Dr. McLeod what increase has been made in the last ten years and he will make a showing very different from the increase that the census shows. I am satisfied that the Baptist church in Canada has been making progress within the last ten years and that it has been gaining new adherents. I asked the hon. minister what was the total number of adherents of that church in 1891 and in 1901 and he gave a very few hundred of an increase. I cannot believe that the Baptist church or any other church professing to be a religious denomination in this country has not made progress greater than that shown from the census, because, otherwise, it would shut up shop and go out of business.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not intend to misquote me but the impression which he would leave would be an unfair one. The statement I read a few minutes ago showed that the Baptists in New Brunswick had increased by 1,000. The whole increase of population in the province is only 9,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Which proves that the census returns are not correct.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, no.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am satisfied that the Baptists have increased more than that.

Mr. FOWLER. I find that this charge for instruction is not general. In King's County, New Brunswick nothing was charged at all for instruction.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I notice that in King's, New Brunswick, there are no special allowance charges. There are no charges for horse-hire.

Mr. FOWLER. Very small charges.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know why it was that there was no such charge sent in. We did not invite charges when they were not sent in.

Mr. FOWLER. How is it that the commissioner received $100 while in other counties, Kent for instance, the commissioners received $150.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Where there was one commissioner he was paid $100 and where there were two they were paid $75 each.

Mr. FOWLER. In Northumberland you paid $112 to each. What was the rate of pay in 1891 as compared with that in 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891; 3 cts. per name, 3 cts. per death, 15 cts. a farm, and 20 cts. a factory. In 1901; 5 cts. a name, 5 cts. a death, 25 cts. a farm, and 30 cts. a factory. No allowance for receiving instructions in 1891 and no horse-hire.

Mr. FOWLER. Why were these additional allowances made.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The country was so prosperous and the rate of wages and the cost of living so much higher, that we could not get the work done without making this allowance.

Mr. R. JOHNSTON. In our county they were tumbling over each other to get the job.

Mr. FOWLER. Did the minister find any difficulty in getting people to act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Quite a little in places.

Mr. FOWLER. Name the places.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were a number of people who refused.

Mr. FOWLER. It was not in the county of King's, New Brunswick, because they were quarrelling for months before hand about it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Liberal committee had to ballot for them.

Mr. BENNETT. In East Simcoe there was an open fight as to who should be the commissioner, and the result was that two of them were tumbled into the job in order to bring about peace at an additional expense to the country. Why was Mr. Storey one of the commissioners, allowed a lump sum of $25 for expenses. If this money is given for sweet charity sake the people ought to know it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Storey's account shows that he was allowed $75 as a commissioner and $25 for postage and the rent of a hall for instructions to the enumerators.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the rent of the hall.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The postage and hall rent are included together at $25.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister know what the rent of the hall was.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad the hon. minister told me that. If that is a sample of the way in which the country has been swindled out of its money the people should know it. This man is a practising lawyer and a police magistrate in the town, and so far as his hiring any hall goes it is absurd. It is a good deal on a par with a certain gentleman who, when they were taking the returns for the plebiscite—that old friend of the Minister of Agriculture—attempted to work in a grant of $25 for the rent of his office. I am glad to learn this from the minister and thank him for the information, because the people there will know they have been swindled out of their money. Will the minister allow me to see that account for $25 for the rent of a hall for this commissioner.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In North Ontario a gentleman named Duncan Graham, commissioner, got an allowance of $100 and $206.95 for revising the returns, and I understand that he can neither read nor write.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should hardly think that is true.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He had a grit heeler as assistant commissioner, a gentleman that was concerned with ballot boxes in North Ontario on one occasion, a friend of the Postmaster General; a grit lawyer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know that gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He is a Grit lawyer of the name of Roach.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The commissioners are entitled to one cent for every name returned to them by the enumerators, and I find on looking up the matter that $206 is the payment for the names for that county.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). That being the case, I desire to draw the minister's attention to the Greys. For revising the returns of North Grey, the commissioner, R. B. Miller, received $188. The population of North Grey is 27,000 or more. The commissoner of East Grey, Mr. Carruthers, received $253, and the population of that riding is 2,000 less than the population of North Grey. If they each received one cent per head, how do you account for that difference ? The cost of taking the census of East Grey was $3,592, while the cost of taking the census of North Grey, which has 2,000 more population, was only $3,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. According to the population of East Grey the payment to the commissioner is correct, at one cent a name. The reason the commissioner of North Grey did not receive so much in proportion to the population of the riding is this : While each commissioner was entitled to receive one cent a name, no commissioner was allowed to receive more than $4 a day for every day of service. The commissioner of North Grey had forty-seven days of service, which at $4 a day made up the sum he actually received.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). There is another matter on which I would like an explanation. J. Frost, of the town of Owen Sound, is down for $12 for horse-hire. I would like to know why he required horse-hire in taking the census of Owen Sound ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say what that particular charge was for; but in some instances enumerators

in a town have been obliged for certain reasons to go out of town, and for that purpose have hired a horse. I remember one instance in which an enumerator in a town found that two or three people whom he had to enumerate were in the country, though properly residents of the town, and he had to drive out of town two or three miles to obtain the information which he was required to get. In such a case he would be justified in charging for horse-hire, and the case the hon. gentleman refers to may have been something like this.

Mr. BENNETT. This paper is an old-looking document. This man made out a bill for $100, and by somebody the $100 was changed to $75.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because when there were two commissioners they could each receive only $75.

Mr. BENNETT. And then, it being found that he was going to be short, some person wrote in : ' Postage and hall rent, $25.' That is not in his handwriting, but was written in by somebody else. He had to be placated, and somebody in the department here hit on this happy idea. Who does this grafting here ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It does not appear to be in the same handwriting.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to see that correspondence.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the minister explain what is the meaning of an assistant commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In certain large areas the commissioners were given assistants, and it practically amounted to having another commissioner.

Mr. BENNETT. Were there many of these gentlemen having money thrust on them as this gentleman seems to have had ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On the contrary, there was a very careful scrutiny of the accounts.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. minister consider this a case of close scrutiny ? The commissioner sends in a bill for $100. It is impossible to allow him $100, so somebody in the department runs his pen through the $100 and makes it $75, and then adds $25 for lease of hall and postage. The other commissioner, Tudhope, was paid $125.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. minister said that each could only get $75, but here is one getting $75 and the other $125.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall have to investigate that.

Mr. BENNETT. I would call attention to another difficulty in that famous riding of North Ontario. Mr. Duncan Graham was allowed $100 and a Mr. Roche $203 for fifty-eight days as assistant commissioner. Each of these got over $100.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. North Ontario had only one commissioner.

Mr. TAYLOR. Probably Graham could neither read nor write and required an assistant.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know him, but I do not believe that he can neither read nor write. Mr. Roche was paid $203 for fifty-eight days' work.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. minister let us have the Bill of Mr. Roche ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will look up the account and furnish it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Are we to understand that $75 was the outside limit which any one of these commissioners was to get ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was a regular allowance of $75 where there were two commissioners, to each one for expenses. In addition each got one cent per name for all the names returned in the riding, but could not get more than $4 for a day's work.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did the hon. gentleman instruct Mr. Blue that no commissioner was to get more than $75 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is the allowance for expenses, and in addition he got one cent per name but could not get more than $4 per day.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why then did the department pay more ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know that it did except in the case of one commissioner, and he got $100.

Mr. FOWLER. In Northumberland county, N.B., two commissioners got $112 each. See page D—134 of the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that there were one or two counties which were difficult and large, in which the allowance was increased. In Northumberland it was made $225 for the two commissioners instead of $150.

Mr. FOWLER. Northumberland is not the largest county in New Brunswick, Westmoreland has one-third more population than Northumberland.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Has it as large an area ?

Mr. FOWLER. Quite as large. A large portion of the county of Northumberland is forest.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that the county of Northumberland has an area of over 3,000,000 acres, and Westmoreland has about 1,000,000, so

that Northumberland is three times as large.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the hon. minister say whether his enumerators went through the forests of Northumberland ? Seventy-five per cent of Northumberland is forest, whereas Westmoreland is almost entirely settlement. The population of Northumberland is 30,000 and that of Westmoreland 45,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman may be perfectly correct, but in a settlement where there is so much forest, the enumerators would have more difficulty in going through the forests.

Mr. FOWLER. But there is no population there.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There must be some population in every parish, and there are twelve different parishes.

Mr. FOWLER. There must be a population in every parish or it would not be a parish. A parish is a municipality. There is a vast forest, of course, which extends over the whole western portion of the county. The different parishes of the eastern part run into the west.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is some settlement in the west ?

Mr. FOWLER. None at all. The enumerators would not go to the lumber camps.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, if the lumber camps were in existence when the census was taken in April.

Mr. FOWLER. No, they would not be in the lumber camps then.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not know as to that, but if there were people in the camps, the enumerators would go there.

Mr. CLANCY. As a matter of fact where there are two or three commissioners, it is a mere matter of party exigencies. Is there not a uniform allowance in Ontario and Quebec of $100 for the commissioner for one cent per name for the commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Where there was one. But where there is two, it was $75 and one cent a name.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. minister say that two commissioners were appointed only where there were large areas to be gone over ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were various reasons—sometimes large areas, sometimes difficulty of access from one part of the riding to another, sometimes two nationalities in one constituency calling for the appointment of one commissioner for each nationality.

Mr. CLANCY. And sometimes none of these existed. Take, for instance, the county of Elgin. There are no mixed nationalities, no difficulty of areas, and it is an old county and a small county, yet there were two commissioners.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose one for East and one for West Elgin.

Mr. CLANCY. No, for West Elgin. The hon. gentleman has no escape of that kind. Then, what about the county of Wellington, what about the county of Wentworth ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the case of West Elgin part of the riding is in the county of Elgin and part of it is in the county of Kent, and a commissioner was appointed for each of these.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister surely is beside himself. Does he not know that no notice was taken of municipal counties ? Does not he know that the census was taken by electoral districts ? Surely his commissioner did not make the suggestion he has just communicated to us.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The reason is correct. In some cases where the electoral division was made up of two or three counties, two commissioners were appointed.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, take the county of Bothwell, which is made up of part of the county of Kent and part of the county of Lambton. Yet there was only one commissioner.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There might have been two.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). North Victoria is made up of parts of three counties, yet the hon. minister appointed only one commissioner. He left out two heelers there. The hon. minister stated to the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Fowler) that he took the census for the lumber camps.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). So, these people will be counted twice.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If, at a given house the enumerator were told that the husband and sons were working at a lumber camp, they would be enumerated there, and again in the lumber camp ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Then, why go to the lumber camp ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If they were enumerated at the lumber

camp, the schedule of the lumber camp would be watched and, if the entries were duplicated they would be struck out in one.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the hour has arrived when we should rise.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) but some hon. gentlemen wish to get information, and I would ask them now to state what they want so that I may try to get it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like the hon. minister to bring information showing why, in the case of the county of Glengarry, he has broken the rule which he spoke about a few moments ago. He stated that where there were two commissioners they each got $75. But, in the county of Glengarry, which is a small county, composed of one town, one village, and four municipalities, he employed two commissioners at $100 each and gave them one cent per name for revising the list.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like information as to the payment of $25 in the case I have referred to.

Mr. CLANCY. And will the hon. minister please bring the account with respect to West Middlesex.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What will be the business for to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We shall probably take up several minor bills standing in the name of the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick). At an early stage of the sitting there will be a motion for Supply to enable the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to move his amendment.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 17, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. SCOTT—by Mr. McCreary—asked :

1. With respect to lands voted to railway companies, and earned, but not reserved for selection, if any, what is the area in each case?

2. With respect to lands voted and not earned, but which may under existing legislation be earned, what is the area reserved in each case, if any, (a) in Manitoba ; (b) in the North-west Territories ? And what is the description of the same by township and range ?

3. With respect to lands earned and reserved, but not selected by the company, what steps, if any, have been, or are to be, taken by the Department of the Interior, or the government, to compel or expedite selection ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. The Saskatchewan and Western Railway has earned a total area of 98,880 acres by construction of its line from Minnedosa to Rapid City, but no reservation has been made to satisfy this grant.

2. The question whether the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company may yet earn any land by construction was dealt with recently in answer to a question in the House.

The only other company which may yet earn land by construction is the Canadian Northern Railway Company. The reservation which was made out of which the company could select lands to make up the area earned and which may yet be earned, lies partly in Manitoba and partly in the North-west Territories.

About 310,000 acres have been selected on account of area earned, all in Manitoba except 15,700 acres.

The land in the reservation is all unsurveyed except a small proportion in Manitoba and a few townships in the North-west Territories. The area reserved is estimated from latest plans at about 4,924,440 acres in Manitoba and in the North-west Territories south of township 50, about 3,364,660 acres. There is also reserved in the North-west Territories a tract estimated to contain about 22,000,000 acres lying between township 49 and Hudson bay and along the projected line of the railway. This latter tract is entirely unsurveyed and largely unexplored.

The description by township and range, except the tract north of township 49, may be given as follows :

IN MANITOBA.

Township.	Range.	Mer.
Fractional 17, 25 and 26	4	E. 1st.
Fractional 17	3	E. 1st.
25 and 26	3	E. 1st.
Fractional 16	2	E. 1st.
17 to 26 inclusive	2	E. 1st.
Fractional 27, 28 and 29	2	E. 1st.
Fractional 16	1	E. 1st.
17 to 26 inclusive	1	E. 1st.
Fractional 27, 28 and 29	1	E. 1st.
Fractional 16	1	W. 1st.
17 to 26 inclusive	1	W. 1st.
Fractional 27	1	W. 1st.
28	1	W. 1st.
Fractional 17, 18 and 19	2	W. 1st.
20 to 26 inclusive	2	W. 1st.
Fractional 27	2	W. 1st.

Township.	Range.	Mer.
28	2	W. 1st.
Fractional 17	3	W. 1st.
18	3	W. 1st.
Fractional 19	3	W. 1st.
20 to 26 inclusive	3	W. 1st.
Fractional 27	3	W. 1st.
28 to 32 inclusive	3	W. 1st.
Fractional 33	3	W. 1st.
Fractional 17	4	W. 1st.
18 to 26 inclusive	4	W. 1st.
Fractional 27	4	W. 1st.
28 to 33 inclusive	4	W. 1st.
Fractional 18 and 19	5	W. 1st.
20 to 26 inclusive	5	W. 1st.
Fractional 27	5	W. 1st.
28 to 33 inclusive	5	W. 1st.
Fractional 34 and 35	5	W. 1st.
Fractional 20	6	W. 1st.
21 to 26 inclusive	6	W. 1st.
Fractional 27	6	W. 1st.
28 to 31 inclusive	6	W. 1st.
Fractional 32 and 33	6	W. 1st.
34 to 37 inclusive	6	W. 1st.
Fractional 21	7	W. 1st.
22	7	W. 1st.
Fractional 23 and 24	7	W. 1st.
25 and 26	7	W. 1st.
Fractional 27	7	W. 1st.
28 and 29	7	W. 1st.
Fractional 30 to 33 inclusive	7	W. 1st.
34 to 38 inclusive	7	W. 1st.
Fractional 22 to 27 inclusive	8	W. 1st.
28	8	W. 1st.
Fractional 29 to 32 inclusive	8	W. 1st.
33 to 40 inclusive	8	W. 1st.
Fractional 19 and 20	9	W. 1st.
Fractional 22 to 27 inclusive	9	W. 1st.
28 and 29	9	W. 1st.
Fractional 30 and 31	9	W. 1st.
32 to 41 inclusive	9	W. 1st.
Fractional 42 to 43	9	W. 1st.
18 and 19	10	W. 1st.
Fractional 20 to 31 inclusive	10	W. 1st.
32 to 42 inclusive	10	W. 1st.
Fractional 43 and 44	10	W. 1st.
18 to 21 inclusive	11	W. 1st.
Fractional 22 to 31 inclusive	11	W. 1st.
32 to 36 inclusive	11	W. 1st.
Fractional 37	11	W. 1st.
38 to 44 inclusive	11	W. 1st.
18 to 22 inclusive	12	W. 1st.
Fractional 23 to 32 inclusive	12	W. 1st.
33 to 44 inclusive	12	W. 1st.
18 to 26 inclusive	13	W. 1st.
Fractional 27	13	W. 1st.
28	13	W. 1st.
Fractional 29 to 32 inclusive	13	W. 1st.
33 to 44 inclusive	13	W. 1st.
18 to 26 inclusive	14	W. 1st.
Fractional 27	14	W. 1st.
28 and 29	14	W. 1st.
Fractional 30 to 32 inclusive	14	W. 1st.
33 to 38 inclusive	14	W. 1st.
Fractional 39 to 42 inclusive	14	W. 1st.
43 and 44	14	W. 1st.
18 to 24 inclusive	15	W. 1st.
Fractional 25	15	W. 1st.
26	15	W. 1st.
Fractional 27	15	W. 1st.
28 and 29	15	W. 1st.
Fractional 30, 31 and 32	15	W. 1st.
33	15	W. 1st.
Fractional 34 to 38 inclusive	15	W. 1st.
39 and 40	15	W. 1st.
Fractional 41 and 42	15	W. 1st.
43 and 44	15	W. 1st.
18 to 23 inclusive	16	W. 1st.
Fractional 24 to 27 inclusive	16	W. 1st.
28 and 29	16	W. 1st.
Fractional 30 to 44 inclusive	16	W. 1st.
18 to 23 inclusive	17	W. 1st.
Fractional 24, 25, 27 and 28	17	W. 1st.
29	17	W. 1st.
Fractional 30 to 41 inclusive	17	W. 1st.
18 and 19	18	W. 1st.
Fractional 20 and 29	18	W. 1st.
30	18	W. 1st.
Fractional 30, 40 and 41	18	W. 1st.
18, 19 and 20	19	W. 1st.
Fractional 21 and 29	19	W. 1st.
30 and 31	19	W. 1st.
Fractional 32, 33, 34, 39 and 40	19	W. 1st.
41	19	W. 1st.
Fractional 42, 43 and 44	19	W. 1st.
Fractional 18, 19 and 20, 21 and 29	20	W. 1st.
30 to 34 inclusive	20	W. 1st.
Fractional 35	20	W. 1st.
36	20	W. 1st.
Fractional 37 and 38	20	W. 1st.
39 and 40	20	W. 1st.
Fractional 41 to 44 inclusive	20	W. 1st.
19 and 20	21	W. 1st.
Fractional 30	21	W. 1st.
31 to 40 inclusive	21	W. 1st.
Fractional 41 to 44 inclusive	21	W. 1st.
19 and 20	22	W. 1st.
Fractional 30	22	W. 1st.
31 to 38 inclusive	22	W. 1st.
Fractional 39 and 40	22	W. 1st.
41 to 44 inclusive	22	W. 1st.
Fractional 30	23	W. 1st.
31 to 38 inclusive	23	W. 1st.
Fractional 39 to 44 inclusive	23	W. 1st.
Fractional 30	24	W. 1st.
31 to 39 inclusive	24	W. 1st.
Fractional 40 to 44 inclusive	24	W. 1st.
Fractional 30	25	W. 1st.
31 to 43 inclusive	25	W. 1st.
Fractional 44	25	W. 1st.
Fractional 30	26	W. 1st.
31 to 44 inclusive	26	W. 1st.
30 to 44 inclusive	27	W. 1st.
30 to 44 inclusive	28	W. 1st.
29 and 30	29	W. 1st.
Fractional 31	29	W. 1st.
32 to 44 inclusive	29	W. 1st.

IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Township.	Range.	Mer.
Fractional 46	9	W. 1st.
Fractional 45 and 46	10	W. 1st.
Fractional 45	11	W. 1st.
46	11	W. 1st.
45 and 46	12	W. 1st.
45 to 47 inclusive	13	W. 1st.
45 to 47 inclusive	14	W. 1st.
Fractional 48 and 49	14	W. 1st.
45 to 47 inclusive	15	W. 1st.
Fractional 48 and 49	15	W. 1st.
Fractional 45 and 46	16	W. 1st.
47	16	W. 1st.
Fractional 48 and 49	16	W. 1st.
Fractional 45 to 49 inclusive	17	W. 1st.
Fractional 47 and 48	18	W. 1st.
Fractional 47 and 48	19	W. 1st.
Fractional 45, 47 and 48	20	W. 1st.
Fractional 45, 46, 47 and 48	21	W. 1st.
Fractional 45, 46, 47 and 48	22	W. 1st.
49	22	W. 1st.
Fractional 45	23	W. 1st.
Fractional 46 and 47	23	W. 1st.
48 and 49	23	W. 1st.
Fractional 45, 46, 47 and 48	24	W. 1st.
49	24	W. 1st.
Fractional 45, 46, 47 and 48	25	W. 1st.

Township.	Range.	Mer.
49	25	W. 1st.
Fractional 45 and 46	26	W. 1st.
47, 48 and 49	26	W. 1st.
Fractional 45 and 46	27	W. 1st.
47, 48 and 49	27	W. 1st.
Fractional 45 and 46	28	W. 1st.
47, 48 and 49	28	W. 1st.
45 to 49 inclusive	29	W. 1st.
27 to 32 inclusive	30	W. 1st.
37 to 49 inclusive	30	W. 1st.
Fractional 30 and 31	31	W. 1st.
32 and 37 to 49 inclusive	31	W. 1st.
Fractional 32 and 33	32	W. 1st.
34	32	W. 1st.
Fractional 35 to 49 inclusive	32	W. 1st.
Fractional 32	1	W. 2nd.
33 to 49 inclusive	1	W. 2nd.
Fractional 32	2	W. 2nd.
33 to 49 inclusive	2	W. 2nd.
32 to 49 inclusive	3	W. 2nd.
33 to 49 inclusive	4	W. 2nd.
33 to 49 inclusive	5	W. 2nd.
34 to 49 inclusive	6	W. 2nd.
35 to 49 inclusive	7	W. 2nd.
35 to 49 inclusive	8	W. 2nd.
35 to 48 inclusive	9	W. 2nd.
Fractional 49	9	W. 2nd.
35 to 49 inclusive	10	W. 2nd.
38 to 49 inclusive	11	W. 2nd.
Fractional 38 and 39	12	W. 2nd.
40 to 49 inclusive	12	W. 2nd.
38 to 49 inclusive	13	W. 2nd.
38 to 49 inclusive	14	W. 2nd.
38 to 49 inclusive	15	W. 2nd.
38 to 41 inclusive	16	W. 2nd.
Fractional 42	16	W. 2nd.
43, 48 and 49	16	W. 2nd.
48 and 49	17	W. 2nd.
49	18	W. 2nd.
49	19	W. 2nd.

3. The selection by the following railway companies is entirely completed: Alberta Railway and Coal Company, Canadian Pacific Railway, Pipestone extension of Souris branch, Great North-west Central Railway Company.

The selection by the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company is all completed except 1,610·71 acres.

The selection by the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company is practically completed.

The selection by the following railway companies is proceeding rapidly in surveyed districts. In each case large portions of the areas reserved and in which selections are not yet made are unsurveyed: Canadian Pacific Railway, main line; Canadian Northern Railway Company, Manitoba South-western Colonization Railway Company, and Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

No selection has yet been made except a few sections by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on account of its Souris branch, as the greater part of the reserves made for this land grant are not surveyed.

Since 1883, when the first railway lands were patented, to the present time, there has been patented to the different railway companies on account of land subsidies a total of about 14,800,000 acres, of which about 11,800,000 acres have been patented since February, 1901.

The department is making every possible effort to have the balance, which remains to be patented in each case, surveyed, selected and patented at the earliest possible date.

GOVERNMENT LANDS IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES, &c.

Mr. RICHARDSON asked:

How many acres of government lands are there available for settlement in British Columbia, Manitoba, and the North-west Territories, each?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). In reply I beg to say:

The superficial area, not yet taken up, included within Manitoba, and North-west Territories, comprising provisional districts of Assiniboia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Athabasca (less land covered with water), 295,319,206 acres. British Columbia, (comprising lands within the railway belt and northern reserve), 13,089,340 acres; total 308,408,546 acres.

From this approximate area, however, must be deducted the area of land unfit for settlement owing to swamps, mountains, sterility of soil and such other causes as may render the land useless.

FIRE AT MORTIMER & COMPANY.

Mr. BELL asked:

1. What property of the government was lost in the fire which destroyed the premises of Mortimer & Company?

2. What was the value, and what will be the total loss to the government?

3. Under what conditions was such property on the premises?

4. Has the government any legal claim for compensation?

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

1. Schedule of property lost is attached marked A.

STATEMENT showing work in hands of the Mortimer Company and destroyed at the time of the fire which destroyed the premises of that firm.

Department.	Description of Work.	Loss.		
		Paper.	Composition, &c.	Total.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Militia and Defence	5,000 each 3, 1,000 of one targets	14 92		14 92
Inland Revenue	4,000 cheques	7 70		7 70
"	2,000 "	4 68		4 68
Census	5,000 letter headings	13 75		13 75
Interior	19,750 Prosperity pamphlets	420 00	150 00	570 0
House of Commons	34,525 English Experimental Farm Report, 1903.	2,798 39	377 30	3,175 77
Labour	3,500 French Labour Gazette for May, 1903.	86 92	247 77	334 69
Geological Survey	5,000 E. sheet Dominion Map	137 80		137 80
	Total	3,484 16	775 15	4,259 31

2. The value and total loss is in the last column of above schedule, and amounts to $4,259.31.

3. The bindery at the Bureau being too crowded to do such a quantity of pamphlet work, the printed sheets were sent out to be bound upon condition of being done properly and at rates settled upon as fair and reasonable.

4. No. The government, by Order in Council of July 5, 1881, adopted the policy of becoming its own underwriter.

GRAIN INSPECTION.

Mr. CLARKE asked :—

1. Is grain which has been inspected at Toronto, for export from Montreal, inspected again at Montreal before shipment ? And if so, why is the second inspection necessary ?

2. What is the cost per car of each inspection?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). 1. Not necessarily if identity is preserved, and not unless requested by the owner, shipper or carriers. This often occurs for reason that its condition has changed and buyers almost invariably under such circumstances require sea-board inspection.

2. Forty cents per car, or when in cargoes, fifty cents per 1,000 bushels.

LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION—LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT.

Mr. BOYD asked :—

What Live Stock Associations have asked the government for a grant to enable them to make an exhibit worthy of Canadian breeders at the St. Louis fair ? What are the names and post office addresses of the individuals who have written to the Minister of Agriculture, or the government, refusing or objecting to send their live stock on account of the anticipated heat of the weather during the said fair ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Copies of the following resolutions have been received at the department :—At a joint meeting of the live stock and poultry interests of the Dominion, held in the city of Guelph on February 24th, 1903, the following resolution was moved by Mr. Robert Miller, of Stouffville, Ontario, seconded by Mr. Peter Christie, of Manchester, Ontario, and unanimously carried :—

That, in the opinion of this joint meeting of representatives of Canadian live stock and poultry breeders, it is most important that we make a strong exhibit of live stock and poultry at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis in 1904. We feel that the breeding of pure bred animals is one of the most important industries in Canada, and the government of Canada should make a liberal grant to pay the expenses of such an exhibit and provide a liberal prize list as well. We think that a grant of $250,000 at least would be necessary, and that the exhibit would be of great benefit to and appreciated by the people of this country, and we pledge ourselves to do all we can to uphold the good name that Canada has already in the live stock world.

At the fifth annual meeting of the Canadian Ayrshire Breeders' Association, held in Montreal on Friday, February 13th, 1903, it was moved by J. G. Clark, of Ottawa,

seconded by W. W. Ballantyne, of Stratford, and carried unanimously :—

That the Canadian Ayrshire Breeders' Association petition the Dominion government for assistance in making a creditable exhibit at the St. Louis fair.

At a meeting of the Eastern Ontario Poultry Association, held at Ottawa, February 11th, 1903, the following resolution was unanimously adopted :—

That it is the unanimous opinion of this association that it would be very desirable in the interests of Canada that the Dominion government and the local governments give every assistance in their power and use every means to secure a good poultry exhibit at the World's fair to be held at St. Louis, 1904.

The following is an extract from the deliberations of the Council of Agriculture of the province of Quebec, at its meeting on March 18th, 1903 :—

Second resolution :—Moved by Mr. W. H. Walker, seconded by Mr. Jno. Draper, and resolved: —That in view of the vast importance of the World's fair to be held in St. Louis in 1904, this council is of the opinion that the Dominion of Canada through its Department of Agriculture should use every effort in its power to make the Canadian exhibit of live stock at this exposition fully up to the best standard that this country can produce, and that with this object in view a sufficient sum be provided in the estimates to uphold the names already gained at Chicago and Buffalo, and that this council use its best endeavours to send stock of highest class to keep up the reputation we have already gained in the past. Certified correct :

(Signed) OCT. OUELLETTE,
Secretary Council of Agriculture.

The following is a copy of a communication received from the Secretary of the Dominion Shorthorn Breeders' Association on February 26th, 1903 :—

The following resolution was moved by Mr. W. D. Flatt, seconded by Captain Robson, and unanimously carried :—

Hon. Sydney Fisher,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—We, the Dominion Shorthorn Breeders' Association, here assembled this 27th day of January, 1903, respectfully ask that your government encourage and assist the live stock breeders of Canada financially and otherwise in making a large exhibit at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis, Mo., in 1904. It is said that the state of Missouri alone are to give $200,000 in premiums on live stock bred in that state, and we believe that this will be one of the greatest contests of the various breeds ever known in the world. We are confident that your government would be acting in the best interests of our Dominion by aiding our breeders in making an exhibit that would in every sense be a lasting credit to this country. The good work done along this line by your department at the Pan-American, Buffalo, last year is gratefully acknowledged, but we feel you should go much further as the live stock industry is the greatest of all industries.

We also desire that the government announce their intention in regard to this matter to the breeders of Canada.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

No individuals have written to the Minister of Agriculture or the government, refusing or objecting to send their live stock to the St. Louis fair on account of the anticipated heat of the weather during the said fair.

TRANSPORTATION AND TREADGOLD COMMISSIONS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he can give any information with regard to the two commissions I mentioned yesterday ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry to say, not to-day. At an early day.

GOOD SHEPHERD REFORMATORY, ST. JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Bill (No. 199) respecting the Good Shepherd Reformatory in the city of St. John, New Brunswick, was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. CLARKE. What is the necessity for passing this Bill ? Are there no penal institutions maintained by the province of New Brunswick for the incarceration of female prisoners ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). It is deemed desirable by the Attorney General of New Brunswick that this legislation should be had. I would remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) that there is in the province of Ontario such an institution as the Mercer Reformatory. The principle of this Bill is absolutely the same as that applicable to the Mercer Reformatory. The object is to make special provision for the care of female prisoners who ordinarily would be sent to prison, but this provides that, instead of being detained in the ordinary jail, they may be sent to this institution. This is applicable to Roman Catholics only, and to the city and county of St. John only.

Mr. CLARKE. But the Mercer Reformatory is a public institution maintained by the province. Is this a public institution ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In what respect does my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) mean ?

Mr. CLARKE. The Mercer Reformatory in the province of Ontario is an institution under the administration of the provincial government of the province. I want to know if there is any difference between that and the institution referred to in this Bill. I am simply making these inquiries for the sake of information.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. So far as we are concerned, we have no control over

the jails in the provinces. So long as the Attorney General in the province is satisfied with the regulations of this institution, I do not think we are called upon to interfere. The province may designate an institution of this sort to which prisoners may be sent. It is for the Attorney General of the province to exercise such control as he deems proper.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But the Mercer Reformatory is a public institution to which prisoners of all denominations are sent. If this government has no right to exercise control in such a matter why should we be asked to pass this Bill ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We have no control over the institution, but we have control over the prisoners. The ordinary course is to send them to the ordinary prisons of the province. But if the provinces desire to have a particular class of criminals, sent to a particular institution, it is proper that we should give effect to that desire.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If it is proper to send criminals of a certain faith to a certain institution for punishment, there must be some reason why they are sent there. Is the punishment more severe ? Is the discipline more strict ? Is the treatment more kindly, and likely to make them better people when the term is up ? If so, then why not send Protestants there also ?

Mr. RUSSELL. They do send Protestant children to similar institutions.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to know if this House has ever legislated to send Protestants to Protestant institutions.

Mr. RUSSELL. They do in Nova Scotia, I am pretty sure.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. and learned doctor should be very sure before making a statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not agree to that. I think every member is bound to throw all the light he can on any question that is discussed. I state my belief, and I am practically certain of it, that there is legislation which enables stipendiary magistrates, instead of sending boys to be herded with criminals and to acquire confirmed criminal habits, to send them to the Protestant Industrial School, where they are taught a trade, and the Catholic boys can be sent to the St. Patrick's Home with the same object.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Then I want to know why some such legislation is not brought in for Protestant criminals as well ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If Protestants desire such legislation as this there will not be the slightest objection. There is no desire on the part of this government to distinguish between people of different religions. Such questions never originate here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am under the impression that there is a provision of this kind with regard to the reformatory of the Good Shepherd in the city of Halifax, and I do not think it has been attended with bad results. We have in Halifax a Protestant industrial school and a Roman Catholic reformatory, the St. Patrick's Home, I think it is called ; and boys are committed to these two homes by the stipendiary magistrate in the city of Halifax under special legislation authorizing them to do so, instead of sending them to prison, the idea being that both women of this character and juvenile criminals are more likely to be improved by sending them to some such institution as this than by sending them to jail or penitentiary. That is the idea of the legislation, and I am inclined to think, from the experience of the city of Halifax, so far as I am familiar with it, that the object has to some extent been attained. I know that so far as boys are concerned a great deal of good has been done in the city of Halifax by the establishment of these homes, and that many boys who have been to these schools have gone out into life as honest, hard working, industrious citizens, when possibly a different result might have followed if they had been sent to prison in the ordinary way.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That being the case, I would like some enactment placed in this Bill so that Protestant people, people of other denominations than those who are referred to here in New Brunswick, may be sent where they would have the beneficial influences of another institution than the prison. I would like the Minister of Justice to take hold of that, and put some enactment in this Bill which will make it general. Equal rights, equal laws and no special privileges.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand from the Minister of Justice that so far as the incarceration of prisoners is concerned, it is within the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities, and in order to enable them to send females to this reformatory institution, they must come to this parliament for a measure of this kind. Is it a matter special to New Brunswick ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, it is absolutely a matter of provincial control, but we must give effect to it by declaring that this institution is of such a character that the magistrate may send this particular class of criminals to it.

Mr. CLARKE. We have nothing to do with the maintenance ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Nothing at all.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—GOVERNMENT TARIFF POLICY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. J. ISRAEL TARTE (St. Mary's, Montreal). The government has received during the last couple of years a large number of deputations and of petitions advising them and requesting them to readjust and revise the tariff in such a manner as to make it more protective of our national interests. Latterly these deputations, requests and petitions to my hon. friends on the treasury benches have become more urgent. Let me give a statement of some of the articles in respect of which these petitions and requests have been made to the government: Iron and steel, woollens, neckwear, yarns, cottons, boots and shoes, pulp, wall paper, granite monuments, earthenware and stoneware, gloves and mitts, carriages and parts, wagons and parts, agricultural implements and parts, soap, salt, barley malt, beet sugar, glass, bicycles and parts, cutlery, lead, wire, furniture, moulding, picture frames, &c., brushes, buttons, pianofortes and parts, watch cases, jewellery, jewellery cases, coffins and caskets, lumber, shingles, lath, hats, cords, mattresses, rice, gardeners' products, cereals in packages, oatmeal and cereals, spectacles, enamelled ware, twine and cordage, canned goods, pork, ham, bacon, horses, salt (bulk), spices, ground bones, games and toys, pickles and fireworks, and dozens and dozens of other articles, the list of which I will take the opportunity of giving to 'Hansard,' as it would take too long to read it all.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to the fact that the hon. Minister of Finance is the only one who is allowed to put in statistics without reading them.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It has been allowed in former cases, but I will take note of the observation of my hon. friend.

The PRIME MINISTER. Read.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I shall not read the list now as I do not wish to take up too much time. There are other means of letting the country know of the industries that have applied to the government. Public bodies have also petitioned the members of the government. Let me read a resolution adopted by one of the most important bodies, if not the most important in Canada, the Board of Trade of Montreal, on the 14th October last:

> Resolved, that in the opinion of this meeting it is manifestly the urgent duty of the Dominion government to adopt a comprehensive——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The right hon. leader of the government (Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has just laid down the rule that a portion of a document not read by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) but from which he has quoted cannot go on 'Hansard.' The hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) in answering a question to-day said that there were three or four pages that he would not read but that he would give to 'Hansard.'

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That does not matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. If one hon. member is to be allowed the privilege on that side of the House an independent member must be accorded the same privilege.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That does not matter. I know that the rule is as the right hon. leader of the government has stated. I do not take any objection to it. I think it is a fair rule, but let me quote what I was going to present to the House—the resolution of the Montreal Board of Trade.

> Resolved, that in the opinion of this meeting it is manifestly the urgent duty of the Dominion government to adopt a comprehensive and positive policy in regard to transportation facilities,
>
> That this great problem should be dealt with on broad national lines covering present and providing for future requirements in so far as the progress and development of the country may be estimated;
>
> That as a first principle, the aim should be to provide for transportation facilities for the commerce of this country, east and west, through Canadian channels;
>
> That in the opinion of this meeting, to avail of the natural advantages and exceptional position of our country, the Dominion government should press forward the works already undertaken in the St. Lawrence river, with the deepening, widening and lighting of the channel with the work upon the inland waterways and canals and with the modern equipment of the harbours and ports; and
>
> Further resolved, that in the opinion of this meeting, in view of the changing conditions in the commercial world, the Dominion government should examine carefully into the working of our present customs tariff on imports, and should so readjust the same as to secure Canadian industrial products against the competition of foreign labour.
>
> That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that from the Board of Trade of Montreal?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That resolution was adopted by the Board of Trade of Montreal on the 14th October last. The time seems to be opportune for a revision of our fiscal policy. The revenue is buoyant. The hon. Minister of Finance has told us that at the end of this month, which is the end of the fiscal year, we will have a surplus of $13,500,000. Such a state of our finances makes it easy for the hon. gentleman and his colleagues to deal with the fiscal situation. The hon. Minister of Finance has a broad margin to play upon. It is indeed more con-

venient and more comfortable for governments to revise tariffs when the treasury is in a prosperous condition, just as it is easier and more comfortable for a nation to prepare for war in a time of peace. Our imports are a good deal over $200,000,000 a year. We require the goods that we so import, otherwise, we would not import them. On a large volume of these goods there are duties. This year we will raise in round numbers $32,000,000 in customs duties. Before we can remove from the custom-houses one single pound of merchandise that we buy from foreign countries, we have to pay certain duties—20 per cent, 25 per cent, 30 per cent, 35 per cent. These duties are clear taxation. They represent so much money taken from the pockets of the public and put into the treasury. I suggest that we remodel the Canadian tariff so as to relieve the people as much as possible from that taxation. They will be so relieved, if we manufacture and produce the goods that we can manufacture and produce advantageously ourselves. Buying foreign goods means paying tribute to foreign countries, foreign manufacturers and foreign producers. It means, in my humble opinion, giving a preference to foreigners over the sons and over the workers of our own land. Let me read an extract from a leaflet that was published last year by Mr. Walker, in London, which is straight to the point. He says :

> Articles that our own manufacturers can easily produce are supplied to us by foreign manufacturers, thus making the flow of goods from our own factories less than it ought to be and consequently causing fewer men to be employed in these factories than would be the case if foreigners had not free admission to our markets. Now, we Englishmen, living in the United Kingdom ought to have more rights and privileges in our own country in addition to those named than foreigners not living in this country, and so not under its laws.
>
> Our laws give our government a right to tax us for the purpose of paying its expenses, and also the right to call upon us, if necessary, in time of war, to defend our country.
>
> If we objected either to the paying of any taxes, or to any liability of being called out in time of war as defenders of our country, we should have no right to expect our country to employ us to do its work in preference to foreigners not living under its control.
>
> The motto, 'England expects every man to do his duty,' stirs us up to do ours.
>
> Another motto shows equal confidence, 'Englishmen, whilst doing their duty, are expecting that England is doing hers.'
>
> England having certain claims on her sons that she has not on foreigners living in other lands, is it not natural that these sons should expect some favour from England in exchange for the claims that she has on them, and how can England grant them any favour except it be by buying their produce in preference to that which owes its origin to foreigners living in other countries ?

I leave these words to the consideration of all those who are approaching the subject under discussion with open minds. I need not say that we are blessed with immense resources ; our lands are the most fertile under God's sun ; we have minerals in abundance; our water powers are innumerable and great ; our climate is varied and excellent ; our soil produces all the comforts of life and everything that a people can desire ; our geographical position is splendid ; our waterways unite the different parts of the Dominion, and they also give us access to all parts of the world. On the east we have the Atlantic ocean and on the west the Pacific. Through the first we have access to the markets of Europe and the motherland, and through the Pacific we have access to the Orient, to China and Japan, which will become more and more civilized and in the not far-distant future be centres of trade and commercial activity. We have grand raw materials in our hands; we have something to work upon. May I ask those who do not take the same view of our fiscal policy as we do ; may I ask them not to take a narrow view of the situation as it is to-day. We who believe in protection are often told ; nay, we are often reproached that we are working for the manufacturers, for a privileged class, and that we are forgetting the interests of the community at large. Well, Sir, the manufacturers are but a very insignificant quantity in the great problem that we have to face now ; they are but a bucket full in the ocean of interests that present themselves to our attention in this phase of our national life. After all, the manufacturers are only a few hundred men. Where are those few hundred going to be in say twenty years ? What portion of the American interests did the Yankee manufacturers represent thirty years ago ? In my estimation, although the manufacturing interests in Canada are of great importance, they fall far below the importance of the agricultural interests. The tillers of the soil should receive our first attention and our earnest consideration at the present juncture.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The first object of a revision of the tariff; the first object of the policy that I am now inviting the House to adopt, should be and would be, to protect and develop our farming interests. The interests of the farming community are intimately bound up with the interests of the manufacturers and of the working men, except that they are a great deal more considerable. Permit me to quote a few words from an address delivered by Mr. Roosevelt, President of the United States, on the 3rd of December, 1901 :

> With the sole exception of the farming interests no one matter is of such vital moment to our whole people as the welfare of the wage workers. If the farmer and the wage worker are well off it is absolutely certain that all others will be well off too. It is therefore a

matter for hearty congratulation that on the whole wages are higher to-day in the United States then never before in our country and far higher than in any other country. The standard of living is also higher than ever before. Every effort of legislator and administrator should be bent to secure the permanency of this condition of things and this improvemeint wherever possible.

I heard behind me a signifiacnt 'hear, hear,' when I said that the first ambition of those who want a revision of the tariff should be to protect and develop our agricultural interests. I fervently hope that those who differ from us will not close their ears—not to my argument for that may be weak—but to the bare facts that I am going to endeavour to place before the House with all the fairness I am able to command. We are invited to think of England and to take our example from England. How often have I not been told: Look at free trade England. Is agriculture prosperous in free trade England? For the benefit of my hon. friends who believe that free trade is the friend of the farmer, I shall quote some extracts and some figures also which I have gathered from the best possible sources of information. Mr. Rider Haggard, a publicist, published last year two volumes which are of deep interest. They are entitled 'Rural England,' and are the result of several years investigation and travel. Mr. Haggard was instructed by the 'Daily Express' to go all over England, and give a report of what he would see. Let me quote from the second volume the following extract:

Rural Population.

The truth is that after some years of experience and investigation, I am driven to the conclusion that the agricultural industry in England is as steadily going down hill as the capital sums invested in it are wasting; that the owners of the soil are becoming impoverished; that the farmers are at best making no headway, and, owing partly to poverty and partly to the natural discouragement that results from continual non-success, are losing heart and enterprise. They work on but they work like tired men who may hope for better things, but do not expect them.

Writing half a century ago, Sir James Caird said on behalf of himself and his colleagues: 'we feel that we may speak with confidence and hope of the future. . . . We rise from our task . . . . with the firm persuasion that, though there are many exceptions, the great body of the landlords and tenants of England have, by mutual co-operation, energy, and capacity sufficient to meet and by degrees to adapt themselves to a change which in its extraordinary effect on the welfare of all other classes of the community will sooner or later bear good fruits also to them.'

The 'change' to which he alludes in these, the last words of his book, is that from protection to free trade whereof, I believe, Sir James Caird was an ardent advocate. Not often has a prophecy been made more completely refuted by the inexorable argument of fact, or at the least the good fruits that were to come 'sooner or later' show no signs of arrival in 1902, more than fifty years after he put this deliberate opinion upon record. Whatever free trade may have done for the country at large—and I maintain that of this matter we do not as yet know all the truth—it is certain that it has brought the land and the agriculture of England very near to the brink of ruin. The destruction which the opponents of this far-reaching revolution foretold for these was, it is true, postponed a while owing to the introduction of steam and other causes, but it has fallen at length.

When we turn to the question of the decrease in the inhabitants of English rural districts, it is to find ourselves confronted with some startling figures. I read that in 1851 the agricultural labourers of England and Wales numbered 1,258,800 and that in 1891 they had shrunk to about 780,700. What the census of 1901 shows their number to be, I do not yet know, but I shall be much surprised if it records any advance. Taking it on the 1891 basis, however, it would seem that whereas between 1851 and 1891 the population of England and Wales had increased by about half, its agricultural inhabitants during this same period had actually decreased by over one-third, with the result that whereas in 1891 the urban districts could show a total of about 25,000,000 people, the rural districts held only about 7,500,000, that is some twenty-three per cent of the population, as against seventy-seven per cent living in towns or their immediate neighbourhood. These figures are very eloquent and very ominous, especially if a careful analysis of those of the last census should prove them to be progressive in the same directions.

Since the above was written I read in a prospectus issued by 'The Small Holdings Association, Limited,' that 'It will be found on examining the census returns (for 1901) that there are decreases in the population in no less than 401 of our rural districts, and that in many cases the decrease has exceeded 1,400 persons.

People are deserting the villages wholesale, leaving behind them the mentally incompetent and the physically unfit; nor, at any rate in many parts of England does the steady flow to the cities show signs of ceasing. Yet—and this is one of the strangest circumstances connected with the movement—those cities whither they go are full of misery.

Now, Sir, let us have a few figures of the acreage under cultivation in Great Britain. The record published in 1902 established that there was in the area under wheat in 1901 a diminution of 144,000 acres, in 1900 a diminution of 156,000 acres, and in 1899 a diminution of 101,000 acres, making all told a diminution of 400,000 acres in these three years. There was also a reduction of the barley area of 18,000 acres, in the oats area of 29,000 acres, in the turnips area of 24,000 acres, and in the mangolds area of 15,000 acres. Commenting on that diminution, Mr. Haggard says:

Because of the unremunerative price of wheat, ten thousands of acres have been withdrawn from its cultivation—indeed, free trade has sent down the corn area enormously. Whether or no their yield of the cereal could be profitably increased, as I and others firmly believe to be the case, we cannot get over the fact that our wheat acreage is now less than half what it was in 1857.

What about live stock? The official records are to the effect that in 1901 the

number of cattle in Great Britain was reduced by 41,000 head, the number of ewes was reduced by 188,000 in 1901, and by 111,000 in 1900, or a diminution of over 300,000 ewes in the two years. The diminution in the number of pigs in 1901 was 202,000, a lower level than had been reached in any year since 1893. What about horse-breeding, one of the great agricultural interests of England formerly? Sir Walter Gilbey, speaking at Bishop Stortford on September the 17th, 1902, said:

He was sorry he was unable to give then anything like satisfactory figures in regard to horse breeding in England, which he could only describe as being in a deplorable state. He did not wish to alarm them, but government rereturns showed a state of things in England at present which were very disheartening. It appeared that in ten years, from 1863 to 1873, we imported into this country 29,000 horses, while in ten years, from 1891 to 1901, we imported no less than 342,000 horses. Those were startling figures enough, but what was even more alarming was the fact that the horse-breeding business was getting worse every six months.

Mr. Haggard describes the condition of rural England in a very graphic manner in the following words:

The real peril, both to agriculture and, what is even more important, to the country at large, lies, however, in the fact that the supply is being cut at its source. The results of my inquiries on this point are even worse than I feared. Everywhere the young men and women are leaving the villages where they were born and going into the towns.

And again he says:

It is now common for only the dullards, the vicious or the wastrils to stay upon the land, because they are unfitted for any other life, and it is this indifferent remnant who will be the parents of the next generation of rural Englishmen. It must be remembered that the census returns will not tell the whole truth of this matter, since very often the rural districts include large townships. Also the elderly folk and many young children still remain in the villages, the latter to be reared up at the expense of the agricultural community for the service of the cities. As they mature into the fullness of manhood or womanhood, they leave their homes and are seen no more. This is certain—for I have noted it several times. Some parts of England are becoming almost as lonely as the veldt of Africa. There the 'highways lie waste, the wayfaring man ceaseth.' The farm labourer is looked down upon, especially by the young women of his own class——

That is very grave indeed.

—and consequently looks down upon himself. He is at the bottom of the social scale. Feeling that there is not hope for the future, he does not even take the trouble to master his business. He will not learn the old finer arts of husbandry; too often he does as little as he can, and does that little ill.

Mr. Haggard calls such a state of affairs a national question.

But behind the agricultural question lies the national question: What will be the result of this desertion of the countryside and the crowding of its denizens into cities? That is a point upon which it would be easy to indulge in strong words. The evils are known, and little imagination is needed to enable a writer to paint their disastrous consequence. I will, however, content myself with a moderate statement.

It can mean nothing less than the progressive deterioration of the race. In the absence of new conditions which cannot be foreseen, if unchecked, it may in the end mean the ruin of the race.

Mr. CLARKE. From what is the hon. gentleman quoting?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. From Mr. Rider Haggard and the English Blue-books. I have verified the exactness of these figures in the English Blue-books, which are available in the library. Mr. Haggard is not the only publicist who has expressed such strong views on the condition of agricultural England at present.

Mr. Byng, a well known English writer, published last year a book which I hold in my hand, and which is named 'Protection.' On page 193 he quotes some words from the Duke of Wellington in the House of Commons in 1842. Said the duke:

I earnestly recommend your lordships not to lend yourselves to the destruction of our native cultivation. Its encouragement is of the utmost and deepest importance to all classes, and I earnestly beg of you not to consent to any measure which would injure the cultivation of our own soil.

Then Mr. Byng goes on:

The agriculturist and the manufacturer are both producers, and the influence which our free trade policy exerts upon their callings is in the main alike. I have maintained, and I believe proved, the disastrous effects produced upon our manufacturing industries. I now assert that the existing system exerts its baneful influence to a fully equal extent over that most important of all the nation's handicrafts: agriculture. Free trade agriculture causes dearness in production, kills enterprise, prevents invention and the introduction of new methods. It makes attempts at technical education inoperative, puts land out of cultivation and drives labourers away. . . . . .

It is now generally acknowledged that the ruin of our agricultural industries is not only a question of loss of money, but a disaster of national and political importance. The subject is now engaging the minds of many politicians and specialists more competent than I to deal with it in detail. I need not, therefore, prolong this chapter, but will only add a few sentences.

We must protect our agriculture. It is the most pressing problem of the day.

In imposing protection, we must discriminate between those products which our soil and climate permit us to raise in abundance, and those we cannot grow in sufficient quantity and for the supply of which we must therefore partly depend on the importer.

If we enact duties in such a way that they can, without any cumbrous red tape, be adjusted to conform to the necessities of good and bad seasons, I feel certain such judicious protection would be immediately beneficial.

The result of such a measure would be to bring waste lands into cultivation, to encour-

age the population of the countryside, to raise rents, and the capital value of the land would regain hundreds of millions.

These are very significant words indeed. What has been lost to England by free trade, as far as the balances of trade are concerned ? I beg leave to quote from the 'American Economist' of the 8th of May, 1903, and the exactness of the figures given I have checked by the figures in the official Blue-books :

England adopted free trade as a fiscal policy in 1846, after an uninterrupted series of annual favourable balances of trade since 1815. She had a good start in the race for commercial supremacy, and did not begin to lose her annual favourable balances of from $353,000,000 (in 1846) to $578,000,000 (in 1853), till 1854, when the tide turned with an adverse balance of $177,000,000. Every year since the balance has been against her. In blocks of five years each her loss of national wealth since 1853 figures up as follows :

1854-58	$ 791,000,000
1859-63	1,260,000,000
1864-68	1,396,000,000
1869-73	1,289,000,000
1874-78	2,667,000,000
1879-83	2,786,000,000
1884-88	2,161,000,000
1889-93	2,871,000,000
1894-98	2,619,000,000
1899-1901, three years	2,423,000,000
Total loss in 48 years.	$21,263,000,000

So speak 'American Economist.'

or an average loss of $443,000,000 yearly for forty-eight years. The loss was about $850,000,000 in 1902, and is accumulating at about the same rate in 1903. The half-century will show a total loss of about $22,963,000,000. The national debt of England is $3,061,000,000. Consequently the avoidance of this $22,963,000,000 of trade loss would have paid her national debt seven and one-half times over.

It must be borne in mind, Sir, that England was an ardently protectionist country up to 1846. Nor must it be forgotten that the full free trade policy was not initiated then. The duties were reduced gradually. In point of fact, the last duties were removed in 1860. The state of the British nation and the positions of the nations of the world were not then what they are now—far from it. Years of war followed the year 1860. There was war between Prussia and Austria ; there was the great civil war in the United States ; there was the war between France and Prussia in 1870. In point of fact, the nations of Europe and the United States began equipping themselves from an industrial standpoint only between 1872 and 1875. Free trade England, then, up to that date had not to compete against the same state of affairs, the same organization as that she has to compete against now. I have endeavoured to show you by the quotations I have brought to your notice the conditions of agriculture in England. Will you permit me then, Sir, to say a few words as to the condition of agriculture, in another country, the highest protectionist country in the world—I mean the United States of America. On a former occasion, I showed that the rural population in England during the last decade has increased 12·7 per cent, while the population increased 21 per cent. I beg leave to give you now some figures which I hope will be considered with some attention by those who, as I said at the opening of my remarks do not wish to close their ears or their eyes to the great subject that is now under discussion, not only in this parliament but throughout the world at large :

Number of Farms.

In 1870	2,659,982
In 1900	9,781,898
In 1890 the value of farms and farm properties was	$16,082,267,689
In 1900 it was	20,439,901,164
In 1890 the total value of farm products was	2,418,766,028
In 1901 it was	3,011,254,076
In 1902 it was	2,989,170,150
In 1890 the number of cattle was	52,801,907
In 1902 it was	61,424,599
In 1890 the number of horses was	14,213,837
In 1902 it was	16,531,224
In 1890 the number of sheep was.	44,544,775
In 1902 it was	62,039,091
In 1890 the production of wheat was (bushels)	399,262,000
In 1901 it was	748,460,218
In 1902 it was	670,063,008

Corn.

In 1890 the production of corn was	1,489,970,000
In 1902 it was	2,523,648,312

Let us now compare the value, in money, of the different crops :

Corn.

In 1890	$754,433,451
In 1901	921,555,768

Wheat.

In 1890	334,771,678
In 1901	467,350,156

Oats.

In 1890	222,048,486
In 1901	293,658,777
In 1902	303,584,852

Barley.

In 1890	32,614,271
In 1902	61,898,624

Implements and Machinery.

In 1870	$336,878,429
In 1900	749,775,970

Live Stock.

In 1870	$1,525,276,457
In 1900	3,075,477,703

Now, I may be told that these figures are all right, undoubtedly they are, but I may be asked what benefit the farmers have derived from these figures. I have often heard well meaning people say : It is true that the value of farm products has increased in the United States, and the value of farm properties has developed, but things are so dear that the farmers do not get any benefit from the increased value of their products. Farmers are the great consuming community, and they are obliged to pay

so high for the things they want that the increased value of their farm products does not help them much. On this point let me quote some more figures. I know that figures are not pleasant reading in the House, but 2 and 2 make 4. In other words, figures are the strongest argument that can be made in such a debate as this. Let us see what has been the advance of the value of farm products from 1896 to 1901, and also what has been the advance of other products, so that we may find out what the farmer is able to buy in 1901 in comparison with what he was able to buy in 1896 with the same quantity of farm products. The figures which I am going to read are taken from the Statistical Year-book of the Department of Labour of the United States, published last year :

Article.	Advance in value from 1896 to 1901. Per cent.	Advance in purchasing power. Per cent.
Farm products....	49.30	
Food, &c..	26.37	18.15
Cloths and clothing..	10.62	34.97
Fuel and lighting..	14.57	30.31
Metals and implements. ..	19.42	25.02
Lumber and building materials..	24.95	19.49
Drugs and chemicals	24.41	20.01
House furnishing goods ..	17.98	26.55
Miscellaneous articles.. ..	17.51	27.05
Recapitulation..	21.02	24.40

In other words, the same quantity of farm products which brought $100 in 1896, would to-day buy $149. The advance is the price of other articles has been considerable, but the advance of the purchasing power of farm products has been much greater.

Now, let us consider the price of certain commodities, to prove that the farmer in every case has been greatly benefited by the protective policy which has been adopted and maintained in the United States. The price of cattle was 32·05 per cent more in the latter year than the former. Fresh beef or cattle products advanced 12·82 per cent ; beef hams, 27 per cent; mess beef, 24 per cent ; recapitulation, 21 per cent, as against 32·05 per cent. What has been the result so far as national wealth is concerned? There is no doubt in my mind, or in the mind of anybody who has studied the history of the United States, that their policy has built up that country to a marvellous degree. The following figures need no comment :

TOTAL WEALTH OF THE UNITED STATES.

In 1870..	$30,068,518,000 00
In 1870, per capita..	779,083 00
In 1880, total wealth..	42,642,000,000 00
In 1880, per capita..	850 20
In 1890, total wealth..	65,037,091,000 00
In 1890, per capita..	1,038 57
In 1900, total wealth..	94,300,000,000 00
In 1900, per capita..	1,235 86

In 1903 the total wealth of the United States has reached the wonderful figure of $100,000,000,000. What has protection done in so far as inviting capital to the United States is concerned ? The investment of foreign countries in the United States on January 1, 1899, was practically as follows : England, $2,500,000,000 ; Holland, $240,000,000 ; Germany, $200,000,000 ; Switzerland, $75,000,000 ; France, $50,000,000, and the rest of Europe, $35,000,000.

We all know that the United States had a very formidable debt at one time, and that the interest on that debt was weighing heavily on the people. What is the state of affairs to-day ? The debt of the United States in 1902 was $969,457,241, and the debt of the United States per capita in the same year was $12.27. The interest per capita was 35 cents. I call the attention of the House to that figure which I take from the official statistical abstract for 1902. In 1903 the population of the United States was 79,003,000. The net debt of Canada per capita in 1902 was $49.97. The interest on the net debt per capita in the same year was $1.66. The interest per capita on the gross debt is $2.01, and the gross debt of our country per head is $67.14. In 1876 the debt of the United States per capita was $45.66, and the interest then was $2.11. Let me remind you once more, Sir, that to-day, instead of the $45.66 that the debt was in 1876, it is only $12.27, and that, instead of the interest being $2.11 per capita, it is only 35 cents per capita. In 1876 the net debt of Canada was $31.54, and the interest per capita was $1.42. The United States of America, under the impulse of the marvellous progress that has taken place there, have been able to diminish the interest charges on their debt, while we have been increasing our debt very rapidly indeed.

It is of interest to make a short comparison of the effect that a high tariff and a low tariff may have on the revenue of the country. In 1893, under the McKinley tariff, the total receipts of the United States government were $461,716,562. In 1894, under the Wilson-Gorman tariff, the revenue immediately fell to $372,802,498. In 1895 the revenue was $390,373,203. In 1896 it rose to $409,475,408. I have just been dealing with the Wilson-Gorman tariff for 1894-5-6. Mr. McKinley came into office, and the Dingley tariff was adopted in 1897. Notwithstanding the fact that the depression was still having its effect, under the impulse of the new tariff the revenue increased rapidly. In 1896 it had been $409,475,408. In 1897 it was $430,387,168. In 1898, when the new tariff began to have its full force and effect, the revenue went up to $494,333,954, in 1899 to $610,982,004, in 1900 to $669,595,431, in 1901, $699,316,531, and in 1902 it was $684,326,280.

Effect of low and high tariffs in the United States.

	(McKinley tariff.) Total receipts.
In 1893..	$461,716,562

(Wilson-Gorman tariff.)	Total receipts.
In 1894..	372,802,498
In 1895..	390,373,203
In 1896..	409,475,408
(Dingley tariff.)	
1897.	
1897..	$430,387,168
1898..	494,333,954
1899..	610,982,004
1900..	669,595,431
1901..	699,316,531
1902..	684,326,280

I have shown that from an agricultural standpoint and from a financial standpoint the result of the protective tariff in the United States has been most beneficial to that progressive nation. Now, I know that I will be told that I have compared a free trade nation with a high protective nation, and that my comparison is not fair. That argument is well worth considering. Let me say that in my opinion free trade England, with its vast, powerful, old organization, with its large population, although free trade as she is, is in a better position to compete and struggle against the highly protected United States than we are with our low revenue tariff. Circumstances alter cases. We must take everything into account when we have to grapple with a difficulty such as the one we have to face now. We are no more able to compete successfully with highly protected nations such as the United States is than old guns are able to carry victory as against modern artillery. We are no more able to succeed with a revenue tariff policy than old fashioned tools can prevail against modern improved machinery. The United States, Germany, and Russia, in spite of their great progress, in spite of their large population, in spite of the fact that they have had a protective policy for years and years would not dare to-day to decrease their tariff. Far from it; they are increasing their tariff as Germany has just done. We must take these things into consideration when we come to readjust our tariff and shape our course for the future. The Canadian tariff in which I believe should protect us as effectively as the American tariff protects the national industries of the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The tariff which I advocate would give to the Canadian farmers an enriched home market. The tariff which I advocate would give to the workingmen of Canada the development of existing industries, the creation of new ones, higher wages and better living for the toilers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. On behalf of Canadian workingmen, I ask from this parliament a better standard of living; I ask permanency of employment for them. I ask for capital security and fair dividends. I ask for all these Canadian interests and industries preference over foreigners and foreign industries.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I know that objections will be made; I have heard those objections often. It is not the first time that I have discussed this important question. I started my political life in discussing it, and although political hazards have been pretty numerous in my career, I am working to-day on the same lines that I was working on twenty-five years ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I trust that I may be able to convince and to bring to our way of thought, some of our friends who say that a high tariff means the exclusion of imported goods and the restriction of trade. I take issue with them on that. Let me call their attention to what has happened in other countries. In the fiscal book of the United States we can learn a great many useful lessons indeed. I declare that high tariffs do not exclude imports. A high protective tariff will change the nature of imports. It will increase the wealth of the country; it will make the circulation of money greater and more active; it gives to the people greater purchasing power. The United States is a striking example to those who say that a high tariff will exclude imports. One has only to compare the imports under the low tariff years of the Cleveland administration with the high tariff years of Mr. McKinley, to see the effect of both policies. It goes without saying that if money is circulating abundantly, articles of common use, the luxuries of life, are more readily bought. Let us compare the importation of luxuries under the Cleveland and McKinley regimes. I quote from the Statistical Abstract of 1902 the official record of the United States:

Importation of luxuries including the same articles in the years mentioned into the United States.

1894..	$ 60,097,719
1895..	92,714,827
1900..	103,908,719
1901..	112,507,715
1902..	132,936,398

The general importations into the United States were as follows.

1894..	$636,614,420
1902..	903,327,071

And this year, if the imports keep up at the same rate to the end of the year, they will reach one billion dollars. It seems to me that these figures are so convincing that there is no use arguing any more upon them.

Now, Sir, there are things that we cannot produce and we must expect to import those things, but there are things that we can produce and surely we will be able to discover what these things are. We are

often told in this House that the duties on agricultural implements, for instance, should not only not be made higher, but that they should be made lower, because it is said that if we manufactured them in Canada they will not be sold as cheaply as if we imported them from the United States or any other country. I take exception to such an empty national policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I mention agricultural implements as I would mention any other article that we can produce in our country with Canadian material and Canadian hands. Our American friends are the greatest producers of agricultural implements in the world. They are a very highly protected nation. For many years agricultural implements in the United States had a protection of 45 per cent and even today some of them are protected by a tariff of 45 per cent. The industry has developed to a marvellous extent in the United States. Before 1894, the duty on agricultural implements in the United States was for many years 45 per cent, and it has always been very high. Then the following clause was inserted in the tariff :

Ploughs, tooth and disc harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins (free) : provided, that all articles mentioned in this paragraph, if imported from a country which lays an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of this Act.

In other words, the duties were abolished for countries which would not impose any duties on American articles ; otherwise the duties remained at 45 per cent. In point of fact, the duty on agricultural implements was never abolished in the United States. After Mr. McKinley's election, the Dingley tariff put up a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on agricultural implements of all kinds, and the duty of 45 per cent was kept on manufactures of metal, that is to say, on the parts of agricultural implements composed of iron and steel.

The result of that protective policy of the United States has been marvellous. The agricultural implement makers of that country annually distribute over the world about 200,000 self-binding harvesters, 250,000 reapers, 20,000 corn harvesters. A single establishment in the United States is said to manufacture each year nearly a quarter of a million machines of various classes ; and it is in the United States that agricultural implements are the cheapest. They have been highly protected, and they have been able to implant themselves solidly, because they were permitted to enjoy the benefit of their home market. The farmers of that country have the benefit of the wise and enlightened policy that has been followed by our friends on the other side. We are importing a large volume of agricultural implements which we could manufacture ourselves, and which we could sell just as cheaply as we buy them now. Our imports of agricultural implements since 1896 has been as follows :

1896	$ 445,070
1897	575,409
1898	905,140
1899	1,639,888
1900	1,826,944
1901	1,896,760
1902	2,655,468
Total	$9,944,674

In the month of February we imported from the United States $192,034, and in the corresponding month of last year we imported $153,342.

I am asking whether we are able to manufacture agricultural implements as cheaply as the United States. I say without any hesitation that we can do so, and I have not yet heard a single argument to the contrary. We have in this country about sixty manufacturers of agricultural implements. Surely home competition should produce the same results here that it has produced on the other side of the line. In free trade England people are paying more for their agricultural implements than the people of this country or the people of the United States. There is no reason why, with a strong Canadian tariff, we should not manufacture our agricultural implements just as cheaply as they are manufactured on the other side of the line.

Mr. McCREARY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the farmers of Great Britain are paying more for agricultural implements than the farmers of the United States and Canada ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Most assuredly.

Mr. McCREARY. I would like to see the figures.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The figures are very well known. They have been placed before me and before my former colleagues in a memorandum presented to us a couple of years ago by one of the best friends of the Liberal party, Mr. Melvin Jones ; and those figures are available. We have the raw material under our hands, we have the labour, we have the lumber and the timber, and we can have the iron for manufacturing purposes. To-day the iron for manufacturing purposes is imported free. There is no reason why we cannot produce as cheaply as the United States. My hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) is from the North-west. I understand his anxiety, and I share his desire to see the farmers of the great North-west, in which we all take the same interest as he does, not obliged to pay more than is necessary for their implements ; but if we can supply them with Canadian articles, there is no reason why we should not do so.

What is true of agricultural implements is true of all the industries of the United States. I will refer to one more industry, the boot and shoe industry. The duty on boots and shoes is not very high to-day in the United States—only 25 per cent; but how did they start that large industry? They started it early. In 1789 they put a duty of 50 cents a pair on boots and shoes. That did not work well. In 1795 they increased that duty to 75 cents a pair; in 1812 they raised it to $1.50; in 1842 they lowered it to $1.25 a pair. Since then the duties have varied from 20 to 25 and 30 per cent, and to-day they have an industry which is well worth speaking of. In 1860 the output of the boot and shoe industry was $91,000,000; in 1900, the output was $255,180,000. This is sound business.

What is true of the boot and shoe industry is also true of the iron industry. To-day the United States is the leading iron-producing country in the world. Its production of iron in 1902 reached the wonderful figure of over 17,000,000 tons.

On the point of cheap production let me quote again from Mr. Byng's book. Mr. Byng lays down as a cardinal principle that the manufacturer in a protected country can manufacture at a cheaper rate than the manufacturer in a free trade country. I for one believe in that doctrine and I believe the result if examined would prove beyond doubt. Mr. Byng said:

> The basis of the theory of cheapness of manufacture is the following often stated by free traders: the cost of production of a manufactured article depends on three factors. First, the cost of the material; second, the cost of labour; and third, expenses. This may have been true to some extent sixty years ago, but it is not true to-day as every manufacturer knows, because this reasoning leaves out one consideration, which we may call the independent factor, the quantity produced, and in most cases this factor influences the cost of labour and expenses to such an extent that it entirely overshadows both.

I have here a little book that is well worth reading, published by Mr. Walker. Let me quote a few lines on the point under discussion, that of cheapness:

> Free traders love cheapness. Cheapness to a certain extent is good. Free traders love a thing which to a certain extent is good. But, unfortunately, they love cheap things because they are cheap, and quite apart from any effect that cheap things may have on their own country. Now, cheap things, which send money out of a country, ruin its farmers, miners and manufacturers, are practically much dearer to the country than things produced by natives, and which are sold at high prices, but which the country can buy without loss of money to itself when no foreign raw materials are used, at the cost of raw materials only.
>
> The country that is buying cheapness at the expense of its own trade and industries, is a country that is getting fried in its own fat, as an old cartoon represented a city as getting this done to it, when it was under siege.

One word more from Mr. Byng. I take it from that short chapter entitled: 'England the dumping ground of the world,' which are the very words used by Mr. Chamberlain lately:

> Take any flourishing old established English industry. The foreigner establishes a similar one in his country based upon experience he has been careful to acquire here. Under the protection, and with the assistance of his government, he erects large works and puts down the best machinery, capable of turning out large quantities of goods. Having satisfied his home demand, he seeks the free trade English market and here offers his goods at very low prices, which need not involve any loss to the foreigner, as I have already shown. But the prices are so low as to mean a considerable loss to the English manufacturer and the latter has to give up making the article. During the whole of this process we in England have been getting cheap prices, and the free trader rejoices. He has killed an English industry but that does not concern him, for has he not got cheap prices? The period of cheapnss is, however, of short duration. It invariably happens that as soon as the English competition is killed, the prices charged by the foreigner goes up to its old level. Then the English manufacturer may start again. But if he does so, the process is repeated: down goes the price, and the Englishman, and after that the foreign charge goes up again and the cheapness is no more!

A few days ago Mr. Chamberlain addressed a letter to one of his electors, from which I shall quote a word or two sent across to us by cable. Mr. Chamberlain said:

> We have been apt in the past to consider too much the advantage of buying cheaply and not to pay sufficient attention to the methods whereby we may have the means that enable us to pay at all. Increased wages are even more important to the working classes then reduced cost of living.

Mr. Chamberlain rightly says that it is more important for the workingmen to have high wages than to buy cheap things. I shall take the liberty later on of saying a word or two regarding the policy which Mr. Chamberlain is suggesting to the British empire. But before doing so let me remind you that there was a good deal of discussion going on in the United Kingdom on the conditions of the British islands and of the workingmen in the British islands and in the United States. An enterprising manufacturer and wealthy Scotchman, Mr. Mosely, had the very original ideas of inviting the different trades of the United Kingdom to elect delegates who would visit the United States, and make on the spot a complete inspection of the condition of affairs in that country. The party consisted of twelve delegates elected by their fellow workingmen in the shops and representing the following trades: Pottery, painting, decorating, upholstering, wood work, engineering, railway building, mining, textile working, metallurgy, coach building and electricity. Mr. Mosely was at

the head of the delegation. The report I received a day or two ago. The 'London Times' of April the 20th, 1903, commented as follows on that report:

Several of the delegates discuss a problem mentioned by Mr. Mosely, in the words, 'How is it that the American manufacturer can afford to pay wages of fifty per cent, one hundred per cent, and even more in some instances, above ours, and yet be able to compete successfully in the markets of the world? Mr. Mosely himself suggests that it is 'the extra speed at which machinery is run, the high specialization of work whereby each man becomes an expert in his own particular branch, which in itself mean efficiency and an increased output, the economy of hands in attending machines and the excellent organization of the factories whereby the smallest items of time and labour are saved, that make all the difference between high profits and none, and a high rate of wages for the men as against the comparatively low standard known in this country.'

Then, the 'Times' goes on to say that Mr. Mosely

does not include mention of the fact that the American manufacturer, thanks to disposing of a very large proportion of his output in the home markets secured by a protective tariff, obtains higher prices from many of his commodities than are enjoyed by his English competitor for similar articles. Several of the delegates show themselves well aware that the high tariff is a factor that must be taken into account, Mr. Cox stating that the wealthiest iron and steel manufacturers strenuously assert the continued existence of protective tariffs as the only means of maintaining and securing their home trade against outside competitors.

The United States government published in 1898 a bulletin, No. 18, which has been supplemented in 1900. The inquiry covered several countries of the world. I intend making a comparison from the official source between the wages paid to workmen in the United States and the wages paid to workmen in England. These statistics show about 100 per cent more paid to the wage earners in the United States than paid to the wage earners of Great Britain. The statistics covered three cities, and I would compare them with three American cities. The cities of the United States that I take are New York, Chicago, and St. Louis, while the British cities are London, Glasgow, and Manchester. I think it is of great importance that, once for all, these questions are placed before the public in the light of the facts borne out by figures. If it is true—and it is true—that the wage-earners of the United States receive about 100 per cent more under high protective tariff than the wage-earners working in the same lines in Great Britain, it seems to me that the lesson is obvious.

——	New York.	Chicago.	St. Louis.	London.	Glasgow.	Manchester.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Blacksmiths	2 45	2 80½	2 26½	1 62½	1 48	1 40
Blacksmiths' helpers		1 69½	1 65		0 85½	0 93¼
Bricklayers	4 00	4 00	4 40	1 68¾	1 55½	1 84
Carpenters	3 49¼	2 54	2 80	1 68¾	1 55¼	1 50½
Compositors	3 14	2 00	2 91	1 54¾	1 68	1 42
Iron moulders		2 78¾	2 30	1 62½		1 51¼
Machinists	2 55		2 52½	1 54¼		1 46
Painters, house	3 50	2 61	2 50	1 48	1 38¼	1 40¼
Plumbers	3 72¾			1 74¼		
Pattern-makers						
Iron-workers			2 88½			1 58¼

Mr. Mosely confirms all these figures in these words at page seventy-six of his report.

My personal conclusion that the true-born American is a better conducted, better housed, better fed, better clothed and more energetic man than his British brother, and infinitely more sober. As a natural consequence, he is more capable of using his brains as well as his hands. Many of the men, however, holding leading positions, are either English or Scotch, and the American mostly is justly proud of his British descent. One of the principal reasons why the American workmen is better than the British is that he has received a better and sounder education, whereby he has been more thoroughly fitted for the struggles of after life, and I believe that my delegates were themselves immensely impressed by the general high standard of education in the United States, a standard which it would be well for our own nation to copy as practicable.

Then he says:—

How is it that the American manufacturer can afford to pay wages fifty per cent and one hundred per cent and even more in some instances above ours?

And he goes on:

That the American workman earns higher wages is beyond question. As a consequence the average married man owns the house he lives in, which not only gives him a stake in the country, but saves payment of rent, enabling him either to increase his savings or to purchase further comforts.

Food; I will deal with that point, because there are people who believe that the cost of living is cheaper in England than it is in

the United States. Here is what Mr. Mosely says :

Food is as cheap (if not cheaper) in the United States as in England, while general necessaries may, I think, be put on the same level.

The last contribution to this question of the comparative cost of living in the two countries is to be found in Professor Sobeck's statement, which has been published in the 'American Economist' of May 15. It is there shown clearly, as it is also shown in Mr. Mosely's report, that the cost of living of the American workingman is as cheap as is the cost of living of his English brother. Now, Sir, I have endeavoured to place before our people the situation in the United States and in England, because in preparing our fiscal policy we must have in mind these two countries chiefly. We cannot lose sight of any country in the world, because I hope we will grow big enough to trade with them all. But we are especially interested with the United States and with England, so far as our trade is concerned. The United States, as I have said, has become the leading exporting nation of the world. Mr. Mosely, who is a wide-awake man, has a large conception of the possibilities of the United States. He says :

The United States is advancing by leaps and bounds. She is beginning to feel the beneficial effects of the education of her masses, and an enormous territory teeming with natural resources as but yet meagrely developed. In the latter respect she has been more blessed, and her natural advantages are bound to make her not only the leading manufacturing country of the world (a position she may already be said to have attained), but must place her in the same position relatively that England herself occupied some fifty years ago. It is more than necessary that both capital and labour should bear this point well in mind. At the present time the home market of the United States is so fully occupied with its own developments that the export trade has as yet been comparatively little thought of; but as time goes on and the numerous factories that are being erected all over the country come into full bearing, America is bound to be the keenest competitor in the markets of the world. That already she has her eye on the export trade is plain to every one, except the wilfully blind; but at present she is only getting ready.

'She is only getting ready,' and still she is the leading export country in the world. I think Mr. Mosely is right, the United States, although they have progressed marvellously, are still, if I may say so, are still in their infancy. Mr. Hill made, a few months ago, the prophesy that before forty years are over the population of the United States will be 150,000,000. They have an immense accumulation of capital, and that accumulation has strengthened their home market. They have to-day a population of 80,000,000. These circumstances, the accumulation of capital, the perfection of their organization, and the home market that their manufactures have enjoyed in the past and are enjoying to-day, make it impossible for any man who has sense or reason to believe that we can possibly compete with them, unless we use the same weapons in dealing with them that they use in dealing with us. They have protected their agricultural as well as their manufacturing interests.

There is some question of reciprocity at the present time. Indeed, we have been told that one of the reasons why my hon. friends on the treasury benches have not grappled this year with the fiscal situation is that they expect the Joint High Commission will meet again. I do not like the way some of our public men are inviting the Americans to meet us again on that High Commission. I am sorry the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is not in his seat. I am going to quote an article from his pen which was published in the 'Outlook' of February 28, this year, and reproduced in the 'National Reciprocity Organ' of March, 1903.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is that organ published ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In Detroit. The hon. gentleman from Norfolk wrote as follows :—

The Canadian economic and political forces opposed to reciprocity are : the manufacturing interests, which have attained considerable development and stand resolutely for high protective duties against the United States and all other countries; the imperialistic sentiment, which sees in reciprocity a deadly foe to its scheme for a united empire and the destruction of colonial autonomy; the preferential trade policy, which looks for the enlargement of our British export trade through the application of preferential duties in favour of the colonies, and all the scattered elements, Tory in instinct and anti-Republican in conviction, which look upon the expansion of the power of the great republic as a menace to the divine rights of kings and all the safeguards of conservative stability.

In addition to these, the transportation interests centreing in the St. Lawrence route look upon reciprocity with suspicion, if not with hostility, fearing that more liberal trade arrangements will tend through the removal of custom restrictions, to draw trade to American canals and railways and to American seaports. Against these forces and influences we may set the lumberman, the mineworker and the fisherman, all of whom ardently desire reciprocity, and the farmer, whose views range from active desire down to passive realization that two markets must be better than one.

In Canada it is objected to reciprocity that it will lead to annexation to the United States. This objection would prove an argument in favour of the policy in the United States. Reciprocity thirty years ago would have been a working force in the direction of political union of the most powerful character.

No doubt it would have been.

Since then conditions have materially changed, and it is useless to speculate as to whether increased intimacy in trade relations, and the establishment of great mutual interests would have a commanding influence upon political relations. It may, however, be affirmed without the slightest hesitation that the continuance of the present trade relations between the two

countries will have a powerful and ever-increasing tendency to render political union impossible.

I hope it will be so for many, many years.

The time to attend to the reciprocity issue is now. The Liberal government now in power at Ottawa is favourable to the consummation of a reasonable treaty, and has the support of the Canadian House of Commons and Senate to secure its ratification. At the general election two or three years hence this government may be succeeded by a Conservative, high-protection government, and the failure to secure a reciprocity treaty before that time will go very far to secure the change. If this treaty should take place, all hope of securing a reciprocity treaty will be gone. The opportunity will have departed, and the evils of a tariff war will be intensified through the adoption by Canada of a policy as distinctly wide of good sense and recognition of true economic principles as the one with which the United States in her dealings with Canada for the last thirty years invited the scorn of future generations and economists.

Again, I say, I do not like that way of putting the question, of telling our United States friends that if we get along in our own way, if we paddle our own national canoe, if we try to build up a nation by a protective policy we will make it impossible for any political union to come into force. I say that is placing the issue upon bad grounds, on grounds that the people will repudiate with energy and I am sure that all men of both political parties will repudiate. Let us discuss that question upon its economical merits. Let us not induce people of the United States to believe that we have not fully made up our minds to build up a nation for ourselves. Instead of reciprocity with the United States, I think the feeling of this nation is to raise the fence against the United States. In saying that I am using the words used by a prominent Liberal of very great influence, the Hon. G. W. Ross, in my presence; who said: Let us raise the fence so that the cattle of our neighbour will not devastate our pasture. We have two markets. I see that my right hon. friend does not mean to raise the fence. Although he started his life, like myself, as a fence raiser, he does not like to do that any more. I was just saying that we have two natural markets. The English market is one of these natural markets. The English people are obliged to import a great deal of their food and a great deal of their raw material. Last year their imports reached the very large figure of $2,540,264,000. Their exports were $1,692,880,000. In food and drink products they imported £219,944,000. These imports are drawn from all parts of the world. Many members of parliament are familiar with that side of the case. Foreign nations contribute largely to the feeding of England. The United States, Russia, Germany and Holland, the Balkans, nearly all the nations of the world, are sending food and raw materials to the mother country. The agriculture of England has been going down hill as I have shown. The total area of England is 77,671,000 acres. The total area under cultivation is 47,800,000 acres. Statisticians calculate that if there were 28,000,000 more acres under cultivation, England could supply her own food in time of war. Unfortunately the arable lands have decreased for the last thirty years by 3,500,000 acres. I quite understand the policy of the right hon. Secretary of State for the colonies (Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain). Not only is he a political man, but he has been brought up in business and he is a wide awake man. He does not close his eyes to the fact that the national life of England is threatened because its agriculture is being destroyed. He does not fail to see that the industries of England are being assailed more and more, that England as far as her manufactured products are concerned is losing her grip on foreign markets in which she was supreme formerly. I understand this policy. It is a bold, an energetic, and let me say in my humble way, a true imperial policy. He wants to protect the English agriculturists and he wants to protect the English workingman. He wants to bind the empire by the bonds of common interest. We have an immense interest in his policy. I fully grant, and nobody can say otherwise, that the colonies cannot possibly supply England with everything that England requires. But the colonies can supply England with more products than we supply England with now. We could not buy from England everything that we are bound to buy, that we cannot produce, but we can certainly buy more from England than we do buy now.

In other words, England can have another policy and we can have another policy also. How many more millions could we buy from England of products that we buy to-day from foreign countries? I am not in a position to state now, but it would not take much time I imagine to figure it up.

We imported from the United States last year manufactured goods and other goods to the total amount of $129,794,147, and of these we imported for home consumption to the value of $114,774,696. We imported from Great Britain $49,022,726; we exported to Great Britain $109,347,345, and we exported to the United States $66,607,784. It must be borne in mind that most of our exports to the United States are composed of minerals and forest products. We therefore exported to the British market the greatest bulk of our home products, while the greatest bulk of our imports came from the United States. That state of affairs has no justification and has no common sense. I repeat that Mr. Chamberlain is right when he suggests that Great Britain should give a preference to the products of the British colonies. We have already

given a preference to Great Britain in certain manufactured articles. The mother country does not expect from us that we will open our markets to all manufactured products of English origin. What is to prevent us from raising our tariff as against all foreign countries that have high tariffs against us on articles that we can buy from the motherland ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Let us have a tariff against all the nations that decline to deal with us in a fair way, and let us have a preferential tariff in favour of England ; a moderate reasonable tariff in favour of England on all these articles that we cannot manufacture advantageously. That is a fair proposition.

My name has been mentioned in connection with an English seat in the Imperial House of Commons. My voice is a very feeble voice indeed, but I would like as a Canadian—as a French Canadian—I would like to make a campaign on this platform in the British Isles. In the press and elsewhere I have expressed an earnest desire to see more Canadians advocating a broad policy in the British parliament. I could not do justice to the case as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister could if he were to share the views I entertain. But, Sir, I feel in my bones and sinews that a Canadian could have some effect in advocating these great national principles on the other side of the ocean. All the nations of the world are raising tariff walls against us as they are against the British Empire. Germany, Russia, France, the United States, Austria, nearly all the nations of the world have a high tariff. What are we going to do ? We must sell our products somewhere. The British market is there. It is the largest market for the importation of the foodstuffs which we produce abundantly in Canada. We have the St. Lawrence as a great imperial carrier ; we have that marvellous channel for conveying the trade of the great west, both American and Canadian, to England. The St. Lawrence belongs to us as a nation. It seems to me that those circumstances make it a duty for us to give Mr. Chamberlain's suggestion our earnest consideration. We have nothing to surrender, far from it, we have much to gain. If England should give us a preference, it would not in my humble opinion increase the cost of living in England. A small preference scattered over a population of 40,000,000 would not injure England, and it would help the colonies to a very great extent indeed. It would help the agriculture of England also. I apprehend that Mr. Chamberlain has not in view the British colonies exclusively. He is looking to avert the destruction of the agriculture of his native land. He wants to protect the agricultural interests of England. But free trade has taken such a hold on the mind of most Englishmen, that he is obliged perhaps to use some of those circuitous arguments that are familiar to all politicians. Be that as it may, his policy would have the dual effect of helping England from an agricultural and industrial standpoint, and of helping the British colonies, and Canada more perhaps than any other. Our own home market is, of course, the most important for us, and I will deal with that aspect of the case at 8 o'clock.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

TORONTO AND HAMILTON RAILWAY.

On the Order,

House in committee on Bill (No. 147) to incorporate the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, after this Bill passed the Railway Committee, some of the rural municipalities that are interested considered that it interfered somewhat with their rights and liberties, and desired that it should stand for further consideration. So it has been mutually agreed to let the Bill stand until a week from Friday, and in the meantime discussion can be had on the Bill in the hope that concessions will be made that will be acceptable to all parties. I would, therefore, ask that the Bill be allowed to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the Order has been called, the regular proceeding will be to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. TALBOT moved that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Power Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

On section 11,

Mr. WADE. Since the clause you have just read, Mr. Chairman, was agreed to, it has come to the notice of the parties interested and to the committee that between the Chaudière and Deschêne there are the Remoux Rapids, which might technically be called a water power. It is not really a water power of any service, and it was agreed that this company should have the right to flood it out. I propose to add the words 'except the Remoux rapids' after the word 'river.'

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. BELCOURT moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BIRKETT. I would suggest that the Bill be reprinted before third reading, and I do not think Mr. Belcourt will object.

Mr. BELCOURT. The Bill has been agreed to by every body. It is the result of an agreement between the parties, and I do not see any reason for delay.

Mr. BARKER. I for one do not wish to put any obstruction in the way of this or any other Bill; but I do not think it is right that Bills should pass the House in this way. I believe that half a dozen members of the House outside of those who stood at the Table when the amendments were being made knew what was passing.

Mr. BELCOURT. The Bill was referred to a sub-committee of the Private Bills Committee and was discussed night after night for weeks. I think that the sub-committee had as many as half a dozen meetings, and that the Bill was very fully discussed. I do not see why the Bill could not be as easily understood as if it were printed. It is typewritten, and any hon. member can see it and understand it as well as if it were printed.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think the hon. member (Mr. Belcourt) has the right to ask that the Bill be passed now. It may be true that it was considered very fully by the sub-committee, but this very evening alterations have been made, and hon. members have not had the opportunity of knowing what they are. Therefore, I submit the Bill should be re-printed that hon. members may have an opportunity to see what it is before they are called upon to deal with it finally.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is only a private Bill after all, and there cannot be much in it that affects the public. And, so far as individuals are concerned in it, the committee have had all the private persons who could have any interest in it before them night after night. I do not believe there is a Bill before the House of a private character that has been so thoroughly considered as this one. The committee had expert witnesses from this city and also from Montreal, and the whole question was very carefully considered. The result that was reached was accepted, as I understand, by all the parties. So, I think we should unnecessarily delay the busines if we waited to have this Bill reprinted. As everybody has agreed to everything that is in the Bill, and as it does not concern the interest of the public, I do not see why it should not be read the third time now.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that the expression of a wish on the part of so many hon. members to have an opportunity to see and study the amendments that have been made is a good reason for leaving it over. For my part I have no objection to the Bill, but I take exception to the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) that Bills of this nature do not interest the public.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that. I do not wish to be understood that way. The point is that the interest of the public is exactly as it was in the original Bill.

Mr. MONK. That is a different matter; it is not what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) said. Of course, it is for those gentlemen who find it in their interest to take cognizance of the amendments made to express their wish, because it is only by unanimous consent that the Bill can take its last stage to-night.

Mr. BIRKETT. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) says is perfectly correct. The Bill was referred to a special committee of five, and that committee took every pains to learn all the facts in the case. But the Bill as amended has never gone back to the committee to be adopted, and has only come before the five or six members of the special committee. But the Bill as it is now in the hands of hon. members is entirely different from the Bill that was referred to the special committee. Therefore, I think it is due to hon. members of the House that the Bill should be printed, so that they may understand exactly what it is before the third reading is proposed.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The very important nature of this Bill is sufficient to make the request for delay a reasonable one. An ordinary railway Bill and many other private Bills do not so greatly affect the important public interest. The whole question of handling these water powers is one of the most important that we have to legislate about. This makes it all the more important that any amendments made in the Bill should be thoroughly understood by all the members in the House. I could not hear what was said to-night when the amendments were being discussed, and many hon. members must have been in the same position. Therefore, the request for delay of the third reading is quite reasonable. In any case, I think the delay will only facilitate the Bill, because a long discussion of it here will only draw attention to the matter in the other House. I do not think this Bill was considered by the whole Committee on Private Bills——

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, certainly.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It was considered by the special committee, reported and passed without consideration.

Mr. BELCOURT. No, it was reconsidered by the committee on the report of the sub-committee.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Then, why are these amendments made here to-night? If there are important amendments, as I understand there are——

Mr. WADE. There is only one technical amendment which is agreed to by all parties.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall this Bill be read the third time? Now?

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in the Bill, but I have always understood that the rule of the House was that when a private Bill was amended in committee it required the unanimous consent of the House before it could take another stage. If I am correct upon that point of order, I submit that this Bill cannot proceed further to-night. I say this in deference to the wishes of hon. members on this side who seem to be particularly interested in the Bill. I am not interested in it, and do not know the nature of it; but I do realize that the House has some rights, and, if we ignore these rights on this occasion, we shall be called upon to ignore them on other occasions.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the point of order raised by the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) is well taken. The Bill is reported from the Committee of the Whole with some amendments. And, that being so, it cannot be read the third time without the unanimous consent of the House. On Friday next.

Order allowed to stand.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that the House go into committee on Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Mr. ROBERT A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont). Mr. Speaker, I gave notice of an amendment that on the motion that Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, be referred to the Committee of the Whole House, I would move that the said Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, with instructions to add to the said Bill the following clause:

40. In the event of any subsidy, or subsidies, being granted to said company, they shall be subject to the condition that the company shall, as far as practicable, construct, equip and operate their line or lines of railway with railway supplies, structural iron and steel, rail fastenings and cement and rolling stock of Canadian manufacture whenever such railway supplies and rolling stock can be procured as cheaply and upon as good terms in Canada as elsewhere, having regard to quality and price among other things, and unless the Governor in Council shall approve of the same being procured elsewhere.

I am not quite sure that I have a right to refer to anything that took place in the committee. This motion was discussed very fully in the committee, and I do not intend now to take up the time of the House in a prolonged discussion upon it. My object in presenting this motion is to protect to a slight extent, if possible, our Canadian manufactures and to see that any subsidies which may possibly be granted to the Grand Trunk Pacific, be expended, so far as practicable, in the Dominion of Canada in the purchase of supplies of Canadian manufacture. I may be told that I have followed the clause adopted in the Subsidy Bill of the province of Ontario, and that it would be well if I did not press this motion, and that possibly the government, when they come down with a subsidy Bill, will insert a clause similar or to the same effect as this clause. Now, Mr. Speaker, my reason for pressing to have this clause inserted in the Bill incorporating the Grand Trunk Pacific is simply this: We send the Grand Trunk Pacific away from here with a charter to construct a line from the Atlantic to the Pacific, it is just possible that they may obtain subsidies from the different provinces of the Dominion. If, for instance, they obtained a subsidy from the province of British Columbia nothing we could put in a Subsidy Bill would in any way give us control of the expenditure of the money which the company obtained from British Columbia. I see no reason why we should not now insert a clause in the Act incorporating this company which shall compel them, so far as practicable, to expend any subsidies which they may obtain—I am not assuming that this government will give aid either in the shape of a cash bonus or in the way of guaranteeing bonds—but it is simply a precautionary measure so that in the event of any subsidy being granted, then the company shall purchase their supplies in Canada so far as practicable. It has been said that this is a subject to be dealt with when the Subsidy Bill comes down. I say in answer that we can only control subsidies which are granted by this House, we cannot in any way control subsidies which may come from the provinces, and I understand an application is now being made by the Grand Trunk Pacific for subsidies from the different provinces. In this clause I have followed very closely the clause in the Ontario statute, II Edward 7, chapter 25, which reads as follows:—

The subsidies hereby granted shall be subject to the condition that the companies to which the same are granted shall as far as practicable construct, equip and operate their lines of railway with railway supplies, structural iron and steel, rail fastenings and cement, and rolling stock of Canadian manufacture, whenever such railway supplies and rolling stock can be procured as cheaply and upon as good terms in Canada as elsewhere, having regard to quality and price among other things, and unless the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall approve of the same being procured elsewhere.

The clause which I suggest is practically that clause. Now, if you look at section 7 of the same Act you will find it provides as follows :—

No cash subsidy or land grant, granted at the present session of the legislature or heretofore or hereafter granted to any railway company by any Act of this legislature, shall be deemed to be earned, nor shall the same be paid, granted or conveyed, unless the rails, structural iron and steel, rail fastenings and cement used in the construction of the railway, or any part thereof hereafter constructed, to which such subsidy or land grant applies, shall have been manufactured in Ontario, provided that the rails, structural iron, steel, rail fastenings, and cement necessary for such construction were procurable in Ontario, or if not procurable in Ontario, then elsewhere in the Dominion of Canada, at a price not greater than the open market price in Great Britain or the United States of America.

Now, Sir, I think there is nothing unfair or unreasonable in attaching this clause to the present Bill. We are not compelling the Grand Trunk Pacific to purchase any of the articles which they may require in Canada, in the event of their not being able to obtain them on as good terms as elsewhere, having regard to quality and price. Now, I do not wish to say anything disparaging of the Grand Trunk Railway. I have been informed, perhaps wrongly, that the Grand Trunk Railway at present purchase large quantities of their supplies in foreign markets which I suppose can be procured in the Dominion of Canada. I do not know whether that is true, but I have been informed that is the case. Now, it seems to me that we should be of one opinion on this matter, that we should make an effort to see that this money, if any money is given by our own country, is not sent to a foreign country. I think we should do what we can, legitimately and without in any way injuring the enterprise, to encourage our own Canadian manufactures. There is another way possibly by which this result could be obtained and which I would be satisfied if the government adopted that is by amendment to the general Railway Act, by a clause similar to this, so that the same end might be accomplished. If the government adopt that course then I think probably it would cover all that is necessary. I do not want to be understood as being hostile in any way to the Grand Trunk Pacific. I am not going to enter into any discussion now as to the necessity of another transcontinental line, that is a matter which no doubt will come up at the proper time. But I say that in this way we can protect the manufactures of this country, we can keep the money, if any is granted to this enterprise, largely in our own country. I would therefore move that this Bill be referred back to the Railway Committtee for the purpose of having this clause inserted which I have just read.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Pringle).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lefurgey,
Angers,	Lennox,
Ball,	Léonard,
Bell,	Logan,
Bennett,	McCormick,
Birkett,	McGowan,
Blain,	McIntosh,
Borden (Halifax),	Monk,
Brock,	Morin,
Broder,	Northrup,
Bruce,	Osler,
Carscallen,	Pringle,
Clancy,	Puttee,
Clarke,	Reid (Grenville),
Cochrane,	Richardson,
Copp,	Roche (Marquette),
Culbert,	Sherritt,
Earle,	Simmons,
Fowler,	Smith (Wentworth),
Gilmour,	Sproule,
Gourley,	Talbot,
Hackett,	Tarte,
Henderson,	Taylor,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Thomson (Grey),
Johnston (Cardwell),	Tolton,
Kidd,	Vrooman,
Lancaster,	Wilmot—55.
LaRivière,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,	Macdonald,
Bazinet,	Mackie,
Beith,	MacKinnon,
Béland,	MacLaren
Belcourt,	(Huntingdon),
Bernier,	Macpherson,
Bickerdike,	McCarthy,
Bourbonnais,	McColl,
Brown,	McCool,
Bruneau,	McCreary,
Bureau,	McEwen,
Calvert,	McGugan,
Campbell,	McIsaac,
Carbonneau,	McLennan,
Champagne,	Madore,
Christie,	Malouin,
Cowan,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Davis,	Martineau,
Demers (Lévis),	Matheson,
Demers (St. John),	Mayrand,
Desjardins,	Meigs,
Douglas,	Mignault,
Dugas,	Monet,
Dyment,	Morrison,
Erb,	Mulock (Sir William),
Fielding,	Parmelee,
Fisher,	Paterson,
Fitzpatrick,	Préfontaine,
Fortier,	Proulx,
Fraser,	Reid (Restigouche),
Gauvreau,	Riley,
Geoffrion,	Roche (Halifax),
German,	Ross (Ontario),
Gibson,	Ross (Rimouski),
Girard,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Gould,	Rousseau,
Harwood,	Russell,
Heyd,	Schell,
Holmes,	Scott,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Stephens,
Hyman,	Stewart,
Kendall,	Sutherland (Essex),
Lang,	Sutherland (Oxford),

Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tisdale.
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Tobin.
Lavergne,	Tucker.
Law.	Turcot.
LeBlanc.	Turgeon.
Lemieux.	Wade.
Lewis.	Wilson.
Lovell.	Wright—102.
Loy.	

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) has not voted, and that the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Archambault) voted although he was not in the Chamber when the question was put.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) ; otherwise, I should have voted for the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Has the hon. member for Berthier heard the question which has been put ?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT (Berthier). Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. The name of the hon. member from Berthier should be struck from the list.

Mr. SPEAKER. He has declared that he was here when the question was put.

Amendment negatived, motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on the Bill.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—GOVERNMENT TARIFF POLICY.

House resumed debate on the motion of the Minister of Finance for the House to go into Committee of Supply and on the motion of Hon. Mr. Tarte in amendment thereto.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Mr. Speaker. The adoption and maintenance of a firmly protective tariff would in my opinion add to the wealth of the country and create a home market. Such a tariff would promote within a few years the manufacture of a large additional quantity of merchandise and products. Suppose, for instance, that instead of buying from foreign countries for a couple of millions dollars a year agricultural implements, we manufactured these ourselves. Suppose that, instead of importing a few hundred thousand dollars a year of boots and shoes that we manufacture these ourselves. Suppose, that, instead of importing wagons and carriages for a million and a half a year, we manufacture these ourselves, suppose, that if instead of importing between $20,000,000 and $25,000,000 worth of structural iron, &c., we manufacture that iron, or part of it ourselves, suppose, that, instead of importing cloth, cottons, woollen goods, beet-sugar, sugar of all kinds, furniture, for a few millions more we manufacture these ourselves. Is it not a fact that it would increase our population, that it would increase our wealth and that it would increase the volume of our home market ? I have just said a word about beet-sugar. This is essentially a farmers' industry. There, are in the United States, about forty of these beet-sugar manufactories. They are considered to be of very great advantage to the farming community. I am glad to say that we have already a few of these manufactories here. The government have received a memorandum on the necessity of giving additional protection to that industry. I hope that they will see their way clear to comply with the request that has been made to them. Last year we imported over $200,000,000 worth of goods. Would it not be possible to manufacture $25,000,000, or $30,0000,000, or $40,000,000 and within a few years $50,000,000 worth of these goods here ? I want to know why that should not be the case. And if it is possible, as I firmly believe it is, is it not beyond doubt that such an additional volume of production would necessarily bring about additional population and additional wealth to the country at large ? It would give a larger market to our farming community. Centres of activity, of trade, manufacturing centres, are a great benefit to the farming community. I live in the city of Montreal. I want to ask the representatives of the district of Montreal and in point of fact all the representatives of half the province of Quebec if the Montreal market is not the best market for Canadian farmers. I see them every day taking to that great market their products, their hay, their grain, their butter, their milk, their vegetables, their meat, their cattle and all things, that, when sold in the nearest market, bring the best prices. What is true of Montreal of course, is true of all the large centres, and of all the centres, and of all the centres of less importance. We must not disregard the foreign markets, but for our manufactures, for our agricultural community, for our working men the home market is the best. If we should double the home market, is it not beyond dispute that the country at large would benefit by that ? All the progressive nations of the world are giving the greatest attention to their home market. Russia has just decided that in future all her warships will be built at home. Since 1879 Germany has not voted a single subsidy to the German Lloyds Company, the Hamburg Company or any other country without making it a condition that the ships will be built in German yards.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). Great Britain does the same thing.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. So much glory for Great Britain. After all, our foreign market is England and that market is open to

us and to all the world, but almost every other market is closed against us. We were doing some business with Germany and I am sorry we have quarrelled with her, for she is a large importer of food stuffs. What has Germany done ? In the month of December last the Reichstag adopted a new tariff which nearly doubled the already high duties, especialy on farming products. Can you imagine that a duty on a bushel of wheat will be 58 cents and the duty on a barrel of flour $4.50 on the first of January next. These are prohibitive duties. The German elections which took place yesterday resulted in the party being retained in power that adopted this high tariff, although the Socialists gained fifteen seats. The United States are formidable competitors of ours in the English market, England is buying more from the United States than from any other country. Russia is becoming more and more a competitor of ours. Last year $10,000,000 worth of Siberian butter was sold in England. There may be some who believe that Russia is only half civilized, but if they look at the English Blue-books they will see that England is constantly increasing her imports from Russia. I cannot too strongly impress upon the government the necessity of giving their best attention to the importance of the home market to our workingmen, our agricultural community, our people at large. Transportation is an essential factor in this question. I believe there exists a strong feeling in Canada that no more railway subsidies should be voted by this parliament, on a large scale at any rate, but that our waterways, our harbours and our rivers should be given more attention by us than in the past. Let us make our waterways as perfect as they can be. The German government controls over 30,000 miles of railway, besides 8,000 miles of improved rivers and canals. What is the policy of Germany in respect to these ? They use their railways to give preferential rates to their manufacturers and farmers for export purposes. When they find that the United States or any other country is competing too keenly with German products, they use the German railways and the German canals to help their people. That is business, it is a national policy in a broad sense, I earnestly advise and urge on the Canadian government to give our canals and our waterways all the attention and consideration that can be given. The United States has improved their waterways and their harbours in a manner to help their commerce greatly. They have 20,000 vessels on the great lakes to-day carrying on trade between the east and the west, while Canada has comparatively few of these ships. The Americans have this magnificent fleet and splendid equipment, because they have imporved their waterways and their harbours and because they have made transportation by this means cheap, commodious and speedy. Let us educate our people. Perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture will be surprised to hear me paying him a compliment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Let me tell him that his department has done a great national work in educating our farming community to their trade. And if we have had a good deal of success in the English market with our cheese for example, it is to a large extent due to the education that has been given to our farming community. Let us make the life of the farmers comfortable, agreeable and pleasant. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) has administered his department with great success, he thinks. I will give him credit for what he has done ; but there is one thing which perhaps is worthy of his attention. I think the time has come when we should have a rural free delivery and a parcel post service. The United States government have inaugurated such a policy in the interest of their farming community. It was inaugurated a very short time ago. In 1899, congress voted for it the paltry sum of $15,000 ; in 1900 it voted $450,000 ; in 1901 it voted $1,750,000 ; and in 1902, the success of the rural postal service had proved to be such a blessing to the farming community that congress voted $8,000,000 for it, and there are to-day nearly 8,000,000 people served by it. It seems to me that such a policy would be a fit and proper encouragement to our farming community, as it would help them to reach more commodiously the home market.

I said at the opening of my remarks that the time is opportune for readjusting and revising the tariff. Let me say that in my humble opinion the time is pressing. There is to-day a lack of confidence in the country. That cannot be disputed, it is broadcast. One has only to go to banking institutions, to centres of trade, to boards of trade, to find out that there is a lack of confidence, that business is paralyzed. We have passed through a dangerous crisis. I ask my hon. friends on the treasury benches to tell me, what the crisis would have been if the prospects of the crop had not been good. I appeal to every busines man of this country, to answer the questions I am asking now. It proves, Sir, that our position is not sound, that we are not on a safe basis. Should we not have a definite and known policy ? Has not the time come for a clear-cut statement on the part of the government ? Inviting the country to wait and not saying why it should wait, is not a policy. If my hon. friends on the treasury benches do not believe in the wisdom of a higher tariff, let them say so, let them state their views. The country has a right to those views. When the government have stated their views, the country will know

what to do. I know that we are not all of one mind. On this side of the House men are not all of one mind. In the Liberal party outside of this parliament, people are not all of one mind. I know—I have said it already, and I say it again, because it is true—that there is a large section of the Liberal party who thoroughly believe that we should have a higher tariff. I have dozens of letters in my correspondence, I have memoranda of all kinds coming from strong Liberals, endorsing the views which I had the honour to state formerly, and which I state now. This is not a party question, and I do not wish to deal with it as a party question. Surely there are questions that are above ordinary party squabbles, and if the tariff question is not one of them, I do not know any question that can be. I say again if my hon. friends on the treasury benches believe that the country should not have a higher tariff, let them say so. If they believe that the country should have a higher tariff, why don't they say so ? If they think that it is necessary to hold an inquiry on the situation, I invite them to say so. It would inspire confidence to capital and to the country at large. There are men just as big as we are in other countries—in England, for instance—who are of opinion that an inquiry should be held. The right hon. Prime Minister of England is of that mind. The Secretary for the Colonies has made public his views on that important question. In England they are going to hold an inquiry. We know what is going on there. If the government of this country believe they must resort to the same policy, we would be only too glad to know it. But let us have a policy ; let us know what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I have not made this motion as a motion of want of confidence. I do share the views of a great many Liberals on the fiscal policy of the country. I know that the rules of the House make my motion a motion of want of confidence, and I suppose I must take the rules as they are, although in a democratic country like Canada, the rules should perhaps be interpreted in a more lenient way. In England they are coming to more lenient parliamentary manners. Ministers there are allowed to hold different views on broad national questions. I would be only too glad to have this motion voted on its merits. I know what party discipline is, what party exigencies are. I know right well that if many of my hon. friends on this side of the House were free to express their views, they would vote for the motion I am going to make. However, I say again, I do not make the motion in any unfriendly spirit. I make it because I am a firm believer in a protective fiscal policy for this country. I firmly believe that it is the only policy that can make us a nation. Holding these views, I beg, Sir, to move, seconded by Mr. Brock——

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Some hon. members say hear, hear. I am very glad of that interruption. It gives me the opportunity of saying why I have asked my hon. friend to be good enough to second my motion. The larger provinces of this Dominion have a common interest, the provinces of Ontario and Quebec more especially have a common interest in this question. They have both a great interest in working together in questions of this kind, which are above party politics. We should all be animated by the same interest, for in point of fact we are all equally interested. The North-west, the maritime provinces and British Columbia should work harmoniously with us. But the larger provinces are more intimately bound together, and that is one of the reasons why I have asked my hon. friend to second the motion, which reads as follows :—

This House desires to express the opinion that in order to assure the permanency and the further progress of the existing industries, as well as the creation of many new ones that only wait the proper policy to spring up ; to inspire greater confidence to Canadian, British and foreign capital ; to secure for the farmers now tilling our soil and those that we invite to share the blessing of our institutions and the wealth that Providence has placed at our disposal, the full advantages of a prosperous home market ; to comply with the legitimate desire of the working classes to see their labour rewarded by fair and uninterrupted wages and by comfort in their families ; to render impossible the slaughtering of our markets by the produce of foreign industries, of foreign combines, of foreign agriculture and of cheap labour countries ; to bring about a quicker development and a more rapid expansion of our vast resources ; to promote closer commercial relations between the different provinces of the Dominion and between this Dominion and the mother country ;

It is the bounden and imperative duty of the government to revise and readjust, without delay, the present tariff in such a manner as to leave no doubt as to the determination of the Canadian people to adopt and maintain a fiscal policy adequate and firmly protective of the large national interest at stake. And also to carry out an energetic transportation policy which will give to our merchandise and products of all kinds commodious, quick and cheap access to the markets of our country and to those of foreign nations trading with us.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to see a tariff like the one I have described in this motion in force in this country for at least ten years. I think that the results would be marvellous. I think that such a tariff would prove as successful as the high tariff in the United States, whose good lessons we should not lose sight of.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Centre Toronto). I do not think that it will be a surprise to any one in this House or country, Mr. Speaker, that I should second such a resolution as has been moved by the hon. member

for St. Mary's division of Montreal. In one portion of his remarks, my hon. friend turned to the government benches, from which he happily has emancipated himself or such a resolution as he has moved this evening would doubtless have had to be moved from this side of the House, and he asked hon. gentlemen on that side to keep an open mind on this question of protection and free trade. We know in this House how many open minds there are on the other side. Did we not last night see one of the hon. members opposite humiliated to the greatest degree by the hon. Finance Minister, who was then leading the House, insisting on his accepting the motion then made as a motion of want of confidence and voting it down.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. member is transgressing the rules of the House. He has no right to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. BROCK. I bow, Sir, to your decision, but when my hon. friend asked hon. members on his side to keep an open mind on this question, he was submitting to them a very difficult task, for we are all well aware how they are terrorized by the government and not allowed to vote as they think fit. They are not even allowed to vote as they pledged themselves to do and as they were elected to do by their constituents. On the contrary, they have to submit their independence to the dictation of the minister who insists upon taking as motions of want of confidence amendments which are not really so intended. My hon. friend who moved this resolution drew attention to the fact that we were passing through serious and troublous times. Had any one been told six months ago that, after several magnificent crops, this country could be so terribly agitated, as it has been during the last few weeks, by a financial crisis, he would have scouted the idea. But the fact remains that during the last few weeks we have passed a severe financial crisis, and the reason is not far to see. During the past seven years, we have been sending out of the country enormous sums which should have been kept at home. So long as we import enormous quantities of goods and send the money out of the country to pay for them, we will be always at the mercy of financial panics in this or in any country. At the present moment the eyes, not only of the Dominion, but of the whole empire are turned upon this parliament. During the past four or five years we have been occupying a most prominent place in the affairs of the empire, and never more so than at present. We are face to face with one of the greatest problems that can possibly engage the attention of any business community or country.

We have before us the various fiscal policies throughout the world which are being worked in such a way as to tell seriously against the great empire to which we belong. Less than a year ago, the great Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain), found that, after several years war, or dealing with rebellion, it was necessary that he should give his own personal attention to the affairs in South Africa. He visited that country; he travelled up and down the length and breadth of it; he spoke boldly to the people there as to what the interests of their country were and what their policy should be, many times speaking to hostile audiences; and he left that country practically peaceful. He returned to England, as another great Conservative statesman did many years ago, bringing back to the empire peace with honour. Then, with the prestige that he had gained through that successful trip, after he had been a short time in England, he visited his constituency and there made a speech which was intended not only for his constituents, not only for the inhabitants of Great Britain, but also for the people of the Greater Britain beyond the sea. He introduced a policy that almost meant a revolution as compared with any fiscal policy that they had ever had in England. Neither the government nor the opposition could be expected at once to agree with him. But when he returned to the great Prime Minister of England after having made these disturbing speeches, which were adverse to the policy the government had maintained, how was he received? Was he called a traitor; was he told that he had no business to make speeches of that kind without the authority of the premier or his government. No, Sir, but the great Prime Minister of England said: You are perfectly right, I agree with you; you are right to agitate this question, for it is a question that should be and must be discussed and discussed freely. And Mr. Chamberlain is still a member of that government. Did our Prime Minister so receive and so address his trusted colleague, one for whom he thought nothing was too good only a short time ago? I can hardly believe that of his own notion he could have taken the step he did in endeavouring to crush out that colleague, a man whom he had honoured and trusted. The influences about the Prime Minister must have been too strong for his own good sense and good judgment and sound political ideas.

One of the elements that will benefit most by the policy that has been brought before the House to-night is the element that some endeavour to turn against it—the element of labour. In almost every description of goods manufactured in Canada labour is the majority of value. Any protection that is given to manufacturers in this country is protection to labour, and an inducement to labour to come to Canada. Not only is it an inducement for labour to come, but it is a very great inducement for capital to be

invested here. Nothing is so sensitive as capital. Let it feel that it is in danger, and we are not likely to get it; and at the present time, capital is being sought for from one end of the Dominion to the other for the development of the resources of the country, and for that development we must be largely indebted to the capital we get from other countries. At the present moment, many of the manufacturing industries of this country are suffering. Nobody knows it better than the government. Representations have been made to them by the leading boards of trade and manufacturers' associations, and also by individual manufacturers in all parts of the country. There is hardly a manufacturing industry in this country at the present moment that is doing more than paying expenses.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BROCK. True, the government tell us that the factories are full of work. Many of them are full of work, but they are full of work that they are producing at a loss, in consequence of the great difficulty under which they suffer at the present moment. There is a want of labour. How can any large factory succeed running only three-quarters of its machinery instead of running it all? Influences are at work to prevent skilled labour coming to this country, and while that is the case manufacturers must suffer. Gentlemen in this House who are largely engaged in manufacturing are suffering at this moment for a want of labour. And labour will only go where it is better protected than it is in this country. The United States, which is more attractive to labour than any other country on earth to-day, is the country which enjoys the highest measure of protection. This is a question which we must approach from no sectional point of view. It is a question with which the prosperity of the whole Dominion is bound up. None need hope to turn to the farming community and ask them to combine against protection, because the farmers of this country are as largely interested as any other class—probably more than any other class, as they are the greatest producers—in advancing the cause of protection. It is quite possible to make a tariff arrangement that will protect all the industries as well as the mines and smelters and manufactures of all kind, and, at the same time, to protect labour, which protection will do more to build up this country than all the free trade that ever was given to any country in the world. Free trade, I repeat, offers no inducement to capital to come to the country, but offers every inducement for capital to leave it. The government having piled up a surplus of about $13,500,000, a large portion of which they derived from customs duties, fancy that this is an indication of a measure of success. I can assure them that every dollar that they got in that way came out of the pockets of the people. If we manufactured these goods upon which duty has been paid, we should not only have saved the duty, but should have retained the value of the labour and the value of the material put into these articles. When we have urged the government to give us a statement of their policy, I think that policy has been summed up in three words—'Not this year.' Now, if they think of raising the duty, it must be because they think it is desirable to do so. Then why not this year? If it is good to do at all, why not do it at once? If it is good, why not do it with courage? The present leader of the government, just before coming into power, stated that if he got the confidence of the country and crossed the floor of the House, he would surround himself with a body of business-men and give us a business administration. He has been in power for seven years, and for that time we have this cabinet of business men. And what has been the result? The result is that, after seven years of great prosperity, financial panic has overtaken some financiers, so that it almost seems as if it were going to sap the foundation of the business of the country; and all because, as I said before, the government adopted such a policy as has resulted in sending an enormous amount of money year after year out of the country to pay for foreign products.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution moved this evening by the hon. member for St. Mary's division, and the resolution moved by the leader of the opposition a few days ago, I contend, if acted upon, would lay the foundation for the future greatness of this country. The United States have adopted this policy, and are pursuing it with courage, they have adopted it in face of great opposition, and having persevered in it, the result is that to-day that country is the most prosperous on the face of the globe. I have before me a small cutting containing portions of a speech delivered by Senator Depew before the Springfield Board of Trade, in which he said:

> Because of the protective system the United States has the greatest home market, the mightiest productive power, the most marvellous internal exchange, the highest development of productive energy, the best scale of wages, the greatest comfort and happiness among the people, and the widest distribution of wealth of all the countries that had ever existed.

Sir, I would like this country to adopt the policy which has justified a statement of this kind, which I think cannot be controverted. I would like a policy of that kind adopted in this country, and holding that view, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion which has been placed before you this evening by the hon. member for St. Mary's division, Montreal.

Mr. J. D. REID (South Grenville). Before this motion is put to the vote, I would like to make a few remarks upon it. I have been in this House ever since the pre-

sent government attained to power, and have listened to the statements of the hon. the Minister of Finance, as to the prosperity of this country. In his budget speech for the present session he made these remarks:

I am far from saying that there are not exceptions to this, but I think it is not too much to say that, subject to some possible exception, the general condition, not only of the country at large, but of the manufacturing interests of Canada in the main, is highly prosperous. We know that all classes have prospered in Canada of late years, and it is an interesting fact that the manufacturers have shared in the largest degree in that prosperity, for they have held their home markets to a large extent.

I must say I was surprised when the hon. member——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. I was surprised when I heard the hon. member for St. Mary's this afternoon read out a list of the manufacturing industries of this country, some thirty-nine in number—and he said he had a long list of others too numerous to mention—that had sent deputations or petitions to the government asking for increased protection. Now if this be true, was it fair to the representatives of the people in this House that the Minister of Finance should tell us in his budget speech that the manufacturing industries——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Again I beg Mr. Speaker's pardon. Would it have been fair for the Minister of Finance to say that this country was so prosperous ? Now, Sir, the first industry that the hon. member for St. Mary's mentioned was that of iron and steel. That industry to-day is not in a prosperous condition. If it was in a prosperous condition it would not be knocking at the doors of the government for more protection. If these gentlemen are asking for more protection, it is not simply that they may make more money for themselves. I believe that if this industry is not better protected the workingmen engaged in it will be thrown out of employment, and will, therefore, be unable to earn the money necessary to keep themselves and their families from want. The gentlemen engaged in this industry are only asking for protection enough to enable them to pay their working men a liberal wage, a wage sufficient to enable them to keep their families honestly and decently as becomes Canadians. They are asking for a tariff that will enable them to raise a sufficient revenue to pay their shareholders, or to pay those who have honestly invested their money in that industry, a fair return. Is it unfair that they should make such a request ? The same way with all the other industries. The woollen industry in this country is in a bad shape. It is well known that they cannot make ends meet. What is the result ? These industries must decrease the wages of their employees or close down. What is the result ? Strikes ensue. The men are complaining that they do not receive as good wages as those on the other side of the line. The woollen manufacturers, the cotton manufacturers, the agricultural implement manufacturers and others, in asking for increased protection, are simply asking for enough to enable them to pay their men wages sufficient to keep them in this country. The agricultural implement manufacturers have now a protection of 20 per cent. The hon. member for St. Mary's explained to us this afternoon that the tariff on agricultural implements going into the United States is 45 per cent. Agricultural implements are sold in the United States to-day as cheaply, perhaps cheaper than they are in Canada, yet they have a 45 per cent protection. Now, I believe that if this government were to grant the same protection, 45 per cent, on agricultural implements to the sixty manufacturers of agricultural implements in this country—for that is the number the hon. member for St. Mary's mentioned—if the government would guarantee them that protection, there would be not a single cent of increase on the selling price of those implements over the price they are selling for to-day. The question might be raised, Why then would they want increased protection? Well, I say that if they had increased protection, a protection high enough to prevent agricultural implements coming into this country, of which $2,600,000 worth came in last year, these sixty Canadian manufacturers could turn out the $2,600,000 worth that are now imported, the result being that the increased output would decrease the cost to manufacturers, thus enabling them to pay higher wages to their men and at the same time make a profit for themselves. The same thing applies to the manufacture of boots and shoes. The boot and shoe manufacturers of this country have to compete against the importation of some half million dollars worth of boots and shoes. The labour employed in the manufacture of boots and shoes is all cheap labour and the poor people who are now employed in the manufacture of these articles are ground down to the very lowest notch simply because the manufacturers must either sell at the price at which American boots and shoes sell in this country or go out of business. I claim that when the manufacturers are knocking at the door of the government and seeking protection it is simply the labourers and the mechanics of this country who are knocking at the door and asking that they may be granted protection to enable them to provide for their families. I might go on and enumerate each one of the manufacturing industries in the same

way. Coming to the agriculturists, and it is an agricultural constituency that I represent, I ask myself the question: Why is it that we have to import from the United States over $1,000,000 worth of animals. We have the finest agricultural country in the world. Cannot we raise all the animals of every kind that we require? Yet, while the tariff is in the condition in which we find it now, people in parts of the United States are able to send over some of their cattle and to pay the duty and they do it more profitably than if they were obliged to pay the freight for the carriage of these animals to some other part of their own country to get a market. The same thing might be said about grain. Why, Sir, I see that we imported about $1,200,000 worth of grain from the United States. We import of barley $3,400 worth, beans $21,923, corn $286,993, oats $69,137, pease $15,426 and so on. I for one believe that sufficient protection should be placed on each of these articles to prohibit a dollar's worth of them being brought into this country. We imported from the United States $170,260 worth of eggs. We are exporting eggs from here to England and taking a much less price for them than our own home market would give. If we had sufficient protection to prevent them coming into this country from the United States the farmers would get a higher price for their eggs. We purchase from the United States $90,000 worth of apples and $121,634 worth of hay. Is there any other country in the world equal to this for raising hay? I claim that the very highest protection should be placed on every article that the farmers can produce so as to prevent one single dollar's worth of these articles coming into this country. I am satisfied that the labourer walking around the streets out of work, if the farmers want protection for food products, would be the first to hold up both hands and say: I will grant you all the protection you want in order that you may have this market because I know if you are granted protection I will be granted protection so that I will receive employment, and if I receive employment and have my money in my pocket to pay for everything I want I can afford to pay for the protection necessary to give you the home market. I listened to the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), when he made a statement that in 1876 the debt of this country was $21.54 per capita and that the debt of the United States was $45.66. We were in a 100 per cent better position then than the United States but the hon. gentleman tells us, after looking at the statistics, that, to-day, the United States per capita debt is $12.27, while ours is $49.97. We are to-day over 50 per cent worse off than we were in 1876, while the United States is four times better off. Does that show that we are in a prosperous condition. Does not that show that we are going from bad to worse? The hon. gentleman has also told us that in free trade England there are 3,000,000 acres of land less arable than there were some years ago. Does not the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) feel really ashamed——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, I say ashamed because of his action in regard to the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's? Does he not think it was very unkind of him to dismiss the hon. gentleman from his position in view of the attitude of the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain has taken? I am always pleased that the right hon. gentleman takes his precedents from England, and in this case I believe if Mr. Chamberlain had made his speech a year ago the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, would be enjoying the confidence of the right hon. leader of the government to-day, because, I believe, that the hon. gentleman—at least we felt it at the time—was one of the men who exerted a very strong influence in making the change of government which resulted in putting the right hon. gentleman in the position which he occupies to-day. However, I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman has had the pluck to stand by his convictions and I appeal to the country to support him because I believe in the end the country will support the proposition he is now advocating. The hon. gentleman stated that protection brings money into the country. There is no question about that. At the present time we are importing $200,000,000 worth of goods. The hon. gentleman asked if we could not now, or very soon, manufacture $30,000,000 worth of those goods and prevent them from coming into this country. When the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was making his speech in reply to the budget he gave a list of the articles that were brought into this country that could be just as easily made to-day as at any future time. And he pointed out that if these articles were made in the country it would obviate the necessity of importing some $32,000,000 worth. If that be so is it not right that the importation of these goods should be stopped? If the government will only protect the agriculturists of this country, the labourers and the mechanics in their industry we might then hope to be on a par with the United States. To-day the United States is the cheapest country in the world to live in, while at the same time it is one of the most highly protective. In each and every store in Ottawa you can find all kinds of American goods. I appeal to the government to grant the protection that will prevent these goods coming into the country. I appeal to them on behalf of my constituents and especially on behalf of the farmers for the highest protection that can

be granted on everything that our farmers raise. I also appeal on behalf of the labouring men and mechanics of my county that protection be granted to all manufactured goods, so that the manufacturers may enjoy prosperity and be able to give employment to British subjects.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria). Were it not that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have endeavoured to show that the farmers of Canada are not in favour of the protective policy advocated by the Conservative party, I should not have risen to address the House to-night. After the last election in North Ontario the Liberals tried to make out that that election was won by them because the farmers had pronounced against protection. Some of these hon. gentlemen had even the hardihood to advance that same argument in the House. Let me compare the result in the last by-election in North Ontario with the result in the by-election a few years ago when Mr. McLeod defeated the sitting Liberal member, Mr. Duncan Graham, and that comparison will illustrate the actual condition of affairs. In the large agricultural township of Brock, the Hon. Geo. E. Foster polled 592 votes as against 581 polled by Mr. McLeod in that previous election and 336 polled by Mr. Grant in the last election and 437 polled by Mr. Duncan Graham. I refer now to the two by-elections which were engineered by the Minister of Labour or the Postmaster General or in whatever capacity he went to the riding. In the recent by-election the village of Cannington polled 115 votes for Mr. Foster, while it polled 138 for Mr. Angus McLeod in 1897, Mr. Grant's vote being increased from 104 for Mr. Graham to 157. I will not enter into an explanation as to the change of votes in that village where there are hardly any farmers, but that explanation will be given in the proper time and place. The fine agricultural township of Scott gave Mr. Foster a majority of seven while in the by-election that Mr. McLeod ran in, it gave the Liberal candidate a majority of twenty-one. In the agricultural township of Scott the Liberal-Conservatives gained in the last election. In the township of Thorah which adjoins Beaverton and along which there are some government works, the Conservative majority fell off, and that was the only agricultural part of the riding where it did fall off. Beaverton gave Mr. Foster only ninety-six votes, whereas is gave Mr. McLeod 108 votes, and Mr. Grant received ninety-nine as against seventy for Mr. Graham. The agricultural township of Mara polled 190 votes for Mr. Foster and only 172 for Mr. McLeod in the previous election. There again we find that in an agricultural township the farmers increased their votes for protection. When we come to the township of Rama where are situated the wood alcohol works of the company with which the government is associated, Mr. Foster polled eighty-one votes as against 118 for Mr. McLeod, showing a large falling off. In as much as the Liberals have gone around the country saying that this was a vote against protection I will quote from a few speeches delivered to the horny-handed sons of toil on that occasion as reported in the 'Globe' of March 3. Mr. Wm. Thompson, a manufacturer at Longford and Orillia, a very esteemed young gentleman said :

> The Standard Chemical Works employ twice the men they informed the government they would employ at the time the government agreed to assist the company in the disposal of a portion of their output. He explained how the money of the company is distributed through the district for wood, teaming, and wages.

That had nothing to do with the money distributed in the election.

> During the last year there had been more mortgages paid off in Muskoka than in any previous year.

That is no doubt due to the fact that the government pays an enormous price for this wood alcohol which is sold in the United States at a far cheaper rate, and which should be sold in Canada cheaper than ever before, because of the market that has grown up for the by-products of wood alcohol. As to the teams employed by this company, forty or fifty of them turned out to draw votes for the Liberal candidate, all of which was paid for by the people of the Dominion in the extra price which the government gives for this wood alcohol. Then we find Mr. Tudhope, a member of the local house, a very estimable gentleman, speaking thus :

> In answer to the suggestion that had been made, that he was supporting the Liberal government because the government had increased the duty on buggies to 35 per cent, Mr. Tudhope explained that that duty is now really $17.50 as against $25 under the national policy. Deducting the duty on the raw material assembled by the carriage-builder, his protection really came to only 7 per cent or 8 per cent.

And yet this gentleman has grown rich by the sale of his buggies to the farmers of the Dominion of Canada, under a protection to the tune of thirty-five per cent. Mr. Tudhope's father was an honest and industrious carriage maker in the town of Orillia, and he grew rich under the national policy by selling wagons and buggies to the farmers of the counties of Simcoe and Ontario. He was a good Conservative, but his son deserted the Liberal Conservative cause, owing to the wily influence of some member of the Liberal party in inducing him to make a deal for the supply of wood alcohol to the Dominion government, and Mr. Tudhope stumped the country and used his influence on behalf of the Liberal candidate. And then these gentlemen boast that the solid farmer vote of North Ontario defeated Mr. Foster. Then we come to a speech de-

livered on that occasion by Mr. Peuchen, who said :

He wanted a little help and went to Ottawa, thinking that as an old Conservative he would have little difficulty in his lobbying. He found it impossible to even see several of the ministers on whom he called, and he came away quite disheartened. After the change of government he went down again. He had no difficulty in seeing the ministers, received a fair and businesslike hearing, and he found that when the ministers were shown a reasonable proposition, and one that was likely to be a benefit to the country——

——and I presume incidentally to the gentleman concerned——

—they would assist it. Assistance was promised him, and the result was the establishment of his business in five Canadian towns, and the expenditure of several millions of dollars. He did not know that the industry would have been started if there had not been a change of government.

All these speeches, you will notice, are appeals to the horny-handed sons of toil. On that occasion the Postmaster General, the Minister of Labour, Sir William Mulock, was present, and he appealed to the farmers. Did he point out where they were ground down under the iron heel of any monopoly Did he show where one cent was unfairly taken from them, directly or indirectly by the manufacturers ? No; but he quoted a little doggerel poetry. He appealed to the lower element of his hearers, and this was his appeal :

Lives of farmers all remind us
We must work at every chance,
And in working get behind us
Bigger patches on our pants.

I may tell my hon. friend that he never was a farmer. In the old days in Bowmanville, near which town I had the privilege of growing up, in a good old Grit riding, there was an old agricultural implement manufacturer named Porter; my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) will know him very well. When a farmer came into his store to buy a set of harrows or a plough, the old gentleman would commence showing him beneath the implement in order to get the farmer to stoop. If he found the farmer's trousers worn out in front and not behind, the farmer was trusted for the implement. I want to tell my hon. friend the Postmaster General that he never was a farmer, otherwise he would not have insulted the intelligence of the farmers of that locality by telling them that any respectable farmer would have his trousers worn out behind. They are worn out in front. But the hon. Postmaster General did not complete the poetry. The next stanza went thus :

But if William swells the taxes,
As he is inclined to do,
The farmers soon will have no clothing
For to sew the patches to.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

Then the 'Globe' report concludes :

Mr. Grant, on rising to address the meeting, was given a welcome that was both flattering and encouraging. He gave a pathetic account of his tribulation in reaching the meeting, concluding a twenty-mile drive with a lame horse and a driver who did not know the road.

When I read that, I said to myself, what will the poor fellow do when he gets down to Ottawa and has to follow a horse much more broken up than that poor animal, and over roads very much more devious than the roads around the good old township of Rama. Not only were these speeches delivered by the Postmaster General, the genial Minister of Customs, and other ministers and speakers who came into the riding, but we find that at Bracebridge, in the presence of the Postmaster General himself, the electors were appealed to to vote for the Liberal candidate because they were going to get a wharf and a new post office. Captain Sullivan, I think, was not in the riding at that time, but there was an army of Ontario government officials there; and one of them, a very decent old gentleman, Mr. Christie, went through the township of Morrison, where the farmers who had taken up homesteads, and who found pine trees lying on the ground, were accustomed to cut them into cordwood to provide bread and butter for themselves and their families, to keep the patches off, and to give their children an education; and this man Christie and others told these farmers that these logs belonged to timber limits which were under license from the Ontario government, and that they would be charged so many cents per cord for the wood unless they voted for the Liberal candidate. These were the kind of appeals made throughout the length and breadth of that riding ; and I regret to say that the Postmaster General so far forgot himself as to ridicule the personal appearance of the Hon. Mr. Foster, saying that this long, lean, narrow candidate very much resembled in appearance the county of Ontario, and adding that Mr. Foster had had something to do with building that county. I want to tell the hon. Postmaster General that when he was in swaddling clothes the county of Ontario was made its present width. It is an old municipally established county, and it has been the same width for many years. And so far as the appearance of my hon. friend, the Postmaster General and the hon. George E. Foster are concerned, just tack Lake Simcoe on to the county, and I do not know but that the water would represent the Postmaster General and the solid land the Hon. Mr. Foster. I do not know that there is much difference—nothing but a little extra wind and water would constitute the difference.

We found another appeal to the farmers made along the line of imperial penny postage, and while I give my hon. friend the

Postmaster General credit for his conduct in that connection, in all fairness let us not forget the man who fought that issue for years before the Postmaster General was in public life, who visited Canada, New Zealand, Australia and every British colony, and paid his own expenses in order to educate the people of the empire into the spirit of penny postage. I refer to Mr. Henniker Heaton, of England, the father of penny postage. In the name of all that is fair, let the hon. the Postmaster General give credit to the man who expended years of labour and paid out his own dollars and cents in order to cultivate the imperial spirit and place the policy of imperial penny postage in such a position that when the Postmaster General had the opportunity of dealing with it, he found the seed well sown and the ground well tilled for the operation. We found also another appeal made to the horny-handed sons of toil along the line of the preferential tariff, although but a very short time before they had been in the same riding pushing the doctrine of free trade with the United States.

Then another appeared on the scene—a gentleman whose voice formerly rang throughout these halls—to the great edification of himself, at all events, if not to the general public and his friends. His friends showed their appreciation of him to such an extent that when they got into power they would not give him a job. I refer to the present Senator McMullen. He appeared on the scene, and although he is the same man who made the welkin ring with his advocacy of free trade between Canada and the United States, he appealed to the electors on an entirely different ground. Speaking of the question of reciprocity, he said he would not move one step to secure reciprocity with the United States, if it would interfere with the advantageous position of our products in England, in this he was adopting the policy which the old Conservative party had advocated for many years. He said further that he hoped that in any negotiations with the United States on trade questions, our government would insist on receiving dollar for dollar. With regard to the sending of their troops to South Africa he said :

> The government had acted wisely in communicating with the imperial government and fully maturing their plans before despatching the troops. He made an eloquent reference to the work of the Canadian contingent in South Africa and then went on to say that the present government had made progress in the reform of the Senate.

How any man pretending to possess that spirit of a statesman could stand before an audience and use the argument the hon. gentleman did, surpasses my comprehension.

> The present government have made progress in the reform of the Senate. There has not been a single instance where a Senator died, in which the government have not appointed a better man in his place. Mr. Foster, in his criticism of the government for not having reformed the Senate, meant that that body should have been brought into closer relations with the people, but what was the use of attempting anything of the kind until they had a majority in the Senate to carry it.

Well, they have a majority there now, and Senator McMullen is as dumb as an oyster and draws his $1,500 per year without a murmur.

These hon. gentlemen also refer on every possible occasion to that very aristocratic body known as the nest of traitors, and are not at all chary in their use of private slander. Then we have the gentleman from West Huron appearing on the scene, and he dilated at length on that advantage to the farmers of the Liberal policy on binder twine. He told them that the government had removed the duty, but he did not tell them that it had doubled the price. These are the lines on which he appealed to the farmers throughout the length and breadth of that riding. From Rama he went into Morrison, where these timber agents got in their work. I must say that Mr. Christie is a decent old gentleman, but he has to do the party's work, as he frankly admits, or lose his position. The vote there was brought down. It was ninety-five for McLeod and seventy-three for Foster. In Bracebridge town, Mr. Foster polled the largest Conservate vote ever polled there, 281 as against 244 for McLeod in 1897, and 278 for McLeod in 1900, although Mr. Foster had to meet the most popular man that ever resided in Bracebridge. Mr. Grant polled 259 votes in his contest with Mr. Foster, as against 113 votes polled for the Liberal candidate in 1897 and 114 in 1900. The cause of the largely increased vote in Bracebridge is to be found in the fact that the industries of that town employ a large amount of labour. Some of the recent industries employ a large number of French Canadian countrymen, and it was not Mr. Grant nor Sir William Mulock nor the hon. Mr. Paterson, but it was Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It was vote for Sir Wilfrid——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And we do not blame them. Next to voting for Mr. Foster, I do not know that they could have done amiss in voting as they did, but that accounts for the large vote polled by Mr. Grant in Bracebridge, although he still fell short of the vote given to Mr. Foster by twenty-four. In Macauley township, Mr. Foster polled eighty-four against fifty-four in favour of Mr. McLeod on one occasion, and a hundred on another, and Macauley is entirely an agricultural township. In Draper township, Mr. Foster rolled up 106 as against 117 polled by Mr. McLeod in 1900 and seventy-eight by Mr. McGillivray in 1896. In McLean township, Mr. Foster got

sixty-five votes as compared with sixty-eight for McLeod in 1897. In Ridout, Mr. Foster got a majority of eleven as against twenty-four given Mr. Graham in a former election. In Oakley, Mr. Grant had a majority of five against what was formerly fifteen. In Ryde, there was a Liberal majority of four against a former Conservative majority, and there and elsewhere these gentlemen had the Langford Lumber Company and the Standard Chemical Works canvassing for them. Every solitary farmer increased the Conservative majority, and the Liberals had their gains entirely where the lumber agents had influence, and the Standard Chemical Company operated. Having briefly endeavoured to remove the illusion which these gentlemen have endeavoured to place before the people of Ontario with regard to the defeat of Mr. Foster, I might go on to point out other results, but I will reserve that for another occasion, under different auspieces. This will prove some of the ways which our friends the enemy sometimes resort to, but at present I shall content myself with pointing out that the farming community of North Ontario was never so solid in an election as in the recent election in that riding.

Now, we are told: It is all very well to talk of protecting the manufacturer or the workingman, but what interest has the farmer in protection? The farmers have two interests in protection—they have the direct interest of shutting out the surplus products of the United States, and the indirect interest of building up manufacturing industries and so increasing the population of towns which furnish a home market for the products of the farm. Let me point out briefly how the farmer is handicapped in the trade between Canada and the United States. When a Canadian ships a horse into the United States he has to pay a duty of $20 or, if the animal is worth over $150, he has to pay 25 per cent of its value whereas, American horses are sent into Canada in droves, reducing the price of our horses in the North-west and along the border generally, and pay only 20 per cent duty. Cattle coming into Canada from the United States pay 20 per cent duty, whereas cattle going from Canada into the United States, if less than one year, pay $2, and if worth no more than $14, they pay $3.75, and if worth more, they pay 27½ per cent. And I remember that our genial friend the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), who has disappeared from his place, a few years ago, coolly stood up in this House and took credit to himself and the government for securing the removal of the quarantine on cattle going into the United States. I happen to come from a district in which there are a number of cattle dealers. One of these gentlemen was a large shipper to Buffalo. When the quarantine was removed from Canadian cattle, a few years ago, and our cattle were allowed to go into the United States for the time being, I consulted this young gentleman on the matter, and he wrote to shippers in Buffalo and New York, and received the following communications which he allowed me to have:

East Buffalo, N.Y., October, 1900.

Friend Brandon,—Yours at hand and note all you say. The matter was taken up at East Buffalo, and we interested Mr. J. W. Wadsworth, who started the matter at Washington. I will write you more fully in a couple of days.

Yours truly,

(Sgd) JNO. HUGHES,

Of the firm of Swope, Hughes, Waltz and Benstead, live stock commission merchants, Cleveland, Ohio; cattle, hogs and sheep, East Buffalo, N.Y.

East Buffalo, N.Y., October 20, 1900.

Friend Brandon,—In regard to removal of quarantine on cattle, it originated at East Buffalo. The meeting was in our office. A committee was appointed to see Col. Morgan, the collector at this port. The committee was John Hughes, Hiram Waltz, Geo. Matheson, Burt Whaley and one or two others. We talked the matter over with him; got advice from him. We then wrote to the Bureau of Animal Industry explaining the whole thing to them, showed them we needed the cattle. Mr. J. W. Wadsworth, member of Congress, took hold of the matter and we finally got the quarantine off. On the books of the association is a resolution thanking the committee for the good work done.

(Sgd) JOHN HUGHES.

And yet, Sir, the Minister of Agriculture had the nerve to stand up in this House and claim that he was the gentleman who had had the quarantine removed.

Now, we talk in generalities, but hon. gentlemen on the other side will say: How can you benefit the Canadian farmer by increasing protection? In answer, I would point out that last year alone, according to the official returns of this government, we imported of farm products, every dollar's worth of which could have been produced by the farmers of Canada, upwards of $15,000,000 worth from the United States. If we figure that out on the basis of 500,000 Canadian families in our agricultural population, you will find that it amounts to about $30 a head for every farmer of the Dominion. Let me give these figures a little more in detail. At page 645 of the Returns of the Department of Trade and Commerce, we find that horses, horned cattle, sheep, hogs and other animals to the value of $1,124,874 worth were imported from the United States. At page 646, we find there were biscuits, and breadstuffs to the value of $332,247, all of which came in competition with the food products raised by our Canadian farmers. We find—same page—that $7,917,883 worth of barley, beans, Indian corn, oats, pease, rye, wheat and other grains were imported in competition with the Canadian farmers' product. On

the same page, you will find that of wheat flours and other flours $413,741 worth was imported from the United States. Leaving out the hay that was imported—$121,000 worth—leaving out the flax and other imports from the United States, turn to page 659, and you will find that of butter, cheese, eggs, lard, bacon and hams, beef, salted in barrels, dried and smoked canned meats, and pork, there came in from the United States $2,462,865 worth in competition with our Canadian meats. Figure that up and you will find it amounts to several dollars a head out of the pockets of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada. Passing on to page 662, we find that of Indian corn and other similar commodities which come in direct competition with the farmers of Canada there was imported free of duty $2,486,006 worth. And these sums total $15,000,000 of food products—not oranges, nor other odds and ends that are generally classed as agricultural products, but articles every dollar's worth of which could have been raised—similar products are raised—by the farmers throughout the length and breadth of Canada. Yet, in the face of such figures, the question is asked what benefit protection can be to the farmers of this country? But, hon. gentlemen opposite say: We have the great market of the 70,000,000 to the south of us, and see what an advantage that is to us. Well, take the returns of last year, and see what the Canadian farmer sold in the United States markets. Of cattle there was about $1,000,000 worth. And, if you look up the number of cattle, you will find that they were worth about $10 a head, that is, they were cattle that should have been kept in our own stables, fattened and sent to the old country. Of horses $282,000 worth were shipped to the United States; sheep, upwards of $1,000,000; other animals, $69,000. Then, of beans, butter, cheese, eggs, wool, hair, hides, meat extracts, bologna sausage—even this classed as a farm product—meat products not elsewhere specified, barley, oats, pea meal, wheat flour, vegetable fibres—upwards of $300,000 of these—fruits preserved, fruits not elsewhere specified, tobacco, beans and peas, potatoes and vegetables, we find a total of less than $7,000,000 that the farmers of the Dominion of Canada sold to the United States. Why? Because when our farmer ships his stuff to the United States he is met by a prohibitive duty, but when the United States farmer ships his stuff to Canada he finds a very low tariff wall to climb over. When you figure up that Canada, in addition to the $15,000,000 worth of farm products I have pointed out, imports dutiable goods worth $67,000,000, or within a few hundred dollars of it, and of free goods $60,000,000 worth more, and that millions of these might as well be manufactured in Canada, giving employment to Canadian farmers' sons and daughters, that Canadian farmers might produce the food products that the people who manufacture these goods would consume, that Canadian railways would have the carriage of these materials and that Canadian industries generally would be benefited, why, then, Sir, comes in the indirect benefit to the farmers of Canada. I cannot see how any man can stand up before a farming audience and say that the farmers of Canada are not benefited by protection. The fact that the farmers are benefited by protection is proved by the increased value of farm property wherever manufactures exist. It is also proved by the increased value of farm labour. Take for instance the United States. In a work contrasting the prices paid for wages throughout the length and breadth of the United States, I quote, on page 45, the following:

> In the states and territories paying farm wage rates higher than the average for the United States, the average rate of wages for farm labour by the month with board appears to as $15.85, and 12·3 per cent of the population ten years old and over were engaged in manufacturing, 7·8 in trade and transportation, and 14·6 in agriculture; while in the states paying a rate of farm wages below the average for the United States, the average rate is shown as $9.80, and the persons engaged in manufacturing are 5·4 per cent of the population ten years of age and over, the persons engaged in trade and transportation 4·2 per cent, and the persons engaged in agriculture 28·6 per cent.

There we find a difference in the wages of farm labour as between $15.85 in manufacturing districts and $9.80 as the average elsewhere. Why, Sir, you cannot get today a hired man in the Dominion of Canada to work for $9.80 and his board, and yet these are the wages paid in the outlying farm districts in the United States. But when you come near the manufacturing centres you find that the wages of farm labourers increase, because those who employ them are able to pay better prices for the reason that they are getting better returns from the sale of their farm products.

Since the advent of my right hon. friend the First Minister and his colleagues to office, we find that they have to give up their old fads of continental free trade, unrestricted reciprocity and all those things—I use to know them by heart in days gone by—free trade as they have it in England, and everything else; they have had to give these up because they found that the sound heart of this country would not tolerate any tinkering or any trifling to any extent with the good old national policy established by the late Sir John A. Macdonald. We find, now that these hon. gentlemen are in power, that the men who have money to invest, not only Canadian but men from foreign lands who desire to invest money in Canada, are not afraid to do so, because they know that the gentlemen on the treasury benches dare not tinker with the tariff to any extent, and they know

that the gentlemen on this side of the House would not permit them to do so if they were inclined. In other words, in place of finding as they did when the Conservative party were in power, a party loyal to Canada, and an opposition namely, the gentlemen now occupying the treasury benches, seeking every means to discredit the industries of Canada and to inspire capital with fear, making men cautious about investing their money in this country--in place I say, of finding that condition of affairs, the investor, the manufacturer, the gentlemen who wished to take part in the upbuilding of Canada, find a party on the one side who dare not tinker with the tariff, and a party on the other side that is loyal to the core in holding to protection to legitimate industries. Consequently many Canadian, British and American investors in Canada have prospered in spite of hon. gentlemen opposite. We find our American cousins, who would be only too pleased to ship, and who could ship, their agricultural implements into the great Canadian Northwest as cheaply as we can ship them from here, we find them issuing their calenders with a little British sailor boy at the top, holding the British flag and saying, 'I am British too.' We find the Deering Manufacturing Company of Chicago establishing their industries in the Dominion of Canada, they are coming in under the old British flag, and that little Yankee boy, I trust, will grow up under the Union Jack, and it will not be many years before he is a full grown man. We find the McCormicks coming in, the American steel industries coming in, and manufacturers of every description coming in, because they know that the men on this side are loyal to the policy that has built up Canada while gentlemen on the other side have been disloyal.

Now I could go on and point out that we have something else to do besides putting on a little protection on garden stuff—but I will not treat that question, because I see our hon. friend opposite who is so interested in it is asleep. There are other aspects of the great question of upbuilding Canada, and one of them is the international development of our own country. We have our waterways, we have our railways, we have our seaboards on both oceans to look after. But the development of these waterways contributes but a small portion of the protective system of the Dominion of Canada. Our friends opposite who oppose protection to the farmers and protection to the manufacturers, will not hesitate, our good friends from the prairies will not hesitate, to endorse a policy that will upbuild their country by grants of public money from the Dominion treasury, because I maintain that the western farmers get an indirect benefit and an incidental protection from protection to the manufacturers. I have referred to our internal development, but we should not end there, we should go in for external development, and build up our magnificent seaports, Montreal, Quebec, St. John, Halifax, Sydney, Cape Breton, Canso, Country Harbour—I do not see the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) here, but all those magnificent harbours are there, and I maintain it is the duty of the Dominion of Canada and the people of the localities interested, to see that these places take their proper position. Let me point out that the Atlantic seaboard is not the only one to look after. We have on the Pacific ocean innumerable and magnificent harbours, and a long coast line. I want to point out further that our American friends are wide-awake, and they see looming up before them a great prospective trade in the west as well as in the east. They see on the far side of the Pacific the Philippine Islands, Japan, China and all that great coast of Asia, they see also the East Indian Islands, all which will form a great market for their manufactures. The Philippine Islands alone last year imported $60,000,000 worth of products from the United States ; Japan and China imported $100,000,000 worth last year from the United States. When we consider the great coast line, our ships can easily find access to almost any part of those Islands. Sir, we find the great waterways of China being opened up and going for thousands of miles into the interior of the country. Then, it is not too bright a picture for we Canadians to draw when we say that at some time in the near future Canadian ships, and Canadian seamen will carry the goods of this country into these distant markets. They import to-day large quantities of flour, wheat, lumber, iron and manufactures of iron, implements, &c., and other manufactures generally. We find sailing from the port of San Francisco, Portland and the Puget Sound ports of Seattle and Tacoma, 361 grain vessels last year alone carrying $27,722,000 worth of wheat raised on the Pacific slope and we find that there was a total of $36,000,000 worth of grain shipped from the western coast of the United States alone. I want to point out to the right hon. leader of the government and to others that the portion of western Canada accessible to the Pacific slope has wheat fields as far ahead of the wheat fields of the western states as sunlight is ahead of moonlight. When the industries and seaports on the western coast of British Columbia are established and proper shipping facilities on that coast are available, I believe there is no limit to the future development in connection with the wheat fields of the great west. Edmonton alone stands in the centre of a wheat belt with a greater area of arable land than you will find in the whole province of Ontario. Go where you will in any direction from the town of Edmonton, north, south, east or west for 150 miles and you will

find magnificent farming land. Away to the north-west you can go for 400 miles and you will still find magnificent farming land 200 or 300 miles from the Pacific ocean as soon as the railways are opened up. Then, why should we not take hold and build up this young nation ? Why should we hesitate ? Why should we be tinkering and quarrelling about little questions like market gardens ? Why should not we be upbuilding our market gardens, upbuilding our seaports, standing by our avenues of communication, extending our railways and shipping facilities, helping our manufactures, our farmers and our labouring men and making Canada what we believe it is destined to be before the end of the present century ? I have every faith that by the close of the present century Canada will stand second to no nation in the world.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the motion brought forward as an amendment to that of the hon. Minister of Finance is the summary of a series of articles and speeches written or delivered by its mover, the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) in the course of the last ten months or so. In his speech delivered a moment ago, the hon. member entreated the members on this side of the House to hear his appeal, to listen to the plea he was about to make.

On the whole, I do not think this new proposal made by the hon. member has much chance of winning favour either in this House or in the province of Quebec. That tariff issue, it seems to me, has been well threshed out for many years back. I do not know that there is in the province of Quebec a free trade party. The hon. member compared free trade and protection ; but I repeat it, I do not know that there is in this country a party favouring free trade pure and simple. People's ideas are settled in this respect and they are in the moderate vein.

I do not think the electors will take kindly to the arguments set forth by the hon. member for St. Mary's, and that for several reasons. In the first place we read in the gospel to beware of false prophets ; and while, on the one hand, we have the hon. member's utterances for the last ten months in favour of protection, on the other hand, we have his numerous protests for ten years in the opposite sense. Which are we to believe ? To his statements of to-day we can oppose the statements of the member for L'Islet, of the candidate in Beauharnois, of the ex-Minister of Public Works and of the candidate in St. Mary's division of Montreal during the last contest.

Those who know the hon. member cannot fail to have strong objections to following him in the path into which he would fain lead away the people.

In the first place, I notice that instead of seeking commercial reciprocity with the United States, he believes to-day in increasing the customs duties. That is an entirely new departure, as I shall show. The hon. member for St. Mary's came out, in 1893, as Liberal candidate in the county of L'Islet, and was elected. Here is the programme he submitted to the electors of that county. I find it quoted on page 1019 of 'Hansard,' for 1893, as follows :—

I am resolved to turn all my efforts towards obtaining changes in the tariff, such as to permit the agricultural class to buy cheaply the things they need, and to sell dearer the produce of the soil.

The manufacturers in the large cities who realize hundreds of thousands of dollars profit per year, by means of the present tariff oppose these reforms. They are organized into an association, and without party distinctions they support the government, the policy of which builds their fortune. From their point of view they are right. The so-called national policy, adopted in 1879, with the object of favouring the establishment and development of our industries in preventing foreign products from entering Canada, has not to-day the same raison d'être.

The interests of the manufacturers have been protected long enough. The hour has come for protecting the interests of agriculture. The manufacturers' interest is to keep the Canadian market closed against the manufactured products of the United States, in order to sell their own goods at higher prices.

The interest of the Canadian farmer is to work towards having the American market opened to him, in order to sell dearer his produce.

Further on, he added :

Let us see that the American market which is practically closed against us, be opened to us, so that we may sell there, our horses, our potatoes, our eggs, fowls, &c.

The Canadian farmer will find in that a double interest. First, he will pay less for what he needs, and he will sell his produce to better advantage.

The struggle is then really between the farmer, who needs the American market and the manufacturer who is afraid to make less profits if the American manufacturer can come and compete with him for the sale of furniture, farming implements, cotton fabrics, vehicles, &c.

Following up the same idea, the hon. member said :

Who does not remember, Mr. Speaker, the by-campaigns that we fought, for instance, that of Drummond and Arthabaska, in 1877 ? It is one of the contests I regret the most, be it said by the way.

That is not quite in line with his Chatham speech of 1902 :

Well, we carried those by-elections, and the general elections by saying : Let us adopt a protective tariff, and we will force the American government to treat with us. The illusion we had then must have vanished to-day ; but it has nevertheless served to carry the elections of 1891.

This was going on in 1893. In 1896, the hon. member, then a candidate for the Liberal party in the county of Beauharnois, sent out to the electors of that constitu-

ency a lengthy circular, of which I hold a copy, wherein he expressed his persistent belief that an increase of the duties would be a misfortune for the country; and that our endeavour should be to secure reciprocity with the United States. He said:

For eighteen years, the Tory party has been in power.

Notice, 'The Tory party.'

What have been the results of their administration. I am not one of those who say that everything the Conservative party have done is wrong. If I were to say so, I would be casting blame upon myself, for, up to 1891, I have followed in the ranks of that party, though at times, on certain points, at variance with its policy. But, I have no hesitation in saying that the purpose we had in view in 1878, when the protective system was adopted, has not been attained.

Our favourite argument during the electoral contest of 1878, was that, by increasing the customs duties, we would force the United States to grant us a treaty of commercial reciprocity. Far from seeing our expectations materialize, we have from that date got to loggerheads with our neighbours, who maintained their tariff and even at times modified it in such a way as to do us the greatest harm.

So that in this respect, the hon. member has greatly varied from the opinions he held in 1893 and in 1896.

Now, in that hon. gentleman's opinion, what was in 1896 the position held, the part played by manufacturers in this country? His contention was that they preyed on the people; that they were monopolists, and underpaid their men. He claimed, besides, that the farmers were being ruined. In that same speech delivered in this House, February 21, 1893, at page 1026 of 'Hansard,' he said:

There is no doubt that, thanks to protection, a certain number of manufacturers have built up large fortunes, but there is no doubt either that the public fortune is not equitably divided. In Montreal we see men who, poor in 1878, have become millionaires. We see at the same time the rural districts losing their population.

So, the country was being depopulated in 1893; had the financial condition of the farmers improved in 1896? Well, let us see what he said in this connection in his address to the electors of Beauharnois:

I need not say that the abolition, or at least the reduction, of the duties would be a clear gain to the farmers, and would increase in a large measure our trade with the United States.

And further on:

Then, again, by allowing the free importation into our country of certain manufactured goods, we will enable consumers to get at a lower price the goods which they need. For eighteen years past large manufacturers have enjoyed a measure of protection which is now found to be excessive. The time has come, it seems to me, for the farmer and the consumer to have their innings.

So, that the consumer and the farmer had not yet had their innings; only manufacturers had been so favoured. Referring to the latter in that same manifesto, he said:

Mr. Laurier and his friends have no thought of destroying manufactures. Why would they do so? They only wish that manufacturers should make fair profits and no more. By allowing the importation free or at reduced rates of the raw material used in industries, we shall ensure to manufactures advantages which will enable them to sell their products cheaper than they do now. Iron, coal oil and many other articles of raw material should enter our country without having to pay the heavy duties to which they are subjected to-day for the benefit of a few score of individuals. Of course, monopolists, those who make every year hundreds of thousands of dollars at the expense of the consumer, are strongly opposed to any change. They are going to make a supreme effort in the present contest, as they know Mr. Laurier will govern Canada in the interest of the people, and not in their own, as the present government is doing.

That able candidate puts the question: 'Is the government the friend of the farmer and the workingman?' to which he gives the following reply:

A fiscal policy which obliges consumers to pay a tribute of from 25 to 30 per cent to a privileged class, cannot be favourable to the masses. Farmers realize what their position is. A couple of years more like those we have gone through and agriculture in this country will be ruined.

Another prophecy! So much for the workers in the country; now, for those in cities:

Inquire from workingmen in cities what is their present condition. They do not find work half the year long; and they are paid salaries barely sufficient to keep their families from suffering from hunger. Never has there been so much misery in the city of Montreal as during the year which has just elapsed. The same is true of all large cities. The reason for that state of things is very plain. Monopolists——

Monopolists once more——

—having done away with all the small factories, have now full control of the labour market. They pay to the workingman whatever wages they please. See what is going on at Valleyfield, where a great number of robust, honest, hard-working men do not earn more than 90 cents per day. The average wage paid in that large factory does not exceed 55 cents per day.

Such was the appeal made in 1896 to the electors of Beauharnois by that hon. gentleman, then a candidate in that constituency. In the newspaper 'Le Cultivateur,' in 1896, the hon. member for St. Mary's published articles to the same intent. On June 13, 1896, under the heading 'Down with tributes,' I read the following:

A few years more of our fiscal system will cause our working classes to fall into a state of bondage similar to that in which monopolists in the United States have long held their employees.

Let us free ourselves from the grasp of monopolists.

On June 6, 1896, I find in the same paper :

We wish manufacturers to make reasonable profits. But it seems to us the time has come for workingmen and consumers to have their day. It is time we should cease paying tribute to men such as Mr. Simpson and scores of others of his stamp.

The electorate followed the advice of 'Le Cultivateur.' The Liberal party came into power, and a moderate tariff favourable to manufacturing industries inasmuch as it enables them to realize legitimate profits, was adopted. The people put their trust in the Liberal party ; they confided in the latter's promises, and the hon. member for St. Mary's was asked to enter the cabinet. Let us see what he thought of the Fielding tariff on April 24, 1897. I read the following in a letter from Ottawa which appeared in his paper, 'Le Cultivateur,' and which I take to have been written by him, as the tone betrays its author :

It is in order, it is a matter of necessity, rather, that there should be a few groans here and there, on the part of those who favour monopolists. . . .

Monopolies once more——

—who, under the old regime, were the real holders of power.

Further on :

It is fair, therefore, to restore equality between the manufacturer, the merchant, the consumer.

On May 1, 1897, he wrote :

Legitimate industries have no right to complain. Specific duties, which had become so obnoxious on account of the wrongful use they had been put to, are things of the past. Manufacturers who were protected by duties amounting to 30, 40, 50, 70 per cent on certain articles, should not be surprised at the changes effected. They could not expect that such an insufferable condition of things should be maintained. A margin sufficient to enable them to carry on their business has been allowed to them, but they will no longer have a monopoly.

Such were the views of the hon. gentleman expressed in his paper 'Le Cultivateur.'

From 1896 until the elections of 1900, Canada, under the present administration, had increased immensely. Our trade had grown by $150,000,000. Our exports of manufactured goods had doubled. Then, the hon. gentleman resolved to seek election in St. Mary's division.

I heard a moment ago the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) state that members on this side of the House do not vote in accordance with the wishes of their electors. It seems to me that the first duty of a member of parliament is to vote in accordance with the promises he made when seeking election. Let us see what statements the hon. member for St. Mary's made in October, 1900, as shown by his organ 'La Patrie,' of October 18th. It seems to be a verbatim report of the speech.

Reference will be made in the course of the contest to the revision of the tariff ; you will be told that we granted a preference to Great Britain of 33⅓ per cent ; that is so, and it is the best thing we have done.

Farther on :

Industries—some of them, at least—were protected to an extent which we thought excessive. We slightly reduced the duties. We gave to Great Britain a preference of 33⅓ per cent.

Farther on :

We were killing two birds with one stone. Please notice : We were lightening the burdens of the people ; we were giving an impulse to industries at the same time as reducing the duties. We were only intelligently pricking on capitalists who had been somewhat lagging behind. What was the consequence ? Canadian industries, feeling a little more the keen edge of competition, improved their methods. Manufacturers imported new machinery in order to be in a position to compete to greater advantage. The result is now apparent. We have witnessed within the two or three last years unprecedented developments. The trade of the country has increased by $150,000,000. I repeat it, if you are not satisfied, you are rather hard to satisfy.

Since Canada's trade has not ceased increasing in the meantime, are we not entitled to say to the hon. gentleman : If you are not satisfied, you are rather hard to satisfy ?

Now here is something in regard to tariff revision, which is more surprising and which most of the hon. members are not prepared for. It is an extract from the programme of the hon. gentleman to his electors, to be found in 'La Patrie' of October 18, 1900. It is on such representations as these that the hon. member was elected in St. Mary's division :

By our revision of the tariff we have given a new impetus to industry. For one, I believe on the stability of the tariff. I do not mean that there may not be necessity later on for some readjustments ; but the main features of the tariff should not be changed.

The hon. gentleman, as we see, was quite orthodox then. He was in favour of keeping the tariff, in its main features, as it is to-day.

Well, barely two years after making these statements, when the country was enjoying an ever-increasing prosperity, and without any change having taken place in the economic conditions of the country, the hon. member thought fit to start a movement in favour of high protection, contending that on it alone the country depended for its welfare. I think we are fairly entitled to say to him that these ten months during which he has been campaigning in favour of protection do not outweigh in our estimate his efforts for a period of ten years in the ranks of the Liberal party.

We have been told by the hon. member that petitions had been addressed to the

government, asking for changes in the tariff. But who started this agitation, if not the hon. member himself? Who travelled the country, impressing manufacturers with the idea that they urgently needed protection, if not the hon. member?

Last session, when the hon. member for Laval introduced his motion demanding protection for the farmers, the hon. member for St. Mary's did not speak in the same strain as to-day. He contended in the way I do now, that an agitation had been started for the purpose of having vegetables subjected to a duty. Here are his very words:

> It is very easy to create ill-feeling among people who think they do not sell their products high enough; but that grievance can easily be remedied.

As a matter of fact, that is what happened, and the proof that no real uneasiness exists is that Liberal candidates in the last by-elections had no difficulty in securing their return by increased majorities.

The hon. member made a comparison between the conditions existing in the United States, and those existing in Great Britain, between a free trade and a protectionist country, for the purpose of showing that the working classes in the United States receive a higher remuneration for their labour than those in Great Britain. An easy answer to this is that workingmen in Germany get still lower wages than British workmen, although the German tariff is highly protective. Wages are higher in America than in Europe, where workingmen are willing to work for a pittance.

On the other hand, the welfare of our farming community is undeniable. That welfare has been so marked since the introduction of the admirable tariff to which the hon. member himself gave his approval, that our farmers, instead of quitting the country to seek employment in the United States factories, now turn to settling in the North-west. And even farmers from the United States are seen constantly crossing the line, thus adding to our numbers and our wealth.

The whole thing may be summed up as follows: On the issue of the tariff, the hon. member for St. Mary's has evidently altered his views out and out. At a time when Canada is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, he would have the government declare in favour of high protection. By the extracts I quoted from his speech and his programme of 1893, have I not shown that he agreed at the time with the Liberal policy in asking for reciprocity with the United States? That was his policy at the time, as well as that of the Liberal party, and no mention was made of any increase in the duties, as he considered this a mistaken policy. The Fielding tariff, which gave such excellent results, was received with satisfaction. It was not, as the hon. gentleman would have us believe, a measure assented to half-heartedly by his colleagues.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville).

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not rise for the purpose of confuting the logic of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Demers), because I have not the honour of understanding his language as well as my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) who seemed to enjoy the speech as much as if it were delivered in his native tongue. I understand, however, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Demers) quoted speeches from the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte) in the past which are supposed to contain different sentiments from those which he has announced to-night. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Demers) could profitably employ his time by taking the speeches of seven-tenths of the members on his own side of the House delivered a few years ago, and he would find that they are diametrically opposite in sentiment from the speeches which his friends delivered to-day. The hon. gentleman forgets that conditions may change in a country, that the views of public men may change with the conditions, that what was suitable in 1896 may not be suitable at the present time, and not be suitable in the future. It is the part of wisdom that public men should change their views in order to meet the requirements of the day. I am here to-night to support this resolution because I believe it embodies principles that are beneficial to Canada at the present time. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) makes this proposition at the outset:

> To insure permanency and the further progress of existing industries and to bring about the creation of new ones.

What member of this House or what true Canadian will dissent from that principle? His next proposition is:

> To inspire confidence for the investment of Canadian, British and foreign capital.

We must inspire confidence before capital will be invested, and we must create permanence so that capitalists may have a fair return on their investment. The next proposition is:

> To insure to the farmer the full advantages of a prosperous home market, and to secure better wages for the labourer.

Who will say that is wrong? The home market is the best market for our farmers. It yields the farmer the largest return for his labour, because a portion of his profits is not consumed in the charges for transporting his products to a foreign market. The next proposition in my hon. friend's resolution is.

> To render impossible the slaughtering of our markets by the products of foreign countries, foreign industries, foreign combines, and foreign agricultural products, and to bring about the more rapid expansion of our vast resources.

With these objects of the resolution we must all agree.

To promote closer trade relations between the different provinces of the Dominion of Canada and between the Dominion of Canada and the mother country.

Is there an hon. gentleman on the other side, from the premier down to the lowest member, who will say that there is anything wrong in that principle? The hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte) further says in his resolution:

It is the bounden and imperative duty of the government to revise and readjust, without delay, the present tariff in such a manner as to leave no doubt as to the determination of the Canadian people to adopt and maintain a fiscal policy adequately and firmly protective of the large national interest at stake. And also to carry out an energetic transportation policy which will give to our merchandise and products of all kinds commodious, quick and cheap access to the markets of our country and to those of foreign nations trading with us.

These are the aims of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for St. Mary's division of Montreal, and these are the matters to which I shall briefly direct the attention of the House. The first question that arises is: Is there need of a revision of the tariff at the present time? Year after year the government have told us that the time is coming when they must revise the tariff, but year after year they have put off revision until some time in the future. Here is one reason why the tariff should be revised now. Last year we imported $120,000,000 worth of goods from foreign countries the greater part of which could be manufactured at home, and of that, nearly $68,000,000 worth represented manufactured goods. The aim of our manufacturers is to supply the requirements of the people of Canada, and the fact that these requirements are being supplied by foreign countries indicate the necessity for a tariff revision. It is sufficient for me to know that foreign goods are coming into the tune of $68,000,000, to believe that the tariff should be revised. In view of this it must be admitted that the present tariff works to the disadvantage of the Canadian manufacturer, the Canadian farmer, the Canadian artisan, the Canadian miner, and the Canadian labourer. In proportion as you bring in these foreign goods, to that proportion do you deprive the Canadian workman of the labour which ought be his. These important resolutions have been moved in the House to-night and the government are silent. Do they think it is not worth their while to speak, or that it is inexpedient to do so? Do the government think that they can sit silently by and allow the interest of our industrial classes to be sacrificed without moving hand or foot to supply a remedy. It is said that this is not an opportune time for this revision. Some weeks ago the Finance Minister told us that times were prosperous and that we should not disturb the existing situation. That reminds me of the logic of the old man, who, when the rain was pouring through the roof of his shanty, was asked: Why he did not repair it, and he replied that it was raining and that he could not go out. Then he was asked, why he did not do it in dry weather, and he said that it did not need it then.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It did not leak then.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the kind of logic the government is using to-day. Do they not know that bad times follow good times, and is it not provident to provide for the bad times when there is a buoyant revenue and when a change can be made without causing any material disturbance? When hard times come as they are sure to come, and bring about decreased values and decreased consumption, and when the slaughter goods of other countries flood the Canadian market; is it then that the government think a remedy should be applied? Will they wait until that time comes? If they do, they are not the provident legislators the Canadian people desire to have controlling the destinies of the country. But that is what they are doing to-day. When the products of other countries flood our markets, as they did from 1874 to 1878, and bring about hard times, the worst we have experienced in Canada, then and not until then the government are prepared to move. Is that what the Canadian people want? I say it is not. They want the very reverse of that. Every class and every industry of the country will need protection then. Many of them need it to-day. Need I mention the fact of the large importations of agricultural products to convince this House that the farmers of this country need increased protection to-day? Need I remind the labourer of this country that the importation of $60,000,000 of manufactured goods is taking away the labour that should be enjoyed in Canada, and giving it to Americans, English, Germans and others who are manufacturing these goods? Need I remind the miner of British Columbia, where the mining industry is stagnant to-day for the want of protection? Need I remind the men who are manufacturing steel in our country that their industry is on the wane to-day because it needs protection to keep it alive and moving? I do not think so. All these people know and see plainly that there is an urgent need to-day for a revision of the tariff. What we need for the future, in my judgment, is a higher or adequate protective tariff to protect the manufacturer of the country, the farmer of the country, the labourer of the country, the miner of the country and the artisan of the country. That, I say, is one of the needs of the situation to-day. That need is growing greater and greater every day. Will the government move before the fatal day comes, be-

fore it is too late, before capital is kept out of the country, or the capital that is employed here is lost, and before the manufacturer will be obliged to close his factory and the labourer to go out of employment? In addition to that, we need to-day an imperial zollverein, as outlined by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain a few weeks ago. That is what we need in the Dominion of Canada and the British empire to-day; and when that is brought about, I am sure we shall have better results from it than many imagine at the present time. Along with that we require cheap and quick transportation, to lay down the products of our country in the markets in which they are sold, in the shortest possible space of time and at the cheapest possible cost. That is one of the great requisites of the time. I have just returned to-day from our north-west country. The outlook there for the future is bright and hopeful. The influx of immigration is very great. The increased acreage brought under cultivation this year is immense. The crops are looking splendid, and the farmers are assured of a good crop owing to a plentiful supply of rain up to the present time. The only fear they express is that there will be blockades in the future when their grain is ready to be moved. What are the government doing to provide for that future? The lethargy that pervades the ranks of the government to-day is noticeable. They are dealing with odds and ends. No great national scheme has been propounded for making the highways of commerce what they should be for handling the products of the country. Where is the fast Atlantic service, which we ought to have had years ago to transport our products to the British market quickly and cheaply? We are told that the government have received two tenders, but that they are dilly-dallying with the subject, as they have done for years. What are they doing for the harbours of the country? As I passed along Lake Superior, I saw that little or nothing was being done to the harbours. There is an immediate demand for action. Are the government equal to that demand. In my opinion they are not. They are not improving our harbours to-day as they should do in preparation for the transportation of the products of the west. They are leaving this work to the future, quite regardless of the consequences. The one great fear the people in the west have is that the government are not equal to the necessities of the situation. They say that the government appear to be asleep. They ask what they are doing about the improvement of the St. Andrew's rapids, that great important work should be carried to completion at the earliest moment? There is, comparatively speaking, nothing being done in the matter. In all these lines the government seem to be doing practically little or nothing. That is not what the people of this country expected of them. In view of these considerations, and the hon. member for St. Mary's division, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has propounded a policy that is admirably suited to the requirements of Canada. I am prepared to support it. I am glad to see the hon. member come out from his friends—his friends of the past. He can have the satisfaction of knowing that he disagreed with them on great national issues that are of vital importance to the people of Canada to-day. He can well afford to disagree with them on these lines. The people of Canada are at his back. Many of his late friends on that side of the House would, I am quite sure, get up and defend him but that they are ashamed to do so or to vote against the government. Judging by their speeches in the tariff debate, many of them would support the resolution he has moved, because it is on the lines these gentlemen talked. But will they do it to-night? I challenge them to show that they have the courage of their convictions by standing by the very policy which they advocated in the budget debate a few weeks ago. I do not think they will do so; but because I believe in the policy propounded in this resolution by the hon. member for St. Mary's division, Montreal, I am prepared to give it my support and vote.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat singular, that, after the complete and carefully prepared presentation of the case made by the hon. member for St. Mary's division, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) no reply whatever has been made from the government side of the House, except that which was made in a language which I do not understand sufficiently to appreciate it; and therefore it was to me to a certain extent an unanswerable argument. There were a great many lines open to be taken by the government and their supporters in dealing with the resolution moved and supported so fully by the hon. member for St. Mary's division. The one we would rather have expected to have heard, in the light of many that we have heard in days gone by, would be a rebuttal of the strong plea made for protection by the hon. member for St. Mary's division. We know that the gentlemen on the other side of this House were at one time very conversant with all arguments in favour of free trade as opposed to the protective system.

We know that not very long ago the right hon. gentleman who leads this House held very strong opinions on the subject of protection. We know that on the occasion of his visit to England in 1897, when the idea of preferential trade was mooted, involving the suggestion that we might have some such policy laid down as is now being propounded by the hon. member for St. Marys' division (Hon. Mr. Tarte), the right hon. gentleman spoke strongly against protection. It had been the curse of Canada, he said, and he could not contemplate with anything

like satisfaction the idea of a statesman of Great Britain taking part in any such policy. If these opinions were still held by the government and its supporters, we would naturally have expected them to reply to the very elaborate argument of the hon. member for St. Mary's division, but on this occasion not one hon. gentleman on that side attempts any reply. Apparently the government has made up its mind to hold its position, relying on the majority at its back for the purpose of disposing of this amendment and deferring consideration of the important question submitted to the House until some future time. The country will thus be warned of the attitude of the government. The country will be informed that the strong feeling of antagonism to protection has entirely disappeared and the government are now prepared to consider that question impartially. That being the case, if the government do not consider this amendment opportune or convenient for the discussion of the question, at a later date, possibly this session, they may be prepared to consider it and move in the direction indicated by the hon. member for St. Mary's. That, it seems to me, is a fair construction to be put on the position. If that be the case, the work done by the hon. member for St. Mary's—and done with a great deal of care and thoroughness—will not have been altogether lost. It has, to a certain extent, brought out this fact that we are now in this House in an entirely different position from what the two parties occupied in 1896 when the late Conservative administration was defeated and the present government took office. At that time it was open for any one to believe that there was a wide difference between the two parties, but now the difference has disappeared and we are all of one mind in so far as the question of protection is concerned. There is no lack of argument which can be urged by any one who conscientiously believes in free trade. You will find that under a similar condition of things in the mother country, the government of the day is apparently either moved in the direction of protection or about to appoint a commission which will warrant them in a short time in moving in the direction of protection, and you will find them met by their opponents who argue strongly in favour of the existing system of free trade in the mother country. These are powerful arguments which can be argued by those who believe that the wondrous effects which have been in the past attributed by the school of Cobden and Bright to the doctrine of free trade, are due to that policy, but, there is a mass of arguments which might be advanced to prove the contrary and we know that the mother country, to which we look for guidance, protection and example, is contemplating a change. Therefore it cannot be for the want of political example that the hon. gentlemen who constitute His Majesty's government in Canada to-day and their supporters, sit quietly and do not reply to the lengthy and complete argument advanced by the hon. member for Montreal. To my mind the question which occupies the attention of every man is the question of how we can most rapidly develop Canada.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL. That is really the question which occupies the attention of every hon. member, and to which every hon. member would most willingly devote his attention. That being the case, it cannot be doubted that the proposition of my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is one of the highest importance. It has to do, not only with our position to-day but with our position in the future. No one can doubt that the hon. member for St. Mary's has made a very wonderful plea for the adoption by this country of a protective policy. We have in Canada to-day a measure of protection, but I think that the arguments advanced by the hon. member are exceedingly powerful and ought to convince the government that it is necessary they should take some steps in advance and decide on a fixed and determined policy. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) capitalists are looking to Canada as a field for investment, and it is eminently desirable that they should have the assurance that there is little or no chance of a reversal of the policy of protection, which assurance they would have if the government would accept this amendment. If you can present to the world the enormous natural advantages, the enormous fund of natural wealth which Canada specially possesses, if you can also show that there has been adopted a policy which will guarantee to capital safe investment and sure return, we shall not have long to wait for the incoming of capital so necessary for the development of our country.

There can be no doubt at all that, so long as there is uncertainty, so long as there is a possibility of a change of course and a reversal of policy, foreign capital will look carefully before it makes investment in our country. But, with stability in that respect, with an understanding reached by the people of Canada that they looked upon protection as a wise course to follow, I am sure we should not have long to wait for the capital which, with population, is all that is required to make of Canada one of the wealthiest commonwealths in the world. The hon. member for St. Mary's division interested me very much in that portion of his speech in which he dealt with the economic history of the United States, and showed that the accumulation of wealth in that country amounts at this moment—if I understood his figures—to about $1,200 per head of the population. That wealth has

probably been created in something like a hundred years. Of course, a hundred years ago the United States had made some important beginning towards commercial advancement and national wealth, but that enormous wealth involved in the idea of a country with 80,000,000 of people who have something like $6,000 or $7,000 per family has been created almost entirely within the last hundred years. In Canada, we have an area equal to that of the United States, resources as great and a population which, in its beginning is as promising and as well adapted to attain success in commercial pursuits. We have here wealth of every kind, and we have one particular form of wealth which will count in the immediate future. In the water powers of Canada we have wealth far surpassing anything of the same kind in the United States, an element of national wealth that will count for a great deal in the near future. Therefore, we have every condition which was possessed by the United States when they entered upon the career which they have pursued with such remarkable success up to the present time. Living beside them, separated geographically only by an imaginery line, we find upon one side amazing advancement, enormous cities, the highest and most minute development of every form of industry. Why do we find on one side such marked advancement as to attract the attention of the whole civilized world, and, on the other side comparatively steady and, to a certain extent satisfactory, yet exceedingly slow progress as compared with the country on the other side of the international boundary ? There is only one thing that we can point to as a difference between the two countries, and that is that we in Canada have lived up to this time, and especially up to 1867, under a system of exceedingly low tariffs, not intended to develop industry, while, for nearly a hundred years, that is since 1809, the United States has been constantly and persistently pursuing a course of protection intended to develop in that country great lines of manufacturing industry. There is no other appreciable difference that I can at this moment think of that would account for the marked difference in the rate of progress between the people of the United States and the people of Canada. If we had adopted a protective system in this country ; if we had developed the older provinces of this country as quickly as we should have done under a protective system, we would have realized our destiny in the form of confederation much earlier than we did ; we would, at a much earlier day, have brought the whole northern part of America under one form of government ; we would have anticipated our history as a people I believe, by a great many years. For, under our old ideas, say, for instance, in the province from which I come, we had not thought whatever of using the tariff as a means of promoting industry. We had, up to 1857, or thereabouts, a simple tariff of 10 per cent, intended to provide for the government of the day the comparatively small sums sufficient for the public affairs of a community living in the comparatively primitive and undeveloped state in which we were then living. We were simply producers of raw material. Our trade was with the United States to a large extent. We sent them our farm products as far as they would accept them, our fish and our plaster, and we received from them almost every item of manufacture that we used. The manufacture of the simplest form of wooden-ware was unknown in our province. It was not until, by the fortunate circumstance of the United States refusing to continue the operation of the old reciprocity treaty we were forced to enter upon a course of industry which, since that day, we have been pursuing with a certain amount of success. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the House ought to affirm the resolution which has been tendered by the hon. member for St. Mary's division. At the same time, I suppose we could not expect that to be done on the present occasion. We can scarcely expect the government to have made up its mind to accept that position. We know, on the other hand, that the government has chosen to take this attitude as expressed by the Minister of Finance in the course of his budget speech, they would prefer to regard the position in which they stand and have stood for the past year since the last budget speech was made, as one that they think ought to satisfy the manufacturers of the country. Because, to quote, not with verbal precision, but with fair accuracy, the statement made by the Minister of Finance, they wish to give to the manufacturers the idea that what is uppermost in the mind of the government of the day is stability—no change for the better, no change for the worse, no advancement, no retreat. As I understand them they chose to stand by the tariff as they gave it to the country in 1897, with certain small changes that have been made since that time. They choose to regard that as satisfactory for the time, and they are not prepared to meet with acceptance the very strong proposition made by the hon. gentleman from St. Mary's division, because it involves the adoption of a system of extreme protection, high protection. It involves the adoption of protection so high as to be adequate, sufficient to retain for the manufacturers of this country every part of the home market ; and it would involve a tariff as high as that which the United States raised against our products. I suppose we cannot expect the government of the day to accept it. But, while I heard with great pleasure the argument made by the hon. member for St. Mary's division, I have additional satisfaction in noting that no attempt has been

made on the government side to rebut or meet his argument. I take it, therefore, that we may assume that there is a practical consensus of opinion in the House on this question of protection. We have not heard a single voice raised in support of the old free trade doctrine. We have not heard a word which would lead any one to believe that the government side of the House is occupied by a party which, only seven years ago declared that protection was a system that contained within itself the germs of destruction for any community that adopted it, that it was a system accursed, injurious, and one under which no community could expect to make progress. They said it could be described as legalized robbery, that its operation was the creation of combines, the creation of barons of wealth and industry on the one hand, and of the poor, degraded classes, the downtrodden classes, on the other. We have not heard lately one word of that language with which the country was familiar for many years. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we may fairly assume that the party now occupying the government side of the House has abandoned their old position, and that we will hear nothing more of it in the future, either in this House or in the country. That I would look upon as an exceedingly favourable omen to this Dominion, because I am satisfied from what I have seen and know of the conditions in our country and in other countries, in the mother country and in those rival nations which are contending with it for the trade of the world. I have seen, I say, sufficient to make an argument that is practically unanswerable, that under present conditions, and in face of the commercial war that is now being waged the world over by every nation that aims at attaining a leading position, there is one weapon that must be in every one's armoury, and that weapon is protection. Without the control and maintenance of the home market, no country can hope to attain to anything like success.

After fifty years, and those fifty years representing the dominance of a school which did not permit a public man to dare to question the correctness of the free trade theory, Great Britain, under the leadership of her foremost statesman, is at this moment apparently making up her mind that her position is in danger of being destroyed permanently if she stands by it. We see the evidence in that startling, that epoch-making speech delivered by the secretary for the colonies after his return from South Africa, a speech which startled every one as might a thunderclap coming from the clear sky, a speech that is being talked over, reasoned about, and the prediction is freely made now that within the course of two or three months, with such education as could be given by a reasonable campaign of education, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain might hope to secure the support of the majority of the electors of Great Britain. That goes to show that facts are being forced upon the minds of the people of Great Britain that an adherence to the old doctrine of free trade means an inevitable decline and loss of their markets, the loss of their pre-eminence. Therefore if that be the case, if Great Britain is to be driven from the position which for fifty years she has held with such apparent triumphant success, driven to abandon the doctrine of free trade and to range herself with the other nations of the world under the banner of protection, then I say that the last example which can be quoted by any supporter of the free trade doctrine will be removed. Look over the world where you will, you will find that the secret of success for a country which aspires to eminence in industrial pursuits and all that tends to greatness in national life, is to use the weapons of commercial war in order to maintain the existence and maintain the progress which that nation may have realized. It is too late to-night, and it is not necessary, in view of the facts that arguments are not being made at all from the government side of the House, to enter upon an argument in support of the protectionist theory. There can be no question that Great Britain achieved her success, and her position from which she could start out triumphantly upon a free trade course, by a system of protection of the most extreme character continuing for many centuries. There can be no question that by her protective system she displaced the Dutch, who up to that time had held the leading position in the commerce of the world. There can be no doubt that when France, Germany and the other nations of the world realized that Great Britain had become the great mercantile power of the world, and held a position they would like to occupy, they attacked her position by setting up in their respective domains a protective system which gives them their own market, and from the advantage ground of which they are able to attack Great Britain in the other markets of the world. There can be no question that protection is the only system that can be adopted by any country which wishes to develop in the direction of industrial greatness.

Now I am sure while we are delighted to know that in this country we have great natural advantages, and great agricultural possibilities, and great natural wealth, there is not a gentleman in this House who would deliberately choose for Canada a future in which the people were to be only producers of raw materials, were even to supply wheat or meat, or fish for other countries, to be consumed in the great manufacturing centres by a teeming population gathered there by industrial activity. That is not a future we want to see for Canada. We want to see Canada building upon the basis of all

this natural wealth, of this enormous food supply, of her wonderful fisheries, of her great mass of raw material, her extensive waterways, her sources of coal—we want to see built upon that basis a great industrial community. We want to see her industries developed, we want to see our people, not employed in the humbler, and grosser, and more poorly remunerated vocations which are required in order to supply the raw material for other people, but we want to see them engaged in the most highly developed, the most difficult, the most technical pursuits that are anywhere in the world being pursued by men of whom we think ourselves at least the equals if not the superiors. Therefore it seems to me absolutely essential that if there be any cogency or power in the case made here today by the hon. member for St. Mary's, we ought either to controvert it or to assent to it. If we cannot controvert it, then I say it is our duty to agree with his proposition, to make it perfectly plain and unmistakable to the people of Canada and to the world generally, that for our part we have chosen that better course which is involved in adopting once for all the policy of protection, of such a character, so far developed, as to be adequate, sufficient to effect the purpose for which it is intended, namely, to protect the industries of Canada and keep the market of Canada for Canadians.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). Mr. Speaker, I do not often intrude in the debates of this parliament, but I must do so for a few minutes this evening. There is in my county a great iron industry, which is now slowly reviving. That industry in 1896, when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, was in a fairly flourishing condition. But these gentlemen delayed their iron policy so long—they did not announce it for a year and a half or two years—that the industry expired, while this company of business physicians stood by the bedside. That industry went down in the county of Colchester, and the whole country has been suffering from that misfortune to the present day. An English company invested some $2,000,000 in endeavouring to establish an industry to make iron in Nova Scotia. It was started some twenty-five years ago. If that iron industry had been successful, it would be today in a highly developed state. But unfortunately, while the Conservative party were in power, even they did not deal with it in the strong and masterful way in which they should have dealt with it; because at times they stood timorous before the free trade talk and doctrines of the Liberal opposition. If they had taken the iron industry strongly in hand and adopted the doctrine, of protection wisely, that industry would have survived, and these gentlemen would not have been in a position when they came into power to strike it down, as they did strike down that industry in the county of Colchester; causing infinite loss to hundreds of people. Hundreds of people were driven out of Nova Scotia, as a result of the loss they sustained. This large manufacturing industry in the centre of the county of Colchester gave a splendid market to the surrounding farmers. A town of 2,000 or 3,000 people grew up, and it purchased the produce of the farmers, in the surrounding country. Well, that industry was striken down, and within a year the whole town was deserted. The houses were closed up, the windows were barred, and the people drifted to the United States, and scattered in every direction. That industry was taken in hand by a number of Montreal capitalists last fall who bought an investment by Englishmen of $2,000,000 for $350,000. Under these circumstances, they undertake, in the face of the vacillating policy of the government to put the industry upon its feet and in doing that they have to take chances that the government of this country will adopt a proper iron policy. But, imagine the position of the iron industry of Nova Scotia when these English capitalists sank $2,000,000 and only secured $350,000 out of it. Today, however, that industry is about to start, and I want to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, if he asks for forgiveness, from the county of Colchester for his conduct, I will guarantee him absolution to-night upon his sincerely undertaking to change his whole iron policy. He must become a true penitent, however, because my church permits no absolution to its members until they are truly penitent. If the hon. gentleman shows that he has become truly penitent, and if he shows a disposition to adopt such measures as will establish that industry at Londonderry, I will ask the Conservative party to give him absolution.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman says that the industry is going to start as things are, without getting any assistance.

Mr. GOURLEY. It is commencing to start, but the gentlemen who have had their capital invested, for three or four months, were here the other day before the door of the hon. minister, on their knees beseeching, him to save their capital.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are going to start. I can give the hon. gentleman the assurance that they are going right on now.

Mr. OSLER. It is a very important statement, that the hon. minister has made, that they are going on now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was assured by a gentleman connected with the enterprise that they are going on now and that they are going to conduct vigorous

operations under the present policy. As I say my information comes from a gentleman connected with the enterprise.

Mr. GOURLEY. They were here the other day to see the hon. gentleman. I am glad that they have given the hon. gentleman the assurance that they will go on, because I infer from that statement, that the hon. minister must have assured them of a change of policy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GOURLEY. It will be all the worse for the hon. gentleman, if I am mistaken.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is going on.

Mr. GOURLEY. I will undertake to say that no iron industry can long survive under the present policy of the government. I will undertake to assure the hon. minister that the iron industry which the hon. gentleman has made his special pet at Sydney is about to go into the hands of a receiver.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I think it is very improper for any hon. gentleman in this House to make a statement that is absolutely and entirely unwarranted by the facts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And most damaging.

Mr. GOURLEY. I would be sorry to say anything that would injure these gentlemen, but I am giving the House what is the current report amongst the people.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. GOURLEY. I cannot accept the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston, Cape Breton) because he is not a director of the company and he cannot know anything of the business management of the company. I cannot accept his statement although, if I should make a statement that would in any way injure the company, I should be sorry for it.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). As I understand the hon. gentleman, he says that he is prepared to make the statement on the authority of a director of the company that the affairs of the company are about to pass into the hands of a receiver.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have made no such statement, but the hon. gentleman, not being a director or a member of the company, cannot know anything of the management of the company.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). There is no intention on the part of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, to which no doubt the hon. gentleman refers, to place its business in the hands of a receiver.

Mr. GOURLEY. There may be no intention on the part of the company to place their business in the hands of a receiver; but the courts have power to place the business of the company in the hands of a receiver when they are unable to pay their debts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Are they unable to pay their debts?

Mr. GOURLEY. I am not aware of it. I can only take general rumour, and I think they are not. I say in all deference to hon. gentlemen opposite that the reports you hear on the streets are generally to be depended upon because as a rule, on financial affairs, they turn out to be pretty correct. I would be delighted to know that the surmise is incorrect, because during my whole life, and every platform from which I have spoken, I have stood by the industries and reputation of Canada; and in that respect hon. gentlemen opposite are in an invidious position compared with any hon. member on this side of the House. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) thought that he noticed repentence on th part of the hon. Minister of Finance in the fact that no member on the government side of the House had spoken in this debate. I took a different view. I was watching the face of the hon. minister, and I saw a grim determination and sullen defiance depicted thereon, which could not be overcome by any logic or argument from our side of the House. I am sorry, because I had hoped that the hon. minister had come to the conclusion that the policy which he has been pursuing should be changed. I want to thank the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) for the magnificent argumentative address which he has made to-day. He has made a speech which will live in the annals of Canada as one of the strongest argumentative addresses which was ever made in this House. Distinguished as it was by sound doctrine and by a recognition of the fact that Canada has arrived at the position which places her amongst the dominant nations of the earth. The name of that hon. gentleman who has thus distinguished himself, will live amongst those of the great Canadian statesmen who have, in great emergencies, done what is right. I am giving him to-night only the meed of praise to which he is entitled. He has followed the injunction of Holy Writ, 'Come ye out from among them, and ye will be blessed, and be ye separate.'

I will venture to say that the author of that fiat is now looking down and blessing the member for St. Mary's, who is preparing a fine measure of punishment for the gentlemen who turned out the brains, and the leadership, and the liberality of the cabinet from its charmed circle. Having listened to the hon. member for St. Mary's division of Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) I can easily understand why the other gentlemen in the cabinet could not feel comfortable in the

presence of the liberality and the breadth of mind possessed by that hon. gentleman.

Some three years ago, when we were running the general elections in Canada, I had the strongest notion that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was not a good and loyal citizen of this empire.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was the common opinion on your side then.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am an Imperialist, believing that there is no country on earth that has the charm for an intelligent and healthy man that Canada possesses, and believing that no people in this country should be as true to the empire as the race to which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) belongs, I read with dismay the speeches which he made in Paris, and I refuted them on every platform in the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. But his patriotic course since he left the cabinet has enabled me to forget all that, and I will now give him my blessing.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Give me absolution.

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes, I will give you absolution because I believe that you are truly penitent. And further, since I have watched the later career of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte), I believe now that evil associations were at the bottom of the speeches which he made in Paris. Since he has left the cabinet, and his bad associates; behold the splendid speech which he has made to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. I understood there is an unwritten rule of parliament that a member should serve three years before he is competent to indulge at any length in the public debates of this House; and as I was bred in a trade that believes in precedence, I bowed to that rule, and governed myself accordingly. But while I have been sitting here I have been watching the faces of the ministers, and endeavouring to draw inferences, and from my observations I had hoped that the right hon. the Prime Minister would be strong enough some day to state that he would no longer attempt to delude the people of Canada with free trade doctrines; but that he would adopt a generous policy of protection which would be in the interest of this Dominion. I am free to declare that a policy which would suit England may not be suited to Canada, because this is a new country and we have to meet new conditions, and even if it were wise to have free trade in England, I would argue as a logical conclusion that we ought to have protection on the American continent. The actual conditions must prevail to settle the fiscal values of this country, and we cannot be guided by the old world views, which may suit France or Germany or England. Speaking of auguries, I notice a very extraordinary augury in the course of this debate. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) occupied the Chair for a few minutes and this accidental fact impressed upon my mind that there might be something in auguries. You will recollect the splendid speeches which the hon. gentleman made on protection in West York a year ago. You will notice that, judging by his speech of last year, he did not convert himself to the doctrine of protection, while labouring to convert the electors of West York to that doctrine, which is one of the most extraordinary things I ever knew in the world. The hon. gentleman went through the constituency of West York making protection speeches, and preaching protection for the market gardeners. I believe that the only man in the whole constituency who was not converted by his speeches was the hon. member himself, because while his constituency sent him here as a protectionist he got up last night and voted free trade. If we were to apply a biblical illustration it mght be said: this sower sowed good seed, in some instances on stony ground—for example in, the mind of the member for West York. He also sowed good Conservative seed among the electors of the constituency of West York, and it grew and produced a splendid crop of protectionist sentiment, for it fell upon good soil.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). With the last rain.

Mr. GOURLEY. If the rain helped the protestionists of West York it did not help the member for West York or the protectionists of the cabinet, because they refused to protect the market gardeners. Now, Sir, speaking again of our iron industry in Colchester county, I will deal with it from a local standpoint in order to illustrate a general principle. I will undertake to say to you gentlemen that it is impossible for us in this country, and it is impossible for this government to apply a principle to the workmen of Colchester county that is only applicable to the workmen of England. The mechanics of Colchester county are educated men. They live in nice houses; many of them in the town of Truro hold schools at night and teach their neighbours' children free-hand drawing and other subjects of learning. Indeed, I might say that the members of the cabinet could not turn their spare time to better account than to go to these schools taught by the mechanics of Truro, and I will venture to say that they will come back more liberal minded statesmen than they are to-day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do they teach cabinet making?

Mr. GOURLEY. We have adopted in this country a system of free schools; we make

our mechanics educated men; we give them the tastes of scholars and students, and let me ask: are you going to introduce a fiscal system into this country that will give to such educated mechanics the same wages as are paid to the ignorant mechanics of France and Germany and England? No, you must adopt a policy that is suitable to the conditions of this country. I often visit the homes of the mechanics in Truro and there you will see the mechanic's daughter playing the piano, or his son playing the violin. Everywhere there is evidence of the highest refinement; a refinement that you perhaps may not find in the drawing rooms of the Peer of England, much less in the homes of the English mechanics.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) And all under a Liberal government.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am enforcing the principle of protection to our industries, a principle that has been enforced by the most competent and most capable men of the United States. The difficulties we are meeting in Canada to-day were met and overcome years ago in the United States by men like Henry Clay and Daniel Webster. I venture to say that the words of these men have demolished for ever on this continent, any sound argument in support of free trade. Daniel Webster very truly said: Can you compare the educated American artisan to the ignorant dunce and the besotted workmen of some manufacturing towns in England, Germany or France. If you cannot do that, then we must adopt on this continent a policy that will suit our conditions and give our workingmen higher wages. I will undertake to say that the mechanics of this country are organizing; they are getting educated leaders, and if you attempt to give them the small wage of $1.10 or $1.50 a day, you are making a great mistake. We must endeavour to educate the manufacturers of this country up to the point of paying to educated mechanics such wages as will give their families an education suitable to their style of life. Therefore we must have protection for our industries in order that the cheap goods of Germany and England shall be shut out. Our manufacturers, if they are compelled to pay high wages, must get good prices for their goods and be protected from the slaughtered goods of the countries that employ cheap labour. That is a doctrine which these hon. gentlemen do not seem to understand. I tell you that the mechanics of the maritime provinces are holding meetings and discussing this question, and they demand from $2 to $2.50 per day for ordinary mechanics as a minimum wage. When you discuss the question from the standpoint of the educated mechanic, recognizing that every boy and every girl must be educated, and that every home is a home of refinement, you upset all the arguments drawn from the free trade system of England, because they are based upon conditions of ignorance and want which I hope will never be present in Canada. You must grapple with this question as the educated men of the United States grappled with it; and when the intelligent and logical people of that country, although originally free traders, became indoctrinated with the idea that a new principle must be applied to the continent of America, they applied it to the United States, as we must apply it to Canada, or we shall fail in the race of development. That is the genesis of the whole question of free trade and protection on this continent. Therefore I do not feel overwhelmed when the hon. gentleman referred me to Free Trade England. I ask them to discuss the question from the standpoint of America. The conditions of life on this account are different from those of any country in Europe. We must deal with the matter according to the conditions as we find them; and when we find a great commercial nation like the United States, a country more filled with universities and schools, with classical, mathematical and technical education, than almost all the world beside—when we find an astute people like that adopting wholesale the principle of protection, does it not seem a folly for a gentleman like the hon. Minister of Finance, who knows nothing practically about free trade and protection, who knows nothing practically about manufacturing or the conditions of trade, to ask us to accept the policy of free trade? When he does so he adds neither light nor argument to the subject.

I want to thank the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) for the splendid address he made. I think it was a splendid augury—I am a bit superstitious to-night—when Quebec joined hands with Ontario in establishing this new policy of protection, and when an hon. gentleman who left the cabinet, and made the most extraordinary sacrifices that a man can make—if you regard the throwing up of a high office for principle as a sacrifice—joined hands with the hon. member for Centre Toronto. I thought it was a splendid illustration of what was to come hereafter, when public men in this country would agree to throw away mere partisanship whenever the interests of the country were at stake. So far as I am concerned—I presume this will fall on very stony hearts opposite—no party will lead me ten minutes when the interests of the country and the interests of my party conflict; but the Conservative party is led so wisely and has such splendid traditions that it is impossible for such a condition of affairs ever to occur.

Hon. WILLIAM ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Mr. Speaker, I have considerable sympathy with the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) who I think has forgotten his eloquence to-night in trying to belittle the

condition of England, the greatest nation on the earth. He is no true Canadian who would attempt to belittle that country, whose ships go to every part of the world, laden with its productions, and carrying civilization to every place where they go, and that under free trade. It is not right to compare the United States with England; but compare any of the old nations of the continent of Europe with England, and you will see that England under free trade outstrips them all in her power and her manufactures. It is a solid fact that there is manufactured in England to-day double the quantity of cotton that is manufactured in the United States.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is making the comparison now himself.

Hon. Mr. ROSS. When I am done speaking, the hon. gentleman may have a chance of making his speech. I have a good deal of sympathy with my hon. friend on my right (Hon. Mr. Tarte). There was nothing too bad for hon. gentlemen opposite to say about that hon. gentleman while he was supporting the present government. The men in the opposition were then grinding their teeth with hatred and malice against my hon. friend. There was no word too low or too base for them to say about him. Now they have swallowed all the dirt and everything they have said. They are all ready to clasp him in their arms and kiss him, and say, come over to us. What position will he be in when he goes over there ? I would not think my hon. friend would occupy any other position than that of leader of the Tory party in the province of Quebec; and then he will overshadow my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) because it will not do for my hon. friend to occupy a low, mean position. He must be at the head of all of them, or otherwise, with his progressive mind, he will not live; because he must rule or he cannot live at all. Now, I was afraid that the prospects of his getting a seat in a Midland county of England was very much injured by the speech he made to-night, in belittling that great country in comparison with the United States. He spoke about the United States being the greatest protective country in the world. The United States is the greatest free trade country in the world, because it has the trade of 80,000,000 people within its own borders. Of course, we had a good many quotations made by my hon. friend. He went back to the Duke of Wellington. Well, the Duke of Wellington was a great general, and we were always proud of his triumphs. But when he came to be the leader of a great political party in Great Britain, he was a great failure; he was a disgrace to the country he came from, Ireland.

I read this winter correspondence of the great Daniel O'Connell, and I formed my own opinion of the conduct of the Duke of Wellington long ago. I must say, that, in my opinion, anything quoted from him could not be of much importance to us in this country. The hon. gentleman spoke of Daniel Webster. I used to be an admirer of Mr. Webster myself, but, like the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley), he made mistakes in his day. Fifty years ago, in a speech in Boston and at the Senate in Washington, the great Daniel Webster strongly opposed the spending of a cent of money on the west side of the great Missouri river, now so rich in states and cities. This is what he said :

> That the country west of the Missouri was a vast wilderness and a region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts, shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs. ' To what use,' exclaimed the great statesman on the floor of the United States Senate, ' could we ever hope to put these great deserts in those endless mountain ranges, impregnable and covered to their base with eternal snow ?'

So that the great Daniel Webster was mistaken in a great many of his opinions.

Mr. GOURLEY. Are you sure that it is not from a speech of the Hon. Edward Blake with regard to the North-west territory you are quoting ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). No it is not. Let me give the hon. gentleman a quotation from a speech delivered by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) :

> I consider the argument of free trade unanswerable. I believe that the moment Canada took a liberal step in the direction of free trade, it will go a long way to place her on the road to the greatest prosperity. The reason why I consider Canada should turn about and adopt a free trade policy is that we might free ourselves from the dominating influences of the United States and on account of the failure of the national policy, because of the startling revelations of the census of 1889.

I think that the hon. member for Pictou must have spoken in a serious and sensible moment when he uttered those words, and has been astray ever since. He asked me the other day how I could sit on this side and listen to speeches from government supporters, which might savour a little too much of protection according to my idea. But I said to him : Where would I go ? Certainly not to your side of the House. I hope that when the hon. Minister of Finance brings down any changes to the present tariff, they will be in the direction of lower rates than those we have now. I think that we can carry on the government of this country and carry it on prosperously with a lower tariff, which will be a blessing to this country. My hon. friend on my right (Hon. Mr. Tarte) did justice to the hon. Minister of Finance when he said that the hon. minister understood political economy and read it. Well, I am glad that he does, and I trust he will be firm in protesting against all the influences

which are brought to bear upon him to make the tariff higher. I was amused to read the account of his meeting a delegation of the manufacturers. He wanted them to state what they wanted and they were not able. They said they would do it in secret, but not in public. On the heel of their visit came the good sensible, honest farmers of the Dominion in a delegation to protest against the raising of the tariff. These were honourable people, and I am glad that there is a majority of such men in the Dominion. I am glad also that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance had the firmness to oppose all these influences to make him change his policy, and I hope, for the good of the country and the blessing of the Dominion, that when any change takes place it will be in the direction of lowering rather than of highering the tariff. His position to my mind reminds me of that Fitz James' contest with Roderick Dhu :

> His back against the rack he bore,
> He firmly set his foot before ;
> Come one, come all, this rock shall fly
> From its firm base as soon as I.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (Toronto West). I cannot help congratulating the government on their showing some little sense. They have to-night evidently thrown the net over the majority of their followers, they have taken warning by the exhibition we had last night, and have been careful that not one of their followers shall get up unless it is absolutely necessary. We have had a magnificent free trade speech just now. I admire the hon. gentleman who has sat down, because he has the courage of his convictions. He says straight out and squarely that he is for free trade and wants a lower tariff. I wish there were more like him on the government side, because the country then would very quickly come to a conclusion. It is very refreshing to find a man on the opposite side who comes straight out and talks as he feels. I congratulate the hon. gentleman. One of his colleagues—I thought he was the last free trader—the government made a senator of, but there is one more free trader left, and I hope that before long he may be elevated to a softer seat and more genial chamber than the one we are now in.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I want to be here to record my vote against the other side every time.

Mr. OSLER. It is indeed refreshing to find an hon. gentleman opposite who votes as he thinks. That is an exception which was lacking last night. But what I rose particularly to say was to express my entire approval of the amendment. I agree with it so much that even if it had been proposed by the hon. Minister of Finance and if my hon. friends on this side voted against it, I would still support it. There are two great questions before the public, in comparison with which all the others are absolutely insignificant. Those are the questions of transportation and protection to our industries. They cannot be disassociated.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

Mr. OSLER. We must have protection if we are going to be anything more than an agricultural country. What agricultural country ever made a name for itself in the world ? I know of none. Unless we have large factories, our brightest young men the best sons of our farmers, who want to go to the cities in order to find an outlet for their energies will, if we have not manufacturing industries, go to the States.

The other question is the question of transportation. Granted protection, it follows as a matter of necessity that we must carry our goods to the market for those goods. We are preparing to expend, and are expending, large sums of money in improving our transportation facilities. I think the hon. member who proposed this resolution probably forgot that we have the promise of the government that the transportation question shall be put in the hands of a very able, a first class commission, and the question is to be solved without any delay and without any doubt. It is quite true that, before these able gentlemen are to have possession of the question, the government wish to dispose of two or three small matters that might embarrass this commission. For instance, they propose, before this commission is appointed and before the government have the benefit of the commission's advice, to give away $3,000,000 to Montreal harbour. That is a trifling matter, and the commission would have nothing to say as to what is to be done with that money. It is true that our interests are considerably bound up with our connection with the North-west. There is the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme, involving about 2,000 or 2,500 miles of railway, which is to be bonused by the government to an enormous extent. That is another trifle which the government wish to have disposed of and out of the way before they ask their big commissioners to report on the question of transportation. Then, there is the Canadian Northern, a matter of eight or nine hundred miles of railway, in the same condition. But, when these inconsiderable things are disposed of, the government are going to have the commission look into the transportation question. I think the hon. member for St. Mary's must have forgotten that the government are going to carry out so thorough a transportation scheme—after these trifles are disposed of. However, I only wished to say that I support thoroughly and entirely the resolution that is proposed, believing that it is in the true interest of Canada and that without some such policy Canada can never gain the standing to which she is entitled by

her position, her wealth and her natural resources.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the question is put, I wish to say a few words, and I promise the House I shall not detain them more than a few minutes. The resolution proposed by the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) while somewhat more elaborate in its terms, is to all intents and purposes the same in purport as that proposed to the House by myself during the present session, and the same in purport as those I had the honour to propose during last session, and the session of 1901. The hon. member for St. Mary's has supported this resolution with a very able and very exhaustive speech, and he has given to the House and the country two object lessons at least in connection with this matter. In the first place, he has taken the ground that the agricultural interest of this country is of greater importance to the country as a whole than any other, and he has directed the attention of the House to the result upon the agricultural industry of Great Britain of the policy of free trade which has been maintained there for the last fifty years. He has pointed out—or if he did not, he might have done so—how much more fatal to the agricultural industry of this country a policy of free trade would be than to the same industry in the mother country. Because while Great Britain has been mainly a manufacturing country, she did have agricultural resources to a very considerable extent, and formerly those resources were developed under different conditions to such an extent that they were almost of as much importance as the manufacturing industry. The hon. gentleman might have shown, as I have said, that if free trade is ruinous to agriculture in Great Britain it would be infinitely more ruinous to this country. We are competitors with the United States in the sale of agricultural products in the markets of Europe. And we must always be so. The United States may possibly, as years roll on, find more and more a home market for their agricultural products, but they must always to some extent, look to Europe. Our competition with the United States is carried on under very peculiar conditions. Not only are the manufacturing industries of that country coming under the control of great trusts and combines, but the agricultural industry —or, at least the agricultural output—of the United States is largely coming under the control of great combines which control prices not only in the United States but throughout the world's markets. Look at the condition with regard to the iron industry to-day. The United States, with its enormous output of iron and steel controls throughout its combines, the output for export from Germany as well, and, in that way, dictates the prices of iron and steel to the world. If free trade has been so injurious to the agricultural industry of the mother country I think the hon. member for St. Mary's division put it none too strongly when he pointed out how a similar policy in this country must be fatal to the agricultural industry here. Let us consider for a moment what the effect would be if we threw down our tariff wall and admitted the agricultural products of the United States on the same terms as those products are admitted into the mother country. Can any one doubt that great combines that control food products and agricultural products in the United States would bring about a condition of affairs under which our farmers would contend on most unequal terms with those of the United States? So far as that is concerned, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has, by his able and exhaustive argument, taught a lesson to the people of this country as to the necessity, not only to the manufacturing industries but to the agricultural industry, of a measure of protection.

Then, the hon. gentleman pointed out the results of a protective policy in the United States upon the manufacturing industries of that country. He pointed out that in many manufacturing industries the United States had not only overtaken but surpassed the mother country. And, in answer to my hon. friend from Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross), I would point out that this question is assuming very important dimensions in the mother country, and that every day is adding to the acuteness of the situation as bringing more and more attention to the question whether free trade shall be maintained in Great Britain or whether England shall attempt to stem the torrent of competition throughout the world by some measure of protection to her industries.

Now I would call the policy which the hon. gentleman has advocated to-night, and which we on this side have advocated in the past, a policy of national commercial self-defence for Canada. That is what it is, nothing more and nothing less. We remember in the old days of fifty years ago, when the volunteer movement was first agitated in Great Britain, the motto of the English volunteer was 'Defence not defiance.' So it is in commercial matters in Canada to-day. We are face to face with high tariffs, with policies of protection prevailing in every country in the world; and the question is whether we shall adopt in Canada that policy which is so well outlined in the resolution of my hon. friend for St. Mary's, and which I think we might well call a policy of national commercial self-defence for Canada. If we do not adopt it, where are we to stand? Are we to stand alone in the world in allowing our markets to be open to foreign competition to such an extent that our own industries will be

destroyed ? Outside of England there is nothing like our position among all the nations of the world.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the government might well have made some pronouncement to-night. It is true that the Minister of Finance made a pronouncement earlier in the session, and if I might be permitted briefly to refer to it, it amounts to this, that our industries are so prosperous in Canada, our warehouses so full and overflowing, that there is not the slightest need for a revision of the tariff. Well, I think some incidents that have taken place during the past few months have perhaps taken away something of the weight which the utterances of the Minister of Finance possessed at the time. The hon. gentleman told us that no capitalist was deterred from investing money in Canada by reason of the uncertainty of the fiscal policy of the government. I do not know whether the Minister of Finance would be so confident about that to-day, and I am not sure that if he were very frank with the House, he would not be able to tell us that certain assurances have been required, at least, whether they have been given or not, before further capital will be invested in some of the great industries in Canada which hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are most anxious to maintain in this country. Now let us look for a moment at the resolution of my hon. friend from St. Mary's. He declares :

That it is the bounden and imperative duty of the government to revise and readjust, without any further delay, the present tariff in such a manner as to leave no doubt as to the determination of the Canadian people to adopt and maintain a fiscal policy adequately and firmly protective of the large national interests at stake.

Now that is a pretty definite statement, it seems to me. It may be characterized by the Minister of Finance as being vague. I do not know whether he would ask his followers to vote it down because it is too vague, or because it is inopportune, or on what other ground. But I venture to say that no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House can stand up in his place and give any adequate reason why there should not be a declared and pronounced policy in Canada to the effect stated in the resolution. At least, no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House has seen fit to do so, if I may put aside for a moment the somewhat general utterances of the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross), whose courage and sincerity, and whose convictions, I am sure, we all admire. But if my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and the government think that by sitting silent and refusing to discuss these motions, they are going to better their position in the country, I am inclined to think they will find themselves somewhat mistaken. They will have to answer these matters sooner or later in the end, and there will come a time when they cannot sit dumb in their seats and say nothing about motions of this kind proposed to the House. That time may not be very far off. What are the reasons, what are the grounds, advanced in the resolution of my hon. friend ?

To assure the permanency and the further progress of the existing industries, as well as the creation of many new ones that only wait the proper policy to spring up ; to inspire greater confidence in Canadian, British and foreign capital seeking investment in our own country.

I ask hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House whether we cannot look around Canada to-day and observe in the condition of certain industries the best possible ground for my hon. friend from St. Mary's proposing this resolution to the House, and supporting it by the arguments we have heard ? Then he proceeds :

To secure for the farmers now tilling our soil and those that we invite to share the blessings of our institutions and the wealth that Providence has placed at our disposal, the full advantage of a prosperous home market.

My hon. friend has put his grounds with regard to that so well that it is not necessary for me to amplify them, except possibly by one illustration. Would it be better or worse for the farmers of this country if we were to throw down our tariff walls, and if the great industries which are being built up, and which should be built up in the future, were built up in the United States of America ? Would it be better or worse for Canada that that should happen ? The articles which are required in Canada for use by our workingmen and by our farmers, are articles that we can manufacture in Canada ; and will any hon. gentleman in this House, in his sane moments, say that it is not better for Canada to have the cities and centres of industry in our own country, and to supply these articles for our own people, by our own workmen, by means of our own capital? Well, that is what my hon. friend from St. Mary's proposes by this resolution, and by the reasons which I have just adduced. The hon. gentleman points out that so far as the farmers are concerned it is better for them to have the centres of industry in our own country, because the creation of these centres of industry affords to the people a prosperous home market. Then he goes on further and he advances another reason :

To comply with the legitimate desire of the working classes to see their labour rewarded by fair and uninterrupted wages, and by comfort in their families.

That is a ground which has been taken before in this House, a ground which I myself have taken, when I pointed out, during previous sessions, the fact that the conditions of life in Canada among the labouring classes are different from those which prevail in many countries whose

goods enter into competition with our own. We know that the workmen of the continent of Europe and of some of the Southern states of the neighbouring republic do not live under the same conditions, do not have the same standard of living as that to which the people of our own country are accustomed. We cannot expect that the manufacturing industries of this country can be maintained unless they are protected by a tariff which is as much for the advantage of the workingmen who are employed in our factories and industries as it is for the advantage of the man who puts capital into these industries.

To render impossible the slaughtering of our markets by the products of foreign industries, of foreign combines, of foreign agriculture and of cheap labour countries.

This is carrying out the idea so many times advanced in this House, that while we can deal with combines in Canada by our own legislation—and we have attempted to deal with them by legislation introduced by this government—legislation of that kind is only useful against foreign combines so long as we have an adequate protective tariff, because when you once throw down the tariff wall you admit the combine to do in Canada exactly what it is doing in the United States, or in any other country. You can only guard adequately against the influence of foreign combines by giving proper protection to your home industries, and unless you do that, you will have the industries of this country, and what is more, the consumers of this country, placed at the mercy of such combines, whose effects are well known, and have been commented upon over and over again by writers on political economy in the United States of America. Then my hon. friend continues :

To bring about a quicker development and a more rapid expansion of our vast resources.

I will not pause to discuss that point. And as his last reason :

To promote closer commercial relations between the different provinces of the Dominion and between this Dominion and the mother country.

Then, in regard to that and especially in regard to that, my hon. friend has concluded his resolution in these words :

And also to carry out an energetic transportation policy which will give to our merchandise and products of all kinds commodious, quick and cheap access to the markets of our country and to those of foreign nations trading with us.

There is this peculiarity in our situation that the portion of Canada which is more particularly inhabited is what might be called relatively a narrow strip lying for 4,000 miles alongside of the United States of America, and while that gives an opportunity to the merchants and manufacturers of the United States to seek Canadian markets it is very difficult for the people in the east and the people in the west of Canada to have that communication between the different parts of this country which is essential if Canada is to become a great and united nation. My hon. friend points out that to promote closer relations between the different provinces of the Dominion and between this Dominion and the mother country it is not only necessary that we should have a tariff adequately and firmly protective of our national industries, but that we should have these transportation facilities which are necessary not only to enable us to send our products to the chief markets in Europe, but also to secure the advantage of the home market by enabling the products of the west and the manufactures of the east to be easily and cheaply exchanged the one for the other. That is the object and the spirit of my hon. friend's resolution as I understand it, and I do not think there is any thinking man in Canada or in this House who does not thoroughly concur in the spirit of the resolution, although hon. gentlemen in this House may vote down this resolution to-night. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary that that particular part of the resolution should be carried out. It is necessary if we are to have transportation facilities, such as my hon. friend has said in this resolution are desirable and necessary, that this government shall come down to the House at once with some broad, well-thought-out and comprehensive scheme of transportation and not come to this House with a subsidy here or a charter there without any comprehensive scheme taking this matter up bit by bit : not letting the House know when the charter is passed whether or not the company to which the charter is being granted is to receive a subsidy ; giving aid to 600 miles of railway without telling the House whether or not the scheme of the government includes aid for that railway to the Pacific coast, and not telling the House what is their scheme for transportation from Fort William, or Port Arthur, to the Atlantic ports. It is all very well for this government to come to the House and say that this is simply 600 miles of railway, that it stands alone and must be dealt with alone. So far as the promoters of the railway are concerned that may be all very well, but so far as the interests of this country in regard to transportation are concerned, I most emphatically deny that it can stand alone. You must have one great transportation policy for this country and this government should do one of two things; they should either hold their hands until they are able to announce that policy to the country or they should come down and announce that policy, while we are dealing with these matters during this session. Therefore, I say it ill-becomes members of the government to sit still in their places when matters of this character are being discussed by hon. gentlemen with ability in this House. It ill becomes them

to sit still in their places and simply call upon their followers to vote down motions against the soundness of which no plausible argument can be adduced by hon. gentlemen opposite. We have listened to speech after speech advocating the views so ably set out in the resolution of my hon. friend, but we have not had one hon. gentleman on the treasury benches who has deigned to open his lips even to say a word about this question of transportation. Every hon. gentleman in this House and all thinking men in this country know that no question is engaging the attention of the people more fully at the present time than the policy of transportation advocated by my hon. friend and listened to by a mute government on the treasury benches to-night. Now, I did not intend to detain the House at this length when I rose to my feet. I was not in the expectation of finding it necessary to say anything on this resolution, because I had taken the opportunity of explaining my views pretty freely in the opening part of this session, but having regard to the fact that not one member of the government has seen fit to say one word about this all important question, I thought it my duty not to give a silent vote but to rise and say what I have said in support of my hon. friend and in support of the resolution which he has so ably advocated in this House, and to say that I for one will take the greatest possible pleasure in voting for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted first to refer to the last observations of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) on the question of transportation, I would desire to say that it is quite possible for us to use empty words and neglect the question of transportation. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to speak of the great question of transportation in respect to some broad and general policy, but none of these empty phrases means anything to the business men of this country. While some hon. gentlemen are content to talk about transportation the government are acting in the matter of transportation, and we propose to go on acting in spite of my hon. friend's statement that unless some broad, general transportation policy is brought down we should not deal in a piecemeal way with it. We propose to go on dealing, if necessary, with these things in a piecemeal way, if by doing so we promote the interests of the country. If it is necessary in order to develop the western country to build 600 miles of railway, we are ready to deal with the transportation question in this practical way to meet the requirements of that new and important territory. If it is necessary to aid the harbour of Montreal, which is the chief port of Canada, we bring forward a policy to advance the money to assist the commissioners at the port of Montreal in doing what is required. That is practically transportation work. Hon. gentlemen can talk of transportation, but, as the need arises, whether it is in the far west or at the port of Montreal or in the maritime provinces, each of these duties as it arises will be met day by day, and we will work for transportation while some hon. gentlemen are content to talk about it. I trust that my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) will not think it was a discourtesy on our part that we have failed to follow him through his somewhat lengthy address of this evening. For reasons which we think are good, and some of which I will venture to mention, we did not deem such a course necessary. My hon. friend's speech, which was quite full of information, was to a large extent what I might call an academic discussion on the question of free trade and protection. And it was not so much a discussion of free trade and protection in Canada as a discussion of free trade and protection in England, with which at the present moment I am not sure that the Canadian parliament has a great deal to do. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) seemed to congratulate himself upon the idea that the cause of protection was making vast progress in England. Well, I think he was a little hasty in that. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that only a few days ago when the question of the corn duties came up in the British parliament, only twenty-eight members were found to be in favour of these duties? My hon. friend will hardly find in that a vindication of his view, that England is running away from free trade. And even the more moderate and more comprehensive policy of Mr. Chamberlain, which has our sympathy, because he is following the Canadian policy——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is recognized in England to-day that the line that Mr. Chamberlain is taking is the outcome of the policy of Canada, and therefore what Mr. Chamberlain is doing is precisely what we have been doing for seven years in this Dominion. But even that more moderate and more comprehensive policy of Mr. Chamberlain is only meeting with a moderate degree of support at present. My sympathies are with that right hon. gentleman, and I trust he may go ahead and that his movement may make progress; but there is no use in our pretending to-day that England is accepting Mr. Chaplin's ideas on the corn duties, or even the larger and grander ideas of Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain is going to have an uphill fight before he accomplishes his object. Our hearts go out to him, but at the same time let us not shut our eyes to the fact that he is encountering a great measure of hostility and that he is not going to win in a moment. There is no reason therefore why we should

occupy ourselves in academic discussions. The leader of the opposition has talked of what would happen if we should throw down our tariff walls. Who is proposing to throw down the tariff walls ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman from Victoria is not proposing anything of the sort. The hon. gentleman from Victoria was a member of a cabinet that had a tariff. There has been no free trade in Canada at any time since this Dominion existed. There is no free trade in Canada to-day. There is no likelihood of a policy of free trade being adopted in Canada in the life time of any man in this Chamber.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why, then talk on academic questions of free trade and protection.

Mr. OSLER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) interrupts. Does he dissent from that ? Have I not stated the case correctly ?

Mr. OSLER. I was admiring how your followers applauded your statement that there was going to be no free trade in Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does my hon. friend know any one who says we are likely to have free trade in Canada in the early future.

Mr. OSLER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who is it ? My hon. friend knows that ever since we have been a Dominion we have had a fiscal policy which included a tariff, and in that tariff there was some measure of protection. It always has been, it is now, and it is likely to be for a long time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does he deny that in 1894 his leader, over and over again stated in the west that the policy of the Liberal party was free trade as it is in England ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the expression 'free trade' as used in these debates——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Free trade as it is in England.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He knows very well that in the debates that take place here the word 'free trade' has a meaning that no hon. gentleman on this side of the House is willing to attach to it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not free traders in that sense.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The whole Dominion of Canada in a general sense has had what some have called a free trade policy. We had free trade, some people may say, in the lower provinces before confederation, but we had a 15 per cent tariff. Sir John Macdonald was supposed to be, up to a certain point, a free trader, but he had a tariff of 15 and 17½ per cent. It is nonsense to talk of the abstract questions of free trade and protection in the face of the record of this country, for there has always been a considerable tariff and there is likely to be for a considerable time to come. I do not know of anybody who has been advocating free trade of late years in the sense that the term is used in this House, unless it be my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) whose words were quoted to-night. I did not intend to refer to this, but I do not know of any man in the whole province of Nova Scotia who could be called a radical free trader, unless the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) is to be taken as a pronouncement of his views on that question.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the hon. gentleman's policy—Is it free trade or protection ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman's policy is to have the present tariff for the present.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The policy of the government is set forth line upon line, figure upon figure, every item of it, and not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite has ever dared to put on the paper an item as to what their policy is. Hon. gentlemen opposite indulge in vague and general statements, but they shrink from the announcement of any particular rate of duty to be levied on any particular article. The country knows that such has been their record.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But one is curious to know why this resolution comes here to-night. There was a time, not so long ago either, when the relations on this question as on other questions, of hon. gentlemen opposite and the member for St. Mary's were not as pleasant and as kindly as they are now, and in these days the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was called the master of the administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I trust that my hon. friends opposite will not deem it offensive if I say that the member for St. Mary's has become the master of the opposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had a great debate on this question and all these great issues were presented to the House some weeks ago. The leader of the opposition, I have no doubt after full consultation with his friends and associates as he properly might have, propounded his policy. He prepared a resolution; he brought it forward here in connection with the budget debate. That was the policy of the opposition then. But the hon. member for St. Mary's comes in and says: Oh, you are all wrong, you don't know how to frame a policy for the opposition; you have used words and expressions which will not meet the wishes of the people, and you cannot win on a policy like that; but I will teach you a great plan.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The member for St. Mary's said to them: You may bring forward your motion and talk about that, but bye and bye I will come forward and I will teach you what is the true Conservative policy. And so the member for St. Mary's brings forward his motion and the opposition humbly accept it, and the leader of the opposition is going to be a follower of the mover of that motion.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is very clever.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad to have the commendation of my always amiable friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane). Whilst the discussion which took place was largely academic, I must admit that there were some few patches of new colouring thrown in, some of which afforded temptation to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to say a word. As an example, the hon. member for St. Mary's pointed out that we have a surplus of $13,000,000, and said that this is the time to readjust our tariff. I have never heard in any country where political economy of any sort was taught, that when you had a large surplus that was the time to increase the taxation of the country. If the hon. gentleman had come forward and said: You have a large surplus and therefore you should reduce the taxation of the country, he might have had a point against us, but to that we would have had a fair reply, because we could contend that the tariff is not a brudensome tariff—and hon. gentlemen opposite do not allege that it is burdensome but on the contrary they say it is too low—we could contend that the tariff is not burdensome and that the people are not complaining of it being too high, and since it is not a burden, and since under that tariff we receive a large and liberal revenue, then we would say it is a sound policy that we should apply this surplus revenue for the payments on capital account and thus avoid going into debt.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But that would be a fair matter for debate. If the hon. gentleman had come forward with the complaint, that in the time of great surpluses we were not reducing taxation, then he might have had some point in his criticism, but there is no argument in the hon. member saying: Because you have a large surplus and more money than you need, therefore you must increase the taxation and take more money out of the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But perhaps my hon. friend would say: You would not take more money out of the people if you increase these duties because the effect will be that you will shut out imports. That seems to be an academic argument.

Mr. BROCK. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend who seconded the motion says hear, hear, but he must have forgotten that at a later stage of his speech the hon. member for St. Mary's undertook to prove that an increase of duties will not shut out imports, and he elaborated that to some considerable extent. Well, Sir, if you shut out imports it must be because you make the goods more expensive at home, and you do not thereby diminish taxation. You diminish revenue, but you take as much taxation or more out of the pockets of the people, and instead of putting that taxation into the treasury of the country you put it into the hands of the manufacturers. I am amazed to find the pictures of blue ruin which the hon. gentlemen opposite have presented to this House to-night. The one comfort we have is that nobody is likely to take them very seriously. If the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite in this House to-night were to go abroad and be treated seriously, they would have a most damaging effect upon the credit, the reputation, and the industries of this country. There is a popular impression, based on facts, that this country is somewhat prosperous at the present time. We have not only evidence of that at home, but throughout the wide world, in the great journals of civilization, you will find articles speaking of the great progress, the wealth and the prosperity of Canada. Is it not true ? Do we not know that it is true ? Yet hon. gentlemen opposite stand up to-night and tell us that it is not true—that this country is not prosperous.

Mr. BROCK. Will you kindly tell us who said so ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto said so.

Mr. BROCK. I deny it positively, and I appeal to 'Hansard.' I stated that some industries of this country were not prosperous.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The industries which my hon. friend referred to chiefly were stock speculations.

Mr. BROCK. I did not refer to stock speculations at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend's remarks on that subject might be taken as seriously as we had to take his observation on another occasion, when he held the policy of the Canadian government responsible for a slump in American stocks. My respected friend from Centre Toronto had a pitful story to tell about machinery that was idle in the factories, and about men not being able to get employment. We do not take that seriously, because I have the circular of the merchants and manufacturers of the city of Toronto which says that they cannot get men enough to do the work.

Mr. BROCK. The very words I made use of this evening—that we had machinery lying idle because we could not get men.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the midst of this picture of blue ruin, which we have had to-night, the hon. gentleman, an old and respected merchant, engaged in large affairs and interested in manufactures, confesses that the industries of Canada, as a rule, and particularly in his own city of Toronto, are so prosperous that the demand for men is greater than the supply. Then, we are told that this movement is in the interest of the farmers. There was a story years ago, when railroad accidents were frequent, that they would put an English director on the cow-catcher to meet all the accidents. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to-night to want to put the farmer at the front, where they would have us understand he is to receive the greatest benefits ; but I suspect, he is intended to meet all the difficulties that are to come. But how is it that we do not find any considerable number of applications from the farmers of this country for a higher tariff ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Did you not have a deputation from the beet sugar growers ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that is the industry which my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) wants to ruin by reducing the duty on German sugar. The deputation in the interest of beet sugar industry was not particularly a farmers' deputation, although some farmers came with it. The beet sugar industry is a manufacturing industry.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Were not the great majority of that deputation farmers ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it very likely, and that makes it all the worse that my hon. friend from Halton will treat them so badly. But we had another deputation from a farmers' organization. I do not know how large it was, but it professed to be a provincial organization.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). Four men.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have known a deputation of four men to represent a very large body. My hon. friend is only one man, and yet he represents a great many people. We had one deputation of farmers which pleaded with us not to increase the protection of the manufacturers. Then, there is the labourer—how anxious hon. gentlemen opposite are on behalf of the labourer. Yet there never was a time in the history of Canada when labour was so busily employed and so well paid as to-day. Can our hon. friends expect to humbug the labouring classes of Canada at a moment when they are more prosperous than they have been at any previous period in their history ? We also had a deputation from a labour organization. I was not present, but I am informed that that deputation, speaking on behalf of the working classes, appealed to this government not to increase the tariff, because they were satisfied that an increase would not be for the benefit of the labouring classes. The farmers !—why, Sir, they have been paying off their mortgages. I was talking to-night to a respected member of this House belonging to the province of Ontario, and he told me that it was within his knowledge that farmers who not many years ago were obliged to borrow money, were not only paying off their mortgages, but were bringing in money and asking for investments for it. There never was a time in the history of this country when the farmers were so prosperous, so well-to-do, and so comfortable as they are at this moment. Let me add that while great changes have been made by the Liberal party in the tariff, while hundreds of items have been reduced, and large and important items, it so happens that in this particular class of items, except in three or four cases, the duties on agricultural products are the same to-day as they were under the national policy. The only difference is that under the national policy the farmers were not so prosperous as they are to-day under a Liberal government. That is the happy condition with respect to the farmers. With respect to capital, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition speaks of the uncertainty which

prevents an investment of capital. My hon. friend cannot be serious. Does he not know that during the seven years of the Liberal administration, the 'Canada Gazette' and the provincial gazettes, have absolutely groaned with notices of new companies and new promotion schemes for the investment of capital in Canada ? I venture to say that during the seven years of the Liberal administration, there has been more capital invested in manufacturing industries in Canada than in any fourteen years in the previous history of the country. I am not speaking of things which are not of common knowledge. Any gentleman who looks at the newspapers, knows that in every part of this country there has been an enormous development of industry. Whether you go to the labourer, the manufacturer, the farmer, or the business man, there is the universal story of widespread industry and prosperity. It cannot be universal as respects every individual, because in any time of prosperity, you will find certain sections or individuals who are not as prosperous as we would like them to be ; but speaking in the large, as respects the country generally, it is not too much to say that during the whole previous history of the Dominion of Canada the country never prospered as it has prospered in the seven years under the administration of the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, I admit that it is quite daring on my part to attempt to address the House at this late hour, and it is making a demand on the patience of my colleagues. But the few remarks I wish to make I am forced to make partly because of one part of the speech delivered this afternoon by the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and partly by one remark that has been made to-night by the hon. Minister of Finance.

Perhaps the speech which appealed to me the most, through this protracted debate, was that made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). I am not referring to the one quoted by the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross) but the one he made to-night. In that speech he said that at present the situation of Canada was such that we might take as admitted the fact that the principle of protection was the basis of our fiscal policy. But admitting that fact, it renders entirely useless the amendment of the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) and the whole discussion we have had to-day. If protection be the basis of our fiscal policy, what is the sense of raising an academical discussion on the respective merits of free trade and protection and asking this government to adopt that latter policy ? In the first speech I made in this House, in 1898, I excited a good deal of hilarity on the other side because I said that, in view of the tariff of 1897, there would probably be no more discussion in the future on free trade vs. protection, and that the respective merits of each would no longer be a bone of contention between the two parties. I cannot, for the life of me, see why there should. I regret that the hon. member for St. Mary's, who has done so much during the past five years to fix a settled policy for the country, should to-night have contributed to destroy the good work he has done. I was one of those who admired the hon. gentleman for the fight he made in order to convince public opinion that a moderate protective policy was necessary, and for the stand he took in the last election that the one thing this country needed was stability of tariff. It was, therefore, with the greatest of regret that I saw him bring in this amendment without giving any serious reason for his change of policy. There is no doubt that it was necessary to destroy the idea, that with every change of government, there would be a radical change in our fiscal policy, and that consequently the investment of capital in industrial enterprises was no longer safe. But by our tariff of 1897 we dissipated that idea, and it seems to me that the motion of the hon. member is calculated to create disturbance in the minds of capitalists. We must take facts as they are and no body can imagine that we are going to adopt a policy of free trade.

In the first part of his speech, my hon. friend made a comparison between the policy of England and that of the United States. He gave so much time to that subject that I began to think that, instead of preparing a programme for the oppostion, he was in reality announcing a platfrom on which he was to run an election to the British House of Commons. I am afraid that he is running for too many positions just now. Not satisfied with framing a policy for the Conservative party of Canada, he seems to be framing a policy for the new Conservative party of England. In so doing he is not only taking a task which is too strong for him or any other man, but he is loosing a good deal of the confidence that many of the independent members of this House and many of the people of this country had in him.

The hon. gentleman made a comparison between the workingmen of England and of the United States, and drew the inference that because the free trade workingmen of England are receiving low salaries and the protective workingmen of America are being paid larger salaries, therefore, the policy of the United States is entitled to all the credit. But why not go to Germany and France, which are highly protected countries, and there you will find that the workingmen are paid less than the same class in England. I am not giving this argument as a free trader, because I am not one, but to show that all these

statistics, when we come to the root, do not prove what hon. gentlemen think they do. The other day an hon. member of this House wanted to make an argument in favour of higher duties on iron and steel, and in support of his plea he gave us the argument that there was depression in the iron and steel industry in the United States under a high protective tariff. The hon. member for St. Mary's gave the House a statement of the prosperity of the farmer in the United States, but there again he was deceived by general statistics. He gave us the prices of wool and grain and cattle in the United States, but did not tell us how much profit each farmer made after he paid his taxes and expenses, or how much money was left to the farmer to put in the bank after he bought all that was necessary. If you want to prove a contention by statistics you must go seriously into them. The hon. member for Pictou was very much struck by the statistics gathered by the hon. member for St. Mary's, to prove how much money was accumulated per head of every man, woman and child of the United States. But that is not sufficient. He should take into account the public debt and the private as well as the municipal debt, which has to be borne by every man, woman and child. Let me give an example taken from our own country. We have been told that in the province of Quebec we are much more indebted than the people in the province of Ontario. If one considers only the provincial debt, it is true. But if you go to the root of the thing, if you go to the municipal indebtedness of Ontario, if you take the indebtedness of the farmers, and divide the total by the sum of the population, you will find that the farmers of the province of Quebe owe less, though apparently the public debt is much higher. All those statistics are deceiving and especially so in the case of workingmen and wages. The question is not only how much a workingman earns, but how much he can buy with the money he earns, and how much he has to put in the bank at the end of the week, month or year.

I do not see any use in my going into a long discussion. I am a moderate protectionist. I believe that a policy of moderate protection is required for Canada. But I cannot see my way to support this amendment. The hon. member for St. Mary's vitiated his own motion at the root when, being still a member of the government, he declared that the tariff was sufficient. But while the tariff was sufficient at that time, he suggests that recent events prove that it is not sufficient now. Surely, if the hon. member for St. Mary's wants to keep his reputation as a serious person—and I hope he does, because he can render service to Canada as a public man—he won't try now to make us believe that because some people have gone, according to the highest financial authorities of this country, to the extremest point of speculation in stock gambling, there is a necessity for a change in the tariff. This is the reason which brought me to my feet. We were challenged by three or four members of the opposition and by the hon. member for St. Mary's to exhibit our freedom. I have risen to tell them that as a free man, as a moderate protectionist, and one who believes that moderate protection is required for this country now, I am not prepared to ask the government to change the fiscal policy because there is a slump in stock gambling or because the opposition may gain some advantage by again raising this cry. The position is not what it was in 1878. The hon. member for St. Mary's in his campaign last year said that history would repeat itself. But, in order that he may convince us that history will repeat itself in the particular way the hon. gentleman indicates, he must convince the people of Canada that the situation is what it was in 1878. The hon. member for St. Mary's himself has said for seven years that the fiscal policy of the country has been readjusted, that it has been readjusted on the principle of moderate protection, that it has reassured capital and industry. What we want now, according to the very words of the hon. gentleman the last time he went to the polls to be elected to this House—what we want now is stability. I am still satisfied that the present tariff gives sufficient protection for what we need. Of course, there will be deputations to the government asking for changes of duty. That is the whole argument of the leader of the opposition. But the hon. gentleman has refuted his own argument when he spoke of the great evils of monopolies in the United States. What we moderate protectionists, who do not want to make protection the tool of a political party or to use protection as a means of giving strength to people who might turn their influence against the government—what we want is that, while we should have enough protection to safeguard the industries of Canada against the slaughtering of our markets, we should not have the high protection that will bring about in this country the very evil which the hon. leader of the opposition has denounced as existing in the United States.

Now, Sir, the one remark of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to which I wish to take exception, is his statement that Mr. Chamberlain was carrying on a policy in accordance with that of the government of Canada. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has reflected very carefully on that point, or whether he expresses the views of his government. But I wish to say that if this should be the policy of the government of Canada, the government would no longer enjoy my confidence, and it should no longer enjoy the confidence of

any man who is proud of the liberties of Canada. If I understood the position taken by our representatives in the colonial conference last year, it was that we had given the preference to Great Britain—a preference which the hon. member for St. Mary's seems to have approved of as minister of the Crown, but which his newspaper in Montreal was denouncing last week—and we were prepared to go further in that direction, with the understanding, of course, that some changes were to be made in our tariff if we did so. But what I understood to be also the position of the government, and what I hope is their position now, was that, although we were ready to enter into an agreement with the motherland for the mutual benefit of that country and of Canada, we should always keep our liberty to break the agreement when we saw fit to do so. That is the position that the Minister of Finance took in his budget speech this year. But what is Mr. Chamberlain's scheme ? We have heard the hon. member for St. Mary's eulogizing the policy of Mr. Chamberlain. That policy is that free trade should exist between England and the colonies. What would be the first result of that ? The first result would be the ruin of half our manufacturing industries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) allow me to correct him on that point ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly..

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Several years ago Mr. Chamberlain took the position that a mutual preference such as was sought by us could only be obtained by the colonies adopting a policy of free trade within the empire. We told him frankly that so far as Canada was concerned we could not agree to that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because the industries of Canada had been established under a tariff, and, even if they had not vested rights, they had rights that we are willing to respect.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman said that free trade might mean 15 to 17½ per cent tariff.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have repeatedly stated the views of the government on this subject. Whereas, several years ago, Mr. Chamberlain took that view, he fully understands that Canada, and not Canada only, but the other colonies, are not prepared to make such an arrangement ; and what he proposes is a mutual preference in which there shall be moderate duties on our side and moderate duties in England on those things upon which she cares to have them. But there is no engagement—he well understands that—on the part of Canada to accept the condition he talked of some years ago of free trade between England and Canada.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not deny that the position taken by Mr. Chamberlain now is somewhat different from the position he took some years ago. But, at the same time, as the Minister of Finance and all the organs of the government have frequently stated since the conference, what did he say ? He said that the present preference which we grant on English goods, and which is admitted by all independent men to be too great for some of our industries to bear, should be greatly increased before any such agreement can be entered into. If he has receded from the position of absolute free trade between the mother country and the colonies, he still contends that the preference given is not sufficient. I say, as a moderate protectionist, I am satisfied with the general tariff of 1897. But when the preference of 1900 was adopted, I thought we had gone a little too far in that direction. Surely the government are not prepared to say to-day that they are ready, at Mr. Chmaberlain's request, to go still further in that direction and increase the preference we have given on British goods.

But that is not the most important point that I wish to make about Mr. Chamberlain's scheme. His policy—whatever our opinion as to its merits—is undoubtedly different from the avowed policy of this government, as it affects the relation between England and the colonies. His scheme is that Great Britain and her colonies shall enter into a mutual compact on trade matters. What would be the first result ? The first result would be that politically and practically speaking, if not legally we should to a large extent, lose control of our tariff. In the second place we should be obliged to stand the effect of all the foreign treaties that the Zollverein might make with other countries. The delegates from Australia, New Zealnad and South Africa might force the Zollverein to make treaty with some nation, which treaty would be favourable to the interests of these southern colonies, but detrimental to the interests of Canada. The majority of the delegates in the imperial council, or whatever body would have the supervision of this policy, would decide matters of this kind. What would be our position ? We would be forced with either to go out of the Zollverein or accept a treaty disadvantageous to us. On the other hand we should be deprived of the power to make our own treaties. What I have always contended and hoped for and, in spite of the declaration of the Minister of Finance, I do not despair of seeing it—is the establishment of Canada's right to make commercial treaties with any nation she sees fit. And the speech made at Lille, in France, by the Prime Minister was an indication of that policy, and I hope it is still the policy of the government.

The Prime Minister stated there, after the conference, that Canada had adopted, in 1897, the principle of preferential trade in favour of all countries that would grant us similar favours. It is true that afterwards we shut off the application of that law to other countries, and we only kept it in favour of British goods. But I had hoped after the declaration made in London by our delegates, and after the speech made by the Finance Minister and by the Prime Minister in Paris and Lille, that we would revert to the policy of 1897, which would have a double effect ; first, of reducing the preference we grant to British goods, and therefore removing some of the anxiety that permits the opposition to make political capital ; and secondly, it would bring us back to our freedom of making treaties with all nations in the world. I sum up my argument in these few words : Our present general fiscal policy is a good one for Canada, it is high enough to grant what the opposition calls adequate protection, while at the same time it does not allow manufacturers to form combines such as those that are the curse of the United States, and which the leader of the opposition has denounced. In the next place, our country should have as much freedom as possible to develop our foreign trade and to make the best reciprocity treaties we could with all nations of the world. For that purpose we must stick to the principle of protection, without going to the excess that the hon. member for St. Mary's and the leader of the opposition have advocated to-night.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). At this early hour of the morning I can promise the House I will not detain it at any length. I did not intend to speak on this subject, but it is so rarely that I can agree with the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) on any points which he raises before this House, that it seems to me I should not allow the opportunity to pass without agreeing with something he has said to-night. The hon. gentleman speaks of being a moderate protectionist. I would go a little further than he goes, I might be accused of being an extreme protectionist, at all events we are both protectionists. But he went on to point out that he considered one of the essential points of a protective policy was stability. There again I am in accord with the hon. member for Labelle, and there I fancy is the greatest weakness in the case of the government that can be pointed out. I venture to say that no tariff can be called properly protective unless it has the two factors : One, the factor of giving the measure of protection, and the other, giving the stability of protection. It is all very well to offer manufacturers or capitalists any percentage you like, ten, fifteen, twenty, fifty or one hundred per cent, as a measure of protection, but unless you also give them such confidence in the government that they believe the protection will be stable, then your protection is inadequate, and will never bring about the results that protectionists have in view. To-day one of the great reasons why capital is chary of investment in Canada is the fact that the stability which the member for Labelle points out as an essential to a protective tariff, is wholly wanting in any tariff that hon. gentlemen opposite have brought down. On this important question before the House now, one of the most important questions that can occupy our attention, the member for Labelle says he believes the present tariff does give adequate protection to all our industries. Does he consider the full practical meaning of that ? As a member of this House he has again and again voted against resolutions introduced by the leader of the opposition in favour of adequate protection. He says he believes the present tariff does give adequate protection. If he so believes, what is to prevent him voting for this resolution moved to-day, even if, in days gone by, he lost the opportunity of voting for the very thing he desired, adequate protection.

When I listened to the Finance Minister and heard him saying that the very fact that machinery was lying idle in Toronto because labour could not be got, was a triumphant vindication of his policy, I could not help wondering what kind of policy the hon. gentleman thought this country should have in order to induce outsiders to come here. Surely if machinery is standing idle in Toronto because wrokmen cannot be found to operate it, there must be something wrong in this country. Why, Sir, we know that a great many idle men in other countries are seeking for employment, and none of them can be induced to come to Canada to accept situations waiting for them to enable the Canadian manufacturers to work even the machinery they have on hand. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite can hardly pride themselves on the success of their fiscal policy when it presents so slight an attraction to the nations of the world that it cannot draw even enough men to work the machinery standing idle for want of operators. The Finance Minister also pointed with triumph to the fact of his large surplus, and said this would be an opportune time to raise the tariff. Would he pause for a moment to consider whence his surplus comes ? He claims he has not raised the tariff then if he has not raised the tariff, he has obtained this enormous surplus because of the larger quantity of goods that are coming into this country than came in formerly. Therefore he stands before this House and takes credit to himself, and is greeted by the triumphant cheers of his followers, because we are not able to manufacture the goods we should, and therefore he is allowing millions and millions more of manufactured goods to come into this country than came in a few years ago. If this be a fact, and it certainly is the fact, what better reason can be given, if we wish

to build up our native industries, than that we find under the tariff as it is, whether it be the old tariff, or whether it be a better or worse one, but taken as it is, if you find the effect of it is that so many million dollars more of manufactured goods have been imported into this country that our surplus has run up to $13,000,000, surely that is ample reason for the representatives of the people to consider whether a higher tariff which would exclude millions worth of manufactured goods, would not be a wiser policy than that which hon. gentlemen opposite have advocated.

The hon. gentleman too took great credit because it had been admitted that farmers were paying off their mortgages. I am sure nobody on this side of the House wishes to gainsay that fact, nobody on this side of the House but rejoices at that fact. But surely it is proper to ask the Finance Minister what kind of a tariff it is that will account for this new and unexpected ability of the farmers to pay off their mortgages. Is it not a fact that the farmers remain precisely as they were under the old tariff, except that in some instances their protection has been decreased? No farmer is better able to pay off the mortgage because he has less protection. Therefore I think we can with peculiar gratitude admit that it is owing to the abundant harvests that this country has been blessed with during the last seven years, to the wave of prosperity of the last seven years, that our farmers are able to pay off their mortgages, and not on account of the tariff.

Now, Sir, the real question before the House, I venture to say, is whether the government is prepared to accept a resolution in favour of protection or not. The hon. the Finance Minister has spoken, as he always does, eloquently and well, but as usual he succeeded in speaking to the delight of his followers without conveying the slightest information so far as his own views on the subject of protection really went. He was good enough to say that he thought there were no free traders on the other side of the House. Surely he has forgotten that a few years ago his leader was a free trader, and if I were allowed to refer to past debates of this session it would not take me long to prove from the lips of his leader that he is still a free trader. But perhaps the hon. gentleman really means that 15 per cent or 17 per cent might be free trade. I venture to say that cannot be free trade, and it is an abuse of language for any person to speak of a tariff of even 15 per cent or 17 per cent as being free trade. A tariff which averages 17 per cent may to a certain extent be a protectionist tariff, but a tariff of 15 per cent, or 17 per cent, or 70 per cent will not be protection unless the government which has to maintain that tariff is pledged to the principle of protection, so that capitalists may invest their money on the strength of the security afforded by the known policy of the government. Is it not a fact that at the present time capitalists are chary in coming to Canada?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Is it not a fact that if you had higher protection more capital would come to this country?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if a highly protective duty were put on iron, steel and lead no further capital would come to this country to develop the iron mines or lead mines? Surely there is no hon. gentleman in this House who will not admit, that, as has been told to us by hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia, the success, such as it is, which has been achieved by the iron industry of that province has been owing to the assistance given by this government, and that but for that assistance it would have been unable to achieve any success at all. In the face of that I think no hon. gentleman will deny that if adequate protection had been given to the iron and steel industry there would not have been the depression which there is in that industry to-day and there would not have been the slump in the market that has recently occurred. I rose mainly to call attention to the fact that although at last the hon. Minister of Finance did speak after the debate had lasted for hours, after supporters of the government had allowed member after member on this side of the House to discuss the question without rising, that although the hon. Minister of Finance did rise and make an eloquent and telling speech he still failed to say a word to show the manufacturers and capitalists of this country and other countries that the government are prepared to give the industries of Canada an adequate measure of protection. As a protectionist I believe that the future of this country depends on our industries being properly protected as the industries of every other civilized country in the world, not even excepting the motherland, have been. I feel confident that the Canadian is the equal of any man in the world, but I am not so conceited as to leave the Canadian without any armour, without any munitions of war to stand up and fight against the troops of other countries provided with modern equipment and unlimited capital. I shall support this motion, because I believe that only by a system of adequate protection can this country be made to prosper. I would be glad if the hon. leader of the opposition would come down with a resolution, not only going as far as this resolution does, but going farther than that and declaring that, situated as we are alongside of a nation of seventy millions of people, as a matter of self defence, if they will not trade with us we will not trade with them, and that unless they will reduce their tariff

to a reasonable level we will raise our tariff as high as theirs. If we raise our tariff as high as theirs, if we secure the development of the industries of this country through a process of judicious protection, when we come to meet the motherland in the proposed scheme for moulding the colonies and the motherland together into a partnership, then we would be in a position to offer something to the motherland that would induce her to give us a preference, that in all probability she never will give unless we are prepared to offer her that which we can only offer when secured by a system of proper protection.

House divided on amendment (Hon. Mr. Tarte).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Avery,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Lefurgey,
Bell,	Lennox,
Bennett,	Léonard,
Birkett,	MacLaren (Perth),
Blain,	McCormick,
Borden (Halifax),	McGowan,
Boyd,	Monk,
Brock,	Morin,
Broder,	Northrup,
Bruce,	Osler,
Carscallen,	Reid (Grenville),
Clancy,	Roche (Marquette),
Clarke,	Rosamond,
Cochrane,	Sherritt,
Earle,	Smith (Wentworth),
Gilmour,	Sproule,
Gourley,	Tarte,
Hackett,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Thomson (Grey),
Henderson,	Tolton,
Hughes (Victoria),	Vrooman,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Wilmot,
Kidd,	Wilson—50.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Law,
Archambault,	LeBlanc,
Bazinet,	Lemieux,
Beith,	Logan,
Béland,	Loy,
Belcourt,	Macdonald,
Bernier,	Mackie,
Bickerdike,	MacKinnon,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Bourassa,	Macpherson,
Bourbonnais,	McCarthy,
Brown,	McCool,
Bruneau,	McCreary,
Bureau,	McEwen,
Calvert,	McGugan,
Campbell,	McIsaac,
Carbonneau,	McLennan,
Champagne,	Madore,
Christie,	Malouin,
Copp,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Cowan,	Martineau,
Delisle,	Matheson,
Demers (Lévis),	Mayrand,
Demers (St. John),	Meigs,
Desjardins,	Mignault,
Douglas,	Monet,
Dugas,	Morrison,
Dyment,	Mulock (Sir William),
Erb,	Oliver,
Ethier,	Paterson,
Fielding,	Préfontaine,
Fisher,	Proulx,
Fitzpatrick,	Puttee,
Fortier,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fraser,	Ross (Ontario),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Rimouski),
Geoffrion,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
German,	Rousseau,
Gibson,	Russell,
Girard,	Schell,
Gould,	Scott,
Harwood,	Stephens,
Heyd,	Stewart,
Holmes,	Sutherland (Essex),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Sutherland (Oxford),
Hyman,	Talbot,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tobin,
Kendall,	Tucker,
Lang,	Turcot,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Turgeon,
Lavergne,	Wade—102.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Thompson (Haldimand and Monck),	Ingram,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
McColl,	Ward,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Parmelee,	Pope,
Roche (Halifax),	Cargill,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Ball,
Sifton,	Maclean,
Ross (Yukon),	Kemp,
Blair,	Roddick,
Power,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Smith (Vancouver),	Ganong,
Wallace,	Halliday,
Grant,	Culbert,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd.),	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Wright,	Lavell,
Riley,	Richardson,
Harty,	McIntosh,
Davis,	Pringle,
Costigan,	Casgrain,
Farquharson,	Kaulbach,
Tolmie,	Kendrey,
Galliher,	Hale,
Marcil (Bagot),	Seagram,
Lewis,	Clare,
Lovell,	Calvin,

Amendment negatived; motion (Hon. Mr. Fielding) agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As it is too late to proceed now, I propose that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:—

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

(Sgd.) MINTO.

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

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In moving the adjournment of the House I may say that at the earlier part of to-morrow's session, it is expected that the Minister of Railways will bring forward his resolutions with regard to the Canadian Northern Railway. Later I would be glad to have the co-operation of my friends opposite in giving consideration to several items of special supply for the current year. They will be in the Departments of Mounted Police, Militia, Public Works and Agriculture. I refer to special items urgently needed for the service of the present year. I hope to have the co-operation of hon. gentlemen in accepting these with as little discussion as possible so that we may get a special Supply Bill through.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We will not be unreasonable in meeting the wishes of my hon. friend. I presume the Minister of Railways will not forget the information which he promised to bring down when we were considering the Canadian Northern Railway resolutions some days ago.

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to draw attention to the following telegram :

Contracts are about to be signed between the Canadian and French governments involving the establishment of a new steamship line of four vessels between Halifax and Rochefort-Sur-Mer, for the purpose of developing the Canadian lumber trade with France. France will obtain considerable advantage from the new arrangement, as there may be a reduction of the Canadian tariff in favour of certain lines of French manufactured goods much used in the Dominion.

Each government promises to subsidize two vessels which will offer passenger service, transferring travellers to the Canadian Pacific at Halifax, whence there is direct and rapid communication with New York. It is stated that the freight interests of the Canadian Pacific, which taps an enormous lumber region, played a great part in the new enterprise. The scheme was first officially sketched during Premier Laurier's visit to Paris last summer. That the scheme should be based on the reduction of the Canadian tariff in certain directions in favour of France occasions comment here, in view of Mr. Chamberlain's recent utterances regarding intercolonial and British commercial union.

I wish to ask my hon. friend who is leading the House whether or not he is able to announce as to the authenticity of the information contained in that telegram ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as the despatch refers to any agreement whatever between France and Canada touching a reduction of duties there is absolutely no foundation for it. There were negotiations, as has already been stated in a general way, between the representatives of this government and the French government in Paris last autumn, but they did not come to any conclusion, and there is therefore no foundation whatever for the statement the hon. gentleman has read so far as it relates to any change of commercial policy on one side or the other. As respects the steamship line, there is a standing offer for a subsidy for a line between France and Canada and negotiations have occasionally taken place with the view of getting that line into operation. It is possible that the Prime Minister, or the Minister of Trade and Commerce, has had some recent negotiation on the subject, with which I am not acquainted, but that would be done under the standing offer which exists in our statute of a subsidy for a line of steamers between France and Canada.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.55 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, June 18, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PETITION FOR PRIVATE BILL.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Hants) moved : That the petition of Mr. B. Russell and others presented this day, praying that leave may be granted to John F. Stairs and others to present a petition for an Act of incorporation to do a general banking business, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills, be read and received forthwith and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we had better suspend the rule entirely with regard to the reception of these petitions and the introduction of private Bills, we have violated it so often. The rule is so seldom observed that we might as well not have it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I second the motion.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No, I do not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). I think the rule a useful one, and one that serves a good purpose; and I think he will agree with me that this year we have had fewer suspensions of the rule than ever before—certainly than any year that I can now recall to mind. Of course, we must admit that all rules have their exceptions, and there are cases where exceptions should be allowed to this one.

Mr. SPROULE. The Prime Minister has said that we have violated the rule less this year than ever before. Why, we have been violating it every week for weeks past.

The PRIME MINISTER. But not several times a week.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY — DEMURRAGE ON CARS.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked;

1. What are the regulations concerning the demurrage on cars loading and unloading at Intercolonial Railway stations?
2. What amount of demurrage has been collected at each station during six months of the present fiscal year, from July 1, 1902, to January 1, 1903?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). When the question was asked the other day, I said that it was altogether too voluminous to be replied to in the form of an answer to a question.

McPHERSON & SCHELL—SUPPLY OF GOODS TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

Is J. T. Schell, member of the House of Commons, for the electoral district of Glengarry, a partner in the firm of McPherson & Schell, who supplied goods to the Department of Agriculture, as appears by the Auditor General's Report, 1901-1902, page D—22?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The government has no information as to the personnel of the firm of Macpherson and Schell which is mentioned in the Auditor General's Report in connection with an item of five dollars and fifty cents.

INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. WILSON asked:

Has Joseph Haycock been appointed an inspector of binder twine? If so, when was he appointed, and what is his salary?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Yes. On the 2nd June instant. $1,200 per annum.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

Has Joseph Haycock, ex-M.P.P., for Frontenac, Ontario, been appointed inspector of binder twine? If so, what salary is he to receive, and what are his duties?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). The first part of the question I have already answered. As respects the rest, his duties are to see that the requirements of the General Inspection Act in so far as regards binder twine, are carried out.

COUNTY COURT JUDGES.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. What are the names of all persons appointed within the last twenty-five years as county court judges; together in each case with the date of appointment, age at time of appointment, and county for which appointment made?
2. What are the names of such of these judges who have since retired, been retired, have died, or for any other cause have ceased to exercise the office of county court judges?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I would ask my hon. friend to bear in mind that to get the information which he seeks will entail a considerable amount of labour, but I hope to be able to give it to him within the next few days.

ADULTERATION OF BUTTER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) moved:

That the House do to-morrow resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to take into consideration the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to pass an Act to prevent the improper marking of butter; to prevent the manufacture or sale of renovated, adulterated, or process butter, or of oleomargarine, butterine, or other substitute for butter, manufactured wholly or in part from any fat other than that of milk or cream; providing for the examination of stock or packages; and providing that one-half of the pecuniary penalties for contraventions of the Act shall be payable to the informant.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is not a motion to grant any subsidy?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will be moved in the regular way to go into committee.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION AND YUKON COMMISSIONS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked me for some information with regard to the commission on transportation and the commission on the Yukon. I will be able to give my hon. friend the information which he desires on Monday.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY—GUARANTEE OF SECURITIES.

House again in committee on the proposed resolutions (page 4,363) regarding aid to the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I was asked by some hon. gentleman opposite if, when we next considered these resolutions, I would bring the estimates of the engineer as respects the cost of these two lines. I find that the actual approximate estimate, based upon profiles and plans showing the actual work which requires to be done on the road, and including a sum for equipment and rolling stock amounts to $18,301 per mile upon the line from Grandview to Edmonton. A suggestion was made to the effect that the amount of the grant which it was proposed to give for the line of 100 miles east of Prince Albert was practically in excess of the estimated cost of that line. I do not know that I heard that statement, but I have heard that it was made in the House. If such a statement was made, it does not correspond with the facts, because the engineer's estimate of the cost of that portion of the line brings the total sum higher than the cost of the Grandview section; the estimate is $18,856.89 per mile. Included in that sum, in both estimates, applicable to both branches, or both portions of the road, there is a sum of $3,000 per mile for rolling stock, making something over $2,000,000 in the one case, and over $300,000 in the other. I will furnish my hon. friend with a copy of these, and in connection with that copy I will give him also a copy of the estimates which were submitted by the engineer of the Canadian Northern. Their estimate was somewhat higher.

Mr. CLARKE. What estimate has the hon. gentleman just been giving ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimate of the government engineer.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the date ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This particular estimate was made on the 13th of June. I have a line from Mr. Schreiber which also accompanies the estimate, and which is to this effect :

> The approximate estimates of the cost of constructing certain sections of the Canadian Northern Railway which were prepared for you last year cannot be found. My recollection is that I handed them to you, either for use in the House or in council, since which I have not seen them. You probably have them carefully put away. However, we now have plans and profiles of these lines on file in the department, and based on these I have had an approximate estimate of the cost of construction prepared by the inspecting engineer, Mr. Simmons, which, being based on more full and accurate information before us than the estimate of last year, should therefore be more correct. It gives a higher cost per mile than the previous estimate.

I stated to the committee that my recollection was that the estimate which we had before council from our engineers made the cost over $17,000 per mile. That is simply my recollection about it, but we have been unable to find the papers that were before council, therefore I have been unable to furnish them to the House, or to the committee. But this statement accompanying the letter which Mr. Schreiber has written me, shows in the first place that the estimate now made is based upon the actual profiles and plans, and is therefore more likely to be accurate than was the other; it also shows that his estimate is still somewhat higher than the estimate which was then made, some $1,300 higher per mile as respects the Grandview and Edmonton section, and something in the neighbourhood of $1,800 higher as respects the Prince Albert section.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does Mr. Schreiber's estimates give us the average quantities ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It gives all the quantities.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Does it include equipment and rolling stock ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It includes $3,000 per mile for rolling stock, which is fairly up to the average, the number of acres of land estimated to be required to be taken by expropriation or otherwise, with the estimate of the quantities of rock, hard-pan and earth excavation, and the quantities in all classes. I may repeat, if I did not make the statement fully the other day, that I have the estimates of the engineers, including those of the engineers of the railway company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have the estimates of the engineers of the railway company too ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they were made up without any connection whatever with the government.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it be possible for the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to have these estimates placed on 'Hansard' ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it would be very easy to do that.

Mr. CLARKE. We can read them on 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot put them on 'Hansard' myself.

Mr. CLARKE. We will have no record whatever of these documents if they do not go on 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can lay them on the Table of the House.

Mr. CLARKE. In that case I suppose it would be well to get them printed.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no objection to having them printed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) will look at them and confer with the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) I think the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals will suggest that there will be no necessity for having them printed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I was not here the other day and perhaps the hon. minister has explained why it is that in the second resolution the mortgage shall be a first charge only to the extent of $10,000 a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I explained that on three different occasions and if the hon. gentleman will look at 'Hansard' he will find there the explanation.

Mr. CLARKE. I am not quite clear as to the information the hon. minister gave us respecting the lien or security that the government will have on the rolling stock on these two branches.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The government will have a lien on the whole of the property of every kind and description.

Mr. CLARKE. On the rolling stock as well as everything else?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. The rolling stock will be owned and not leased by the company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, undoubtedly. They own this rolling stock. They are not getting it under any lease. It is included in the estimate.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) whether it would not be possible for this House to have laid on the Table before we decide upon this question the documents which the government propose to execute as the agreement between the Dominion and this railway company. I think it is of the utmost importance to the country that before we enter into this guarantee we should have full knowledge what the terms of the bargain may be. It is quite obvious to anybody that the resolution laid before us gives most meagre particulars of what is contemplated. The hon. gentleman assures us that rolling stock to the extent of $3,000 per mile shall be acquired by this company, and, I presume, placed upon the railway and maintained there, and that the country shall have a first mortgage upon the rolling stock. I mention that here simply for the purpose of pointing out that no person would gather from this resolution that any such provision is intended to be put into the contract. The hon. minister tells us that it is the intention and no doubt it is the intention that this shall be done, but from the resolution that we have here, nobody would know that anything of the kind was contemplated. There is no word in this resolution about rolling stock. There is the one word 'property' and everybody knows that no person taking a mortgage on a railway would consider that under the word 'property' he had acquired rolling stock or any particular amount of rolling stock. One car would cover the word 'property' if this one car were necessary to comply with the conditions of this resolution. Those who are at all familiar with the present methods of railway companies know that while they may have a large amount of rolling stock upon any given concern not one locomotive or car may be the property of the railway company. There may be a certain amount of rolling stock to begin with and within twelve months there may not be a car left. I do not think it is right that we should be asked to pass a resolution committing this country to a very large guarantee without knowing really what we are doing. We have to receive an assurance from the hon. minister that certain things that are proper and reasonable in such a transaction are intended, but there is nothing in this resolution to indicate that they must be included in the terms of the contract. I do not suppose that the hon. minister has got to this stage of the transaction without having very carefully considered and negotiated the whole of the terms of this contract, and before we are asked to commit ourselves to a vote in favour of the transaction we ought to be as fully informed of it as the hon. minister is. Then, I would like to ask, supposing that this company goes into default, and the country is called upon to pay a large sum year after year upon the guarantee, and we may be called upon to pay a million dollars in four or five years upon the guarantee, in what position do we stand in regard to the indebtedness of the company to the country? Are we to have interest upon our advances? What are the terms in that respect? If we pay $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 upon these bonds to the bondholders, is that to be a loan without interest, or has the company to pay us interest upon the advances? Surely that is a matter in regard to which men looking after the interests of the country are entitled to know what the terms of the con-

tract are in that respect; yet from the terms of this resolution they are completely in the dark. These are details, but most important details, and I do not think it is right that we should be asked to enter into a bargain of this kind and pledge the credit of the country to such a large extent without knowing more than the mere terms of this resolution.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am unable to see that these resolutions are wanting in clearness in any respect, and I would not have supposed, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) had not assured the committee of the fact that they left one in any doubt as to the main principles involved in this proposition and that they did not as fully cover the ground as is necessary at this stage. I am not prepared to say, but that when the Bill is introduced it may not be found necessary to enter into fuller detail, but even if the Bill is in more detail it will be quite open for any member of the House who thinks that some conditions ought to be introduced, to move that they shall be included in the measure. These resolutions are simply introductory features so as to enable a Bill covering all proper and necessary ground to be laid before parliament. If when the Bill is introduced, the hon. gentleman has any views to suggest to the committee looking towards some additional clauses or amendments to clauses, it will be very proper for him to move them, and I am sure the committee will be disposed to give any suggestion of his the fullest consideration. The request that we should lay the contract on the Table, or the documents which it will be necessary to have executed after legislation is passed, is not a request that I am afraid I could accede to. We have not advanced to that stage and could not have advanced to that stage. The necessary drafting of the technical work which is required to be done by the Justice Department and the legal fraternity will be done when we have passed the Bill, and until the Bill is passed it will be inexpedient and I would submit to my hon. friend quite unnecessary for us to enter upon the drafting of the necessary agreements, contracts, and securities. Parliament is informed by these resolutions of the main conditions upon which we think that this guarantee could properly be given, and it must rest upon the responsibility of the government after the Bill has passed to see that the papers necessary to be executed between the parties are properly drawn. We will have to ask the House, as is customary in such cases, to treat us upon that basis. We have not the time to give to the necessary consideration to the working out these features. Having regard to the immense work which devolves upon us, we cannot expect the government to drop other necessary work and delay parliament while we are having these securities drawn up in technical legal shape and form.

Mr. BARKER. The minister tells us that these resolutions contain all the information he is able to give us at this moment. He says we can obtain further information when the Bill is introduced; and almost in the same voice he tells us that the government will not be able to settle the terms of the contract until after the Bill has been passed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the hon. gentleman would misquote me; but that is not just what I said. I said that when the Bill comes down, then, if my hon. friend thinks that there is not sufficient protection provided in the public interest, it is quite open to him to move any amendment he wishes to the Bill, and everything he suggests would receive a proper measure of consideration.

Mr. BARKER. I certainly understood the minister to say clearly, that it could not be expected that the government would settle the terms of these contracts until after the Bill was passed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said: Would draft the contracts and have them drawn up.

Mr. BARKER. It will not be much satisfaction to this House and the country after we have passed the Bill, to know that the terms of the contracts are objectionable. It will be too late then. I do not see why in such a matter as this the House should not be placed as far as possible in possession of everything that is material to the consideration of whether we should give this guarantee or not. It is useless to say that negotiations have not been going on for some time with a view of the settlement of the terms of this guarantee. If it is not so, then the position we are in is this: that when the Bill is introduced the government will have no more knowledge than we have at the present time, and we will be asked to pass a Bill authorizing this guarantee and leaving it entirely to the minister to settle with the company what the terms and details shall be. I would like to call the minister's attention to the fact that when the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway was entered into it formed part of the Bill. It was a complete contract signed and sealed between Her Majesty and the railway company. It was introduced to this House, and parliament had the opportunity of seeing every word of that contract before they passed upon it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. Practically we are going it blind in this case, and I think it is most unfair to the House and to the country that we should be asked to vote on matters of this

importance when the minister tells us that after the Bill has passed the government will settle the terms of the contract. I would like now to refer to clause 7. It is a very simple clause which might have been introduced, not by the government but by the railway compnay. It is a way not unknown to introduce a clause that looks to be in favour of the country while it is really perhaps in favour of the company. It says :

Resolved, that the Governor in Council or any authority created by parliament for the purpose may also grant running powers over any portion of the lines hereby aided to any other line of railway upon terms considered equitable.

That is a very nice clause. Supposing that next year or three or four years hence, the government choose to grant running powers upon this line or upon some short distance of it to another railway upon terms that the government may consider equitable—why the terms the government may consider equitable may be the releasing of a large portion of the security that the country is now stipulating for. We are practically leaving the whole of this subject to be settled by Order in Council. I mention it as showing that it is of the utmost consequence to the interests of Canada that we should know every word and every detail of it before we commit ourselves to the guarantee. I am not endeavouring to obstruct the government in what they are proposing to do, but I do say that before we enter into an enormous contract of this kind we ought to know what we are contracting about.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) is indulging in very strong adjectives in connection with a proposition that certainly on the face of it does not warrant him in so doing. I surely do not understand my hon. friend, when he discovers anything like a reasonable analogy between the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway original contract and the Canadian Northern Railway guarantee. There is not to my mind the least similarity between the two. In the one case this country was giving without competition or tender, an immense amount of money, a large quantity of land, and other privileges, properties, and rights, of the most extensive character. We were giving all these things to the company, whereas this is an offer of the guarantee of the government, by way of security, to enable this company in the public market to raise money for the purpose of building the road, which guarantee is covered and secured by the property which is thereby created, and which every one believes will be well able to recoup the country for every farthing that is advanced or paid. If the hon. gentleman can discover any analogy between these two cases, he succeeds in doing what I think very few members of this committee will feel able to do. We are providing here, I think in the amplest manner, that the property which is being created by the use of this guarantee, shall be subject to the liability to repay the loan contracted under the guarantee. I am not saying that these resolutions contain all that a Bill will contain or ought to contain. I have not yet got down to framing the Bill in its entirety, or dealing with it. When that comes before parliament, if it seems wanting in any respect, it will be quite open to parliament to make good any omission in it. The hon. gentleman refers to clause 7. That seems to me to be plain and clear. The hon. gentleman discovers under that clause a possibility of the government throwing away a large portion of its claim. My hon. friend might just as well say that we ought to introduce a provision in the Bill to say that the members of the government shall not steal the whole of the bonds, and dispose of them for their private advantage. What just reason or cause is there for assuming that under a clause which is manifestly a proper clause, providing for the granting of running rights, a government could absolutely wipe out the security that is given, or any part of it ? My hon. friend ought not, it seems to me, to discuss the resolutions from any such point of view. He is not approaching this question with the usual judgment that he applies to the matters which he considers. I would like to know what other language could be employed in clause 7. We cannot put in this resolution the terms it might be necessary to impose. What would be equitable terms must depend altogether upon the circumstances at the moment. What would be equitable under one set of conditions might be inadequate under another. Ought there not to be somebody vested with the authority to grant these running powers ? And if the Governor in Council ought not to be vested with that authority, who ought ? Is it necessary that we should wait until parliament meets before giving to any other company the right to run over the lines of this railway, and get the sanction of parliament to the express terms on which that right is granted ? That is not done in any ordinary case. At present the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has power to decide on what terms one railway shall have running powers over another. Why is it necessary in this case to introduce suspicions which do not attach to ordinary cases ? If this government is not entitled to the confidence of the House sufficiently to enable it to determine what are equitable terms, it is not entitled to the confidence of the House at all. My hon. friend, of course, has not any confidence in us ; but his suggestion, I apprehend, is not made from that point of view. He would, I suppose, make the same criticism and expect the same advantage to be taken, even if his own friends were in power.

Mr. BARKER. Certainly. It is not the present government that is referred to here, but whatever government may be in power at the moment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, whatever government commands the confidence of parliament must have that power. You cannot legislate in any other way. You must give somebody the authority to say what will be equitable terms on which these rights may be exercised.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose the minister would contend that it would be quite proper that the government of the day, whatever political party might be in power, could impair the terms of this guarantee in order to give running powers over this railway. That may be done under this clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see it.

Mr. BARKER. It is quite possible. The government of the day may determine the equitable terms under which another company shall have running powers. They may alter the whole conditions, reduce the rate of interest, or do anything else they like in consideration of the company conceding certain running powers. I say that any arrangement of this kind ought to be made with the approval of parliament; and further than that, I say that the government of the day should have no power to [illegible] any terms with the contracting party which would impair in any way the security of the country under the contract originally entered into. I think that ought to be a part of the agreement. I do not say this with reference to the present government. I sincerely believe that this government is not going to be in power many years; but whatever government is in power—when there is a Conservative government in power four or five years hence—it ought not to have the power to dicker with this railway company for running powers on terms which would impair the security of the country. Suppose the country has to pay to bondholders $1,000,000 in the next four or five years, what position do we stand in with reference to the interest on that advance? There is not a word hinted at here with regard to that. It is simply an advance for the use and benefit of this company, without interest, so far as we know.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. There is one point in this connection which I think has not yet been mentioned. This is not likely to be the last case in which we are to be asked for a guarantee; and therefore it is reasonable to ask the minister to consider this case very seriously. Then, we must not forget that these securities will go into the hands of investors, and then it will be too late for us to change the arrangement, because these investors will have got vested rights which we shall have to respect. So far as this parliament is concerned, this is a new style of security. Ordinarily, I grant, the minister's position is sound—we adopt a resolution, and put the responsibility on the government of carrying it out. No one contends that all the details should be in this resolution. As an opposition, our duty is to assist the government as well as criticise, and in a matter of this importance, which, if reports be true, we will be asked to implement by still another transaction before this session is over, we cannot take too many precautions. We are assuming an obligation of $11,000,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A little over $9,000,000.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. This resolution simply relegates the country to the position of a surety. If the surety pays a part of the debt, he is to that extent in the position of a bondholder. I do not think that the country ought to be satisfied with that. I think that the government ought to take some additional security, as for instance, a second mortgage from the company, and thus be empowered to act of their own violation and not have to go through the ordinary routine imposed on a bondholder. I think that the hon. minister should endeavour to meet us half way and give us an opportunity to pass upon the contemplated contract before we are bound by it.

[illegible]STER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no disposition on the part of myself or my colleagues not to profit by any suggestion which hon. gentlemen opposite may have to make, which would facilitate the carrying out of what we have in contemplation. But I do not feel free to give the committee any definite assurance that we will furnish the committee with the prepared documents—the mortgage and security and contract. In an important matter of this kind, it is very necessary that calm and careful thought be given to the working out of the proposition, and if we were to draft the documents too hurriedly, there would be danger of error or oversight. I do not think that any interest will be served by hurrying this matter and adding it to the work at present before parliament. We lay down the conditions in our resolution, and in the Bill we will state any further conditions which we may think it well to submit to parliament, but we must ask parliament to allow us the time and opportunity to work them into shape in any agreement to be entered into between the company and the government. I do not think that it would be of advantage to the country and the undertaking, that we should depart from the rule in the present instance.

Mr. COCHRANE. When was the rule laid down?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If it was never laid down before, I am laying it down now. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is very much exercised concerning what would happen if the interest were not paid by the company and the government had to pay it. I would say to my hon. friend that the government would then be in a position to enforce the payment of that interest under its mortgage on the property. The government would be entitled to force a sale of the property or take it over.

Mr. BARKER. Do you propose to collect interest on your advances ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will come to that in a moment. That is the power we would have ordinarily under these resolutions. Well, it is a question which the government must take into their serious consideration what would be equitable and fair treatment of a new enterprise and one which, admittedly, it is in the public interest to encourage, aid and promote in every way. Now, how should we treat a company having in hand a laudable enterprise of such great public interest and importance ? What would the people of Canada justify the government in doing with them ? Would they justify the government, in the initial stages of the enterprise, when the road is hardly in full operation, coming down and demanding the pound of flesh and telling the company they must forfeit their property unless they could pay the interest at once ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But you intend to take the power to do that if you like ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is the point.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no question about that. And the people who own this property and are making it subject to this mortgage realize that they will be in the hands of the government. Now, I am not going to suggest—nor do I believe—that the government would be warranted in pursuing their remedy in any other than a reasonable, moderate, thoughtful and deliberate way—give them time ; let them get their road in operation. We propose to have the right to know just what they are earning, how they are spending their money and what should properly come to the government from these proceeds. We propose to keep ourselves informed on these matters. We should deal—I am not now speaking for the government, for I know my colleagues have not considered this question—I am giving my individual, personal view, and I do not want to be understood as binding anybody else—we should deal with the company on the whole undertaking with a proper measure of consideration, after ascertaining what they have been able to do. If they have done all that they could reasonably be expected to do, the government should have leave to deal with them reasonably ; and I think parliament would sustain the government in dealing with them in a reasonable, lenient spirit.

Now, the question raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) is whether we should impose interest upon that interest. I have not considered it ; I do not know whether any of my colleagues have considered it. But I would remind my hon. friend that we are departing from a policy which has been followed ever since before he entered public life. Formerly money was given to the railway companies ; we have given away absolutely almost untold millions, and with the full approbation of my hon. friend. Now, when the government is starting out with the intention of adopting a new system as respects this undertaking, my hon. friend has discovered that there might possibly be interest paid by this government for a short period, and he would insist that we shall collect interest upon that interest.

Mr. COCHRANE. He did not.

Mr. BARKER. I merely wanted to know what the government intended to do about it. We want to know what the bargain is to be.

The MINISTER OF RAILAWYS AND CANALS. I am glad to know that my hon. friend does not insist, because it seems to me that, having regard to all that has taken place in years past, it would be unwise, in dealing with a meritorious railway that is being constructed for the benefit of the great country that we have in the west, an enterprise that is doing its best to realize the hopes and expectations of the people in every way, to treat them in a niggardly manner.

Mr. COCHRANE. I wish to say that no one on this side of the House talks in any such strain.

The MINISTER OF RAILAWYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, why does the hon. minister imagine that sort of thing ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) would not do it, I know.

Mr. COCHRANE. Nor any other gentleman on this side.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will acquit my hon. friend, and he ought to be satisfied with that.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not want to be acquitted by the hon. minister ; I am not on trial before him. I would not like to depend upon his mercy, if he thought he could wipe me out. I do not see any reason for so much talk about this matter. The question was asked simply whether the government

intended to put themselves in a position to collect interest on the interest, if it were found necessary to do so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know that my hon. friend has a great aversion to talk. I hold his views and wishes in profound respect, and I do not wish to do any more talking than is necessary. Let me say, as he refuses to be acquitted, that I must convict him of wishing to treat this enterprise harshly.

Mr. LENNOX. No one on this side, I am sure, has any desire to obstruct the resolutions proposed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). But I think we are bound to have reasonable information with regard to the bargain upon which we are about to enter. We are bound to know, in the first place, that the hon. minister who proposes the resolutions understands exactly the position he will occupy with regard to this railway company. It hardly seems to me, after following what the hon. gentleman said the other day, and endeavouring to follow what he said to-day, that the hon. minister himself has any clear conception of the bargain which he proposes that this country shall enter into with the railway company. The first essential is that the administration or department should know what they propose ; and the second essential is a consequence of the first—that when they know, they should make full disclosure to the House. Now, if hon. members of this House, having agreed to these resolutions, go to their constituents and are asked what is the bargain between the government and the railway company, I think there is not an hon. gentleman on either side of the House who would be able to tell definitely what the proposition was. It is not at all a question of confidence ; it is not a question of suspicion, as the hon. minister suggests ; it is a question of business principles to which we are directing the attention of the minister. It is a question whether the members of this House, they having but a delegated authority, shall further delegate that authority to the government, or shall determine the matter themselves as representatives of the people. Speaking for myself, I propose in every case, as far as I possibly can, to represent the people who sent me here, and to have a voice, so far as I can, in the affairs which concern them ; and not to delegate these matters to the decision of any other body. I believe it is the duty of this opposition, and it is the duty of hon. gentlemen who sit behind the ministry, to say that before we go any further we must know exactly what it is that is proposed. The hon. minister says : You must not have delay ; this will mean great delay, and the members of parliament, forsooth, will be sitting here idle until these documents are drawn up and laid upon the Table of the House. I propose nothing of the kind, Sir. I do not propose, as a member of parliament, to sit idle and wait for this railway company, or any other railway company, to lay before this House the propositions they have to make in order to get assistance from this parliament. Whatever propositions they have to make should have been outlined in writing and should have been laid before the committee before now. So when you talk about delay, I say to the Minister of Railways that there should be no occasion for delay. These resolutions were introduced the other day, and it was then stated, I understand, that the matter would be delayed for a few days in order that more information might be obtained. An hon. gentleman supporting the government suggested some of the information that we desired. None of that information is before the committee to-day. The Minister of Railways says that there is no similarity between the cases of the Canadian Pacific Railway and this railway. I admit that, to a large extent, he is right. In the one case we were supposed to be making a bargain by which we got in every instance dollar for dollar for our money ; and even then, when we were getting value for every dollar we invested, we had a bargain outlined and laid before parliament before we sanctioned the expenditure.

Mr. SCOTT. Did we get it ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, my hon. friend got it. A member from the west should be the last man to raise the question whether we got value for building the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, my hon. friend got value. A member from the west should be the last to assail the contract that made the west. A good many hon. members supporting the present government, a good many members of the government, too, do not like to be reminded of the value received from the Canadian Pacific Railway—men who condemned the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if allowed their way, would have prevented its construction. Not one of those members in parliament to-day from the west and supporting the administration, would be here to have a voice in the affairs of the country. We did get value in opening up that country. In the development of that country we got value over and over again for the investments made. But when I contrast that bargain with the proposition before us to-day—without saying that we should not perhaps aid this railway to some extent—and the minister saying that the two cases are not similar, I agree with him. In this case the railway company asks for a favour at the hands of the government, a favour which should be granted of course if it is in the interest of the country. But before we make that grant, it is the duty of members on both sides to see that it is a fair business

transaction, and safe in the interests of Canada.

Now, let me say with regard to the general question of assisting railways that I am unalterably opposed to giving money or lands for the purpose ; and when resolutions of this nature are brought before us, I regard it as my paramount duty to see that we are not giving the railway a subsidy under the guise of guaranteeing its bonds. I want to have the proposition so clearly laid before parliament that we shall know that in no event will this country hereafter be called upon to expend money on this or on any other railway. If a proposition can be brought before parliament so clear, and definite, and so safe-guarded as that we can give assistance by way of a guarantee without it costing the people an expenditure of money, then I am willing to assist. But I want the Minister of Railways and Canals to make his bargain so clear that we shall not have to take anything on trust, I want him to outline a fair business transaction, so that we shall know that, in voting for the resolutions, we are not voting for anything that will involve an expenditure later on.

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not think there will be any disagreement with the Minister of Railways with reference to so fair a proposition as the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) made, and the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) fell in with, that when we have fixed by Act the terms of the guarantee and the security upon which that guarantee shall be held, it is only fair that the Bill should contain a clause that these securities shall not be impaired except by the same authority that created them, that is this parliament. I do not think that the power to impair would be a safe power to place in the hands of the government. Perhaps it might be a safe power to place in the hands of this government, but some Tory government might follow, and then there would be trouble. I think therefore that if we create these securities by Act of parliament, the proposition made by the member for Hamilton, namely, that they should not be impaired or lessened except by consent of parliament, is eminently fair, and I think the Minister of Railways as a lawyer would agree to that. But there are many more important questions even than that. It is clear that we are here entering upon a new policy with reference to the building of railways. So far as I am concerned, I have been for some time meditating the introduction of a resolution for the purpose of discussing the question of bonuses to railways, and I am prepared to take a position perhaps different from that which I see advocated in some quarters. The only question I am concerned about is whether the policy propounded in the resolutions is the wisest policy that can be adopted. I undertake to say that when the Bill is brought down to parliament there are enough lawyers in this House to see that it contains every safeguard, both for the interest of the company and for the interest of the country. For I want to make a fair bargain. I want the company that obtains our sanction to build a railway to have a fair mercantile chance to profit by it. I also want the interests of this country to be safeguarded, I want a fair and honourable bargain. I want it understood that in endorsing these resolutions we are not laying down a general statement of policy. In these resolutions, as I understand them, we are called upon to endorse a new policy, with reference to the building of railways, in general terms, but I am not bound to every proposition when the Bill is brought down. All I agree to is that if I vote for these resolutions I assent to the general lines of the policy, reserving to myself the right to object to every detail when we come to settle the clauses.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are many features that are far and away more important than the general question of whether we shall build railways by a direct gift of money or by a gift of land or by a guarantee of securities. The whole question of building railways in this country is one that we must discuss before the people. I undertake to say that the discussion that has been going on in some of the papers in Ontario for some time past completely misrepresents the public opinion of Canada. Why, some papers in Ontario say that the time has come when we should not bonus railways, when we should not lend the influence of the credit of Canada toward building railways. I say that doctrine is most narrow and unworthy of the people of Canada. We are just on the threshold of railway building in Canada. We have no railways in Canada. The country is almost as barren of them as it was upon the day when Jacques Cartier arrived, and I hope his spirit is not looking down upon the people of Canada to-day. I believe that if the French people had held Canada it would not have been so backward as it is to-day. There never was a greater heritage given to a people than that which has been given to the people of Canada and no people ever dealt with a great heritage in so unappreciative and miserable a manner as the people of Canada have done. I am bound to say that I think the people of Ontario are more responsible for the backward state of Canada than the people of any other province. I say that kindly, because I am a true Canadian and I would vote for an improvement in the province of Ontario to-morrow with the sincerest friendship and with as much good-will as I would vote an improvement in the county of Colchester. But, I repeat, that the people of Ontario, have been a brake upon Canada, down to this time.

But, Sir, we will forgive the past. I believe that there is a new breed of men growing up in the province of Ontario, who will help to carry Canada up to the great destiny which she should achieve in this century. I want the young men of this country to be impressed with the fact that we possess the better half of this continent. I am a geographical student of this country and if you give me twelve students, or twelve educated men accustomed to reasoning, accustomed to following the processes of logic to their conclusions, I will convince them from the physical geography of Canada that we possess the most dominant portion of the continent of America, and that if we play the game as men, we are destined to become the dominant, political and material power of this continent. We have a lot of men in this country who have been crippling public opinion, who have been crippling the ambition of the people, and I say that it is the duty of public men, instead of belittling the country, instead of crippling the great ambitions of the people, to stimulate them upon all occasions and to impress upon them that we possess the greater portion of the geographical surface of this continent, that we possess the greater lumbering interests, the greater water powers, the greater mineral resources of this continent and by far the greater agricultural resources and if we but be true to ourselves, we can in twenty-five years bid defiance to any power on this continent or anywhere else. But, in order to accomplish that high purpose we must play the game of men and not the game of children. I said a minute ago that if Jacques Cartier came back here he would be ashamed of the progress that these six millions of people have made.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What about the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) ?

Mr. GOURLEY. And our friend Champlain. I am a great admirer of those magnificent French explorers who came out to this country, and I am certain that if power had not passed away from them we would have been much farther ahead in the race of progress than we are. I have said that Jacques Cartier would be surprised if he came back here to find that we had not made more progress. And I say more ; if the great Indian chiefs came back they would not have much respect for the white men of this country. They would say : We had a pathway—of course it was only a pathway—from the great lakes down to Montreal and the maritime provinces along the shores of the lakes and River St. Lawrence. What more have we to-day than a railway, a mere white man's pathway down the lakes and down the St. Lawrence ? The whole country beyond the mere border of the St. Lawrence and the great lakes is as silent and undeveloped as it was at the time when the Indian chiefs travelled those pathways. They had also a pathway from the lakes down the Ottawa river. We have the same. We have the Canadian Pacific Railway stretching up through the country, but as far as any development is concerned the country is about in as undeveloped a state as it was when the Indian chiefs sang their war songs on the banks of the Ottawa. Look at the great inland sea up there—Hudson's bay. That is one of the greatest seas in the world and if you will study the geography of this country and the situation of that sea, you will observe that it is in the centre of this continent. It was placed there to modify the climate of this continent, the climate is modified by it, and it makes the 60th parallel of latitude no colder than the 45th parallel which passes through the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does the hon. gentleman mean Hudson's bay ?

Mr. GOURLEY. Hudson's bay.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I thought the hon. gentleman meant a Canadian sea.

Mr. GOURLEY. It is a Canadian sea four times as big as the Mediterranean. People in Europe talk about the Baltic sea. Why, you could take the Baltic sea and drop it into Hudson's bay, and it would scarcely cause a ripple on the surface. In regard to the Mediterranean sea, and we remember that the Latin and Greek books were filled with references to this historic sea, this middle sea of the world, Hudson's bay would make four or five Mediterranean seas. If we play the game correctly, we will find that Hudson's bay will be one of the greatest seas of commerce of this continent. However, some persons may say, perhaps, that this is an unwarrantable prediction. I say no. To the student who sits down and studies the geography of this country, this is no exaggeration ; this is a fact. But we have to play the game. We must build railways in spite of what the papers of Ontario say. Who on earth edits the papers of Ontario ? I never could find out. They say that we must stop building railways. I submit that the necessity for building railways is now greater than ever it was before, if we are to take advantage of the enormous opportunities that are lying before us and everywhere around. We have a country which is far larger than the United States. We have 18,000 miles of railway, and the people on the other side of the line have 200,000 miles of railway. Divide 18,000 into 200,000 and you will find that it gives almost the exact proportion that 6,000,000 bears to 70,000,000. Just in proportion as the United States built railways they gained population and power. We have contented ourselves in this country with building 18,000 miles of railway. Having

18,000 miles of railway and 6,000,000 of people, we must adopt the logical conclusion that if we had 200,000 miles of railway, we would have 70,000,000 of people in this country. If we are to have thirty or forty millions of people in this country in the next twenty-five or thirty years, we must have 50,000 or 100,000 miles of railway constructed during that time. If we want to take our proper place in the march of progress, and challenge the admiration of the world, we must play the game and build 50,000 miles of railway in the next ten years. I will give the House an object lesson. The United States between 1860 and 1865 went through a great war. They had very few railways compared with their immense territory, and they met enormous difficulties and cost in moving their armies. When the war was over the public men said: We must girdle this country by railways if we hope ever to be able to dominate it as a political entity, and what happened? From 1870 to 1880 in ten years, they built 60,000 miles of railway. Therefore, when I ask the people of Canada to stand up and be men and build 50,000 miles, I am not asking that which is unreasonable or has not already been accomplished under more adverse circumstances. I am a great imperialist and admirer of the English race, but I limit my admiration to the race of forty or fifty years ago. They went on and dominated the earth, but there was a little breed that grew up in England forty years ago that almost threw away the whole achievements of the Saxon race. That little breed known as 'Little Englanders,' I exclude from my admiration; but fortunately, to-day there is a more dominant breed growing up; owing to the genius of Joseph Chamberlain and two or three other leading men, who are again infusing into the people of England the ancient spirit that in the elder years conquered and dominated and civilized the earth. But while England hesitated a moment, during these forty or fifty years, they are girding themselves again for greater achievements, and now I hope some day to see the flag of England floating over the entire globe.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to tell you how these Yankees built that 60,000 miles of railway. It cost £9,000,000,000 and these shrewd Yankees fooled £8,000,000,000 out of Englishmen and supplied the other £1,000,000,000 themselves. It was one to nine; and that is about all you will ever get in any commercial transaction with a Yankee.

Mr. CLARKE. Sixteen to one.

Mr. GOURLEY. It was nine to one in this case. The Yankees only put up £1,000,000 000 and they got £8,000,000,000 from English capitalists. Of course they built their railways when they got this money so easily from these foolish Englishmen; but I blame the public men of Canada in a great measure for that, because if the public men of this country had gone upon the platform, pointing out that we had the best half of this continent, telling the people to stand by the flag and not cringe before the United States, we would have attracted a large share of that money, and in some measure won the attention of the world. If the United States in reply had attempted to take our territory we had three or four millions of men that could have beaten them back at any time if we had had the men to lead and inspire them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GOURLEY. But our leaders were craven, and if the leaders are craven the people will be craven. When Napoleon led the armies of France he chased the Germans and the Russians and the Austrians like sheep all over Europe. These same Germans who afterwards invaded Paris were scattered like autumn leaves by Napoleon, because Napoleon was a demi-god and he spoke to his men and he went up and down his lines before the battle and inspired his soldiers and they became demi-gods as well.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. GOURLEY. Splendid order, Mr. Chairman. That is the greatest compliment that could be paid me, because I have aroused the enthusiasm of the House. On one occasion Napoleon had 60,000 Frenchmen whom he had deified by his own personality, and he said at ten in the morning: 'There are 150,000 Germans'; in the afternoon at six o'clock the whole lot of them were prisoners of war. But later on when France had no leader to inspire her people; and when the Germans, Bismarck and VonMoltke, the whole circumstances changed. Therefore, I say that the people are just as big as their leaders, and the people of Canada unfortunately have not had national results in the true sense because they were without leaders who could arouse the national feeling of Canada. That has been the destruction of Canada. They had great leaders in the United States like Henry Clay and Daniel Webster who exalted the nation. I was out west one time in Illinois. It is a very level state, and has no hills higher than that table yonder. I was there on the 4th of July and went to hear one of the 4th of July orators.

Mr. BENNETT. What did he say?

Mr. GOURLEY. There was a little rise in the land, scarcely perceptible to a Nova Scotian, who is accustomed to beautiful hills and mountains, and that man described that hill as infinitely grander than the historic and renowned Alps, and the little brook that ran through his community rivalled in his mind the fabled Nile or the castellated Rhine. Sir, that is the teaching

that has helped the citizens of the United States to become great. Their leaders told them freely that they were the greatest people on earth and by and through the inspiration created by that teaching they achieved more than any other people, and I give them that credit, while detesting their very existence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GOURLEY. Now, gentlemen, you must get away from all this narrow and provincial feeling and imitate the people of the United States in that respect. We must believe and declare that Canada is the greatest country on earth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. We must recollect that by the new census—and that is the only thing we have to thank the Minister of Agriculture for—our territory according to the latest calculations of our geographical officers includes 3,745,574 square miles, while the United States, including Alaska, has 350,000 square miles less. We could put the United States into Canada and have a great province like Ontario and half of Quebec to spare. I was amazed the other day at the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) underrating Canada ; if I had my way, a man like that would not sit in this parliament five minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. I believe that in a British parliament there is a constitutional rule that a member ought to defend the interests of the empire, and in this House there is an implied rule that every word that is said should be in the interest of Canada. When a member violates that rule he should be at once promptly expelled from the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. If we did that two or three times we would not have men getting up here to belittle Canada. The hon. member from North Norfolk said that Canada was an annex of the United States, and that Ontario belonged to the Mississippi valley and things of that kind. I expected to see a dozen men from Ontario resent the insult, but apparently they have become so accustomed to insult that they passed over the matter without the slightest protest. So far as I am concerned if a man maligns Canada in this House, I will get up and stop him if I have to act alone. If that had been done for the last thirty or forty years the right hon. knight from Oxford would have been stopped on many occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. There is a great national feeling growing up in Canada, that will not deal lightly with the public man who defames his country. We used to have men in Nova Scotia who sometimes indulged in talk about annexation. They were few and far between and they never represented a particle of the sentiment of Nova Scotia, because the great body of our people were United Empire Loyalists, and we have no kindly recollections of the men who stripped our grandmothers and our grandfathers of every possession they had and sent them down bare handed to the shores of Nova Scotia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. GOURLEY. We would be unworthy descendents of a great race, did we not resent such treatment, and if ever I were to say a word in praise of the United States, I should expect my ancestors to leap up from their graves to avenge me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. If that had always been the feeling in Canada, do you think we would be only 6,000,000 of people to-day. If we had had undaunted and dominant leaders, it would be to their eternal glory that Canada would now be far and beyond any other land on the face of God's earth. The public men of the United States were eternally vaunting their constitution ; this was a cruel misrepresentation, but that did not deter them. In fact they have the most unworkable constitution on earth—a perfect jumble of tyrannies. If you asked me to say, what was the worst constitution in the world, I would say that it was either the tyranny of Algiers or the tyranny of the United States. An eminent man in the United States has recently declared that the constitution of that country is absolutely unworkable. It would have been found unworkable many years ago if any attention had been paid to it; but when the people were busily engaged in honest industry, they needed no government, for every man and woman governed themselves. But to-day, when they want a government, what have they got ? A Senate—a tyrant for six years; a House of Representatives—a tyrant for three years; a President—a tyrant for four years; and a Supreme Court, which bosses them all, eternally and for ever. The result is that a man who lives in the United States has four tyrants to deal with, whereas in Algiers you have only one, and if you get rid of him, you get rid of them all. Yet we had men in Canada willing to listen to these Yankees vaunting their constitution, when every man knows that the only constitution under which men are free to roam the world and win their way is the British constitution, and we have that constitution in the most perfect and refined form in Canada. Here the British race has the finest exemplification of British government in the whole world. We have improved on the English constitution as it is administered at the court of St. James. Yet for one hundred years we have permitted the

United States to claim that the only government on this continent, worth living under, is that of the stars and stripes. I am going to devote my time for the next few years to demonstrating that the only government that is worth living under is that of the old red-cross flag of England; and I undertake to assert that the people of the United States will be the first to recognize the fact, because, having experienced the tyranny of their own government, they will be only too glad to get back under the old flag which they tossed aside 150 years ago, under the leadership of misguided and ruined men. If every man in Canada were inbued with a high natural spirit, in a short time this country would fill the eye of the world to the exclusion of the United States, and a vast population would be flowing into Canada. Then the building of 500 miles of railway would be the easiest task in the world. I desire to say to the people of Ontario that I hope they will stop talking about not subsidizing the building of railways. This is a new country, with only a few people in it. So far, the railways are built only through those portions of the country that can yield them a revenue; they are built only along the rivers and in the settled portions of the country. The people of the United States felt that their country could not develop so long as its rear line was the Missouri river. They therefore said, we have to girdle this continent with railways, because otherwise we cannot expect to get population; and they built the railroads long before the population came. That is how the Englishmen lost their money. The railroads were built; the population did not come at once; the railroads failed to pay in the first few years; then the Goulds, the Vanderbilts, and the Fisks got possession of these railroads, unforeclosure, and their fortunes were built up on that basis. What I am up for now, is to say to this government, and this parliament, that I am a railroad man; I believe in the policy of building railroads rapidly, but what we want to do is to adapt the wisest method of accomplishing that purpose. The government must for many years be behind the railways. I am strongly in favour of the Trans-Canada; our railroads must be built much farther to the north; but how can we expect the capitalists to build these railroads without assistance from the government? Every one who studies the map of this country knows that neither the Grand Trunk nor the Canadian Pacific Railway can ever be of much value to us in the maritime provinces. They take the wheat from a country 500 or 600 miles to the north, carry it down to the lakes, and then proceed to carry it again to the north to Halifax or St. John, making the route a quarter longer than nature intended it to be. Therefore I am persuaded, from the study of the map, that these railways are too far south to yield us the greatest advantage due our geographical position. I do not say that they should not have been built. I admit that the southern routes were the only ones possible at the time. So eminent a man as Edward Blake, whom some on the other side of the House may still worship, though I think they are very foolish if they do, did Canada more injury than any other man of his time. He defamed Canada by endeavouring to make the people of England and the people of the United States believe, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was being built, that we had a country of no value. We had the greatest difficulty, when we were offering immense sums to induce capitalists to build that railway to get them to undertake it because gentlemen on the other side of the House did not give the government of that day, the fair play which I am giving to the government at the present time, and which I hope every Liberal Conservative will give them. They did not hold up the hands of Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper, the two most distinguished men that God ever gave to this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. God sent those men, as he sent the great prophets of old to lead the people of this country to a high destiny. But when these men appeared, they were treated like John the Baptist in the wilderness, whom the priests and Rabbis went throughout the land and reviled and said, this man is preaching heresy, when in reality he was preaching those truths which, if they had accepted, would have given them eternal life. And if Sir Richard Cartwright and Edward Blake and the other men who led the Liberal party at that time, instead of imitating the Rabbis and the Jews, had aided Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper to develop Canada, as I am now trying to aid this government to settle up on the best policy, they would have been more worthy of honour. I have not a word to say against this enterprise. I want to see the Canadian Northern completed and the Grand Trunk Pacific built. I want to see three or four transcontinental railways built in the next three or four years. The country is ripe for them; and if we play our game well, there will be plenty of business to make every one of these transcontinental lines a paying concern. With reference to guaranteeing the bonds of the railway, I am not so sure, whether that is the wisest policy on the part of Canada or not. I am not so sure that the best policy is not to give a lump sum to the railway company and be done with it. I am with the government with reference to giving no land. I think that is a wise policy. If the government would adopt the policy of giving every alternate block away for homestead purposes, but reserving every other block to reimburse the

government for the cost of building the railway, in the case of every transcontinental line, they would not only provide for every financial risk the government might assume, but would throw large sums of money into the treasury of this country.

Look at the lands which the Canadian Pacific Railway have sold, and you will find an answer to those timorous, faint-hearted creatures who figure out millions of loss with their little pencils and predict all sorts of blue ruin wherever any great enterprise is projected in the interests of Canada. The experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway has shown how unfounded are these predictions. What you require is faith and confidence, and you will find that there is nothing in the way of railway building which you can undertake which will not pay for itself in from five to fifteen years. Whatever assistance the government intends to give, let them give it in cash. In my opinion a cash bonus would be best in the interests of the country. We should not allow ourselves to be carried away by the idea that the giving of $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 is something tremendous. What we should consider is whether the building of the railway is fairly justified, and once we have decided that it is, let us not be niggardly in our assistance. We will perhaps be asked to bonus the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Well I have no objection to bonusing the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Northern Railway. I want our country developed, and it will pay to develop it; because until railways are built there are large sections which must remain unproductive. When the United States built their 60,000 miles of railway, the whole world rushed out to that country. Placards were posted all over England, telling the English people to go to the United States and there they would be paid from $2 to $4 per day. When these people went out to the new world, they found these enormous railways under construction. In ten years the American republic spent nine billion pounds sterling, or $45,000,000,000 on railway construction, which it filled the country with gold, and the Irishman who said that he could pick up sovereigns in the streets of New York was not so wide of the mark. For to be able to earn from $3 to $4 per day was tantamount to the mind of the Irish labourer to picking up gold in the streets. The United States played a winning game. They started every emigrant in the world writing: 'Go to the United States,' and they borrowed English money and fooled the Englishman and got their railways for nothing. But I want Canada to be honest, I want the men who put their money into railways in this country to get a fair reward. Circumstances are different in that part of our country, which has not yet been pierced by railways, from what they are elsewhere, and we therefore should be generous in our treatment of pioneer railway builders. And should we give them the assistance we ought, we will be amply repaid ten or fifteen years hence. From Ottawa to the Hudson's bay, the distance is in the vicinity of 500 miles, and there is scarcely a mile of railway built in that direction, and because of that lack of railway facilities, our country is sneered at as a little fringe of territory along the St. Lawrence and the lakes down to the maritime provinces. Had this transcontinental railway been built ten or twenty years ago, as it should have been, there would to-day be a different story to tell. A railway makes its own market. When you build a railway, you find towns and villages and settlements of all kinds, springing up, along its route, population flowin, and the enterprise a paying undertaking in a short time. You give a new value to the land which repays a hundredfold the money expended in the undertaking. I am instructed to urge on behalf of the maritime provinces the building of the Trans-Canada Railway. From every board of trade, chamber of commerce and town council, resolutions have been sent me, as no doubt they have been sent to other hon. members, asking me to urge on parliament the building of this line. I hope that every hon. member from the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces, irrespective of party, will give his support to this project. Let us build thet Trans-Canada Railway and thus secure to Canadian ports the great traffic of the Northwest. By our present railway system, we are bound to lose a large share of that traffic. You bring the wheat down to the lakes, and you find the ports of Duluth and Buffalo waiting with hungry mouths to seize it, and once they can get hold of it, nobody else will have any show. If that is satisfactory to the people of Ontario, it is not to the people of the maritime provinces. We want the Trans-Canada, which will run away north four hundred miles, and from which branch lines will be built to those other lines running to the Great Lakes. The Trans-Canada will come out at the Saguenay river, just in the direction of England, whereas these other lines go to the lakes and there the trade is diverted to American ports. Having its outlet on the River St. Lawrence, the Trans-Canada will be directly on the line towards Halifax and St. John, or Country Harbour, which my hon. friend from Guysborough desires to see developed into a great port. If he succeeds in doing so, I shall not be envious. What I desire is that the traffic should be brought to the maritime provinces, and then let the best port win, whether that be Halifax, St. John or Truro, or any other. If the government would propose a general measure of subsidizing all these transcontinental railways, that would be a policy which would appeal for my support. Instead of this being the

time to cease bonusing railways, it is the very time when we should begin. We should make it our policy to build 50,000 miles in the next ten years. If we should undertake this, money would come pouring in from all over the world, and it would then be said of us, as it has been said of the United States, that you could pick up sovereigns in the streets. The adjoining republic would send us in its people by the hundred thousands. I have heard it said that they would not make good loyal British subjects, but let me tell you, Sir, that any man who has lived in the states any length of time and then comes to Canada, could not possibly be persuaded to go back, the contrast is too attractive. You could not drive him out of Canada with hounds. Such people would become the best citizens of this country, and these little Englishmen, on the other side, who are predicting the contrary, had better hold their peace until they learn something and form correct opinions of Canada.

With reference to this proposed guarantee of bonds, I would prefer, since the policy of giving land grants has been abandoned, giving a cash subsidy. I am not concerned about a subsidy of ten or twenty million dollars. I had rather give Mackenzie & Mann their subsidy in cash and be done with it. They are business men and would make the enterprise pay much better than if it were in the hands of the government. If the Canadian Pacific Railway had been dealt with as we are proposing to deal with the Canadian Northern, it would not have become the commercial success it is. If we were to adopt the policy of assisting railway construction by cash bonuses, the hon. Finance Minister would not object. Every year our revenue is leaping up by $8,000,000, $10,000,000 and $15,000,000, owing to the wise policy inaugurated by the late Sir John Macdonald. That great man built the Intercolonial Railway when we only had a revenue of $12,000,000, and the Canadian Pacific Railway when our revenue was but $22,000,000. Hon. gentlemen seem timid and afraid to build a transcontinental railway even at this late date. Why, in a few years we will have a revenue of $100,000,000. When we built the Canadian Pacific Railway we had but a revenue of $22,000,000, and to-day we have a revenue of $65,000,000, which shows that the increase of our revenue is in direct ratio to the increase in our railway building. Let my hon. friend the Finance Minister set some of the calculators in his department at work, and he will find that there is a mathematical progression in our revenue, in direct proportion, to the increase in railway construction. It must be evident to any one who gives impartial study to the facts, that whatever progress we have made, is due to the wise policy of the late Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper, who inaugurated the national policy and the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was they who left us the magnificent heritage we enjoy to-day, and those hon. gentlemen who seek to have the credit of our present prosperity given to this government, remind me very much of the profligate and reckless heir who, having inherited a noble estate built up by a long line of virtuous and distinguished ancesters, would point to their pictures on the wall, and say : 'These are not the men who built up this heritage.' These fellows had nothing to do with it ; I am the one who alone made this magnificent heritage, and to me the whole credit is due.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we should have a general policy of railway building in this country. This is a new question, and I want the government to consider it. I was surprised when the hon. Minister of Railways, who is usually very logical, spoke so jauntily about adopting this new policy of his. He says that in former days we gave away millions to the railway companies, and that we should have taken mortgages on the railways for these millions. But, suppose such a mortgage had been proposed at the time when the money was voted for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the opponents of the project would have said that it was bad enough to give away our millions, but that to take over such a mortgage would be eternal damnation. I am sure that Mr. Blake would have taken that view. And Sir Richard Cartwright, whose luminous mind I respect, when he devotes it to proper subjects of discussion, if it had been proposed to take a mortgage on the Canadian Pacific Railway for the twenty-five millions that was given them. I am persuaded would have wiped the dust of Canada from his feet for ever ; for he would have felt that Canada had better have been swallowed up in the waters under the earth. I say I am surprised that the hon. Minister of Railways treats his new policy in such a jaunty fashion. I am not certain but that the best policy is to make a lump sum of it, pay it out and be done with it—no mortgages, no securities, but let them go their way for the guarantee may involve us in untold financial difficulties later. Take a good contract, a carefully drawn contract like that of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and build the road, reserving the land. If this is done, I will undertake to say that in five years after the railway is completed, we shall sell enough land to pay the subsidy twice over and have millions of people coming into that country whose contributions will swell our national revenue and enable my hon. friend the Finance Minister, to come down in a few years —if he should be alive and well at that time—and announce that we have a surplus of forty or fifty millions for the year. If the government will subsidize the Trans-Canada, we in the maritime provinces will

feel that we are in a position to wish MacKenzie & Mann, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific God speed on their way. I am for railways all over Canada. This is an imperial railway. With the Trans-Canada built, should we have a conflict for our territory, we would be able to maintain uninterrupted communication from end to end of our country, far from the border of the United States. I was speaking the other day with an eminent military man, and we were examining the map which the government has recently published. In passing I wish to thank those who have made that map. It is one of the greatest gifts to Canada. It lays our great country before us. Nobody knew what Canada looked like until they had an opportunity to inspect this splendid map. And I want the government to let me send thirty or forty copies of that map to the schools in Colchester, for it is an education in itself. A copy of that map should be sent to every public school in Canada. It is the first map that has ever exhibited to us in its true light this enormous country of Canada. Why, my little boy when we looked at it, said: Pap, the United States are gone; we are sitting on top of them. Well, that military officer said: 'Give me the trans-Canada fully equipped and I will guarantee the safety of Canada. Let us build the trans-Canada five hundred miles away from the United States border, so that the British fleet on the Pacific and the British fleet on the St. Lawrence can give us supplies, and send them along that railway. Then, I care not if there were two millions of men against us, the campaign could be only a summer campaign, and we could retreat and retreat and play upon the invader the game that the Russians played upon the astute Napoleon. We could retreat——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never.

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes, the Boers have taught us that retreat is very often the prelude of victory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never retreat.

Mr. GOURLEY. Then, when the summer——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never retreat.

Mr. GOURLEY. We could retire——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never retire.

Mr. GOURLEY. We could retire as a strategical necessity——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never.

Mr. GOURLEY. Let me put my point. We could retire as a——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never, never.

Mr. GOURLEY. But, in the end, gentlemen, the snows of winter coming on, the invaders would be compelled to retreat. So, from a maritime province point of view, that railway should be built, and built at once. Then from the general point of view, we should have a country opened up, five hundred miles in breadth, extending three thousand five hundred miles across the continent. The people would come in to possess the land and this country would spring from six millions of people to fifteen or twenty millions within ten or fifteen years. If these railways now before parliament are to be subsidized, I urge, as a complement to these undertakings the subsidizing of the Trans-Canada. I speak in the interest of all Canada, for every one who knows me will acquit me of advancing any sectional interests or opinion. I would build a railway in British Columbia as soon as I would build one in the county of Colchester. I tell my people so when I address them. But the people of Ontario and the people of British Columbia must be equally broad, and must agree to the building of the Trans-Canada, which will be the salvation of the maritime provinces. We can never have a great country unless we can bring our own products to our own ports to be shipped thence to the markets of the world. Is it not a disgrace to us that we have a trans-continental line which is building up Portland? Every man in this parliament ought to be indicted for allowing such a state of affairs. If we had a proper national spirit in this country not one of us would escape punishment. To think of it—permitting a trans-continental railway that we have subsidized with enormous sums (for a great deal of the debt with which Ontario came into confederation represented money paid to the Grand Trunk, and we are bearing that burden to-day, but I do not complain of that)—permitting this transcontinental railway to build up a foreign port. I say we should give the Grand Trunk two or three years' notice to quit Portland. I do not want to do anything wrong or unfair. Vested rights must be respected, but we should not pay more respect to vested rights than we pay to the national rights of Canada. We should give the Grand Trunk three years' notice that they must leave Portland and establish their Atlantic terminals in Canada. If they could not sell out their wharfs and other property except at a loss, let us compensate them; for God's sake, get rid of the disgrace of a trans-continental railway of ours being permitted to build up a foreign port. I am amazed that this has not been debated in every hamlet in the country. But the people begin to understand. When I was at home not long ago, I was met on the street by Liberals and Tories alike who told me: Go back to Ottawa, for Heaven's sake, and put a stop to the Grand Trunk using Portland for their terminus. That is the universal cry there. And I want to warn the Prime Minister that Liberals there are thinking for themselves. No longer can you call a man a

Liberal and bind his mind or his conscience with that word. If the Prime Minister is a business man and the head of a business administration, if he is half what is claimed for him by his friends he must deny to the Grand Trunk the right to insult Canada longer by taking the products of this country to an American port. The people in Europe must think we are a very incompetent people when we cannot exploit our own Atlantic sea-board. I desire also to warn the ministers with reference to the difficulties that will occur in consequence of the people studying this new map which you are placing upon the walls of our homes. What a humiliation. Your children will come and ask you : Is that all Canada up there ? Why is that narrow strip on the Pacific seaboard not painted red ? Why do the Yankees own half the Pacific sea-board of Canada ? This is the most insulting thing that ever happened to a free people, to a race like the Saxon race, that loves the sea, that dominates the sea, whose lives are on the sea. Look at the map you have up there, half of our Pacific seaboard stolen, from 54° 40′ up to Alaska, a narrow strip, whether thirty miles or one hundred and thirty miles wide, it matters little ; stolen by a lot of greedy Yankees from a lot of improvident English diplomatists, or statesmen, so-called. You call them statesmen, you call them diplomatists. I would be sorry to think that any schoolboy in Canada was so stupid as these statesmen or diplomatists were.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I call the hon. gentleman to order. The Alaskan boundary cannot be discussed now.

Mr. GOURLEY. I apologize ; I was only referring to that, because I see that a new arbitrator may be appointed. I desire to say that I hope a Canadian will be appointed that will die in the ditches, that will die in the trenches, before surrendering the rights of Canada ; and if Canada sacrifices this territory, God help the government that permits the sacrifice, because we know our rights in Canada at the present time. Now, Sir, I have done. I wanted to say many other things. There is a subject I desire to introduce in a day or two with reference to building a few railways in the county of Colchester. We have got no railways there. At the same time, a very little money will give us all the railways we need. I am now advocating the interests of Quebec and the interests of western Canada, and when the trifling matters I refer to come up, I hope all hands will be raised to give us aid.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We will, we will.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I congratulate the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) on the able and eloquent speech that he has given to us this day. I regret exceedingly that he has been rubbing into his friends on his own side of the House their ignorance and their narrowness. I join him in the suggestion to send these twelve enlightened young men from the county of Colchester to enlighten his friends opposite in geography, and to expand their minds as to what is necessary for the future progress of this country. I do not see why the young men of Colchester should want any maps to be sent to them, because I think they must be as enlightened already as his friends from Ontario on both sides of the House. Now, I think that Canada has made some progress, the province of Nova Scotia has made some progress. Time was when immigrants to Pictou had to come to Truro and carry their burdens on their backs when they wanted to put their seed into the ground. What do we see to-day ? Two pullman cars backwards and forwards every day from Halifax to Sydney, and a railroad to Windsor. There is scarcely an hour in the day or night but there is a train coming in or going out of Truro. The people of Nova Scotia built the road to Truro and Pictou before Sir John A. Macdonald had anything to do with the government of Nova Scotia. He says Sir John A. Macdonald was a great man. I do not want him to detract from the great men we have had in Nova Scotia, greater than any others that ever existed in the Dominion of Canada——

Mr. GOURLEY. I did not intend to.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). And they will be remembered by their writings and everything else when very little will be said about Sir John A. Macdonald, or Sir Charles Tupper either. Now, the hon. gentleman can go from Truro to Halifax in a pullman car, he can get his dinner in a dining car, as fine a meal as he would in any hotel in Montreal. I do not think it is well to speak slightingly of the progress that has been made in the Dominion of Canada. I have lived long enough to admire the progress made in Canada, both in railways and canals, and I hope that progress will be continued in future—not by leaps and bounds, but gradually, wisely, little by little. That is the way to grow, that is the way the most permanent progress will be made. When I was listening to the hon. gentleman, to his most eloquent speech, that has created the greatest sensation of any speech that I have heard in this House, and I have been a long time in it, I was thinking that our hon. friends opposite made a great mistake in the selection of their leader, that they ought to have selected the hon. member for Colchester as their leader——

Mr. GOURLEY. The hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte).

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.)——in place of my hon. friend from the city of Halifax (Mr. Borden). Perhaps they will correct that mistake when they meet again next session. I do not wish to take up the time of the House any longer, because the sub-

ject of railways will come up again when the Minister of Railways submits his Bill. Then we will be able to discuss it and think it over in as enlightened and as logical a manner as we can. Of course, we do not expect to do so with that broadness of mind that characterizes my hon. friend from Colchester, we are not gifted that way. But perhaps when these young men come up here and give us a lesson or two, we may learn a little more than we know now, and be better able to discuss this subject in a proper manner.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would say to the committee now, after this diversion for about an hour, that I earnestly request them to get down to work and consider these resolutions.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before the resolutions are adopted, I want to know something more about the estimated cost. I had not the pleasure of being in the House when the Minister of Railways introduced the resolutions for the purpose of granting assistance to 620 miles of railway in the direction of Edmonton, and a branch railway to Prince Albert 100 miles further. I do not see in the 'Hansard' that the Minister of Railways stated whether it was the intention of the government to assist this railway as a transcontinental line, or whether they intended to continue this line from Edmonton to the coast. It is generally considered to be a new transcontinental line from the Pacific to the head of Lake Superior, taking it in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific, which they propose to assist in reaching that territory. The grant that the minister proposes to give would virtually build the road, because, according to the estimate of his own engineer, it would take about $17,000 per mile for one section and $18,000 per mile for the other section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Before we had the profiles and plans before us showing the exact quantities.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before he got the profiles and plans, one was $17,000 and the other nearly $18,000 per mile. That includes $3,000 per mile for rolling stock on each section, according to his engineer. We are virtually, then, giving to the company what would nearly build the road. I notice that there is nothing in the resolution—it may be supplemented, it is true, in the Bill—which requires from the company the placing of $3,000 worth of rolling stock on the road, which would be liable to the lien which the government proposes to place upon it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have that provided for.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the policy of the government in aiding another railway to Prince Albert to the extent of $13,000 per mile? You have one railway running there already completed. You have an agreement with another railway company which obliges them to reach that same place within three years. They have built their line from Yorkton and the promise was given to the railway committee by the promoters of the road the other day that they would build to the extent of forty miles a year, which would oblige them, as they are now within 105 or 110 miles of Prince Albert——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are referring to the road running north and south.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am referring to the extension of the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway. It is at present within 115 miles of Prince Albert and they intend to reach that place in 1906.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a distance of about 120 miles from the end of their present line to build.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood from the statement in the committee the other day that they had put the rails on thirty-two miles of road last year, and that there was a contract made to have forty miles more graded and finished this year. That would bring them within 100 or 115 miles of Prince Albert. So, you have two roads going to Prince Albert, one of them finished and one of them to be completed in 1906, and you are supplementing this by a third road and giving nearly the whole price necessary to complete it to the same point. Prince Albert ought to be very well satisfied with the generosity of this and other governments in having three roads run to that particular place. I do not know whether the hon. minister explained the particular reasons that influenced the government in regard to the building of that particular branch, and I would like the hon. minister to state when the Bill comes down, the policy of the government in reference to this particular road as a whole. Surely the hon. minister does not intend to assist this company in building a road from Gilbert Plains to Edmonton unless he contemplates this being a transcontinental road. The hon. minister should also furnish us with a statement of the kind of property that the railway company at present own, that is 'all the lines and branch lines of railway of the company now in operation and all property and franchises connected therewith.' Surely the committee is entitled to a statement showing what the security will amount to. I notice, although it may be supplemented afterwards in the Bill, that the resolution does not propose to give any security on the rolling stock at all. It would be impossible to give any security on the road as already completed, because the company do not own the rolling stock. If I understand correctly the rolling stock belongs to another company which has loaned

it to the Canadian Northern and which receives a rental for the use of it. I notice that the resolution carefully guards against any promise of giving any security upon that, showing that it has evidently passed through the hands of the company's solicitor. I notice that there is no provision to meet the case of a default in payment. There is no provision, if there is a default in any of the payments against the whole of the amount of money becoming due. I think we should carefully guard against such a contingency. I remember a case of a railway in Nova Scotia which had received assistance from the government down there, in which it was maintained that default in the payment of any portion of the interest or principal did not deprive the railway company of its franchise or right of running the road until the whole of the aid had been given. There is a new phase in which it is said 'the government shall be subrogated in all the rights of the holders of the securities.' I do not know that the word 'in' is a proper preposition to follow the word 'subrogated.' It may be a perfectly legal term and may be all right, but my information upon grammatical construction and the meaning of words suggests to me that it is all wrong. After the word 'subrogated' it should read 'to all the rights of the holders of the securities.' But, if it were 'to' all the rights of the holders, it would not convey the rights of the holders of the securities over to the government. However, that is a technical point. What I want to impress upon the hon. minister is that if there is a default in any of the payments by the railway company on any of the securities, which securities perhaps had been taken over by the government or paid by the government, the government should be in a position to exercise the right of taking over the railway or exercising such control as they see fit and not be obliged to wait until the whole payment is due in reference to the matter. The whole policy of the government in reference to railways in the North-west and the assistance given to them ought to be fully stated. We have the right, on the introduction of a resolution like this, which must pledge an enormous sum of money for the building of 750 miles of railway and contemplates, as I should judge, a very large future obligation for the extension of the road to the Pacific, to have a full statement of the policy of the government. We should have a statement of the policy of the government as to the location of the line, where it approaches the Canadian Pacific Railway, how far distant it is from terminal points, the points which the line intends to pass, where the line is to be located in comparison with the proposed Grand Trunk Railway extension to the Pacific, and if the government have determined upon having two more continental lines we ought to know the location of these lines and the contracts they are entering into with the different companies should be laid on the Table of the House. I have not the slightest doubt in the world that before this resolution was brought down to the House there was an agreement made with this company. It seems extraordinary that there should not have been some kind of an agreement with the company, upon which these resolutions are founded. Surely there must have been some verbal communication at least. We are entitled to the fullest information in reference to all that, and when the Bill is being considered the Minister of Railways and Canals must have that information to submit to the House, as well as the policy of the government in respect to the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I call the attention of the minister to clause 8 :

> Resolved, that it shall be unlawful for the Canadian Northern Railway to lease or sell any of its lines or any portion thereof to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or to amalgamate with the said company or enter into any agreement with the said company whereby rates upon freight or passengers shall be pooled ; but this provision shall not extend to traffic or running arrangements made with the assent of the Governor in Council.

Why is that prohibition limited to amalgamation with the Canadian Pacific Railway ? I presume it is because the Canadian Pacific Railway is the only line in operation at the present time, but the Grand Trunk Pacific will undoubtedly receive a charter this session and the people of that country are desirous that this separate trunk line should not fall into the possession of the Grand Trunk Pacific any more than the Canadian Pacific Railway. This road has received aid from the Dominion government and from the provincial governments of Ontario and Manitoba, and I think this resolution should be amended so as to read that the line shall not amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other company that may be chartered in the future.

Mr. OLIVER. Before the resolutions are adopted, I would ask the minister if it will be possible to introduce into the Bill when it comes before the House other important provisions not contained in the resolutions ? I want to ask particularly if it would be possible to introduce a resolution in regard to the acquirement of the road, in regard to the maximum rates and in regard to the date of completion ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) means simply to get my view as to whether it would be open to the committee to add to or take from the Bill or any clause of it when it is laid before the House, I answer him that it is quite open to do so. If his question is as to whether I would be in a position to approve of any proposal, of course I could not say that until I know what it is.

Mr. OLIVER. Without it being necessary for a motion to re-commit the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When the Bill is in committee, or on second reading.

Mr. OLIVER. Without requiring it to be sent back ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is just the same as any other Bill before parliament.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I asked the Minister of Railways what induced the government to decide to subsidize, or virtually to give nearly enough money to build another branch to Prince Albert. My hon. friend (Mr. Roche) asked him why it was that this railway was only prohibited from amalgamating with the Canadian Pacific Railway and not with any other company. The Minister of Railways has not deigned to give us a reply.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understood that my hon. friend was to bring up that matter when the Bill was brought up before the committee. I heard him state that over and over again.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is in reference to other matters.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite prepared to answer both questions as far as I can. My hon. friend asks why it is that these resolutions cover a grant in aid, or rather a proposed guarantee for a portion of what is called the Prince Albert branch. The hon. gentleman mentioned that there was provision already made by legislation for the building of the Manitoba and North-Western from a point north to Prince Albert and that there were therefore two lines of railways converging upon the one point.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I said there was one built and running into Prince Albert.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would be three. One of these roads is on the western side of the Saskatchewan, and it would not serve the people who are settling south of Prince Albert and to the east of the Saskatchewan. This other running from Prince Albert east, and through the Carrot Valley, is rendered necessary by reason of the fact that there is a very large settlement and has been a very large settlement there for some years. That valley is a rich and fertile belt, and I am told on creditable authority that the people have been unable to get their grain out and that two or three years' accumulation of grain has been stacked in that district. The people are getting very disheartened and discouraged because they have been promised a railway and have not got it. There is no question at all, from the information we have been able to gather, that that section of the country can well afford to, and will sustain handsomely a railway along this route. If my memory serves me, the distance is something like 180 miles. It is proposed to aid to the extent of 100 miles east of Prince Albert. The company intend to build the other eighty miles, and this resolution contemplates that they should have the right to place a first mortgage for $13,000 a mile upon the difference of mileage between the easterly point of the 100 miles and Erwood, and that the mortgage to the government will take its rank as a second mortgage to that, being on the same footing as the other securities.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Will that be $26,000 a mile altogether ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, no. The second mortgage will, as a matter of fact, be a $26,000 mortgage on that portion of the line; that is because we are taking a second mortgage, not because we are giving any more money. Let me repeat, condensing the statement I have made. These three lines of railway are all passing through different sections, serving different settlements. One of them is to the west of the Saskatchewan, and therefore will not serve the district to the east of it. The district to the east of the Saskatchewan will be served by the line which is under construction by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and which I believe they are to have completed under their statutory arrangements in the course of three or four years. That line runs practically due north and south. The line from Erwood to Prince Albert runs practically east and west, serving the same district until it gets to within a short distance of Prince Albert.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Will the hon. gentleman say why he singles out the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend has in his mind the idea that there will no doubt be chartered during the present session a railway called the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I apprehend that he is somewhat curious to know why we do not mention that road in this resolution. In the first place, there is no Grand Trunk Pacific actually there; there may never be. It would scarcely be worth our while to name a non-existing road, and say that the Canadian Northern should have no right to connect with that. But my hon. friend will say that it could be as well stated that this railway should not connect with any other main line. If that suggestion should be made by the hon. gentleman, I would say this, that we know of no other road that it would be so prejudicial to the public interest that this line should amalgamate with, as the Canadian Pacific, which is the other great competitor serving that district. This will be, I think, a very great and very important line. We hear a good

deal and see in the newspapers a good deal about an amalgamation or purchase of the Canadian Northern line by the Grand Trunk Pacific. Supposing that should take place, it would not, I think, be very prejudicial to the public interest—I am speaking my own view; but I think it would be a very serious thing if, by any combination which could be made, it became permissive to the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific to amalgamate and become one line. We know that the tendency of these great through lines is to acquire every other line within possible reaching distance. The tendency is to absorb everything in sight; so that if you have two competing powerful transcontinental lines, you guarantee to the people a measure of competition, and give them an additional security which would be wanting if there was a combination of all the lines.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not understand that hon. gentleman's distinction—why he thinks it would be injurious to the public interest that this road should amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific, and why he thinks it would not be injurious to the public interest that it should amalgamate with the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I have in my mind. We know that the Grand Trunk system is a great system. We know that it drains the older portions of Canada, at all events the province of Ontario, in almost every direction, and the province of Quebec in part, and I think there is a very general feeling that if there is any one railroad which in the interest of Canada should project itself into the western country and to the Pacific coast, it is the Grand Trunk; and I see no reason why, if that were to take place, another railroad should be built. The Canadian Northern would be the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and we would have the two powerful railway corporations in competition for the protection of the public.

Mr. COCHRANE. According to that, we are helping to build the Grand Trunk Pacific with this bonus.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know. I am merely throwing that out as a possibility.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appears to me that the minister should know. The premier laughs. Perhaps it may be funny to him, but it is a serious matter to the men who are paying the taxes, if we are aiding the Grand Trunk Pacific under the guise of aiding another railroad, when to my mind the minister has put it pretty plainly that it is going to be the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific. And I suppose that resolutions will be brought down to grant aid to the Grand Trunk Pacific, although the Canadian Northern is now being aided as part of that line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then I do not know what he did say, or I must be very obtuse.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am bound to say that I think my hon. friend must be.

Mr. COCHRANE. Perhaps I am, but I think I can see a nigger on that fence. I would like to ask the minister if he does not know, down deep in his heart, whether exactly that is not arranged now. I have heard a good deal from the premier about robbing the country to build railroads that would never pay the grease on the axles; and yet he has the audacity, if I may say so, when a gentleman in this House asks for information, to smile because he thinks his question is not pertinent. I think it is no smiling matter that I am asked to vote millions of money which the electors of my riding have to pay their proportion of, especially when we are called on to make such a new departure as to aid branch lines. I would like to ask the minister if that is not a new departure.

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope my hon. friend will acquit me of any intention to be discourteous to him if I laughed, because it was far from my intention. I laughed simply because of the fiery way in which my hon. friend objected to the answer given, which was not accepted by an hon. gentleman on the other side. The question was asked by the hon. member for Marquette why provision had been taken in this Bill to prevent the amalgamation of the Canadian Northern with the Canadian Pacific, and why a similar provision had not been made with regard to the projected Grand Trunk Pacific. The reason has been given by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways. I am simply repeating the idea already conveyed to the committee. The Canadian Pacific Railway is already an entity; it is built and in operation. It must be evident that if the Canadian Northern Railway were to amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the two were to come under the same management, the people of the North-west would lose the benefit of the competition, and therefore we insert this provision to prevent such an amalgamation. I do not understand that the wisdom of this provision is challenged by anybody opposite. I think my hon. friend admits its desirability, but he asks why a similar provision is not made with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway? For this reason, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is not an entity, it is a mere project in the air, which may or may not take place. What is important is that a rail-

way should be built, not only in that section of the country which this subsidy would cover, the valley of the Saskatchewan, but also that it should extend southward and eastward towards the tidal water. Then it is a matter of no consequence whether we have an extension to the sea by the Grand Trunk Railway alone as well as the existing line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or by an amalgamation of the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. It is only one railway which it is contemplated to subsidize—if it is to be subsidized—and one line to be put in operation. The two cases therefore cannot be put in the same category. In the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the wisdom of the provision is obvious, but there is no reason to apply the same treatment to the other projected railway which goes by the name of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that the announcement made by the hon. the Minister of Railways and the right hon. the Prime Minister is of the utmost possible importance. It seems remarkable that this announcement should have been made only incidentaly after two days discussion. Here is a clause providing that this railway shall not amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways, in very vague terms, attempted to draw some distinction between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and the reason he gave, which has just been repeated by the right hon. gentleman, is that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is not an entity at present, and we need not guard against it. But it will be an entity very soon, and it is obvious that some similar provision must be made either in this or in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway charter. My right hon. friend shakes his head. I would like to understand if it is undesirable to amalgamate the Canadian Northern Railway, with the Canadian Pacific Railway, what reason does my hon. friend give for amalgamating it with the Grand Trunk Railway or how in the public interest can it be right to amalgamate it with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The reason he has suggested is that that there is no entity to provide against and the danger is not existant. But if the intention of the promoter be carried out and if the intention of the government be proceeded with, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will be an entity and the danger which these hon. gentlemen say will be caused by an amalgamation with the Canadian Pacific Railway will exist equally in the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, except for another important announcement which the Minister of Railways made, and which is practically this, that the line which we are asked to subsidize——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I made no announcement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) —is to be the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. If the hon. Minister of Railways did not make that announcement, I do not understand the English language. He made it as distinctly as he could. He said that there was no doubt that if this project went on, it would be the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for a transcontinental line. Apparently therefore the government are asking us to guarantee these bonds for a line which the hon. Minister of Railways said the other day stood alone by itself, which we are not to deal with in connection with a transcontinental line, and yet the intention in the mind of the hon. Minister of Railways and the government is that we are really doing this as part of a proposed transcontinental line, the charter for which is going through the House at present.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said nothing to warrant such a statement. What I did say was that I had seen in the newspaper press—as other hon. gentlemen have, no doubt—that there was some talk of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway coming to an understanding and combining their interests. That is a matter of common rumour, and I can only say that I am in no position to make any announcement that anything of the kind is either probable or possible, nor did I do so. If we were to express an opinion, I would say that it is neither possible nor probable, but it is stated in the press, and I was giving that rumour by way of explanation to show hon. gentlemen how impossible it would be, if a thing of that kind were to occur, for us to insist that it should not take place. I think it would be an eminently proper thing to happen, but it is not likely to happen and I did not announce that it was going to happen.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I desire to invite the attention of the committee to several items of urgency in the supplementary estimates for the current year, which the hon. leader of the opposition has been good enough to say that he would, so far as might be reasonable, co-operate with us in having passed. As hon. members are aware, we are approaching the

end of the fiscal year. Some of our appropriations are insufficient, and it is very desirable, while reserving the right of full discussion at later stages, that we should have the co-operation of hon. members on both sides in obtaining the passage of these urgent items, so that we may have a special supply Bill. The first item to which I invite the attention of the committee is the vote for the North-west Mounted Police. This is one of several items submitted to the House some weeks ago. I think it likely that hon. gentlemen have not a copy of that estimate, as it was on a single sheet. The amount is for the services in the Yukon, $150,000. My right hon. friend the premier (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will explain the circumstances.

North-west Mounted Police—amount required for services in the Yukon $150,000.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I can give an explanation of the circumstances which would make it necessary for us to ask for the amount of money here proposed, or if it would be more agreeable for hon. gentlemen to take up the main estimates for this service, page 68, items 190-191, I could give the explanation for the whole estimate, and then, the supplementary estimate for this year will, perhaps, come up more naturally. I will proceed in that way, or, if more agreeable, I will confine myself to the single item now proposed.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps it would be better to confine the discussion for the present, to the item before the House, as the other has not been considered on this side.

The PRIME MINISTER. Last year our expenditure in the Yukon Territory was, in round numbers, $499,000. The expenses for previous years are as follows :

1895-6	$ 27,000
1896-7	22,000
1897-8	495,000
1898-9	890,000
1899-1900	492,000
1900-1901	498,000
1901-2	499,000

We have been unable to confine our expenditure within this appropriation this year. For the coming year, we shall ask an appropriation of $500,000. But, in order to balance accounts and make up arrears that have accumulated, we are obliged to ask this amount of money. The estimate for the current year was based upon a force of 250 men, but the force now in the Yukon numbers 300 men. About eighteen months ago, we discovered a conspiracy which had its origin in Skagway—perhaps it was not serious, or it may have been serious ; at all events it existed—the outcome of which it was said, would be an attempt on the part of American desperados to take the country. We quietly sent into the country fifty more men. But, since then, we have found it impossible to reduce the force to 250 men as we did before, but have been obliged to maintain the force at 300 men. The whole territory is patrolled at present and we have the 300 men distributed at thirty-five different posts. There are two main stations, one at Dawson and one at White Horse, and other stations are distributed all along the creeks, the river and the Dalton trail. The stations are as follows :

Dawson, Minto, Selkirk, Selwyn, Halfway, Stewart River, Ogilvy, Indian River, Forty Mile, Grand Forks, Sulphur, Dominon, Eureka, Gold Run, McQuestion, Hunker, Stewart River Crossing, Duncan Landing, Glacier, White Horse, Dalton Trail, Wells, White Pass, Summit, Cariboo, Upper Laberge, Livingston Creek, Hootalinqua, Kynock, Braeburn, Montague, Tantalus, McKays, Takhini River.

The men are employed not only in police duty, but in many kinds of service. They act as collectors of gold-dust in the collection of the royalty for the Gold Commissioner, they do service at the court-house, they accompany the bush rangers and wood inspectors, they serve as customs collectors and inland revenue collectors, and in many other capacities. Therefore, it is not extraordinary that we have found it indispensably necessary to keep that force. But it may be asked, what is the reason for this $150,000 which we feel bound to ask for. I may say that the men have to establish their own buildings and look after their own establishments. Some time ago the trails followed the sinuosities of the Yukon river from White Horse to Dawson. We have cut a trail now which is used summer and winter. The winter trail is used now also in summer time, but in winter time we use exclusively the winter trail. This new trail cost us $30,000. With these general explanations, let me give the details of this estimate of $150,000 :

Pay of 50 men not provided for	$ 27,000
Rations	27,000
Uniform and clothing	5,000
Transport and billeting	15,000
Establishment of new posts	30,000
Cost of murder case Labelle and Fournier	12,000
Accounts of previous years caused by emergency of providing men	30,000
Total, say	$150,000

Mr. SPROULE. Are these men supplied by tender or by ordinary purchase ?

The PRIME MINISTER. All the supplies are provided by tender to the extent of 75 per cent. As to the remainder, they are supplied generally by the local firms or by the men boarding themselves. We may have at some stations only one man and at some others, two, three, four or five men. In these places, the men who can afford it, pay their board, or, if not, they are provided by local tradesmen. For the general provisions of the force, however, we have tenders for 75 per cent of the supply.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it contemplated to keep that same number of men continuously in the Yukon in the future ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, but we do not contemplate to increase the force for some time.

Mr. BLAIN. Do these fifty-two men that are selected have to undergo any examination ?

The PRIME MINISTER. First of all, they have to undergo a physical examination for constables, either at Ottawa or at some other post. They have to undergo also an examination as to their mental capacity.

Mr. BLAIN. From what part of Canada were they selected ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The fifty that were selected and sent to the Yukon were drawn from the mounted police force at Regina.

Annual drill, clothing and stores—further amount required, $100,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Militia, I think, had some conversation with hon. gentlemen opposite about this item. This is to pay for the camp which is being held this week, and the vote is very urgent.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you come to require such a large sum beyond what you estimated for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand this is owing to the change in the date of the camp. These camps are held about midsummer. If they are held immediately before or after the 1st of July, it makes quite a difference. There is a change of a few days in the date of holding the camp, and this money becomes necessary for the present fiscal year.

Mr. SPROULE. Last year were the camps held in the present fiscal year ? It would be doubling it up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It may be possible there would be two camps within one fiscal year, yet only one camp in each season. I am not able to give at this moment any further information. My impression was that there would be no discussion over this item, because the Minister of Militia informed me that he had a conversation with some hon. gentlemen opposite, and he understood the matter would go through pro forma. If there is any serious objection, I must hold it over until the minister is present. I think the explanation I gave is the correct one.

Intercolonial Railway—steel rails and fastenings, $275,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Railways has occasion to be absent, but if it is necessary I will send for him. In the meantime, I may say this is grouped with a number of other items, and I ask the committee to approve of this one. I would move that it be expressed in this form :

That a sum not exceeding $275,000 be granted to His Majesty on account of the item 285, steel rails and fastenings.

285 is the official number, though it is not the number as it appears in the printed volume, but it will be the number in the Supply Bill. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways informs me that this is necessary in order that they may pay for some rails which have been ordered, and are either delivered or are on the way. The item is almost wholly covered by one contract for 11,000 tons of steel rails purchased in England at the price of $22.25. That will take up nearly the whole sum, there is a small balance, which I presume the minister requires for some other account.

Mr. SPROULE. To be delivered there or here ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid to answer that question, lest I may make a mistake. I imagine that would be free on board in England, but I would not like to be positive. I understand these rails were purchased by tender in England.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that all the steel rails the minister has purchased lately ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not in a position to give the information that I should give. If he desires it, I will send for the minister. But there will be other opportunities, the same item will be discussed later on.

Item voted.

Rideau Hall, including grounds—renewals, improvements, furniture and maintenance, &c., $12,200.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is one of several items the Minister of Public Works has desired me to ask the committee to approve. If hon. gentlemen opposite desire some information upon them, I will send for the minister, who is attending a committee in another part of the building.

Mr. WILSON. Is this an addition to the main estimates ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, this is not for the coming year. The main estimates deal with the year beginning next July, these estimates deal with sums necessary to be expended in the current year, and which are now falling due, over and above the sums authorized last session. I will have to separate this item from the rest, as I did before.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that he required these items to pay some employees.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a general vote, and will be largely for employees.

Mr. WILSON. Can he tell us the whole amount that was spent last year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. These are proper questions, and if my hon. friend wishes for the information now, I will send for the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. WILSON. You can give us that a little later. I suppose the Minister of Public Works is attending a very important committee ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will let these items go, I will guarantee there will be the fullest opportunity for discussing them at a later stage.

Ottawa public buildings repairs, material, furniture, &c., $36,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That also is a general vote, and I imagine includes largely moneys due for wages.

Working expenses and maintenance—lines on north shore of the St. Lawrence and cable ss. 'Tyrian'—additional amount, $30,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for the telegraph service.

Mr. WILSON. Is it understood that these items may be discussed again ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can promise hon. gentlemen that if they are good enough to pass these items there will be no reservation whatever. They can discuss all of these items at a later stage.

Quarantine—organized districts and public health, $60,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the need of this $60,000 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I require this supplementary vote this year for the purpose of guarding the frontier of the United States against incursions of small-pox. Last year and the year before there was a great deal of small-pox all over the continent. I am happy to say that the Dominion of Canada has apparently been free from it for some time, but in the United States there has been a good deal of this disease and requests have been made from the local authorities, municipalities and others, that we should guard the frontier against incursions of small-pox. Last year, when I made out my estimates for this current year, we hoped that small-pox had disappeared and that we would not be required to continue the expenditure for this service. Unfortunately it has continued and at present it is perhaps as active as it was last year or the year before, and we have to continue this expenditure all along the frontier.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much did the hon. gentleman ask for this service in the main estimates last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One hundred and ten thousand dollars. This makes the vote $170,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was that not big enough ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It would have been enough if the epidemic had ceased, but unfortunately it continued. In the year before we had $170,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the hon. gentleman asking for next year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One hundred and seventy thousand dollars.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, the hon. gentleman intends keeping on this army of doctors along the frontier who are practically doing nothing except drawing their salaries. Surely the small-pox has abated sufficiently to enable the hon. gentleman to drop this $170,000. If we grant this $60,000 to pay them for last year the hon. gentleman is surely not going to keep on this staff of M.D.s, paying them large salaries for doing nothing. We can look at the Auditor General's Report and see the names of a great many doctors that we know in different localities who are doing nothing except drawing this money.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has misrepresented the facts, without knowledge, of course. The epidemic is still continuing in the United States. I am asking $170,000 for next year because of our experience this year. If I had asked for $170,000 this year I would not have been obliged to have asked for a supplementary vote. If the epidemic ceases and there is no need of the maintenance of the watch along the frontier, certainly, that watch will cease at once. But, if this condition of affairs continues as it has continued for a year back, it would be necessary to keep up that watch. The hon. gentleman says that these doctors are doing nothing. That is not correct. Wherever doctors are appointed they are appointed because of the actual danger existing in the locality making it requisite that we should watch the frontier and guard against the incrusion of this disease. If the disease were to come in at any place through lack of watching on our part, we would be open to the gravest censure by the community into which the disease had been introduced. Wherever there has been an abatement of the disease the doctors are laid off. Sometimes they are laid off for several months and when there is an outbreak of the disease on the other side of the line, there is a reinstatement of these doctors.

Mr. SPROULE. How many doctors has the hon. gentleman employed, where are they, and what are their duties ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can give a list of them. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to read the list ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be well to have the list read.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the province of Nova Scotia : Yarmouth, Dr. A. J. Fuller, $100 a month; Louisbourg, Dr. F. O'Neil, $100 a month; Canso, Dr. P. A. McGarry, $50 a month. In the province of New Brunswick : McAdam Junction, Dr. W. T. Ryan, $100 a month. In the province of Ontario : Thessalon, Dr. J. Baxter, $100 a month; Bruce Mines, Dr. F. Parker, $100 a month; Port Arthur, Dr. G. W. Brown, $100 a month; Fort William, Dr. W. H. Hamilton, $100 a month; Owen Sound, Dr. J. A. Hershey, $100 a month; Sault Ste. Marie, Dr. R. J. Gibson, $100 a month; Sarnia, Dr. Wm. Logie, $100 a month, and Dr. E. Oliver, $10 a day for part of the time, and Dr. W. Henderson, $10 a day; Mr. W. Henderson, of Sarnia, $1.50 a day as guardian; Dr. A. A. McCrimmon, Rainy River, $100 a month. In the province of Manitoba : J. W. Caldwell, Sprague, $2.50 a day, and part of the time $2 per day, as guardian; Dr. D. Henderson, Emmerson, $100 a month; Dr. F. D. McKenty, Gretna, $100 per month; Dr. C. T. Sharpe, Morden, $100 per month, as guardian; F. R. Beatie, Morden, $2 per day; William Bottrell, Morden, $2 per day; J. S. Gilles, Morden, $2 per day; B. O. Hole, Morden, $2 per day; C. Wriger, Morden, $2 per day; Dr. G. Riddell, Crystal City, $100 per month; Wm. Maxwell, Crystal City, $2 per day, as guardian; Hy. Kittrick, Crystal City, $2 per day, as guardian; Jas. Sinker, Crystal City, $2 per day, as guardian; Thos. Robinson, Crystal City, $2 per day, as guardian. In the North-west Territories : Dr. D. R. Davies, North Portal, $100 per month; A. J. Valens, North Portal, $2 per day; Dr. T. A. M. Hughes, Coutts, $100 per month ; and a part of the time, $200 per month; Dr. W. G. V. Forbes, Macleod, $100 per month. In British Columbia : Dr. R. H. Port, Huntingdon, $100 per month; Dr. A. Kendall, Blaine, $100 per month; Jas. Harris, Blaine, $3 per day; Bion Smith, Blaine, $3 per day; J. MacDonald, Blaine, $3 per day; Harry Smith, Blaine, $3 per day; Naboth Allan, Blaine, $3 per day; Wm. Chantrell, Blaine, $3 per day; Neil Johnstone, Blaine, $3 per day; T. Forster, Blaine, $3 per day; Thos. Harris, Blaine, $3 per day; Dr. J. E. Spankie, Greenwood, $100 per month; E. B. McMynn, Myers Creek, $2.50 per day; J. S. Harrison, Midway, $2.50 per day; C. J. Kingsley, Sidley's, $2.50 per day; Dr. J. Westwood, Grand Forks, $100 per month; J. K. Dunlop, Carson, $2.50 per day; Wm. J. Cook, Cascade, $2.50 per day.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there any stationed at Sarnia or Windsor ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. We were informed that Detroit is very well organized to combat the disease and there being no danger, there was no necessity for an appointment.

Mr. SPROULE. How do these officers perform their duties ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They meet the trains generally on the American side and board the train and examine the passengers as they are coming into Canada. If they find a diseased person they stop him.

Mr. BLAIN. Do they report to the department yearly or half yearly ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They give monthly reports.

Mr. BLAIN. How many cases did they detect last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that they have not actually found a single case. The fact that they were there, prevented anybody having the disease from coming in.

Mr. SPROULE. I personally attended one man that came across the line last winter who had it when he crossed the line. To say that diseased persons are prevented from coming in is to say what is not a fact. I am told that the work is performed so perfunctorily that dozens of cases might come across without ever being detected.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have had one or two cases reported to us as having come across the line. In some cases the municipalities have made a demand upon us, but when most of these cases were investigated it was found that the persons did not cross the line having the disease. I wonder that the case mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) was not brought to my attention.

Mr. SPROULE. The man came from Dakota, and I attended him myself and he told me he had the disease crossing the line and that it was apparent then as it was when I saw him.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At what point did he enter Canada ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We do not have officers on every railway that enters Canada. We get reports from the United States officials as to the amount of small-pox in the different states and whether it is active or whether it has decreased. If in the judgment of the superintendent general of public health there is no danger there is no appointment made. If the local health officer or other local officers represent that there is danger and if their demand is founded on reason we make an appointment. The case mentioned by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) may have come across where there was no officer.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who made the demand for a medical officer at Bruce Mines and what railway comes in there ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no railway but there are ships coming across the lake. I am informed that there is considerable traffic from Michigan to that port and that there is small-pox in the Michigan lumber camps. Dr. Parker was appointed at $100 per month.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why is it necessary to have an officer at Thessalon ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For very much the same reason as at Bruce Mines.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). We have the statement from the minister that no cases of small-pox have been detected by these officers. Those who live at places where these doctors are appointed look upon it more as being a political job than as being of any public utility. We have a large amount of money paid out to these officers who have not detected a single case of the disease and it seems to me that it is high time that these appointments should be cancelled.

Mr. SPROULE. The disease has been imported several times without detection.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). The doctor who formerly acted in the Owen Sound district, has left there during the past year, and the department has appointed Dr. Hershey. I wish to ask the minister on whose recommendation Dr. Hershey was appointed ? I know that a great deal of dissatisfaction exists owing to the fact that medical men who have had a great experience and who have been in the town for years have been overlooked, while a man who is practically a new comer has been appointed over their heads. A great deal of dissatisfaction exists, and there is no necessity for this official. I would like the minister to say who it was recommended Dr. Hershey for this position in Owen Sound ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say on whose recommendation Dr. Hershey was appointed. His predecessor was appointed on the recommendation of the late Dr. Horsey, but he went away not very long ago. I take for granted that Dr. Hershey was recommended by the Liberal candidate in the last election, or by some other leading Liberal in the constituency.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Then I understand that the appointment was made on the recommendation of the Liberal candidate in the late by-election ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that this appointment was made while the minister was away, and while I was acting for him. In that case, I am responsible for the appointment. I have no doubt I obtained the recommendation from one of my colleagues from Ontario in the administration, and I have no doubt that he received it in the way the hon. gentleman suggests. That is the usual way.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know how these officers are paid ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One hundred dollars a month for the time their services are required.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). As you have not succeeded in detecting one case of contagious disease through these officials, what is the necessity of continuing the service ? It is not popular in the country and why the government should insist on making these appointments when no service is given to the people is more than I can understand.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The work connected with the quarantine is all preventive. I appreciate fully what the hon. gentleman says about the people not appreciating the necessity of the service so long as no glaring case occurs ; but every now and then there is a case of disease entering the country and loss of life occurring, and a large expenditure of money being required to combat the disease. The whole quarantine system is for the purpose of preventing that, and if it succeeds in doing so, there is nothing to show actually the effect of the work except that there is the negative advantage of disease not coming into the country. We might dispense with the service in a certain county to-morrow, and in a few weeks we might have a case of disease entering that county. On the other hand, we might continue the service for a year and have no case of disease coming in. But the quarantine system is acknowledged in the country, it has been in existence for many years, and the people have demanded over and over again that they be protected from the incursion of disease. I may say that before this system of quarantine against the incursions of small-pox from the United States was adopted, there were representations by the dozen from the municipalities and individuals, protesting against the exposure of certain localities to that incursion of infectious diseases from the United States. It was in consequence of these representations that the system was adopted, and it has been carried on in the same way ever since. It is well understood by the local health authorities that we are doing this work, and occasionally representations come to us from particular places, setting forth their danger and requesting us to make an appointment. As a rule, our officers examine the condition of affairs, and if there appears to be danger, the representations of the local authorities are carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says that if the disease is found on the American side, an officer is always appointed to prevent it coming in. I am credibly informed that a case of small-pox came into Collingwood from Dakota, where the disease had been in existence for a year or two back. Another case came from Wisconsin. At different times different cases have been brought over in the last few years to my certain knowledge, and not a single one has been detected by these medical health officers. It seems to me that though they are appointed to receive a salary, they do not do the work very effectively, or these cases would not be imported. I could understand a case not being detected when the disease has not developed; but in these cases the disease was developed when the men crossed the line, and was as apparent then as it was afterwards when it was brought to the attention of the medical men; and yet they passed in without any interference whatever.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman says he knows these cases of his own knowledge, and I accept his statement. Then that individual must have passed through a place where there was no physician watching the trains. I cannot believe that if one of these physicians was watching the train, a case of that kind could pass without detection. I stated a few minutes ago that the provincial health authorities in many instances made demands for this protection. I have just been informed that within the past two weeks we have had urgent representations from the provincial health authorities of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, that we should not cease this protection on the frontier against infectious diseases coming in from the United States, and I may say that only to-day a statement was made to me that in the state of Montana, south of the boundary line of Alberta, there is a great deal of this perambulatory small-pox going about.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the officer at Collingwood board every boat that comes in?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It happens that we have no officer at Collingwood.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). I may say that the service of these officers at lake ports is not at all satisfactory. Boats come in like the Canadian Pacific Railway liners, carrying 200 or 300 passengers. The doctor may be at his practice or anywhere else when a boat comes in, and by the time he reaches the wharf, if he reaches it at all, a great many of the passengers have left. I do not think there is a satisfactory inspection. We have not been free from small-pox in Owen Sound, and yet not a single case of infectious disease has been detected by these officers. As nothing has been done by them, I think it would be well to dispense with their services. I do not think this service is of any advantage to the town of Owen Sound, and the present appointment is very unpopular.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will certainly try to find out, and if the provincial health authorities and the local health authorities consider it quite safe to dispense with the service in Owen Sound, I will be happy to do so. I have given strict instructions that whenever possible the services of any of these physicians should be immediately dispensed with. In reply to the hon. member for East Grey, the duty of these physicians is to board every train and boat and examine the passengers. If a passenger comes from what is called an infected district in the United States, and has not been recently vaccinated, it is the duty of the physician to vaccinate him. If a passenger does not come from an infected district and shows no signs of the disease, he is allowed to pass, but if he shows any sign he is detained.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is there an officer at Niagara?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because in New York state and Buffalo and that neighbourhood, there is a very thoroughly organized system of combating the disease and keeping it under control.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why has the hon. gentleman an officer at Chippewa, a few miles above Niagara Falls, where they cross in row boats? It is evident that physicians are only employed who have political pull. At Kingston, Gananoque, Brockville, and Prescott, which have a ferry service, there are no officers, but at Chippewa, and Cornwall, where the people cross in boats, there are officers. At important points such as Niagara Falls and Kingston, where we have railways and ferries crossing every hour of the day, there are no officers; but at Thessalon and Bruce Mines, Beaver Mills, Cedar Springs and other places, where there is practically no traffic, we find an officer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the state of New York there is a very efficient health organization which looks after the disease, but in Northern Michigan, from which point people come to Thessalon and Bruce mines, there is no such organization and a great deal of disease, and consequently much more danger of its being carried to Canada from there than from New York. At Chippewa there was an officer a very short time in consequence of the fact that there was an outbreak of small-pox in Buffalo or somewhere in that neighbourhood, which occasioned momentary alarm.

Mr. TAYLOR. At Chippewa, Mr. Grey drew a salary of $493.35 last year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Where a physician is engaged permanently by the year, is he allowed to continue in general practice? I was surprised when the hon. member for Grey told us that this doctor was probably attending to his other practice. I remember when the Conservatives were in power, that there were strong arguments put up against Dr. Hickey practising in Morrisburgh while he was superintending the canal. He was compelled, owing to the opposition put up in the House by the opponents of the government, to discontinue his practice. I see that the doctor at Beaver Mills received twelve months salary and in addition he inspected four vessels for which he made an additional charge of $4 per vessel. If this gentleman was appointed permanently, I would like to know why he charges for inspecting these vessels? Are these men who are thus bonused to be allowed to practice in opposition to other physicians in the same town. Where is Beaver Mills?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Somewhere in the neighbourhood of Rainy river. I do not know how this doctor came to charge a fee.

Mr. REID (Grenville). On page D—97 of the Auditor General's Report, Doctor A. A. McCrimmon is down for salary from May 30th, 1901, to June 30th, 1902, at $100—$1,306.45; inspecting four vessels at $4; vaccine tubes, 300 at six cents—$1,340.45.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot explain the fee. He had no right to charge any fee, if he worked at $100 per month. The hon. gentleman asked if these physicians are allowed to practice. They are, provided they do the work which they are instructed to do, namely, meet every train and boat and examine the passengers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is Mine Centre located?

Mr. DYMENT. It is fifty or sixty miles above Fort Francis on Rainy lake. Beaver Hill is near the mouth of the Rainy river where the Canadian Northern Railway crosses from Minnesota.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is no post office there?

Mr. DYMENT. Yes, the Rainy river post office.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is the doctor at Mine Centre? There is a Mine Centre on the Canadian Pacific Railway between the 'Soo' and Sudbury.

Mr. DYMENT. I do not think that there is any station called Mine Centre on the Canadian Pacific Railway at all, certainly not between the Soo and Sudbury.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any regulation in the department which will cause these gentlemen to refrain from attending to their ordinary practice every day

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister lay on the Table one of the monthly reports sent in by these officers?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can lay that on the Table another day.

Mr. BLAIN. Has not the hon. minister one of his reports now, with his officer there? I am particular about one from Owen Sound.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I have not one at hand.

Mr. SPROULE. It does seem to me that this is almost a burlesque in quarantine. The minister says the medical man is expected to attend every boat, but that he can continue his practice if he does that? Suppose a medical man is away in the country several miles distant attending to his practice. As often happens, he is detained away all day. The boats are coming in at the regular hours. How is it possible for him to attend these boats? Or, say, he does attend the boats, what then? Take the case of Owen Sound. The boat comes in with perhaps three or four hundred passengers. If you stand beside the gangway you see these people coming off as quickly as they can rush. The medical officer does not board the vessel before it comes to the dock. The passengers may come from Sault Ste. Marie, or Port Arthur, or any of these other ports. So far as I know, no examination is made of them and it would be impossible for a medical man to make even the most cursory examination of the passengers who get off these boats in the short time at his disposal. I can readily understand how cases come in with small-pox actually developed on their persons and there is no knowledge of it until it comes under the attention of some medical man throughout the country. This has happened more than once, and more than twice, to my own knowledge within the last two years. And, I was going to say, that in every case they have passed where there was a medical quarantine officer standing. I do not know that I should be correct in saying that. But certainly there are cases in which the officers have allowed persons infected with small-pox to come in. The officers are paid so much salary, but I frankly confess that, in most cases, they do very little for it.

Mr. McCREARY. So far as Manitoba is concerned, in my opinion, the men who are there looking after the quarantine earn their money and earn it well. I believe that had it not been for the quarantine we have on the boundary there would have

been almost an epidemic of small-pox in Manitoba last year. As it is, a number of cases have come across. Some from Sprague, on the Canadian Northern, were held up in the cars at St. Boniface two days before they were taken to the quarantine hospital. Others come in by Gretna, Deloraine and Emerson. I believe that not only are these officials required, but extra officials are required along the boundary line. In fact, the officers could not do the work were it not for the assistance supplied by the mounted police. There is another point concerning which I desire information, either now or when the other items relating to the service are under discussion. In the Committee on Immigration the other day it came out that there had been brought into this country over 300 immigrants suffering from trachoma, and favus, two diseases that are considered contagious and dangerous by the American officials, so much so that the American officials refuse admission to immigrants infected with these diseases. It came out in the committee, in the minister's absence, that these people had passed the officials at Halifax and Quebec and gone on to Winnipeg, and from there had attempted to get into the United States. The United States officials, seeing the danger of immigrants coming through the port of Quebec and Halifax and getting into the United States across the northern boundary into Dakota, have stationed no less than fifteen officials, I believe, along the boundary line, to prevent immigrants from Canada going into the United States. As a consequence, in the month of April or March they deported or refused admission to about 380 people. These people were brought back to Winnipeg and are now in that city. I would like to know if the minister is going to bring down in his estimates an appropriation to look after these people infected with these contagious diseases. They are living in the north end of the city, in crowded houses. I think it will be the duty of the minister to help the city of Winnipeg to look after these people, or else provide a train and deport them to Europe. The expense of caring for them or deporting them should not fall upon the city of Winnipeg.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to point out that there is a difference between what are known as quarantinable diseases and other diseases commonly called contagious. The disease the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) mentioned, trachoma, has not been held to be a quarantinable disease in any country where quarantine laws are in force. The stopping of these people from entering the United States is not affected by action of quarantine officers in that country, but by the action of the immigration officers. In the same way, in this country, at Halifax, St. John and other places, my colleague, the Minister of the Interior, directs a certain examination of immigrants from the immigration bureau standpoint. But that has nothing to do with the quarantine service, which defends the country from certain diseases called quarantinable diseases.

Mr. McCREARY. The quarantine department has nothing to do with immigrants coming in with trachoma ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Every ship must be passed under examination by quarantine officers for quarantine diseases. Trachoma is not one of these diseases. My officers in Quebec, St. John or Halifax would not stop any passenger who had trachoma. The immigration officers would stop an immigrant who had trachoma, but they would not stop a first-class passenger if that passenger happened to be suffering from the disease. Now, if people affected with this disease have come into Canada, that is something over which the quarantine department has no control. We have no power under our Act, no authority from parliament, to deal with these people. We could not seize them or stop them. But the immigration authorities, under an Act which was passed last session or the session before, has authority to stop them and deal with them. In reply to the observations of the hon. gentleman opposite, I would point out that, in the United States, on the 1st of June, there were over 26,000 cases of small-pox, and of these no less than 19,000 were in cities contiguous to Canada. The North-west has been referred to. In Minnesota there were 3,553; in Wisconsin, 1,313; in Michigan, 633; in Ohio, 4,390. These figures show that, along the frontier of Manitoba and the lakes, there is a very great prevalence of this disease. I could at once dismiss all these officers and allow the passage of people freely across the boundary. But my department has received the most urgent and persistent representations from the provincial health boards, the local municipal health boards and officers of various corporations along the frontier on this question. If I were to dismiss all these officers, I should raise a storm of indignation throughout the Dominion of which hon. members, I believe, have no conception, which no minister, government or parliament could ignore, and which they would hardly care to face. The people of the country are desirous of being protected from disease, they are anxious about it, nobody can blame them for it; and we have to take the steps that are necessary, in the opinion of the best medical authorities and the best health officials that we can find, to protect people from the incursion of disease. It is possible that we do not do enough, it is possible we might have an officer on every line of communication from the Atlantic to the Pacific which crosses the American boundary; it is possible we might stop every individual and have him carefully examined before he is allowed

to cross our line. But we have also to take into consideration the necessities of travel, the convenience of travellers and people who are passing across; and we have tried as much as possible to harmonize the safety of the people with the convenience of travellers. That has been our sole aim in the administration of this work. I can assure my hon. friends opposite that not only myself but my officers have in every case dispensed with the services of physicians just as soon as it seemed to be possible in the interest of the locality that we were watching.

Mr. SPROULE. Then we ought to have a return showing the number of cases that were either quarantined or turned back at the line. Because if the aim of the minister be to keep out disease—and he has read the number of cases in Ohio, and the number in Michigan, the number in Minnesota—I would like to ask him how it is that there is no quarantine officer stationed at Sarnia, none stationed at Windsor, none stationed at Niagara Falls, while there are officers stationed at small places where not one passenger crosses for every hundred passing at these places that I have named. Now, if there is danger of disease being imported, it will be greater according to the increased number of people who come across, and yet where the people cross in the largest numbers we have no medical health officers stationed and no work being done. Does it not appear on the face of it to be a burlesque? The minister says he has urgent demands from the people that this should be done. I have no doubt of that, the desire of the people is to prevent the importation of disease. But what we complain of is that when we are paying money for this purpose we do not get beneficial results from it. We do not complain of the expense, if disease was kept out of the country, but we know for a fact that from time time it is allowed to come in by the officers who are paid the people's money to keep it out, and then the municipalities are put to great expense to stamp it out. Take the case I referred to, twenty or twenty-five cases of small-pox developing from that one case. Yet that case crossed from Michigan, the officer failed to detect it, and it is only discovered by medical men in the locality away in in the interior of the country, more than a couple of hundred miles from the frontier. Yet that patient says he was infected when he came from Dakota, the disease was out on him when he crossed the line, and it was then that he should have been inspected by a medical man. Take the immigration department as well. The minister says that trachoma is not a quarantinable disease. We have been told from time to time by the Minister of Agriculture, in whose department immigration is maintained——

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Immigration is under the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Agriculture appoints the quarantine officials. Now, would you not think it natural that a quarantine officer who inspects incoming immigrants would report to the immigration officer the number of those immigrants who were infected with trachoma and some of those diseases that are contagious? These cases are allowed to come in in hundreds, whereas on the American side they are all turned back, as I am informed. I saw a report from an American inspector, who said that a very large number were refused admittance to the United States on account of disease, and were allowed to come in and roam through Canada as they liked. Now, when we are paying money for this purpose we complain that not enough care is exercised to prevent the importation of disease. If these medical men were doing their duty, if the government were compelling them to do it in such a way as to satisfy the people that disease could not be imported unless in exceptional circumstances, for instance, where the infection had occurred but the disease had not developed—I say unless a disease was imported under these conditions, it ought to be prevented. It is because it is not ascertained, because it is not prevented, and because we find it is imported notwithstanding this large amount of money paid out, that we object to the working of the system and ask for a better system. On the other hand, there is no medical man in the world but will tell you how utterly impossible it is to go to a boat with 400 passengers and inspect them as they are rushing off the gangways as these have done. It is no use sending a medical man on board a boat after it has entered the port and expect him to make an inspection under these circumstances. It may sometimes take place, but I have seen over and over again that these passengers come off in dozens and hundreds, and no medical man in the world could examine them so as to know whether many of them were infected. It is because the department is playing this farce of a quarantine that we object to paying out money without getting the results to which we are entitled.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman who has just spoken tell us when it was these men were allowed to come into Canada over the American boundary?

Mr. SPROULE. They came in both in summer and winter. One came in about four months ago, and the other two years ago, the last two that came under my notice.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Was it before or after the regulation was made?

Mr. SPROULE. After the regulation was made, and during the time these men were earning the salary that is paid them.

Mr. KENDALL. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he knows to what stage small-pox had developed in the case to which he referred that came across the boundary ?

Mr. SPROULE. I told the Minister of Agriculture that my information from the patient himself was that the small-pox was developed to the full extent at the time he came across the border, and during all the time he was on the train. He came through Minnesota into Canada.

Mr. KENDALL. No doubt the hon. gentleman knows very well that in some cases of small-pox you might have a full development, and yet it would not be apparent enough for any medical man to detect unless he made a very accurate examination to tell whether it was small-pox or not.

Mr. SPROULE. I admit that to be a fact, but what I say is that this man had the pustules developed over his face, head and hands and those portions of his body that were plainly visible to inspection in the event of any medical health officer having inspected him.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Could the hon. gentleman tell me where the man came from in the United States ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think he came from Dakota.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By what route ?

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot tell as I did not inquire.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is quite true that we have not got an officer at every route coming in. It is possible at any time that a case may come across from the United States where there is no officer. Until we have an officer at every route we cannot absolutely protect the frontier. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is complaining that we are spending too much money and he says that we ought to reduce our expenditure in this respect.

Mr. TAYLOR. Because it is useless.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Then, I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) to say that we ought not to protect the frontier and that we ought not to have these officers along the frontier to prevent the introduction of this disease ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman ought to have officers at the important points such as Niagara Falls, Kingston, Sarnia and at points where railways and ferries cross. In place of that the hon. gentleman has officers away up at Beaver Mills, Mine Centre, Bruce Mines, Chippewa, Owen Sound, Thessalon and all those places where there is not one person crossing for every thousand that crosses at the points I have named. Therefore I say it is a fraud and a farce to throw away the money of the country in the way it has been done. We have no protection at all. It is simply giving a sop to some of the hon. gentleman's political supporters who claim that a certain doctor is a good political agent like the hon. gentleman who sits beside him (Mr. Dyment) who has one at Beaver Mills, and one at Mine Centre drawing $100 a month and who are, no doubt, political canvassers in that large country. There is not one person who goes into those parts of the country for every 10,000 who cross at Niagara Falls, or Sarnia, where there is no officer to protect the frontier. What a farce it is !

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend says perfectly truly that there are thousands crossing at Niagara Falls and Sarnia for every one crossing at other places, but at the same time my hon. friend chooses for his own purposes to ignore absolutely that in the State of New York and around Detroit and opposite Sarnia and Windsor there are complete and effective organizations on the part of the United States to control and manage that disease.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then why appoint a man at Chippewa.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was for a short time a flurry of excitement, for which reason an officer was appointed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why at Cornwall ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the same way there was a little flurry of excitement and when there is a flurry of excitement it is necessary to allay public alarm and meet the views of the authorities. In the case of Michigan and Minnesota, from which states people come to Thessalon, Bruce Mines and Beaver Mills, there is no effective control of the disease by the United States authorities and therefore we have to take precautions that we do not have to take in watching the passage of people from places like the State of New York and in the neighbourhood of Niagara and Buffalo where such a complete control is exercised as it is also exercised in the neighbourhood of Detroit.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why are Windsor and Sarnia neglected ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because opposite Windsor and Sarnia there is a complete organization.

Mr. TAYLOR. In Michigan ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, in that part of Michigan there is an organization. But in the northern lumber woods of Michigan from which people come to Bruce Mines and Thessalon there is no

organization. There is no use in the hon. gentleman undertaking to misrepresent the state of affairs.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Auditor General's Report represents it fairly and I take my information from it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not denying one fact in connection with the Auditor General's Report, but I am stating the grounds upon which we make these appointments.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). How do these people get to Bruce Mines without going to the Soo where the hon. minister has a medical officer ?

Mr. TAYLOR. There are two of them at the Soo.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). What is the necessity of having one at Bruce Mines ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that there are vessels that come across from Michigan to Bruce Mines which do not go to the Soo at all.

Mr. DYMENT. Boats on their up trip go to the Soo and then cross over to Mackinaw and then cross to Bruce Mines which is the first port they call at on the Canadian side after leaving Michigan.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). What line of boats ?

Mr. DYMENT. The Northern Navigation Company's boats sailing from Collingwood.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The remarks made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) may apply to the country which he represents west of Port Arthur but they do not apply to the portion of country from which I come. Why should there be a medical officer appointed at Owen Sound unless for political purposes ? The railways running into Owen Sound do not come from any American port ? It is no part of the duty of the medical officer to attend the incoming trains and pass the people who get off those trains. The only duty he can perform is to visit the boats which may touch at American ports. Now, there are two lines of boats that run to Owen Sound—the Northern Navigation Co. and the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers. You have an officer at Fort William, one at Port Arthur and one at the Soo, and there is no necessity for one at Owen Sound. The boats only touch at the Soo, Port Arthur and Owen Sound. They do not go to Mackinaw or any other port. The only line of boats to which this may apply is the one to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dyment) has referred, the Mackinaw excursion boats. If it is necessary to have an officer at Owen Sound then is it not equally necessary to have one at Collingwood ? Collingwood has no medical officer, nor Midland, nor any of those points, where those boats touch. There is no doubt this appointment in Owen Sound is purely a political one, and if all the officers are appointed with the same amount of wisdom as the one appointed at Owen Sound I think the money of the country is simply being wasted in this service. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he would kindly bring down one of those monthly reports ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not one under my hand at present, but I will bring one down.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman has in the main estimates an item, No. 58 :

Salaries and contingencies of organized districts and public health in other districts, $170,-222.

That he is asking for this year. When that item comes up, I hope the hon. gentleman will have the monthly reports of all these officers and be able to give us full information. He asked for $110,000 last year, and now he comes down with a supplementary estimate of $60,000 making the expenditure $170,000 for the present year. We have had a very large amount of this money wasted and I hope the hon. gentleman will be prepared, if we allow this item to go through, to bring down the information when the main estimate is taken up. We must have the names of the men and the work they do.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have given the names.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, but we want the monthly reports of the work they do, so that we may know if they are doing something for their money.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister should carry out the policy he advocated when he was in opposition, and that is that these physicians who receive $100 per month should not be allowed to compete in active practice with other medical men in the locality. That was the principle that the Conservative government went on, and even the present government has appointed a physician in Kingston and prevented him to do private practice. I would like the minister to give me an assurance that these men will not be allowed to continue in active practice, because in addition to its being unfair to other doctors, they may be absent attending patients when these vessels and trains arrive and so neglect their duty to the Dominion. In my constituency there is a boat crossing every day bringing carloads of immigrants, and there is no one to inspect them. Indeed it would be impossible to inspect them here as elsewhere, because the moment the boat arrives they are put upon the waiting train and started off for their destination. But the strange

thing about this whole thing is that while throughout all Ontario, from Glengarry to Port Arthur, we spent $9,677 on this service, $8,166, or nearly the whole of it, was spent in the constituency of Algoma. We need not wonder at the anxiety of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment) who sits behind the minister, trying to get this item through.

Mr. VROOMAN. When we realize the good that may be done by this service, we should not stop to consider the expense of it. I do not know to what extent this service has been abused for political purposes, but I can easily conceive that even under the most careful scrutiny of a medical man, a case of the disease may come into Canada. If the appointees of this government do not scrutinize the ports of entry very closely, their services had better be dispensed with, because in order to perform their duty with any measure of success they must exercise the greatest care. The explanation of the minister as to the methods employed by these medical officers have not been satisfactory to me. We are not instructed as to whether the trains are held up until the medical officer makes his inspection, and we know that if a train is allowed to stop at a station people get on and get off, and those affected with small-pox may not come under the scrutiny of the medical officer at all. If a case of small-pox is well developed any medical officer can easily detect it, and in that way the service is important and useful, but even under the closest scrutiny certain types of the disease may escape detection. We know that in the frontier towns of the United States there have been numerous cases of small-pox, and if I were assured that these medical officers carefully discharged their duties, I would be more reconciled to this vote. I would not attempt to discourage the service, but I fear there is ground for the complaints made by hon. members on this side of the House that the service has been abused for political purposes.

Mr. MORIN. It appears to me that the government is taking great care of the United States people, while they are neglecting their own people in the interior of the country. From Cornwall to Lake Superior there are large stretches of water which make it difficult for disease to come into Canada in that territory, and yet all this money is spent there while from Cornwall to the Ste. Croix river, where the international boundary is on land, the government take no precautions at all. In the county of Dorchester which I have the honour to represent, there were some cases of small-pox last year, and the municipal council passed a resolution preventing people from going within four miles of where the disease existed. This shows what precautions we take in the county of Dorchester, but it would appear that the Minister of Agriculture thinks that it is only necessary to protect the constituency of Algoma, in which he has spent all this money. At St. Johns, Quebec, where many railroads centre and where the people from Montreal and Quebec cross to the New England States, and vice versa, there is no precaution taken, whatever, by the government. Can the minister explain that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can explain that very easily. In the first place we are not taking care of the people of the United States, but we are trying to protect the people of Canada by keeping out disease which may come from the United States. The Dominion government has nothing to do with the interior of the country, because that is looked after by the provincial or local health authorities, and our duty is only to protect the frontier. There has been no physician appointed at St. John, Quebec. The reason is that the provincial health authorities have expressed to us their entire satisfaction with the condition of affairs, saying that they have no fear of the introduction of disease along the Quebec frontier. We do not know of any disease in the state of New Hampshire or the state of New York, the state health authorities having it so well under control. We do not appoint these officers anywhere unless there appears to be danger; we do not appoint them unless the local or provincial health authorities have made a demand for their appointment; and we appoint them only after an examination by the medical officers of the department to assure themselves that the fear on the part of our own people seems to be reasonably well founded. The hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Reid) has asked me to assure him that we will not allow physicians occupying this position to carry on their own practice. I do not think I can give him that assurance. If I were to do so, it would be with the utmost difficulty that I could get medical men to accept these positions. The salary given would be no temptation to them. Even as it is, we have great difficulty in many places in getting doctors. If we were to forbid them engaging in any private practice, we would cut out all the physicians along the frontier who are now in office, because they could not afford to give up their ordinary practice for the purpose of getting a temporary appointment lasting perhaps a few months, though in some instances a year, at $100 a month. The hon. gentleman is a physician, and he knows perfectly well that that salary would not tempt any physician of decent standing to give up his practice and take such an appointment. We would have to fall back entirely upon young physicians who have just passed their examinations. The result would be that we could not get officers to do the work. Therefore, I cannot give the assurance the hon. gentleman desires. But while these officers are allowed to carry on

their private practice, they are not allowed to do it in such a way as to interfere with their duties as officers of the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Of course, I only refer to those cases where the service is permanent for the year. The hon. gentleman says it is practically impossible to get physicians at $100 per month. That is the salary paid to the superintendent of canals at Morrisburg. There are a good many physicians who have practiced a good many years, and who, not wishing to continue in hard practice, would be very glad to take one of these appointments at the salary that is allowed, and agree not to go into active practice. I do not say that a young, active man who would be able to do good, hard country practice, would take that salary; but I do say that there are a great many physicians of fifty years of age or so, who have worked very hard during their lifetime, and who would be glad to take that position at $1,200.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Do not let my hon. friend misunderstand me. There is no one of these appointments for the year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But some of them are engaged for twelve months.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They might be dismissed at any time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If it is understood that they are for the year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is not understood in any case.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is the hon. gentleman not asking a grant for the whole year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not asking a grant to pay for the whole year. I am basing my estimates on the expenditures of the last two years; but there are comparatively few of these officers who were on for the whole year. I cannot say how many, but certainly less than half. The amount I am asking would not pay them the whole year round.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I admit that. For instance, this man at Beaver Mills is in active practice. I ask that he and the man at Mine Centre and the man at Sault Ste. Marie be asked to discontinue active practice, or else that the appointments be given to physicians who will take them and give up active practice. I think that is not unfair. I only ask that in places where you are paying the officers for twelve months service, and I ask it in justice to the other physicians of the different localities.

Mr. DYMENT. The hon. gentleman has particularly mentioned the doctor of Sault Ste. Marie. I am told that he was wanted for that position by almost everybody in Sault Ste. Marie, irrespective of politics. His practice is worth to him at least $5,000 a year, if he devoted all his time to it, so that it could hardly be expected that he would give that up to accept $100 a month for an indefinite period, or even for a full year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman says I mentioned Sault Ste. Marie in particular. He knows I did not. I mentioned every case where a physician is appointed for twelve months. The hon. gentleman knows that the first place I referred to was Beaver Mills. Perhaps he can tell us whether there is another physician at that point ?

Mr. DYMENT. I do not think there is.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then, why not let another physician go in there and do this work ? I would say the same of Mine Centre. That rule has been followed on both sides of the House, and I think it is only just to the physicians practising in the different localities. If this man at Sault Ste. Marie does not wish to give up his practice, there are just as good men to do the work. Will the hon. member say that if this man is doing a practice of $5,000 a year, he can attend to this work every day ? It would be impossible for him to attend every train and every boat at Sault Ste. Marie. I appeal to the minister to protect the physicians practising in these different localities. He knows that if he sends out and asks for applications for these positions, he will have a thousand applications inside of two weeks from men who will accept them. I appeal on behalf of the interest of these physicians practising in these localities, that the department should insist on these men discontinuing their active practice or else give up their government appointment.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman would be quite right if this were a permanent position, but it would be difficult to get any good men to settle down in these places on a monthly salary with the possibility of their services being discontinued at any moment. The hon. gentleman says that the practice he lays down is well understood. I was not aware of that. I can refer him to the port of Halifax where the port physician, under one of my predecessors, carried on his regular practice and drew a salary from the government besides.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What was his salary ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. $1,800 per year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When the hon. gentleman states that he could not get a physician to go out to Beaver Mills with the possibility of being employed only a few months in the year, let me tell him that if he will leave the matter to me, I will get a physician—— .

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Would you go ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). No, but I would get a better man than myself to take the position at $100 per month with the risk of being only employed some months.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the hon. gentleman explain what Dr. B. Gibson's duties are and how he attends to them ?

Mr. DYMENT. He meets all the trains coming from Michigan. They of course have regular stated times for coming in, within a few minutes every day, and he can arrange his engagements so as to be at the stations when they come.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about the boats, are they included ?

Mr. DYMENT. One year there was an assistant to Mr. Gibson to meet the boats. I do not know whether there is one this year. This man spends practically the whole of his time at the docks looking after the boats.

Mr. WILSON. I would ask the hon. minister whether these inspectors stop people who are infected with trachoma and favus ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, they are not quarantined.

Mr. WILSON. I think that it is time the government took an active part in preventing people infected with these diseases from entering this country. They are not admitted to the United States. Forty per cent of the immigrants at Winnipeg, en route to the United States who applied to the American Board of Inspection of the United States were rejected. Two thousand of them at Montreal, destined for the United States were rejected last year who applied for permits to go into the United States were also rejected. Such people are undesirable citizens and we should not allow them to be dumped on us. If they are not fit to be citizens of the United States, they should not be allowed to remain in this country, but be deported altogether. I presume, however, that this discussion will come up better on the item of immigration and I hope that the Minister of the Interior will be here soon.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice an item of $720 for an inspector at Fort William, and the same amount for an inspector at Port Arthur. These two towns are within a mile or two of each other and are connected by a street railway system. Furthermore, on the line of railway which runs through that section, there is not a train which does not touch both towns. Nor is there a boat that touches Port Arthur which does not go to Fort William as well. Why is it necessary to keep an inspector at each of those places?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are boats from the United States, some of which go to Port Arthur and others to Fort William, and each of these ports has to be guarded. There is a large number of people continually crossing from the lumber woods on the south shore to the lake and going to work in the lumber woods on the north shore. In the lumber woods in Michigan and the south shore of Lake Superior, there is a considerable amount of this disease, and it is desirous to guard against it being brought into our country.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. minister say that there is a line of vessels which runs to Port Arthur and does not call at Fort William ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A number of vessels go to Fort William which do not go to Port Arthur.

Mr. SPROULE. It is evident that smallpox is imported from northern Michigan into Ontario. In the lumber woods of Ontario it has broken out from time to time. Last year away around Sudbury it prevailed most of the year. Almost every month of the year it can be found there. The fact that it is imported from Michigan to that extent shows how imperfectly this work is done. We are not complaining of the act in trying to keep up the quarantine, but we complain about paying out money and getting no benefit in return. If it were necessary to cite any particular case to show that the work is not properly done, the one cited by the hon. member for Algoma might be mentioned. You employ a man by the year at $100 per month, and according to the hon. member for Algoma he has a practice which gives him $5,000 per year. Well, everybody knows that a man with a practice of that kind has all his time taken up and cannot possibly attend to government business. He may be detained in a house hours at a time and therefore cannot possibly fulfil his duty as quarantine officer.

Mr. DYMENT. I can assure the hon. member for East Grey that the doctor I referred to does attend to his duty, and if he were to leave it, I firmly believe, protest would come from members of his own party rather than friends of my own. His practice is altogether a city practice, and as these trains come in with great regularity, it is quite possible for him to make arrangements to meet those trains and then attend to his other cases. I know that he has the confidence of the whole town of Sault St. Marie, irrespective of politics. I am sure that my Conservative friends there would be the first to ask to have him retained if the proposal were made to dispense with his services.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not saying a word about the professional ability of the medical man. He may be the best in the world, or he may be the worst. But to say that the medical man who is employed to the

extent spoken of in every day practice can be available to attend trains when they arrive, is to say what to medical men will be manifestly absurd. You do not have sickness when you can attend to it most conveniently; it comes every day and every hour. The medical man may be detained for hours at a time, and he cannot leave a patient just when he pleases.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) says he has no objection to the work if it is done effectively, but that he knows that it is not done effectively. I will not give him any statement of mine, but I may give him a few facts upon which he can form his own opinion. The Ontario provincial authorities have to pay the expense where there are outbreaks of small-pox in the unorganized districts, but the municipal authorities have to pay the expenses of an outbreak in an organized municipality. These people take the ground, and I believe properly, that where they can prove that an outbreak of disease is the result of importation of the disease from across the line, they can make us pay for it. In the last three years, during which this work has been carried on, a demand has been made upon this government for the payment of these expenses in only two cases where those making the demand could establish their complaint. In one case the outbreak was due to a man who crossed the ice on foot above Sault Ste. Marie. It was shown that he had small-pox upon him when he crossed. He escaped the vigilance of our officers, but in a way against which it would be practically impossible, in my opinion, to guard. In the other case, a passenger came across at Sault Ste. Marie and got as far as Sudbury. He concealed himself on the train and was not seen until the conductor came across him on the train at Sudbury. In these two cases we had to pay the expenses. If there had been other cases to which the hon. gentleman referred, I have no doubt but that the provincial authorities and the municipal authorities, who are in charge of these matters, would have placed the responsibility upon my department and demanded payment. This rule is true for Manitoba, the Territories, British Columbia and every other province. Yet, these two cases are the only two in which it has been shown that the affected people came from across the line and escaped the vigilance of our officers.

Mr. SPROULE. I have given the hon. minister two cases, and in both these cases the municipalities paid the cost of stamping it out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think they could make a good case.

Mr. SPROULE. It is probable that some of these parties do not know that the Dominion can be held responsible. Or, it may be, that they do not care to take the trouble to collect the money. Rather than engage in a troublesome and expensive lawsuit the municipality bears the expense.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no lawsuit about it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I remember a case that was presented from Winnipeg a few years ago. And, after a great deal of work, the result was that the city got nothing, and the cost, borne by the city, amounted to about $2,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know the case to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) refers. But I believe there was a case in which the government did pay. There was no law case about it. The representations were made to the government, the case was made out and the government paid.

Mr. SPROULE. In the case I speak of the government refused to pay. I remember the case, because I was one who went to the government on behalf of the city of Winnipeg, and the government declined to be held responsible, because the immigrants were inspected by their quarantine officer, though the disease developed among them in Winnipeg.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Will the hon. minister say how much the supervision of these cases cost the department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that the cost amounted to about $700 or $750. I have not the exact figures.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The hon. minister has not made it clear on what principle he bases the payment to these officers who keep the small-pox from coming in from Michigan. It appears that we have medical officers in Port Arthur and Fort William, about a mile apart, and others at various points along the North Shore, while there are none at Sarnia and Windsor. The hon. minister says that the authorities in Detroit are well organized. But surely there are other people coming into Sarnia and Windsor besides those coming from Detroit. Men from all parts of the state of Michigan may come in at Sarnia or Windsor just as they come across at Sault Ste. Marie.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At Detroit there is a well organized system, but for the northern part of Michigan, where the lumber camps are, there is not.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Why cannot these people from northern Michigan come across at Windsor or Sarnia ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They would be stopped by the officials in the southern part of Michigan.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Are there people engaged in watching the people of the northern part of Michigan to prevent them from coming into Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The organization is of a municipal character. They would not allow the people with the disease upon them to enter their municipality.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). But how is that carried out ? They cannot stop a train coming in from the northern part of Michigan and inspect it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say what precautions they take, but the report is that they watch the disease, and that report is of such a character as to satisfy my principal officer that there is no danger there.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have been wondering if this is not a provincial matter. The provincial government have their board of health and they have a provincial health officer. Why does the Dominion government look after these interior ports ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What interior ports ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Owen Sound and others in the province of Ontario. I can understand the quarantining of ports into which immigrants come from European countries, but I do not see why this other work in the interior is not done by the provincial authorities.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That question was submitted to the Department of Justice before we undertook this work, and we were told that we are responsible for the frontier between the United States and Canada just as much as we are for the sea-board.

Mr. VROOMAN. Does this government have anything to do with supplying of the vaccine ? Have they got a farm where they develop vaccine ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have no vaccine farm. There has been some discussion as to the advisability of the government undertaking the manufacture of vaccine, but we have not yet undertaken it.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—contingencies—further amount required, $1,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At the end of the fiscal year, 1902, the sum of $878 was carried forward and paid out of the appropriation for the current year. In order to square up the accounts this amount is required to be voted.

Ocean and river service—further amount required for Dominion steamers, $30,000.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman explain that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The appropriation for 1902-3 was $225,000. That includes the cost of sending a crew to Scotland to bring out the new steamer and repairing damage done to the 'Lady Laurier' by heavy storm on the ocean. The appropriation was found inadequate, owing to the large expenditure in connection with the Dominion steamers running between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The amount required for the maintenance of all the steamers was $240,569, so that the amount voted was insufficient. The expenditure for the current year is estimated to be $255,000 in all, this will make an extra amount of $5,000 over the estimate of the fiscal year 1903-4. Owing to the damage done to the steamers while caught in the ice during the winter, both steamers have been put on the marine slip. The 'Minto' had to have her propeller blades renewed, and the 'Stanley' had also to be placed on the slip to be partially rerivetted on the bottom. This work will necessitate a large expenditure, in addition to this the indentations will be taken out of the sides of the 'Stanley' and intermediate frames put in to reinforce the plating.

Mr. MONK. I do not clearly understand why we have to pay this further amount of $25,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The amount voted was $225,000, instead of $255,000, which has been expended.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year the minister said that $225,000 would be sufficient. What is wrong in his estimate ? Why this over expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not make that estimate.

Mr. MONK. The minister knows he is responsible for it. The statement was made last year that the sum which we voted would be sufficient to carry us through to the end of this current year. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could give us some details of the purposes for which this extra sum is required.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman's predecessor asked us for an amount that he could run the business for. But there has been a change in the head of the department, and the hon. gentleman has probably been extravagant in spending this $30,000 more than was voted, and hence this urgency now. Had his predecessor remained in office, I do not think he would have required this extra amount.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I suppose if my predecessor had remained in office, he would still have required this vote. I entered the office on the 11th of November, nearly at the end of

the season of navigation, and I had to take the government steamers in the condition in which I found them. There were extensive repairs to be made, as I have explained. The 'Aberdeen,' for instance, had to be repaired and repairs to the extent of $8,364 were done.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who did the repairs?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were mostly done on the 'Aberdeen' by day labour.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In Quebec and Halifax. Then, there were very extensive repairs to the 'Minto' and 'Stanley'?

Mr. MONK. What was the amount of each?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $15,000 on the 'Stanley' and $7,000 on the 'Minto.'

Mr. MONK. Were not these $15,000 of repairs foreseen by the department?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They could not be foreseen.

Mr. MONK. Therefore, there must have been some accident.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was. Everybody is aware that during last winter the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' were caught in the ice and that the 'Minto' was disabled. We had to repair the 'Minto' in order to put her into service again. We had also to repair the 'Stanley.'

Mr. MONK. Were these repairs made at Quebec?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The 'Aberdeen' was repaired at Quebec, the 'Minto' at Pictou and Charlottetown and the 'Stanley' at Charlottetown and Pictou during the fiscal year.

Mr. MONK. What firm carried on the repairs to the 'Minto' and 'Stanley'?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Bruce, Stewart & Co., of Charlottetown, made the repairs to the 'Stanley.' They are the only people able to do such work on the island.

Mr. MONK. And who made the repairs at Pictou?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. J. & J. Yorston.

Mr. MONK. Were these repairs done by day's work or by contract?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is impossible to make a contract for repairs of this kind. We get our own officers to make an investigation and to specify what repairs are necessary, but it is almost impossible to say in advance by 25, 30, or 50 per cent what will really be required to be done. But, they are always within the estimate and we have very good officers in that part of the maritime provinces.

Mr. MONK. Still, in the case of repairs amounting to $6,000 and still more in the case of repairs amounting to $15,000 I could scarcely conceive that it is impossible that these repairs can be carried on by contract as they always are in Montreal by steamers that have to be repaired there. At any rate it would be possible to have an estimate made beforehand and to be able to show the committee whether the expense actually incurred tallies with the estimate. I would like to ask my hon. friend if these precautions were taken in these two cases, because, it seems to me, barring the case of accident, that this is a very large extra amount, $30,000 in a sum amounting to a little over $200,000, and I think we are entitled to the fullest information. It seems to me that the hon. minister might be able to state the reason of this rather extraordinary expenditure so that the committee will feel fully justified in voting this amount if these precautions have been observed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All these precautions were taken. All these repairs were made within the estimate of our officer who examined the steamers before the repairs were made and examine them also while the work was going on.

Mr. MONK. I shall not push my inquiries any further. It seems to me in a case of this kind it would be much simpler if the department had an estimate made before the work began with accounts of the work done and if all this were put in a tabulated statement and laid on the Table of the House an item such as this could be disposed of in two minutes without all these questions being asked and the business of the House could proceed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no objection to doing that.

Mr. MONK. I am just mentioning this to my hon. friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister stated that he got hold of these vessels in November and that he had to make extensive repairs to the steamer 'Aberdeen.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is one of them.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much was spent on the 'Aberdeen'?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $8,364.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much did Mr. F. X. Drolet, of Quebec, get out of it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman, but I will furnish the information.

Mr. TAYLOR. These repairs have been done and this $8,364 has been spent. To whom was it paid ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have to put the 'Aberdeen' in commission early in the season to see to the lighthouses, buoys and so on.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the hon. gentleman took charge of that steamer on which he spent $8,364 his predecessor had spent $6,000 for repairs with one firm in Quebec.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was in the year previous.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly it was in the year previous. It appears here in the Auditor General's Report covering the period from July, 1901, to July, 1902.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is nothing extraordinary in that. The 'Aberdeen' does double service. She does service during the summer between Quebec and the maritime provinces and when navigation closes between Quebec and the maritime provinces she does winter service below Halifax and around the maritime provinces. Now and then that steamer has to be repaired. It is impossible for a steamer doing the heavy service she is doing to continue without being repaired, as everybody knows that steamers engaged in ordinary passenger traffic are obliged to undergo repairs.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not wonder at the over expenditure because Mr. F. X. Drolet, of Quebec, draws $6,633 for doing some repairs for this steamer and furnishing some supplies. Mr. Drolet supplied tubes, 104 pounds at 60 cents a pound and he charges 3 cents a pound for 5,930 pounds of iron when $1.85 to $1.90 per 100 would be quite sufficient. He charges for labour on board the steamer 387½ hours at fifty cents an hour, and from $3.50 to $5 a day for men to make repairs. That is the way the money is spent. Everything is charged double. Mr. Drolet drew $6,000 out of the money we voted last year, and I have no doubt that he is getting a large share of this $8,000 for doing this work for which $6,000 was paid a few months before.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If there is anything wrong about these accounts it is very easy to have them scrutinized before the Committee of Public Accounts. Since last my estimates were up, I have made inquiries and I have ascertained from the accounts and from the explanation given by Mr. Gregory, our agent at Quebec, that there does not appear to be anything wrong. Mr. Gregory, who looks after these things, has been in the department for thirty-four years, under all governments, and up to the present time he has done nothing deserving of reprimand. The accounts of Mr. Drolet, or any body else can be examined before the Public Accounts Committee and can be justified to the last cent. Mr. Drolet is one of the best machinists in this country. He is the best machinist in Quebec, and these accounts have been verified by our officials from day to day. After we have taken all these precautions the department cannot be held responsible if there is anything wrong, and before any charge is made against the department, these accounts surely ought to be scrutinized before the Public Accounts Committee. Since the last discussion I have written Mr. Gregory to be ready at any time to come here with all the facts connected with these repairs, and Mr. Gregory has sent to the department an explanation which seems to me perfectly satisfactory. But if hon. gentlemen are not satisfied, they can have an examination before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am satisfied that the accounts which will be brought down before the Public Accounts Committee are correct so far as making the calculation goes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What I mean is that the amounts charged are reasonable.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister is a business man and he ought to know that $5 a day is too much to pay for a man working on repairing a steamer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am enough of a business man to know that men are worth $5 a day when they are making certain repairs to machinery, and the work is done in a machine shop where steam plant is used as well as mechanical skill and labour. In the city of Montreal at the present time we are paying $4.50 per day to bricklayers, and you cannot compare the work of a bricklayer with the work of a mechanic who repairs very intricate and delicate machinery. I have had experience in Montreal for a long time not only for the public but in connection with enterprises with which I am connected, and I am well aware of what prices are paid. We must take into consideration the use of the expensive tools that these people have to use in this special work.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am satisfied there is not a machinist working in any machine shop in Montreal who gets any such wage as $4 or $4.50 per day. Let the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty) tell the minister what he is paying for machinists in his locomotive works. The hardware men in this House who know their business have pointed out that everything that goes into the repair of these vessels is paid for at

a higher price than you could buy them for in any country hardware store. You paid nearly double the usual price for zinc and magnolia metal, and you paid three dollars a hundred pounds for iron that any one can purchase to-day for $2.10 per 100 pounds, and the prices are higher to-day than they were last fall. No wonder the expenditure was exceeded last year, when such prices were paid.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister told us the other day that it was the policy of his department to purchase the supplies for the government steamers by tender. He also told us that last year the cost of these supplies was about $35,000, and I asked him if he would be good enough to furnish the Committee, at its next meeting, with information as to what proportion of that $35,000 was for purchases by tender and what proportion in the other way.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will send over these papers to the hon. gentleman and he will see how the tenders were asked for and how they were dealt with.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not what I want. I want to know what proportion of the $35,000 was for goods purchased by tender.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That would be very difficult to answer. If the hon. gentleman has any idea of business he will know that it would be impossible to give that statement without entering into a very extensive and intricate calculation. It must be remembered that these steamers do not get their supplies all at the same port. When the captains call for instructions they get their supplies in Halifax or St. John or Charlottetown, or wherever they may be. Sometimes they go to ports where we have no contracts and where we have no regular sources of supply, and they have to get necessary supplies at such places. It would be impossible to call for tenders in such cases, and we have to rely on the honesty and intelligence of our officers to purchase under the best conditions. The accounts are examined, and if the officers are satisfied that the prices are fair, the accounts are paid. If the prices are considered unfair, they are discussed and reduced. A business company would do the same thing. This system has been going on for the past fifty or sixty years, and it has not been changed by this government. I do not know where fault can be found. If some of the charges seem to be too high, it is not possible to obtain the explanation simply by reading the Auditor General's Report ; but if an explanation of any item is asked for before the Public Accounts Committee, it will be given.

Mr. BLAIN. What I say is that these supplies should be purchased by tender.

Mr. TAYLOR.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister says that there is no difference between this side of the House and himself on that question. He says that the policy of his department is to purchase these supplies by tender. I find that $35,000 was spent for these supplies last year. Is it unreasonable for us to ask what proportion of these were purchased by tender, under the policy which the hon. gentleman says is adopted by his department ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That information could be got, no doubt, but it would require a good deal of calculation and book-keeping to prepare the statement. I suppose that about seven-eighths of the amount are bought by tender. The rest were bought as the occasion may require. These accounts are all in the department, where they can be consulted, or they can be produced in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BLAIN. Surely the hon. minister is not going to adopt the policy whenever a question is asked along this line, of referring us to the Public Accounts Committee. Does he state that seven-eighths of the amount purchased last year was purchased by tender ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the information the deputy minister gives.

Mr. MONK. This question of taking tenders for supplies for the government steamers has been discussed here several times. My hon. friend is new in the department and I am sure that with his experience and his information he would say that the taking of tenders for supplies would be of great use.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is done.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is mistaken. It is done in his department in the same way as in other departments ; letters are written to a few gentlemen, and they are asked to give prices—sometimes, not always. But we expect great reforms from my hon. friend he is greatly interested in the improvement of the St. Lawrence route; and I am sure that he would save at least thirty per cent in the cost of these supplies if he would adopt the simple method which is followed in other countries. If he will tell the committee this evening that next year he will positively give public notice that tenders will be received for supplies according to certain specifications, and that this notice will be given in the papers so that the public generally will have a chance to tender, I for my part will be ready to give him peace, and this amount will be voted without too much controversy.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am ready to give the assurance that I will take the necessary precautions that supplies will be purchased at the lowest price in the market and in the best manner possible.

Mr. MONK. But the hon. gentleman will not give the assurance that he will call for public tenders.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will not, when it is not necessary and when I would have to spend twenty-five per cent or thirty per cent in advertising without getting any reduction in the price. For instance, you have to buy $1,000 or $2,000 worth of goods in a port like Charlottetown. If you advertised for tenders in the public press, you would have to publish your advertisement in all the papers. If I published it in only one paper, I suppose I would be reproached for that in the same way that I am for sending notices to one class of traders. In that case $500 or $600 would be spent perfectly uselessly, whereas, by sending circulars to first-class dealers and comparing their prices with the market prices, we get the supplies at the lowest possible cost. We are supposed to have competent and honest officers. Most of them belong to the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs, and we have sufficient confidence in them to keep them in office. We think they are doing their duty, and that is why we keep them. When a very large quantity of supplies is to be purchased, we call for public tenders; but when ordinary goods are required for a steamer, I do not think there is any necessity of calling for tenders.

Mr. MONK. I am very much disappointed in the new Minister of Marine and Fisheries—bitterly disappointed. I do not think there is any question in what we are urging as to the efficiency of the officers. I have no doubt that they are good officers, whatever may be their party. My hon. friend will admit that to put an advertisement in a Montreal paper, a Quebec paper, and a couple of papers in the maritime provinces, stating that tenders for supplies according to specifications which would be furnished by the department, would be received, would not cost twenty-five per cent of what we would spend for these supplies. To call for tenders would, according to the hon. gentleman, cost from $20,000 or $25,000 for advertising. That is quite unreasonable. My hon. friend knows that that is the way we proceed in municipal affairs in Montreal, and the way steamship companies proceed all over the world. Why should not this government adopt that simple method? There is no reason, and I am very much disappointed with my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am very sorry.

Mr. BLAIN. On these tenders which the hon. gentleman has submitted to the committee there are one or two notes. At the bottom of one are these words: 'The names have been recommended by Senator Templeman.' At the bottom of the other are these words: 'All names have been recommended by Colonel Tucker.' If tenders are asked for, the presumption would be that the lowest would be accepted, why then was it necessary that the names should be endorsed by the member representing the county?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Before giving a contract to any firm, we inquire as to its responsibility, as any body would do in his private business. The lowest tenders were accepted.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Were the supplies for the steamer 'Scout' purchased by tender?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The 'Scout' is a new steamer which is doing a new service and her supplies were furnished by people who had tendered. We asked for prices in the ordinary way without specifying to what steamer the goods should be delivered.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What service is the steamer 'Scout' performing?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Between Lachine and Kingston, doing for the most part service for the Department in maintaining buoys in the St. Lawrence River and other work. The work will be increased by adding lighthouse attendance.

Mr. TAYLOR. I find in this list of tenders sent by the hon. minister to the hon. member for Peel, that very few are for supplies to Dominion steamers. They are mostly for lighthouse supplies. In the tenders for supplies for Dominion steamers to be delivered at St. John, I find that there are five tenders for five different supplies of groceries. The price for granulated sugar is 4¼ cents, whereas at Halifax the price tendered was 3·75 cents per pound. Yet at Quebec the hon. gentleman paid 5½ cents per pound. Has the hon. gentleman the list for Quebec?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not brought down all the lists. It would have been a very paying business, if when we wanted fifty pounds of sugar at Quebec, we sent to Halifax for it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman ought to know how much sugar is consumed on each steamer and if he can get it 3·75 cents per pound in Halifax he can buy a sufficient quantity there to supply each steamer. But here is the secret of the whole business. It is to be found in this endorsation by the

Liberal member. 'I recommend the acceptance of the above tenders. All the names are on the patronage list.' Thus three or four merchants, who are on the patronage list, are asked to tender, each for a different article, so that there is really no competition, yet according to these documents, although the hon. gentleman could have purchased all the sugar he required at Halifax at 3¼ cents per pound, he preferred paying five and a half cents per pound in Quebec. Is that the way the Richelieu Company do their business ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I say that no business man would do business in that way. No wonder the hon. gentleman asked for an extra $55,000 to carry on the work.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I am a purchaser of sugar and know something about it. Sugar at 3·50 per lb. is Austrian sugar which comes to Halifax in bags and very inferior compared to what you get from our own refineries. People who want a good quality of sugar will not use it. It has been returned to me by some of my customers, and I was obliged to supply the best quality from the refineries in its place. There is as much difference in the quality of sugar as in the quality of tea.

Mr. TAYLOR. Granulated sugar ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). We have inferior granulated sugar, and we have high-class granulated sugar.

Mr. OSLER. Let us not assume from what the hon. minister has said that supplies are bought by public tender. As I understand it they are not so bought, it is merely a question of dividing the spoils and of the particular government supporter to whom this patronage shall be given. As the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Tucker) is present, I would ask him on what principle he advises the acceptance of the various tenders for supplies ? Are tenders publicly called for and does he recommend the lowest tenderer, or does he recommend the supporters of the government ?

Mr. TUCKER. I have not the faintest idea what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) is reading, except that it relates to certain tenders for supplies required by the government in the city of St. John. With regard to the amount to be paid with regard to the cost of those various articles, I know practically nothing. What I do know—and possibly this may be what the hon. gentleman requires—is that when I have been asked to recommend firms in our city of St. John to respond to the wishes of the department asking for these goods, I have recommended first class houses. Further than that, I do not think that I or any other hon. member of this House has the faintest right to deal with the almighty dollar—that is altogether foreign to our business. All I have to do is to give the names, and those names I am only too glad to give, selecting, as I do, the best men to carry out the wants and wishes of the government.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that the same policy has been pursued for many years in the past ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Twenty years.

Mr. BLAIN. This policy has been pursued for twenty years, and the hon. minister is pursuing the same policy now ? Let me read this document and perhaps the hon. minister will give attention to it and explain it :

> The firms of E. B. Marvin & Co., and Peter McQuade & Son, were recommended to the department to invite tenders from for ship chandlery for the steamer 'Quadra.' The agent has been instructed several times to invite tenders for staple articles only. A tender form including a great many things that may or may not be required was given to each of those firms and they have tendered for nearly all the articles mentioned in the form. It is an old form used when we invited tenders publicly, and a tender for the lowest bulk sum was accepted, thus giving to one firm all the patronage.
>
> Under the system that has been in force for the past three or four years——

That is, since hon. gentlemen opposite came into power——

> —we have not invited tenders publicly.

The hon. gentleman tells this committee that the policy adopted thirty years ago is still in force. But this document that the hon. minister now submits to the committee with the old form of public tender attached shows that that form has been abolished and now a new condition of things prevails. Will the hon. gentleman now tell us that they are purchasing supplies in the same way as before ? The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has pointed out that we are only deceiving ourselves if we imagine that we are purchasing supplies by public tender. Would the hon. minister explain this new method of tender, and say if they have abolished altogether the public call for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Did the document the hon. gentleman read say anything about a public form of tenders ?

Mr. BLAIN. I will read it again :

> A tender form including a great many things that may or may not be required was given to each of these firms and they have tendered for nearly all the articles mentioned in the form. It is an old form used when we invited tenders publicly, and a tender for the lowest bulk sum was accepted, thus giving to one firm all the patronage. Under the system that has been in force for the past three or four years we have not invited tenders publicly.

It seems to me that means a change.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The matter is very easy to understand. This is for Victoria, B.C., I think. It may have been found easier, up to a certain time to ask for tenders publicly and to give the contract to only one person for all the goods in the complete list of articles to be furnished. Probably it has been found better to proceed in another way, that is, to buy from each firm the articles which were offered cheaper by that firm, and, in that way, to distribute the furnishing of these supplies to different traders. I know of these two forms of tender, and I know that sometimes although asking for tenders in that manner, the distribution is made to the different firms that have tendered the lowest for the different articles. Sometimes it is more advantageous to do it in that way, because you get the best articles at the lowest prices, and you are sure that tenderers do not control the situation. It might be that a tenderer having inside knowledge would know of certain articles mentioned in the list of which a very small quantity would be taken and these he would offer to furnish at almost nothing, knowing that his actual loss would be very small. Then, if you calculated the prices upon the whole list of articles, and gave the contract to the lowest tenderer, you might be obliged to pay a relatively high price for some staple article of which a considerable quantity is used and which you could have got at a lower price, though you would have low prices for articles of which little or none was used. I do not see much difference in the way of doing it. The principle is the same, except that it may be found more advantageous in certain cases to proceed by apportioning the articles among the different traders at the lowest price, than to give them to the same party.

Mr. OSLER. The fact is clear enough, there is no need of any further explanation from the minister, that originally, up to three or four years ago, tenders were invited publicly and now they are not. I read from a document the hon. gentleman sent over here, a report initialled by W. W. S :

> Under the system that has been in force for the past three or four years we have not invited tenders publicly.

There is the whole secret, and there is no use humbugging ourselves, and there is no use for the minister attempting to make us believe that the system of public tendering is in force now as it was.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I never said that public tenders were asked for, I said that circulars were sent to those who were on the list of the department.

Mr. OSLER. I understood the minister to say that the system he is now following is the same system that has been in force for the past twenty years.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the information that I have from my department.

Mr. OSLER. This document shows that statement is incorrect. I am reading from the document I have, this is a form of tender, and this is the information that is given by an official of the department. Don't let us make any mistake about this, or go away with an explanation which is no explanation at all. There can be only one reason, and that is that public tendering has been abandoned, and that tenders are only asked from those men who may be recommended by the member for the district. That is not public tendering, it is simply a division of the spoils.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would be unwise for my hon. friend to go away humbugging himself. He should not do that, and he should not try to humbug anybody else. But he is conveying an impression now that there was a general system of public tendering in former years, and that that system has been changed. That is the impression that would be drawn from his remarks. Now, according to the document he has in his hands, he has shown no foundation whatever for that impression.

Mr. OSLER. I am speaking only from what I have before me.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, and I have only the same thing.

Mr. OSLER. Under the system that has been in force for the last three or four years tenders are not invited publicly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That refers to the port of Victoria, B.C.

Mr. OSLER. Will the minister say that Victoria is the only port ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I will not.

Mr. OSLER. Will he say that system does not generally prevail ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will hear my hon. friend, then I will answer.

Mr. OSLER. I am reading from this document which the minister has sent over here. I am speaking from knowledge of what has been the custom for the past twenty years, and with this document before me on which there is a direct statement by an official of the Crown that the system has been changed within the last three or four years, and that tenders are now asked privately and not publicly. Now, if Victoria is an exception, I would confine my remarks to Victoria only, and say that so far as Victoria is concerned, that so far

as this tender is concerned, and this particular case, it is not inviting public tenders, it is a mere distribution of patronage as the local member may recommend.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then if my hon. friend's remarks are confined to Victoria, I cannot take much exception to them because the document seems to afford a foundation for his view. I asked the question whether the document had reference to public tenders, for this reason, that I was aware from general knowledge that the practice on the Atlantic coast has been for many years to invite tenders in the way described by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Now if any member would say that to his personal knowledge that is not correct, I would not assume the responsibility of denying it. But I am speaking from general information which I think is correct that as respects the Atlantic coast the method of buying supplies under the late government was precisely the same as under the present government. Therefore if the hon. gentleman wishes to point out that there has been a change in Victoria, that is a fair criticism, as the document shows, and I would leave the department to look into that. But I do not think that that change has taken place in the other ports of the Dominion. I know, at all events that the practice of the late government was to order supplies from their own friends on the eastern coast of the Dominion, and I always understood that the practice which now prevails as respects these ports of which I have the most knowledge, is exactly the same practice which has prevailed for many years. I am only taking exception to my hon. friend's remarks if they have a general application.

Mr. OSLER. I think the Finance Minister will not tell me that this system applies only to Victoria, because the same form and the same suggestion are carried out here in asking recommedations, or purchasing supplies on the recommedation of some local member. Now the same recommendation is on each of these other forms of tender, the names are recommended by this member or by that member. So I say the inference is clear that the same form and the same system are in vogue in other ports as is clearly shown to be in vogue in Victoria; and I think, unless the minister can absolutely give a statement that Victoria is an exception, and that no change has been made in any other ports, the only inference we can draw is that there has been a general change.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Finance a few evenings ago took issue with me when I made the statement that the system of purchasing supplies had been changed in some places from the system followed by the former government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know that my hon. friend mentioned any particular place. He was dealing with the practice generally.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Here is an instance. I say that it occurs all along the St. Lawrence. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if the statements of his crews are correct, must admit that they simply run in now and purchase their supplies at any port they wish, while under the late government they were purchased by tender.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no evidence of that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the minister deny the fact ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If they buy a pound of butter at the port where they stop, or a pound of sugar, of course I would not deny it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Take the steamer 'Scout' running between Montreal and Kingston, do they not purchase their supplies at any port they wish ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The officers of steamers have got to buy their staple goods from the people with whom the department has a contract, made by tender.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understand it, they have notices of who they must go and purchase from. There are no tenders.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISEHRIES. Prices are asked in the ordinary way as you see there in St. John, Halifax, Quebec or Montreal and other places.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood from the hon. gentleman that Mr. J. U. Gregory, the purchasing agent, did all the purchasing at Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is the agent of the department, and if some thing is not provided by tender they have to go to him to get an order to buy it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see in the Auditor Generals Report, at page P—61, that Mr. Gregory paid $1,404, and that among other items was $8 for spruce bushes for decorating on St. Patrick's Day. I would like to know how many bushes he got for $8.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, we had that up before.

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course, we had it up before, and the hon. minister promised to allow him to decorate on the same terms on the 12th of July. I would like to know how many spruce bushes he got for $8 and how many we might expect to get on the 12th of July.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The same quantity.

Mr. TAYLOR. We can get a load of spruce bushes in Ontario for a dollar, and to pay $8 seems an extravagant price.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the hon. minister if he would kindly have a list of the names of the parties from whom he received tenders for supplies for the steamer 'Scout' for the last year, for the information of the committee, because I am anxious to convince the hon. Minister of Finance that he is wrong in what he said in regard to that latter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have already given the information to the hon. gentleman. We do not ask for tenders for any particular boat. We ask for tenders generally for a port, and whatever steamer comes to that place is supposed to buy from those who have tendered and at the price of the tenders, whether it is the 'Scout,' the 'Aberdeen,' the 'Quadra,' or any other boat.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister admits that the department did not ask for tenders for the steamer 'Scout' along the St. Lawrence. I am satisfied that I can produce evidence that previous to this government coming into power tenders were asked for.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have told the committee that we do not ask for tenders for particular steamers. We ask for tenders generally.

Mr. MONK. Does my hon. friend persist in saying that for the incoming year he will not ask for tenders publicly ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot make any promise one way or the other.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend said a moment ago that he would not ask for tenders publicly. Does he still adhere to that determination ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never said anything of the sort. I said that we would proceed to the best of our judgment and ask for tenders for staple goods, for articles that can be furnished cheaper by getting prices fixed five or six months in advance at the different ports where supplies are required. I will not undertake to ask for tenders for articles that may be wanted in small quantities at periods we do not know in advance, and which may not be required at all. We will not ask for tenders for these articles, because it would not be in the public interest to do so, but, in future, if it is thought in the public interest to ask for tenders we will proceed to the best of our knowledge as we have been proceeding for the last number of years.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman tell the committee that he will, at the beginning of each year, publicly advertise for tenders for supplies for the Dominion steamers ? Will he say that or will he not ? If he says he will not, I am perfectly satisfied.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If it is thought advantageous to do so we shall do so. But if we think that by continuing in the way we are proceeding we will serve in a better manner the public interest, we will do it in that way, and leave the matter to be judged by the House and the people.

Mr. EARLE. The hon. minister has handed us a number of tenders which he claims are the lowest for the goods named in each. He must have received other tenders, and we would like to be furnished with those.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, of course.

Mr. EARLE. You will let us have them ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). A steamer, after receiving supplies at Halifax, leaves Halifax to supply the lighthouses, going from station to station, towards St. Paul Island, and then comes back and goes into the Bras d'Or lakes. By the time she has made this trip other supplies are required. Then, they can buy supplies such as beef, pork, butter, and flours in sufficient quantities to take them back, to Halifax. That is often done, and it is impossible to stand upon tenders in all cases. There are circumstances under which it cannot be done.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the hon. minister if he decides to call for tenders by circular, if he will have the circulars sent to merchants in each locality other than those who are supporters of the government, and give them an opportunity of tendering also, or will the circulars only be sent to supporters of the government ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I suppose there will be no objection at all to sending circulars out more generally.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then, the hon. minister will see that it is done.

Fisheries, further amount required for salaries and disbursements of fishery officers, $30,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. We cannot touch that tonight.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You are not going to keep these men out of their money, are you ?

Mr. TAYLOR. We will pass items Nos. 90 and 91, and that is all you can expect.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is an item of $500 gratuity to the widow of the late Captain Jas. Rood. Surely you will not keep her out of her money.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman insists upon it, I am going to move that this $30,000 be struck out, because I have something in my desk that I want to bring up, and I will not only have a vote in the committee, but I will have a vote when the Speaker is in the Chair. There is no use of getting up a fight to-night, because if we do we will be here till morning.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a fish story.

Mr. TAYLOR. They do not deserve it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The widow ; oh, yes, she does. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. MONK. We will vote that for the widow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We cannot separate the widow from the others.

Mr. MONK. Oh, yes, we can.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. What is the business for to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Railways and Canals will resume consideration of the Canadian Northern guarantee. The Minister of Agriculture intends to proceed with two notices of motion that he has on the paper, and if there be further time we will resume supply.

Mr. MONK. In what department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We would wish to have all the supplementary estimates, and if we go into the main estimates it will be the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BOYD. I hope we will not go into that contentious item of the census on Friday night when there are few members in the House. Every Friday night during almost the whole session business has had to be conducted with half a dozen members present, and these contentious items had better be brought up some other night.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have not only had them on Friday night but we have had them on several intermediate nights, which is not our fault. However, if it is the wish that that particular item should be held over we will take other less contentious items.

Mr. MONK. Take Fisheries for Friday.

Mr. TAYLOR.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would like hon. gentlemen opposite if possible to give us these supplementary estimates as we are getting to the end of the fiscal year, and unless they are disposed of, a number of our public officials will be without their pay. I would ask hon. gentlemen to facilitate the disposal of the supplementary estimates with the understanding that there will be ample opportunity on the main estimates and the supplementary estimates for the coming year to discuss any question they wish to raise.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, June 19, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY—ESTIMATED COST OF CONSTRUCTION.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) moved for leave to lay upon the Table of the House copies of certain estimates of the engineers respecting the cost of the Canadian Northern Railway.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CLARKE moved that the said estimates be printed and distributed forthwith for the information of this House, notwithstanding rule 94 to the contrary.

Motion agreed to.

ADULTERATION OF BUTTER.

House in committee on the following proposed resolution :—

Resolved, that it is expedient to pass an Act to prevent the improper marking of butter ; to prevent the manufacture or sale of renovated, adulterated, or process butter, or of oleomargarine, butterine, or other substitute for butter, manufactured wholly or in part from any fat other than that of milk or cream ; providing for the examination of stock or packages ; and providing that one-half of the pecuniary penalties for contraventions of the Act shall be payable to the informant.—Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. minister kindly explain ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. (Hon. Sidney Fisher). Mr. Speaker, this matter comes forward in the shape of a resolution as it deals with trade. The resolution when passed by the House, will be the foundation for the introduction of a Bill. I have in my hand a copy of the proposed Bill which covers mainly these points.

First of all, forbidding the manufacture of what is known as process butter. Joined with that is the reiteration of the already well known statute of this country forbidding the manufacture of oleomargarine, butterine or substitutes for butter. In addition the Bill provides for the proper marking of butter packages so that only butter shall be marked as creamery butter that is really made in a creamery or factory and that any butter made in a private way shall not be marked as creamery butter. Again, the Bill deals with the matter of the adulteration of butter and provides that any butter that contains more than sixteen per cent of water shall be considered adulterated. There is also a provision forbidding the mixture of any acid, alkali or chemical for the purpose of causing the butter to absorb water. It also goes on to provide in general terms for penalties to be imposed upon anybody who offers for sale these things which are thus forbidden and for people who contravene the provisions of the law in regard to marking. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the necessity for the adoption of some such law as this is due to the fact that quite recently, I think, within about a year or so, there has arisen a new condition of affairs in this country in regard to the manufacture of process butter especially. For a long time there has been a manufacture in the United States of process butter, but about a year and a half ago, or perhaps two years ago, the Congress of the United States passed stringent laws regulating and making very difficult the manufacture of this process butter. The result seems to be that certain people who have been doing this in the United States have thought that they could see an opportunity in Canada of transferring their business to this country and certain efforts on the part of certain people to do this have been brought to my attention and to the attention of the officers of the department. We considered that the introduction of this manufacture into Canada would be a very serious hurt and detriment to the dairy interests of the country and to the trade in butter in Canada, which is advancing in a satisfactory way. We wished to obviate the difficulties that have arisen in the United States and by passing a law of this kind at the present time, when this industry is in its infancy, when it is, in fact, hardly established in the country at all, I think we are adopting the best means of securing our great dairy interests from what, if it is allowed to proceed and increase and multiply in the country, will be very difficult to deal with and will be a very serious hurt and damage to these dairy interests.

Mr. BELL. What is process butter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Process butter, in general terms is made according to the following system. Cheap butter is taken, melted down and dealt with under a certain process of manufacture, it is then chilled so as to become granular and then churned up with buttermilk and skimmed milk and packed in the ordinary way. At first sight this may appear to be a perfectly innocent procedure, but the fact is, which is well known and established, that this butter, while it may be fairly good in appearance and fairly good in taste when first made, cannot maintain its quality for any length of time. If it were to be put on the market in various localities in our own country and used up at once there might possibly be no great hurt provided it was sold for what it was, but, unfortunately if it is to be kept or mixed up in any way with properly made butter it will be marked with the name of Canada, it will be sent abroad, before it reached any foreign market it would appear very badly and create a bad impression of our Canadian butter, practically in the same way as oleomargarine, or butterine, or any substitute for butter would do.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. minister why he requires this Bill for that purpose ? Because, as I understand, the Bill which prohibits the manufacture, sale, or importation of oleomargarine, butterine, or other substitutes for butter would cover the manufacture and sale of process butter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Under the interpretation of the law we believe that this process butter could not be called a substitute for butter. It might come under the actual meaning of the word 'butter.' That difficulty has occurred in the United States and they have had to provide special legislation there dealing with it. The history of dairy legislation in the United States may be a warning to us and a guide as to what we have to do here. In the United States they did not prohibit the manufacture of oleomargarine and butterine, and no doubt that fact has contributed very largely to the discredit which the foreign market has always attached to the dairy products of the United States in comparison with the high reputation which Canadian dairy products have had. I have no hesitation in saying most emphatically, that the course of the United States people in permitting various substitutes for butter to be manufactured in that country, and their system of tinkering with their dairy products, has tended materially to keep down the reputation of these products in the markets of the world. The action of this parliament long ago in prohibiting the manufacture, importation, and sale of oleomargarine has helped materially to keep up the reputation of our butter in foreign markets as well as at home. This is a new thing that has come up in connection with the butter business of this country, and it is wise for us to nip it in the bud before it has assumed proportions that will hurt our trade. The vested interests in the United

States have become so great that they do not seem to be able to prohibit the manufacture and sale of adulterated butter as we have done, but they have provided a licensing system which no doubt will protect the public to some extent from being deceived. We could do that, but I think our best course is to forbid the manufacture of this butter at once. If we allow it to go on for even another year we will find established industries here, and we may be confronted with the same difficulties that confront our neighbours on the other side of the line. It is I believe the part of wisdom and prudence to take the thing in hand at the very beginning and to proceed against it drastically. We have been very fortunate in Canada in the general purity, and I may call it, the immaculate reputation of our dairy products. Filled cheese and imitation butter are unknown in Canada while they are common in the United States, and the result is that our dairy products have a higher reputation than theirs. Let us take immediate steps to conserve the interests of our dairy products and to ensure that this process butter is not allowed to be manufactured here so as to hurt them. This is the main feature of the Bill, and the other details of it are to secure a proper marking of butter. We have dairy butter and creamery butter. Coming from certain people dairy butter is quite good, but at the same time the creamery butter has a standing on the market which dairy butter has not. I am sorry to say we have a number of complaints that dairy butter is being sold as creamery, with the risk of hurting the reputation of creamery butter. Let me say most emphatically that there is a large amount of dairy butter which is just as good as creamery butter, but under the heading of dairy butter there is a large quantity of butter accumulated at country stores in rolls and small packages which is afterwards re-packed and sold. Under this Bill that could not come under the definition of creamery butter.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this process butter made of ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is made of butter, but the process through which it goes is such that dairy experts find that it deteriorates very rapidly as the process destroys certain characteristics of the butter fat globules in the butter. I have given careful consideration to this resolution, and I have introduced it on the representation of those who are interested in dairying and on the best expert information which I can get in the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. It takes a long while to get anything through the head of the Minister of Agriculture. If he will turn to 'Hansard' of 1886 he will find that I then moved the following resolution :

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, butterine or other substitutes for butter.

That resolution was broad enough to take in this new idea that the minister has got into his head about process butter. I spoke strongly in support of my motion and I produced statistics to show that oleomargarine was then being manufactured largely in the United States, was being imported into Canada and that a factory was about being started for the manufacture of it in Canada. After this motion, the then Conservative government came down with a resolution to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale into Canada of oleomargarine. The present Minister of Agriculture then rose in his place to oppose the passage of my resolution and he spoke as follows :

But, Mr. Speaker, anxious as I am to see the agricultural interests, and especially the dairy interests of the country carefully guarded—and I say this as representing one of the greatest dairy counties in this Dominion, the county, according to the last census, which made the greatest amount of butter of any county in the Dominion—still I do not wish to see the dairy interest guarded at the expense of any other interest in the Dominion. If any person chooses to put upon the market an article which is not hurtful in itself, and which is properly stamped and shown to be such an article, if it does compete with the producers of butter it will be merely an extra stimulus to them to make a better article with which this spurious article cannot compete. But I do not believe it would be right or wise for this parliament absolutely to prevent all the people in this country from producing an article which in itself is not hurtful, and which, at the same time would be stamped so as to show its true nature.

Mr. SPROULE. The scales have fallen off his eyes.

Mr. TAYLOR. When did the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fisher) get new light ? I proved then that this oleomargarine which Hon. Mr. Fisher would not prohibit from coming into Canada was made out of products of dead hogs brought into the Chicago market, and some of which were dead and buried before they started to make oleomargarine out of them. Yet the hon. gentleman at that time was willing to allow oleomargarine made in these Chicago factories to be brought in here and sold, so long as it was sold as oleomargarine, to the poorer classes of this country in competition with our butter. He not only voted against the resolution I then introduced, but he gave it all the opposition he could. Later, the government came down with a proposition in the tariff prohibiting the importation of oleomargarine into Canada. And now, seventeen years afterwards, the hon. gentleman wakes up to the fact that it would be injurious to the dairy interests of Canada to have oleomargarine made in the country. There is no necessity for this Bill, as oleomargarine is prohibited to-day. The hon. gentleman only introduces it in

order that he may go to the farmers and claim credit for having introduced and passed a Bill prohibiting the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine, butterine, or other substitute for butter. Surely the hon. gentleman does not want to take up the time of the House with a Bill for which there is no necessity, because the laws put on the statute-book by the Conservative government, who had the true interests of the farmers at heart, amply meet the case. Surely the hon. gentleman does not expect in this way to make amends for the speech which I have quoted, and which was properly understood by the farmers of his county, because they left him at home in the next election after he had made it. It is nothing but a bit of buncombe, this legislation which the hon. gentleman is introducing after seventeen years of opposition to the Bill which I introduced, having the same object.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that this Bill is entirely unnecessary, because it is the same as the old Act, which is as follows :

No oleomargarine, butterine, or other substitute for butter, manufactured from any animal substance other than milk, shall be manufactured in Canada, or sold therein, and every person who contravenes the provisions of this Act in any manner whatsoever, shall incur a penalty not exceeding $400 and not less than $200, and in default of payment shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months and not less than three months.

Where is the difference between the two Acts ? There is simply none, so far as I can see, beyond the fact that the hon. minister attaches the name of process butter. If this is a substitute for butter which is destroying the dairy products of the farmers, it can be attached under the old law as a substitute for butter. If it is some harmless preparation which is made out of butter-fat, I do not think that even the Act the minister is passing would attach it. It is only a change of name, and you cannot sell an adulterated article under a changed name any more than under the original name ; it can be stopped under the Adulteration of Foods Act. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is introducing this measure for the purpose of leaving on record the fact that the present Minister of Agriculture has stopped the importation and sale of these spurious articles. He opposed the old Act, but now it seems that in order to make amends for his shortcomings of the past, and to leave on record something that he can hold up as evidence of the great interest he takes in the farmers of the country, he introduces this Bill. In his speech in opposition to the old Act, the hon. gentleman, referring to the proposition that an excise duty and a customs duty of 10 cents a pound should be placed on these spurious articles, said :

But if these articles are stamped, so that the public know what they are buying, and if the oleomargarine or the butterine are composed of materials which are not injurious to the health of the consumer, I do not see why the production of these articles should be forbidden in this country.

He admits that this process butter is not injurious to the health of the consumer, and yet to-day he is endeavouring to pass a law to prohibit it. He went on to say :

And if it does work any inconvenience to the dairymen of the country, their true remedy would be to manufacture a still better article of butter.

Is that not what they are doing to-day ? The hon. gentleman says that this article does not keep like prime dairy butter, therefore, he is going to prohibit it ; but a few years ago it would only stimulate the farmers to manufacture a still better article of butter.

Let the dairymen of the country see to it that they make the very best butter possible, and no butterine or oleomargarine can compete with that article. As a matter of fact, we know that in the United States, where these articles have been very largely put upon the market, they have competed with and injured the sale of lower grades of butter, but I think they have not at all interfered with the sale of the higher classes of butter.

Is that the hon. gentleman's experience to-day ? He admits that the article is not injurious to health, that it is made out of butter ; but it has not stimulated the farmers to such an extent as to prevent it interfering with the sale of the higher grades of butter.

That being the case, and seeing that the government have proposed this resolution, I am not quite prepared, without further explanation at all events, to support the motion of the hon. gentleman. However, it might be well for us to go into committee and see the details of this Bill.

That is what the hon. member thought then; but to-day, as Minister of Agriculture, he has evidently acquired additional light. But I respectfully submit that if the article which he seeks to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of in Canada, is either a substitute for butter or is injurious to health, it can be prohibited under the present law.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will just read to the hon. gentleman the present law, and point out to him how it is that this article cannot be prohibited under it.

Mr. SPROULE. I have just read the present law.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman does not seem to have read it understandingly.

Mr. SPROULE. I read it and left others to draw their own understanding from it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I want to attempt to drive into the hon. gentleman's head the exact meaning of the words :

No oleomargarine, butterine or other substitute for butter manufactured from any animal substance other than milk——

The hon. gentleman read the words of the law a few minutes ago, but did not seem to attach any significance to certain of those words which I shall repeat: 'or other substitute for butter manufactured from any animal substance other than milk.' This process butter is not made from other animal substance than milk, and therefore does not come under this provision of the Act of 1886, and the people who are making it cannot be prosecuted, and we require a new Act in order to be able to deal with this particular matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why will not the hon. gentleman not simply introduce an Act to amend the old Act, as is done in all other legislation?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because, in the first place, the new Act will cover a great deal more than the old Act; and, in the second place, I wish to deal with other matters besides this particular section of the old Act. Therefore, I prefer to introduce a new Bill providing not only a law, but machinery to enforce the law, which the old Act did not provide at all. The hon. gentleman alluded to some ancient history, and I would not refer to it except to correct a misstatement. He said that in consequence of certain words of mine, which he quoted, I was left at home in the next election. The hon. gentleman's memory is just as much at fault as that of the hon. member for Leeds. It was in the session of 1886 that I made the remarks cited. In 1887 there was an election, in which the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite tried to impugn my position on this question.

Mr. COCHRANE. Gracious me!

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. COCHRANE. Oh, go on.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has sufficient grace to be ashamed of his interruption.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am ashamed to have to listen to such nonsense as the hon. gentleman is speaking. By what right does he take up the time of the House in making statements about his own election which are of no public interest?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am quite ready to answer questions put by the hon gentleman, but would prefer he did not make a speech in the middle of my remarks.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do you call that a speech?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the election of 1887 the chief point made against me by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite was what I had said on a particular occasion. But the only effect it had was to increase my majority from 160, in 1882, to over 350. At the next general election this question was not discussed. It never came up in any way whatever, and I was defeated by the casting vote of the returning officer on a totally different question. The question now before the House is the importance of this legislation, and I have given my reasons for deeming it to be necessary. The only reason to the contrary is that advanced by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), namely, that the old Act was sufficient. But I have fairly proved that the old Act would not meet this case.

Mr. SPROULE. The old Act says: 'If it is an article used as a substitute for butter.' Does that not cover the case?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The words are 'other substitute for butter manufactured from animal substance other than milk.'

Mr. TAYLOR. It is none the less a substitute for butter. The next question is whether it is injurious to health.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That does not come in.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. minister think that it is injurious to health?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say. That would depend a good deal on the condition in which it arrived after manufacture. If it became rancid and stagnant, it would be injurious to health, but not if eaten when fresh.

Mr. SPROULE. Butter, if rancid, would be equally injurious to health. If, in its normal condition, it is not injurious to health, the hon. minister must be taking a different line from that which he took in 1886, because he then said that no article which was not injurious to health should be prohibited. He said that such an article would not interfere with dairymen, but would stimulate them to make a prime article which would command a sale. My hon. friend says that there is no machinery to enforce the law in the old Act. Well, we know, as a matter of fact, that those who contemplated building ceased their operations when this law came into force. They were prevented by this law from beginning the manufacture of the very article which it was intended to prohibit. It also stopped the importation, and it would not have had that effect were the Act not supposed to be effective for the punishment of the wrong-doer, whoever he might be. What machinery does the hon. gentleman propose that may not be invoked to-day for the enforcement of the law, should the law be violated?

Mr. REID (Grenville). The great desire of the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Fisher) to do

something for the farmers by protecting the butter industry seems to lead him a little too far in dealing with dairy-made butter. I understand from what he said that any butter, whether dairy-made or creamery-made that contains over 16 per cent of water, cannot be sold without the party making himself liable to a heavy penalty. How can the ordinary farmer's wife know to a certainty exactly what percentage of water is in the butter? But, if, in packing there should happen to be a fraction over 16 per cent of water she brings down upon herself the punishment provided in these resolutions. I am as anxious as the hon. minister to prevent any inferior butter being placed on the market to interfere with our dairy interest, but I think it is going a little too far to include dairy butter, a great deal of which is just as good as any creamery butter, within the scope of this measure in this fashion. The farmer's wife has no desire to do anything that is not right, but a mere mistake of a fraction of a percentage would make her liable to the heavy penalties here provided. It seems to me that that is going too far.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson). I think it is a great pity there should be any objection to this Bill. The very fact of its being introduced shows that there is a necessity for it. I was surprised to find an hon. gentleman who has been so long connected with the Committee on Agriculture as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) opposing a Bill that is intended to protect our great dairy industry. The question is not, as some hon. gentlemen seem to think, what position the Minister of Agriculture may have taken years ago upon another measure, but what is the position taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) now when a Bill is being introduced to preserve the great dairy industry. The hon. gentleman should not try to defeat the object of the Bill——

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. minister who is trying to do that?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. member for East Grey.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) argues that the present law covers all this, and there is no necessity for this measure.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it does.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If that view prevails, we shall not get this new law passed, and the manufacture of this processs butter will go on in this country. The question has been before my department as well as before the Department of Agriculture, and it has required very careful consideration. We have come to the conclusion that the present law will not prohibit this article, which it is intended to manufacture in this country. The way to stop it is to nip it in the bud, before the business is established and a vested interest is created with valuable machinery. We find objection made to this Bill, and it is argued that, as the Minister of Agriculture made certain remarks upon another measure introduced some time ago, therefore, this Bill must not be introduced. That is not a proper course to take. If I wished to refer to old events, however, I might point out that the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was a Bill to encourage the production of oleomargarine. The Bill proposed by that hon. gentleman placed a customs duty upon oleomargarine imported, and an excise duty upon that produced in the country; and, as the excise duty was lower than the customs duty, the general effect of the Bill was actually to afford protection to the manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada. I moved in amendment that the manufacture and sale of this material be absolutely prohibited. That prevailed with the government, and the law was framed in that way. The resolutions before us have for their object the prohibition or manufacture of another article which we consider injurious to the dairying interest, but which is not covered by the existing law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to say a word in justice to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) has not done justice to my hon. friend. A certain object is to be attained, and my hon. friend argues that if the existing law were enforced that object could be obtained now. He is entitled to his opinion on that subject, and it is quite unfair for the Minister of Customs to charge him with endeavouring to defeat the object of this measure, which he says can be attained, and should be attained, without a change of law. The hon. minister has given a somewhat terse description of the object the Minister of Agriculture has in mind when he says that the proposition of the Bill is to nip this bad butter in the bud. I am sure the process could not be stated more effectively, though I do not know exactly what it is. I do not know whether my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture would be inclined to give his proposed Bill the heading suggested by the Minister of Customs, and bring it before us as a Bill intituled 'An Act to nip oleomargarine in the bud.'

Mr. HENDERSON. After the scolding that the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) has given to one hon. gentleman, I think it well, before saying anything with reference to the resolution before the committee to give the Minister of Agriculture the most positive assurance that I have no desire whatever to obstruct the passage of resolutions which will help to improve in any way the character or promote the

sale of butter in the country, I think, however, the resolution ought to be explained a little more fully before the Bill is introduced. I notice that the resolution says, 'That it is expedient to pass an Act to prevent the improper marking of butter.' That would seem to apply to all butter. But, if every package of butter made in this country is to be stamped or marked in some particular way to indicate its quality, that would be a most serious interference with trade, something which it would be practically impossible to carry out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. So that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) may not be in any way misled, I would say that the marking does not refer to the quality of the butter. It only provides that butter marked 'creamery' shall be made in a creamery.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then, from the wording of the resolutions we have been very much misled. If the Bill is only intended to apply to butter made in a creamery it may be quite possible——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That provision of the Bill only applies to creamery butter.

Mr. HENDERSON. And does not apply to dairy butter?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will read the provision:

> No person shall brand or mark the word 'creamery' or any combination of words which includes the word 'creamery' upon any box, package or wrapper containing butter, unless the butter contained consists wholly of creamery butter manufactured in one place.

That is the only clause that applies to the marking or branding of butter.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is rather an accusation against the farmers of this country that they have been indulging in the practice here prohibited. I never heard of it before, and I do not think it is done to any extent. What the hon. minister said a short time ago is perfectly true—there is a very good class of butter made throughout the country and put up in very suitable packages. It is not made up, as a rule, in the way the hon. gentleman speaks of—buying it in country stores and repacking it. So far as my section of the country is concerned, the day of that practice has entirely passed away. We never hear of a merchant repacking butter, because, if he did so, it would result in loss to himself. The practice at the present time is to give out pails holding about fifteen to seventeen pounds to the farmers' wives who take them home and fill them with first-class dairy butter, then return them and get another pail. These pails are shipped by express to the large markets of the country, and in that way the best possible price is obtained. Where a farmer is able to make a larger quantity, he takes a tub holding twenty-five to thirty pounds. In this way the dealers secure first-class butter, which is in many respects quite as good as creamery butter, and by some preferred, as it is not quite so costly. My idea was that if these packages had to be stamped, and inspected and marked in any way that was going to cause the least interference with the trade, a trade which is carried on to a large extent in country stores, it would be an injury not only to the business man who handled the butter, but to the farmers who made it. I am glad to know, however, that the hon. minister is not placing such restrictions on the trade as would cause that interference. Possibly I will be better able to discuss this matter when the Bill comes down. I am quite willing, having elicited this information, now to leave the matter until the Bill is before the House.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I think it would be advisable to have the Bill printed so that we may read it and know what it is. I would like to say something on this question, but I want to be sure first that I know what the Bill is.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The rules of the House require a Bill of this kind to be introduced by resolution. The resolution contains only a general description of the Bill, the details will come when the Bill itself is introduced, which I propose to do the moment this resolution is passed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). When I heard the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) expressing their views upon this question, and attacking the motives of the Minister of Agriculture, and referring to his past record on this question; and when I heard the hon. member for Leeds claiming credit for having placed an Act upon the statute-book prohibiting the importation of oleomargarine, butterine and other such articles, my mind went back a few years ago when a debate took place in the House of Commons on this question, and perhaps my hon. friends opposite would like to have their memories refreshed as to what their views were on that occasion. They have endeavoured to refresh the memory of the Minister of Agriculture as to what he said and did. The hon. member for Leeds claims to have introduced a measure to prohibit the manufacture, sale and importation of oleomargarine. As the Minister of Customs has stated, that was not the object of the member for Leeds, nor was it the policy of the member for East Grey.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman allow me one moment? The amount that was put on it was declared to be prohibitive, and that is why it was not an Act absolutely to prohibit. But the amount

put on it was a prohibitive amount, and it was believed then to be sufficient.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I see. And then the member for East Grey, believing that it was prohibitory of the manufacture of these articles, supported it for that reason, he was in favour of that prohibition.

Mr. SPROULE. So far as that went, I was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, let me refresh his memory. The question in that debate on which the member for East Grey spoke, was whether there should be a regulation of the traffic or a prohibition of the traffic. Let me read the opinion of the member for East Grey on that occasion. I quote from the 'Hansard' of 1886, April 7, page 550. After dealing with the subject generally, the hon. member for East Grey proceeded as follows :

Now while the restrictions proposed by the Minister of Inland Revenue may be sufficient in one direction to remove this evil, I think they will hardly be sufficient to entirely control this article. I believe they are in the right direction, and if there are those in the country who wish to buy and use oleomargarine and butterine instead of butter, I think they should have the right to do so;——

Is that my hon. friend's opinion to-day ?

Mr. SPROULE. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, open confession is good for the soul, I commend him for his confesson. Let me refresh his memory further, for he went on to say :

—but let it be distinctly understood that they know what they are buying ; let a stamp and the name be put on each package so as to clearly show what it is.

As my hon. friend has modified his views, I will not press him any further, because he has openly confessed that his views have undergone a change. The hon. member for Leeds, however, stood by his guns, he was determined to legalize the use of oleomargarine in this country. He stood by the resolution to put a duty upon it, a tax upon it, to protect, as the Minister of Customs said, and encourage its manufacture.

Mr. TAYLOR. Quote what the member for Leeds said.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give the hon. gentleman's resolution, which I suppose explains his meaning.

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, butterine and other substitutes for butter.

Not to prohibit but to regulate the manufacture. He said a great many things that were not very pertinent to the question, but here is something he said which I will read. It will be found in the 'Hansard,' of the 7th of April, 1886 :

I asked at the same time that an excise and customs duty of ten cents per pound be placed on all oleomargarine, either imported or manufactured in the country——

Mr. TAYLOR. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (reading) :

—and I am glad to say that the government, true to its protective policy—the national policy —came down with a resolution placing a customs duty of ten cents and an excise duty of eight cents per pound on all these substitutes. For this act I am sure they will receive the thanks of every farmer in Canada.

For encouraging the manufacture of oleomargarine, butterine and other fraudulent substitutes for butter, the member for Leeds says he is sure the government will receive the thanks of the farmers of Canada. Will the hon. gentleman repeat that sentiment to-day ? And to-day if he had a chance, would he support a policy of protecting and encouraging the manufacture of oleomargarine, butterine, and other frauds of this character ? Is that his position as a friend of the farmer ? He goes on to the same effect.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read it all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will have some mercy on this committee. I will show how the question was disposed of. This proposition of the member for Leeds to encourage the manufacture of oleomargarine was challenged by the member for North Brant, to-day the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson). In amendment to the motion of the Minister of Customs of that day, the then member for North Brant moved the following :

The importation of these articles into Canada is hereby prohibited under a penalty of $200, together with the forfeiture of such goods and packages in which they are contained.

What was the fate of my hon. friend's measure ? The fate of it was that he had to abandon it. The government threw him overboard. The government found that they had to abandon the proposition to license the manufacture of oleomargarine. They repudiated my hon. friend's policy and ultimately adopted the course which had been marked out by the then opposition as to what was in the best interests of this country. My hon. friend underwent a change of heart. He receded from his position and adopted the policy suggested to him by the present hon. Minister of Customs so that prohibition of oleomargarine became the law of the land.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not surprised that the hon. gentlemen occupying the positions of Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) and Minister of Labour and Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) should condescend to try to distort the facts for the purpose of endeavouring to injure a member of the opposition and to take credit from the late Conservative government for

the resolution moved by a member then in opposition which the government accepted. What are the facts of the case ? I introduced a resolution just as the hon. Minister of Agriculture is introducing a resolution to-day because it affected the revenue.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What was your resolution ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am going to read the resolution. I moved the following resolution :

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, butterine or other substitutes for butter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Could the hon. gentleman not have introduced a resolution in the terms of the amendment that the present hon. Minister of Customs presented to the House ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will give the hon. gentleman the information. After my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the late member for Cornwall, Mr. Darby Bergin, who had thoroughly studied this question, myself and other hon. members sitting behind the government of that day had proved conclusively to the government that there was something in the resolution which I had introduced, and that the government should deal with the question, the government took it up notwithstanding the opposition of the present hon. Minister of Agriculture who made the speech that I have just quoted opposing the action of myself and the government in interfering with the subject at all. Another hon. gentleman who then sat on the opposition side of the House, Mr. Jackson, a lumberman up west, opposed the proposition, because, he said, if it were adopted he could not go over to the United States, buy oleomargarine and send it to his camps to feed his men. The present right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said it was the most outrageous proposition ever propounded in this House and I met with the fiercest opposition from other hon. gentlemen then in opposition some of whom are now on the treasury benches. My resolution was defeated. I shall quote the words that the hon. Postmaster General has just read. The hon. Minister of Customs misrepresented me in saying that I brought in a Bill asking for a lower duty for excise than for customs. The hon. gentleman made a misstatement and I want him to apologize and to take that back. The hon. Postmaster General read my words in which I said :

I asked at the same time, that an excise and customs duty of ten cents per pound be placed on all oleomargarine.

What is ten cents a pound ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That was to regulate it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that not better so far as prohibiting the manufactured article coming from the United States is concerned than the Bill that the hon. Minister of Agriculture proposes ? Ten cents per pound was prohibition and more than prohibition and that is the duty which I asked the government to impose. But, when the government came down with a resolution, they proposed a customs duty of ten cents a pound and an excise duty of eight cents a pound.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is just what you wanted.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where does the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals get his information ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Here, if the hon. gentleman will allow me. The hon. gentleman said :

And I am glad to say that the government, true to its protective policy—the national policy—came down with a resolution placing a customs duty of ten cents and an excise duty of eight cents per pound on all these substitutes For this act, I am sure they will receive the thanks of every farmer in Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and his colleagues have just had one policy since they came into possession of the treasury benches ; and that is to attempt to make the people believe that they are doing something, when they are not doing it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You had better not have risen on this question.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has made the statement that eight cents a pound is just what I wanted. If he will read what I said he will find that I asked for ten cents per pound customs and ten cents per pound excise.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You did not ask for what you wanted, but you got what you wanted.

Mr. TAYLOR. Any person who has read 'Hansard' and who has followed the discussion which took place day in and day out on several occasions must know that all of the arguments of the then opposition were to the effect that ten cents a pound duty was prohibitive. The present hon. Minister of Customs suggested to Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who was then Minister of Customs, that as ten cents a pound was prohibitive he might as well prohibit it altogether and the government accepted that proposition. What was the result ? The present hon. Minister of Customs went through the country claiming that he was the father of the oleomargarine resolution and the late Speaker, Mr. Bain, wrote a letter approving of the suggestion that the

hon. Minister of Customs was the party who had introduced and carried through this law.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs says 'hear, hear.' What had he to do with it? Who was the party who introduced it? He simply suggested, when we were in committee, that as ten cents per pound would be prohibitive it might as well be made prohibitive and the government accepted the suggestion. Yet, he claimed credit for having been intrumental in bringing about that law. Mr. Bain, through correspondence in the press, challenged me to meet him and discuss the question and to bring 'Hansard' and the records of the House. I accepted the challenge and left him to name any place of meeting that he liked in the country. He named a strong Grit hole in my constituency where there was not a Tory living for five miles around.

Mr. FRASER. Blessed place.

Mr. TAYLOR. I accepted his challenge and we drove to this place. The hall was filled with 300 or 400 people, and he read from 'Hansard' and the Votes and Proceedings and I made my speech. We left it to the vote of the audience as to who had won the bet, and notwithstanding that he had named his ground and named the audience more than seven-eights of the people stood up in favour of my contention. If you have ever seen a gentleman leave a meeting like a dog with his tail between his legs you will know how Mr. Bain left that meeting and the hon. Minister of Customs would have done the same thing if he had been there with his loud voice. He claimed that he was the man who was responsible for having that law passed and now the hon. Minister of Agriculture comes forward with a Bill claiming that the law passed by the Conservative government is ineffective because it does not contain machinery for enforcing the penalty. What is the penalty in the Act?

That every person who contravenes the provisions of this Act in any manner whatsoever shall incur a penalty not exceeding four hundred dollars and not less than two hundred dollars, and in default of payment shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months and not less than three months.

I will refer to the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) and ask him if there is not legal machinery in the country sufficient to enforce the statute law of this country. What better could the hon. Minister of Agriculture do in his Bill? He talks about the law not being effective. The Act which I am responsible for getting the government to pass seventeen years ago reads as follows:

No oleomargarine, butterine or other substitute of butter manufactured from any animal substance other than milk.

Is process butter manufactured entirely out of pure milk? Is there not some ingredient in it that would make it a substitute for butter, and bring it under that Act?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not that we know of.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, you can very easily add two words as an amendment to that Act which will bring process butter under it, but what you want to do is to resort to the fraud of making the people think that you are introducing a new Bill and posing as the friends of the farmer. If you amend the existing Act by two words it will be stronger than the Bill you introduce now. I do not believe that the Minister of Customs, occupying the honourable office that he does, should take upon himself to misrepresent me, by stating that I asked for ten cents a pound customs duty and eight cents a pound excise duty on oleomargarine. My words are on record that I asked for ten cents customs and ten cents excise, which would be just as prohibitive as total prohibition of the manufacture and sale, but the government made it ten cents customs and eight cents excise. If there is any person in this country to whom credit is due for having that law in the statute-book prohibiting oleomargarine, it is the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who is now addressing you.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. Nearly every Liberal member in the House spoke against that measure at the time, and some of them are in the House to-day, and some are not. Now, after seventeen years the Minister of Agriculture comes forward to try and make the farmers believe that he is introducing an Act to protect them, and that the present law is not sufficient for that purpose. The Minister of Agriculture said that he was not left at home at the elections of 1887 because of his vote on that resolution. The question was not brought up in that election.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The whole contest in my county in 1887 turned on that question, and my hon. friend's heelers were primed to come there and try to beat me, but my majority was three times as great as it was before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was not in the elections of 1887, but in the elections of 1892 that the phamphlet quoting his speech was circulated and the Minister of Agriculture was snowed under.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. You are entirely mistaken.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have no desire to detract from the efforts of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) in this direction, and I give him all the credit due him for the Bill which he speaks of in such appreciative terms. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) was in favour of a Bill to put eight cents a pound excise duty and ten cents a pound import duty on this article, and he will see that this gave a protection of 25 per cent to the manufacturers of oleomargarine in Canada. True to their protective instincts, the Conservative government were in favour of encouraging the manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada by a 25 per cent duty.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the government put eight cents a pound excise duty on biscuits would the Minister of Customs manufacture any ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If they put an excise duty of eight cents a pound on biscuits and an import duty of ten cents a pound, we would have 25 per cent protection and we could get along very well. That is precisely what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) thanked the Conservative government for doing in the case of oleomargarine, when they put 25 per cent protection on to promote its manufacture in this country. I give the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) credit for that and, my friends claim the credit for me that I was opposed to the manufacture of oleomargarine, butterine and other such substances in this country at all. I am willing to leave it that way. There is no quarrel between the hon. gentleman and myself. He thanks the Conservative government for putting a less excise than export duty on oleomargarine, and I held that it was better to prohibit it altogether, and my views prevailed with the government, and that law is the law of the land to-day. And to-day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) seems to manifest hostility to the prohibition of the manufacture of this process butter which tends to reduce the value of our dairy products. The fact that people are about to invest large sums of money in machinery for the manufacture of this kind of butter shows that they are confident that it will be a legitimate enterprise under the present law, and I have no doubt that they have taken legal advice on that. The leader of the opposition has facetiously referred to nipping ideas in the bud, but I suppose the ideas of the leader of the opposition have come from the bud to the full fruit in some cases. The idea of manufacturing this butter in Canada is just in the bud, and the Minister of Agriculture thinks that this session should not pass without preventing this budding idea from bearing fruit. I am heartily in accord with my colleague, and I believe that every gentleman in this House who has the protection and encouragement of our dairying interests at heart, is in accord with the Minister of Agriculture in his policy in this regard. I have no desire to detract from any service which my hon. friend from Leeds rendered to the dairy interests by any resolution he moved in this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman if he should not change the last words he gave utterance to ? He said, we propose to deal with this article just as we did with oleomargarine and butterine. Could he not say just as the late government did ?

Mr. COCHRANE. I am sure that this debate must be very interesting to any gentlemen sitting in the House and listening to it. It originated from the fact that the Minister of Agriculture introduced a resolution, and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) referred to something that the hon. Minister of Agriculture had said in a previous session ; and what an exhibition we have had from ministers of the Crown. When the Minister of Agriculture, as the boys say, got into a hole, we saw the Postmaster General rushing to his rescue, and what an argument he produced. He wanted to show that the hon. member for Leeds should not get any credit at all—that the resolution was moved by the Minister of Customs when he was on this side of the House, and that he is entitled to all the glory. He wanted to lead the country to believe that this was a great Babylon which they had built when in opposition. I was surprised to see the Minister of Customs, occupying the honourable position he does, descend to such trivial matters in order to get a little mushroom popularity ; and the House has been detained for hours——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And is being detained now.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, profitably detained, if the hon. minister will open his great mind to receive a little instruction. Now, does he not think, when he looks the matter over, that it was beneath his position as a minister of the Crown to spend an hour or two elaborating that fact that he was responsible for the great notoriety of moving to amend an Act when he was in opposition ? Well, I am glad to state to the hon. gentleman that the government I supported at that time had brains enough to accept something which appealed to the better intellect of the ministers of the day ; and I am very much afraid that is a commodity which hon. gentlemen appear very much lacking in. They are so big in their own estimation that they cannot receive any instruction, and they talk about 'my' officers and 'my' engineers, 'my' this and 'my' that. Who ever supposed that the Minister of Customs had any officials ? Why, they are the country's officials, and he is the servant of the country. The trouble with

these gentlemen is that they have got swollen heads, and they do not realize that to the extent they ought to. They do not realize that they are servants of the people, and they talk about 'my' officials. I think they had better get down to hard-pan and common sense, and occupy the time of the House in a different way. We have been here between three and four months, and why was this resolution not brought down some time ago? Why are the important measures left till we have been here so long, when we might better be at home attending to our business than listening to such nonsense as we have been hearing to-day?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are you in favour of the Bill?

Mr. BOYD. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture to read that portion of the Bill which refers to the percentage of water?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Any butter that contains over 16 per cent of water shall be considered bad butter.

Mr. BOYD. That is, farmers' butter and all?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Any butter.

Mr. SPROULE. Who would determine the percentage of water?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Ultimately it would be determined by an analysis.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood the minister to say that this Bill had no reference to dairy butter. I think it is a most dangerous thing if every package of butter, no matter how small is to be dealt with in the same way as creamery butter, and a penalty imposed if it does not come up to the required standard. For my part, I am not able to determine how much water a good class of dairy butter should contain. I presume that when the minister said water, he meant liquid of any kind. For instance, I presume he would treat dissolved salt as water. Some people think that an ounce of salt to the pound is only a fair proportion to use and if that were dissolved you would have 6 per cent of water in the butter. So that a woman making butter with that proportion of salt and the usual 13 per cent of water might render herself liable to a penalty of $100 or $200, whereas if she put in 15¾ per cent of liquid she would be quite free. I think it is very dangerous legislation. It almost makes the making of butter prohibitive.

Mr. HEYD. Is salt, water?

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman is surely old enough to know that salt is not water; but if you dissolve salt you will get something very like water. I suppose that is what the minister has reference to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, no.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do you mean to tell me that you are making a provision that will prohibit fresh water to the extent of 16 per cent from being used in butter?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend is using wrong terms altogether. Salt, when dissolved in butter is not included. When the butter is analysed, its original constituents are taken, and the salt is one thing and the butter another. The question of the amount of salt in the butter and the amount of water are two entirely separate things. The hon. gentleman said I had misled the House in saying that this did not apply to dairy butter. I said that the clause which dealt with the branding of creamery butter applied to creamery butter, and there was another clause applying to dairy butter, and the rest of the Bill applied to butter generally. With regard to the quantity of water in butter, my reason for including that clause in the Bill is that recently in England there has been considerable discussion as to how much water should be rightly contained in butter, and within the past year a law has been passed in England providing that any butter which contains more than 16 per cent of water shall be held to be adulterated. Therefore, I wish to see that no butter is sent from Canada to England, which is our great market for butter, which can there be held to be adulterated. If we found that our Canadian butter was liable to be seized in England, and declared to be adulterated under their law, that would be quoted against us in the English market and would seriously injure us in our trade there. The particular adulteration which was found would not necessarily come out, but the fact that a package of Canadian butter had been found under their law to be adulterated because it contained more than 16 per cent of water, would hurt our trade there very much.

Mr. HEYD. Can this deterioration take place innocently or is it supposed to be the result of intent?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The percentage of water in butter results from the process of manufacture. The manufacture may be so managed that the butter will hold more or less water. As a matter of fact, Canadian butter contains, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, much less water than sixteen per cent. It is a remarkably dry butter. The water is worked out of it to such an extent that the average water remaining is between twelve and thirteen per cent. In very rare instances it is over sixteen per cent.

Mr. BELL. Is it not a fact that New Zealand and Australia claim that they are producing a butter with something like two per cent less water than Canadian butter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That has been stated. But as a matter of fact, on analysing a number of specimens of Canadian butter, we found the average of water to be between twelve and twelve and one-half per cent.

Mr. BOYD. What kind ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Creamery, chiefly.

Mr. BOYD. It was all creamery.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose my hon. friend alludes to some analysis made lately at the experimental farm, but those are not the only ones made in the country by any means.

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). Has any objection been found by the English people with the process butter shipped from the United States to England ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware. But the United States have found the evil so great that they have been obliged to legislate against it. They have passed stringent laws dealing with the trading in and manufacture of this process butter. They have not gone so far as my proposal does. They have undertaken to regulate and license it, but we think it better to stop it altogether. It is because of that legislation in the United States, that proposals are being made to introduce the manufacture of this process butter into Canada. I believe that actually very little has been made in Canada for exportation either to the United States or to England. With regard to the water question, I have adopted the measure of sixteen per cent, because that is the English law, but, as a matter of fact, there is very little, if any butter, made in Canada which contains anything near sixteen per cent. The average is twelve and one-half per cent, and in very few cases over thirteen per cent has been found. Any ordinary experts would declare butter, whether dairy or creamery, having over sixteen per cent water, as not being of the finest quality. There has been a certain process adopted for the purpose of keeping more water in the butter. There was a proposal made to start a factory in this country for the express purpose of manufacturing a particular kind of butter under a particular system, which would have something over twenty per cent water. If that enterprise were gone on with, such butter would be sent to the English market, and there pounced upon as adulterated, and the story would go abroad that Canadians were exporting adulterated butter.

Mr. HEYD. I suppose we have a right to assume that any butter which contains over sixteen per cent of water contains that water for a fraudulent purpose ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It would certainly be detrimental to the quality of the butter. No one who is familiar with the process of manufacture would leave over sixteen per cent water in the butter with the expectation or intention of making good butter.

Mr. WRIGHT. As a manufacturer and exporter of butter, I think this law very desirable. Perhaps many hon. members do not know how this butter is manufactured. When it comes from the churn, it comes in a granulated form. We then wash the buttermilk out with clean water. When washing that buttermilk out, you can leave as much water in the butter as you choose, and it is very desirable we should know what the law is so as not to leave a greater percentage than the law allows. After you take it out of the churn, you put it into a butter worker with the water all in, and that is the time when you take out the extra moisture. If you leave too much moisture in, that butter will deteriorate very soon after shipment. While perfectly fresh, it is all right, but if you export it with too much water in it, it becomes rancid and objectionable in every respect. The greater percentage of water you leave in, the greater number of pounds you get paid for, but you are selling water as butter. It is very desirable we should know exactly the amount of water we are allowed to leave in, and not ship an unsaleable article to the old country. With reference to salt, you can put in about just as much salt as you like; but when the butter analysts of the United Kingdom find too much salt and water, your butter will be condemned and that will give a bad name to all Canadian butter. I am exceedingly pleased that this law will be applied to butter manufactured at the farm, because, let me tell my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) that I have purchased butter myself which contained two hundred per cent salt. The outside is butter and the inside is all salt.

An hon. MEMBER. Where did it come from ?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am sorry to say that it came from my own riding, but I understand that such practice is not confined to one riding, but is found in almost every county of this country. As I have said, I am very desirous that this proposed measure should become law in order that our butter makers may have a standard to go by and know how much moisture they should leave in the article.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not think there is an hon member in this House who would desire to do anything that would not benefit the butter industry. The only point I would make has regard to butter made on the farm for home consumption. If this Bill would apply only to butter made for export, I would certainly consider it would be a great help to the farming industry, but what I object to is that if a farmer

takes a few pounds of butter which contains a little more water than sixteen per cent into a town, he is liable to be brought up before a magistrate and made to pay a heavy penalty. If this butter were exported, it could all be inspected at the port of export, or, if any butter should reach the other side of the Atlantic which was found to contain more than sixteen per cent of water, the shipper might be made to pay a heavy penalty. I have no objection to a heavy penalty being imposed on anybody exporting this class of butter to a foreign market, because the export of inferior goods injures the whole industry of this country. But, if possible, I would like to see the butter sold in our own markets, butter sold in the ordinary way in the stores by the farmers, excepted from the operation of this Bill. If this exception were made, I think the Bill would be a good thing and would greatly help the butter industry.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a detail we could discuss when we come to the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it intended to apply to all butter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Parts of the Bill apply to all butter, and parts to a certain class of butter.

Mr. SPROULE. I mean that portion referring to the percentage of water.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That applies to all butter.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I can only say that I think the minister will find very strong objection to this portion of the Bill. There is a large quantity of butter made by the farmers in private dairies that would be liable to attack if this Bill were made law, and that would be likely to bring some people who had no intention of violating the law under a penalty. Butter made in rolls and afterwards assorted in the stores and repacked, frequently, I am quite sure, would contain over 16 per cent of water.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is very little butter made anywhere in Canada that contains anything like 16 per cent of water.

Mr. SPROULE. Butter will absorb and contain a very large proportion of water. It is said that you can incorporate with lard no less than 60 per cent of water; and, if that is so, I am quite sure you could very easily retain 16 per cent of water in butter and yet the butter not appear very bad. But there is another point in the packing of butter which might add to the quantity of water. The farmer covers butter with salt, which afterwards dissolves and would be found in the package, adding greatly to the percentage of water.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of test would be applied to detect it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Salt that is melted in the water does not become part of the water, but is still salt.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no doubt that water will dissolve a very large quantity of salt. The test must be the fluid that the butter contains.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If you take a tumbler full of water and dissolved in it as much salt as the water will hold, you do not add anything to the quantity of water. There is more salt and water but not more water.

Mr. SPROULE. That is very clear. But will the hon. minister say that he will not increase the weight of it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but not the weight of water.

Mr. SPROULE. How are you going to determine the percentage of water but by the weight ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By analysis.

Mr. SPROULE. But you must, by some means or other determine how much fluid is in the butter and——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, you determine the quantity of water by analysis.

Mr. SPROULE. You must extract it from the butter in some way before you ascertain the percentage. If 16 parts in 100 of the butter are found to be liquid, that butter would be condemned under this Act, I take it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If 16 parts in 100 were found to be water, the butter could only be sold in violation of the law.

Mr. SPROULE. How will the analysis determine the difference between salt dissolved by the water and the water itself ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not a chemist, so cannot tell the hon. gentleman how it is done, but I know that chemists can ascertain these proportions.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that is where the minister is entirely mistaken in his view, and where the Bill would be likely to work very great hardship amongst the farmers. Many of them, I am quite sure, sell butter that contains fully 16 per cent of fluid that would be regarded as water by the party buying it. That is where it seems to me, the Bill goes a little too far. I can readily understand and appreciate the desire of the minister to ensure the making of a good article for export, because the placing of an inferior article on the foreign market destroys the reputation of our butter. If he would apply it only to butter

that is exported, it would not be so bad. But so long as farmers will continue the old process of making butter at home and selling it in pails, crocks, or boxes, I am afraid that, with such a law as this strictly enforced, many would be found unintentionally violating the law.

Mr. FRASER. I do not wish to discuss the resolutions, but to deal with another matter. Really, are we not losing time by this discussion ? When the Bill comes up, all this will have to be said over again. Why not pass the resolutions, and then, if there are objections to the details of the Bill, they can be raised when the Bill is before us. Surely this discussion of all the details of a Bill at this stage and the discussion afterwards of the Bill, is a waste of time. The resolutions are worthless unless they are followed by a Bill and the discussion of that Bill is all that is necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) offers his suggestions a little prematurely. It has always been the rule for the House to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by the resolutions to ask questions with a view to gaining information from the minister. This is quite within the right of hon. members. We desire to have information, and it is proper that that information should be given at this stage.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not want to be charged with prolonging the discussion, but, I would like to ask a question. And, by the way, I think that, perhaps, the hon. minister himself (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has taken as much time as anybody else, and, if there are offenders, he is as great an offender as any hon. gentleman on this side. There are certain things we ought to know now with reference to the wording of the Bill, that we may think the matter over. I would like to ask the hon. minister what provision he proposes to make for the enforcement of this law ? Will he have an inspector in every country village to see that not more than 16 per cent of water is to be found in every pound of butter brought into the country store ? And, if it does contain more than 16 per cent of water, how is he going to determine it ? I am afraid that, if he is going to secure the strict enforcement of this law, he will have to have an army of inspectors all over this country. We had it brought to our attention only yesterday the fact that there has been appointed an inspector of binder twine, a man to ascertain whether a ball of twine stamped as containing 600 feet really does contain 600 feet or not. And this inspector is to be paid $1,200 a year, and he cannot inspect that ball of twine without making it useless. I am afraid that this Bill means positions for a large army of officials, an opportunity for the hon. minister to provide positions for his friends, and at the same time, it will be such a restraint on the ordinary trade of the country that, in my opinion, it will not be acceptable to the country.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Perhaps I have packed as much butter and know as much about it as any member of this House, and I may say that there never was a time in the history of Canada when it behooved the exporters of butter to look after its quality more than to-day, otherwise their butter will not stand the test in the European markets. I heard a lecture given by a man from Glasgow, the editor of the 'Scottish Farmer,' in which he said that Canadian butter contained more water than that which came from New Zealand, and that after it got to 16 per cent, it ran the risk of being condemned in the Glasgow market. Therefore, I think it is the duty of exporters and makers of butter to see that the standard is kept up as high as possible. Otherwise our butter will only compare with that which is now imported from Siberia.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. With regard to the suggestions that have been made, I may say that while I have drawn this Bill to the best of my ability, I do not claim that it is perfect, and I will be willing to discuss suggestions. The question as to butter which contains 16 per cent of water, whether it is for export or not, is worthy of consideration and discussion. I confess for myself that I cannot see at the moment any way by which we can tell whether butter is for export or not. A great deal of butter that might be said not to be for export might afterwards be exported. We have got to guard against difficulties of that kind. But I shall look into that matter before asking the House to consider the details of the Bill. If any hon. gentleman in the House can propose improvements to the Bill, I will be glad to discuss them and, if convinced, to adopt them.

Mr. SPROULE. As I made a statement which has been criticised somewhat severely, I may say that the present Act might be slightly amended so as to cover all that is required. Take the present Act where it reads :

No oleomargarine, butterine or other substitute for butter manufactured from any animal substance other than milk.

Insert the word 'process' after the word 'butterine,' leaving out the following three words 'other than milk,' and then amend your Marks Act, and you have the whole Bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I desire to ask the Minister of Agriculture by what means a farmer can ascertain how much water there is in his butter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know that the farmer himself could easily determine that. I suppose any good

butter maker would know how much water ought to be left in the butter, by its consistency or its dryness when it was finished. As a matter of fact, people who make butter in Canada never leave 16 per cent of water in it, nor anything near that percentage, generally. In cases where more than 16 per cent has been found in butter, I believe it was done intentionally, so as to try to sell water for butter. I am convinced that no farmer's wife or daughter who make butter in this country would leave 16 per cent of water in it, or anything near that.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I believe that the minister is right, that the women who make butter leave no more water in it than they can help. But the butter dealers might have a suspicion that there was an undue quantity of water in the butter, and if this Act is passed I fear it would have a tendency to make farmers take their cream to the creameries rather than run the risk of being prosecuted for having too much water in their butter, when they have no way of knowing how much water there is.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The proof that the butter had too much water would be on the person attacking.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). The farmer takes his butter to a store, he has no way of testing it for water, and perhaps the dealer has no way of testing it, though he may pretend that he has, and he may frighten the farmer by asserting that his butter contains too much water. The effect would be to drive the farmers to take their butter to the creamery, seeing that they have no way of testing it themselves. The dealer would say to them : Your butter contains too much water, I cannot give you such a price. The farmer has to take the price offered, or take his butter back. I do not think the duty of testing the butter should be on the farmer who makes it, but on the dealer—on the person who exports it.

Mr. BOYD. I think that is the crucial point in this Bill, and the minister, before he proceeds with his Bill, should be very well informed on that particular point and be able to give the information required. I may say that the information that has been given before the Agricultural Committee by officers of the experimental farm, is that out of 105 samples of creamery butter that were examined, they ran from 7 and 8 to 16 per cent of water. The majority of the samples showed between 12 and 13 per cent. So when the minister says that no farmers make butter with anything near 16 per cent of water, I do not think he is quite correct. There was one sample of creamery butter containing over 16 per cent, and made for export. I think, therefore, that portion of the Bill should be very carefully considered. I suppose the minister will have a test and examination made of farmers' butter before he asks us to support the Bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I would be sorry to oppose this Bill if I thought it was in the interests of the general public. I believe that something should be done to keep up the standard of our butter in the old country market, but I do not think the farmers should be compelled to do something they cannot do. The burden of testing the butter for water should be thrown, not upon the farmers, but upon those who buy the butter. There is nothing in the Bill to indicate who it is that is to judge of the amount of water in the butter. It has to be tested in some place, and the famers have no way of testing it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And the ordinary dealers cannot test it either.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Then the farmers do not know whether it contains too much water or not ?

Mr. HEYD. I have been handling butter for the last forty years in the grocery trade, and the question has never presented itself, in all that length of time, whether there was too much water in the butter, and I am inclined to think that if this Bill becomes law it will not affect the farmer in the slightest degree. It will only affect that quality of butter which is exported. In regard to the butter which is sold by the farmer to the grocer, the question of water never presents itself, and I am satisfied that no Canadian woman who makes butter will ever make butter that contains 16 per cent of water. If 16 per cent of water is left in the butter, it is left in designedly, and it must be left in as the result of a peculiar process adopted for the purpose of perpetrating a fraud.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). There is no way of testing the percentage of water. The manufacturers of butter in creameries are able to test for the percentage of water, but the woman who makes butter has no way of making a test.

Mr. HEYD. If the maker of creamery butter leaves in 16 per cent of water he does it designedly, but if a farmer's wife makes butter containing 16 per cent of water she does not do it designedly.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). But she is liable to this penalty whether she desires to do it or not.

Mr. HEYD. She never will be liable.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). That is your judgment. Did you ever make butter or farm ?

Mr. HEYD. I have bought butter for years.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). You did not know the percentage of water in it ?

Mr. HEYD. Pretty nearly.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Without wishing to prolong the discussion,

I would say to my hon. friend, that as a matter of fact the ordinary butter that is made in Canada does not contain as much as even 14 per cent of water, and what the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) says is perfectly true, that if it contains more than that it is because the maker has wished it to contain more. Butter that contains more is verging on the limits of butter that will be inferior and in some cases it becomes of actually inferior quality. The person who intends to make simply good butter will make it in such a way that there will not be 16 per cent of water in it. That is the way the ordinary dairy butter is made in this country by people even who make it by rule of thumb, and the result is that the butter they make if of good quality, does not contain as much as 14 per cent of water. When it goes to a larger percentage it is because somebody is attempting to put in as much water as he possibly can without making his butter bad, and in this he is liable to overstep the limits. However, I am perfectly willing to discuss this question and to investigate it, and I will do so before I bring in the Bill.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture if it is his intention to appoint butter inspectors ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no intention to appoint inspectors to carry out this Bill ?

Mr. SPROULE. How are you going to carry it out ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In regard to what the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) has said, of course, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) may introduce a Bill in such terms as will make any farmer liable for even an innocent violation of the law. There are examples of statute law requiring guilty knowledge and of other statutes not requiring it. I understand the observation of the hon. member for South Brant to be a little different from the hon. minister's understanding of it. I understand him to suggest that it might be quite possible for a farmer's wife to make butter of such a character that it would contain more than 16 per cent of water, and to do that quite innocently. The hon. gentleman supposed that an individual who was innocently violating the terms of the statute would not be subject to any penalty. That might be a matter for the consideration of the minister before he brings in a Bill. In some cases motives of public policy have induced parliament to hold a man guilty and to make him liable to the penalty even where there is no intention whatever of violating the Act, because in such cases it is in the public interest that whether innocently or with guilty knowledge there should be a penalty for the violation of the terms of the statute.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to the hon. minister's opinion that this law could not be violated unless a person designedly intends to do it, I may say that I do not agree with his opinion as to the way in which a large percentage of water will be found in butter. When butter is churned, it is in granules, and between these granules the space is filled up largely with milk and whey, and water is put in to wash out the milk and whey. If this is properly worked on an inclined plane the water will run off. In the ordinary dairy, whether worked with a machine or on a tray, it is always on an inclined plane, and the water will run off. If it is not worked sufficiently it will contain a larger percentage of water and milk, and the reason why butter deteriorates rapidly is because of the large percentage of milk it contains. If that is well washed out it is purer and better butter and will contain a less percentage of water than it otherwise would. But, if butter is very little worked, and worked in some improper way, and the water is not constantly poured off, and the buttermilk washed off, then, it will contain a very much larger percentage of water and will be liable to be found to be in violation of the law. It is the careless butter maker who will be more likely to suffer, not from any design to put water into the butter, but from the fact that he did not work it enough to take out the water.

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

INSPECTION AND SALE OF SEEDS.

House in committee on following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to pass an Act providing that seeds of cereals, grasses, clovers, forage plants or vegetables, sold for the purpose of seeding, shall be free from the seeds of certain weeds ; establishing grades of seeds, of timothy, red clover, and alsike, and providing that such seeds offered for sale shall be marked with the seller's name and address, the name of the kind of seed, and the grade ; providing for the examination of such seeds, and their analysis by an official seed analyst ; and providing that one-half of the pecuniary penalties for contraventions of the Act shall be payable to the informant.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. minister explain this ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Chairman, this resolution comes up in consequence of the ruling of Mr. Speaker that the Bill which I introduced to the House and explained the other day, being a Bill dealing with trade in some of its provisions, must come in the form of a resolution. I explained the Bill the other day on its introduction and first reading. I would, therefore, ask the concurrence of the House in this resolution, so that we can

proceed again with the Bill in the ordinary form.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the hon. minister gave any explanation in regard to the Bill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes I did.

Mr. HENDERSON. I regret that I was not present when the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill, but I trust we will get some information in reference to it when the Bill is again introduced. The hon. minister seems to have been guilty of the very wonderful mistake for a farmer, of practically putting the cart before the horse when he introduced a Bill first and had it read in the House, and then this afternoon brings in a resolution on which he founds that Bill. I do not suppose it will be necessary to go through the form of reintroducing the Bill, but it struck me as rather peculiar that some hon. gentlemen did not take exception to it, and hold the Minister of Agriculture to the same rule that was meted out to the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) on his Cigarette Bill. This Bill will have to be very carefully dealt with. There is a great deal of danger in having so much inspection. It certainly would be of benefit to the farming community to get seeds free from all kind of adulteration, but I rather fear that it is dangerous to inflict these large penalties for such slight infringements of the law as the difference between 81 per cent of purity and 79 per cent. I am not sure from the wording of the Bill whether it applies to the farmer who grows the seed and who sells it to the dealer in the first instance.

Mr. BELL. It does not.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have read the sixth clause which refers to that, but the same question comes up here as came up in connection with the last resolution we considered. One person may sell butter to another not intending it for export, but the purchaser may afterwards export it; and so the farmer may sell seed to a merchant not knowing whether it is going to be recleaned or not. If it is recleaned he would not be liable for the penalty, but if it is not recleaned there is a danger that he may be made liable.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is not the intention of the clause.

Mr. HENDERSON. All these things will have to be very fully considered.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. The farmer must have his apples inspected and he must have his butter inspected, and now he must have his seeds inspected. I do not find fault with these laws, but before putting them on the statute-book they should be well thought out. I rather fear that such legislation is going to open the door to the appointment of persons to be inspectors of one thing or another, just as in the case of binder twine. I trust that these various Bills are not passed simply for the purpose of giving positions to the friends of the government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can assure my hon. friend that the Bills are not promoted for that purpose. There is no intention of appointing an inspector with regard to the butter, but, although I cannot say positively, there may have to be an inspector or two appointed under this Bill. The farmers in the country have for years complained of the quality of seeds they purchased, first because of the number of weed seeds among them, and in the second place, because frequently the seeds are not found to be matured and germinable. For many years individual farmers have sent seeds to the experimental farm to be tested, and the report was sent to the individual and was of no public utility. These complaints became so frequent that I instructed certain officers in my department under Prof. Robertson to start an investigation into the trade in seeds and the results were so startling that that investigation was extended. We found that farmers were imposed upon either by people who are selling inferior seeds, or through their own desire to obtain cheap seeds. We obtained a mass of information which was published in the bulletin issued by the department last year. I took advantage of the gatherings of farmers last fall and winter to ask the speakers at meetings to discuss this question, and as a result we have had a large number of requests that we should protect the farmer in this respect. This Bill embodies what seems to be necessary to protect the purchaser of seeds in Canada. I do not say that the Bill is perfect. It is a difficult problem to deal with, and it requires the closest scrutiny, as my hon. friend from Halton has said. My officers before drawing up this Bill discussed the matter with the seed dealers and with the various agricultural bodies and I hope that with the thorough ventilation which the discussion of a Bill like this ought to receive in the House (and I invite the fullest investigation and discussion of every detail of the Bill) that we may be able to find a solution of the difficulties which surround the seed trade in Canada. It is only when we have found that solution that I desire to make the necessary enactment which will carry out the full and matured judgment of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. It is desirable I think that this resolution should pass; and probably without that extended discussion that we have had on the resolution with reference to process butter. It is, however, important to know definitely from the minister to what extent the farming community have

expressed a desire for legislation upon this matter. The farmers know better than anybody else whether they need this legislation or not. I have not heard from the Minister of Agriculture whether there has been an expression of opinion by a majority of the farmers of Canada for legislation along this line. If there has been, then it is right that we shall have legislation; but I am inclined to think it will be found that there has not been anything like a universal expression of opinion in favour of legislation on the subject of seeds. I am clearly of opinion—and I hope I shall be able to press this view on the attention of the House from time to time—that we are too apt hastily to introduce legislation of this kind. I do not think we sufficiently appreciate the fact that the farmers of Canada are quite capable of looking after some of their own business themselves; and I think there has been too great a tendency, not only in this parliament, but in other legislatures, to interfere with the farmer and treat him as if he ought to be in leading strings, and if his conduct required to be regulated. This measure, as has been said, necessitates an inspection, and inspection entails expense and patronage and other evils which do not result beneficially to the farming community. I am not at all opposed to this resolution passing; but I want before the Act passes, to have some definite statement from the minister, and some indication from the farming community as to their will in the matter.

Mr. HEYD. I regard the Bill before the House as one of the most important that we have had before us for a long time. When the government presents a railway Bill involving the expediture of millions of dollars it is regarded as a very important matter. But when a Bill of this kind comes before us, it appears trivial; and yet associated with it are facts of such tremendous consequence that it is very important that we should consider it carefully and deliberately. This Bill is intended to prevent the fouling of the soil throughout the length and breadth of this country. I am surprised when I go through the country to see the number of farms completely covered with noxious weeds, which could have been entirely prevented if the care which we now intend to exercise had been exercised ten or fifteen years ago. The mere fact that the farming community have not asked for this Bill does not prove that the necessity for it does not exist. I am surprised at the ignorance which exists throughout this country upon the subject of seeds. That was brought to my attention a short time ago by a visit which I paid to the seed experimental station which we have in Ottawa. The necessity for this very Bill was there strongly impressed upon my mind. Farmers often buy seeds at $5 or $6 a bushel when they are really paying about $30 a bushel for the fertile seeds; they being loaded with twenty or thirty varieties of noxious weeds. It is to prevent this that this Bill is introduced; and before it passes the final stage, it would be well for hon. gentlemen who are interested in the matter to visit the seed-inspecting station and acquaint themselves with what this Bill is intended to do for the country.

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

INQUIRIES, &c.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. E. F. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals if he has yet received from the commissioner he appointed to inquire into the cause of the accident at West Lorne, the report he was instructed to make?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I have received the report to-day, and I am having it copied.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman lay the report on the Table?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I will do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I moved some time ago for the correspondence between this government and the government of the North-west Territories on the subject of provincial autonomy. I do not think the papers have yet been brought down. I also moved some time ago for a return of all persons in the North-west Territories who had been naturalized within a certain period of years. I believe the return has been sent forward, but it has not been brought down.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will bring the matter to the attention of the acting minister.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to draw Mr. Speaker's attention to the telephone service which we have in the House of Commons. We have downstairs a long distance telephone which I use considerably, as I do at home, and I must say that the service we get here is disgraceful. In saying this I am expressing both my own sentiments and those of a great many other members. If a person is called in half an hour, he is doing well. I would like the Bell Telephone Company, if it is at all possible, to give us a long distance service in the House of Commons at least equal to the poorest that they give in other places.

Mr. SPEAKER. I shall be pleased to call the attention of the telephone company to the service, and I hope they will remedy the defect which the hon. gentleman complains of.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY—GUARANTEE OF SECURITIES.

House again in committee on the proposed resolutions (page 4363) regarding aid to the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

On resolution 2,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I observe that some words have been left out at the end of this resolution—I do not know whether in the copying in my office or as I received the resolution from the Department of Justice—which leaves it in a very incomplete form. You will observe that the resolution reads: Provided also that the said mortgage shall be a charge next after a first charge of $13,000 per mile (to be created by the company) on that part of the said Prince Albert Branch. But the description of the part is left out, and I propose to add these words: From the eastern end of the 100 miles hereby aided to Erwood.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be practicable to provide in these resolutions that the company, whose bonds are to be guaranteed by the government, should pay a larger rate of interest than that at which the government borrows the money? The company could not borrow at less than 4 per cent, and it would not be unreasonable, in view of the responsibility we assume, to ask that it should pay that rate for the use of the money. If that course were pursued, the government could invest the 1 per cent as a sinking fund, and in the course of fifty years the accumulations would wipe out the indebtedness. It would not be a hardship to the promoters to be asked to pay interest at the rate at 4 per cent, and provision might be made that the sum at the credit of the sinking fund should be handed over to them whenever they were prepared to relieve the government from the responsibility. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has considered the advisability of such a provision?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member will observe that what we are here doing is to provide a government guarantee on bonds to be issued by this company bearing 3 per cent interest. If the government were to conclude to charge an additional rate to the company, they would do that, not in these bonds, but in the further mortgage security contract, or arrangement that might be made with the company. It would not answer to place the rate at 4 per cent in these resolutions, because the bonds we are guaranteeing bear interest at the rate of 3 per cent, and to do what the hon. gentleman suggests would probably place the value of the bonds at a premium, which would not be very advisable. I am free to say that it would be quite open for us later, as perhaps one of the conditions to be embodied in the general mortgage which we propose to take upon all the undertakings of the company—it would be open for us, if thought desirable, to put in that document such a clause as the hon. member suggested, and I would ask him to raise that point when the Bill is before the House.

Mr. CLARKE. The reason I asked the hon. minister for information on that point is because when this matter was first discussed throughout the corridors and about the House, I understood that what the government intended doing was to guarantee the interest for a period of years on a certain sum of money per mile. But I find in the fifth clause that the government assume responsibility for the principal as well as the interest. That is a different proposition altogether. I think it goes without saying that the government can borrow the money at 3 per cent, and it would not be unreasonable to make the proprietors of the road pay 4 per cent. Suppose the government advanced $9,000,000 for the purposes of construction, on an annual payment of 4 per cent interest, the government, borrowing money at 3 per cent, would have $90,000 per year to dispose of, which, invested annually, in fifty years would amount to more than sufficient to wipe out the debt. I would just as soon see the government borrow the $9,000,000 and hand it over according as the work of construction proceeded, on such terms as I have taken the liberty of suggesting.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not know where Erwood is. But if I understood rightly the branch from Prince Albert to where it joins the main line is about 180 miles in length.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On which the government guarantee $13,000 per mile for 100 miles, and that the road on which this guarantee is to be given is to be built from Prince Albert towards the point of junction. That is the 100 miles which is aided by the government. Is Erwood at the end of the 100 miles or the point of departure from the Canadian Northern Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Erwood is now the terminus of what is known as the Prince Albert Branch and is 180 miles from Prince Albert. There is an intervening mileage there of eighty miles between the easterly point to which we are aiding the railway from Prince Albert and Erwood. Upon those eighty miles the company will be free to make its line as a first charge up to $13,000 per mile.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister has the location of the road in his department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It runs almost due west.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And the location from Prince Albert down to the point of junction ? Could he tell what the gradients and curvatures going east and west of the proposed line are going to be—the maximum?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it is more than one-half of 1 per cent—not quite that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, we made it a condition on the Canadian Pacific Railway from Winnipeg to Lake Superior that the gradients should not be greater than twenty-six feet to the mile one way and fifty-two feet the other way. It is very important in the construction of a railway, which is intended to carry freight cheaply, that the gradients and curvatures should be provided and put in the contract by the government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are going to do that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the reason for the provision in the latter part of the second section ? 'Shall be a first charge next after a first charge of $13,000 per mile (to be created by the company) on that part of the said Prince Albert Branch from the eastern end of the 100 miles hereby aided to Erwood.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They must be afforded some opportunity to raise the money with which to construct this eighty miles—assuming it to be eighty, which is as nearly as I can state the number. They are getting no government aid, the hon. gentleman will observe, and they have to build eighty miles, and when they do build they will require to encumber to the extent of $13,000 per mile.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have they authority to do that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they have power under their general Act. I trust I make myself clear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think, I must have missed something that the hon. gentleman said before, for I do not understand the matter yet. The government are to guarantee bonds for 720 miles of railway, roughly speaking. Is it a portion of that 720 miles ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And the eighty miles farther west ? No, there is no part of that. Perhaps I might make it a little clearer to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax). The government is more concerned as to the building of the 100 miles eastwardly from Prince Albert than as to the building of the 80 miles further to carry it to Erwood, for the reason that there is a continuous and growing settlement, a settlement of long standing, extending along this line, for 90 odd miles. The government has been so pressed by the people who have been looking for a railway in that locality that we have felt ourselves justified in making provision whereby that stretch of 100 miles should be promptly built. And we understand from the company that it is their intention as speedily as possible not only to complete that 100 miles which they contract with us to build, but to complete the other 80 miles, making the connection complete from Erwood to Prince Albert—completing the Prince Albert branch so called. We have, therefore, left the opening to enable them to place a mortgage to the extent of $13,000 a mile upon this 80 miles. When they are in a position to do it they will go on with the work, but, in the meantime, subject to that reserve right to them, we take an encumbrance covering the whole, the same as we do the rest of the undertaking.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the settlers in that section are anxious to have the road why does the hon. minister make the line of railway complete from the main line, instead of being built from Prince Albert 100 miles down, and leave them with an 80 mile gap reaching from the main line. And, while I am on my feet, I would ask, is there any subsidy in land or money from the local government or this government on this 80 miles of road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. The hon. gentleman will recollect the fact that this mileage is all in the North-west and none of it in Manitoba. They are not getting any land grant for the line from Erwood west to Prince Albert. We are giving them no aid whatever except what is provided in these resolutions.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I did not mean from Erwood to Prince Albert but from Erwood to the main line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have it complete to Erwood.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see. The hon. minister promised, when this matter was last under discussion to lay on the Table a statement showing the extent of road of the Canadian Northern already built, and the amount of rolling stock on the road that is to be given as further security for the advance proposed by these resolutions.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, the hon. gentleman understands that that is information not in my possession ; I can only give it as it may be furnished me. I shall not be able to have it to day, but I will have it by the time the Bill comes up.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That will do perfectly well, if the hon. gentleman will have it the day before the Bill is introduced,

and also a map showing the location of the Canadian Northern and this branch——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman mean the branch from the main line ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, the main line and the branch to Prince Albert, that the hon. gentleman proposes to subsidize. We wish to see it on the map.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that, perhaps. I could manage to bring a small sketch map.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That will do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is, perhaps not aware that the Swan River section was at one time supposed to be intended as the main line, and when they made that line to Erwood and started to build to Prince Albert, it was expected that that line would be continued on to Edmonton. But, two or three years ago a change was made in their plans. A shorter route to Edmonton has been determined upon. They start out from Grandview and build direct to Edmonton.

Amendment agreed to.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MARCONI WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 131) to incorporate the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. McIsaac.

On section 24,

Mr. BARKER. I call the attention of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Railways to the wording of this section. This company is formed under section 15, to conduct the business of telegraphic communication not only by wireless, but by any other system, and by section 24 this company is authorized to acquire and deal with the capital stock, shares and so on, of any corporation having objects similar to the objects of this company. The telegraph companies of Canada are just as important as regards monopolies as any other corporation, and hence this section is of very great importance. I think it is time that the government should take care that clauses are not inserted in Bills of this kind that are likely to, or may create monopolies. The question arose years ago with regard to railways. It was found that when the parliament of Canada inserted provisions in various charters to prevent one railway company from absorbing another, shrewd business men soon found that it was quite possible to get the control of another railway without any absorption of it. By acquiring a majority of the stock and electing a board of directors a railway company desiring to monopolize the business of the country could just as effectively control the competing company as if it were actually amalgamated by Act of parliament. Everything that applies to railway companies in that respect applies equally to telegraph companies. It may be all very well for gentlemen to think that the Marconi system is confined to wireless telegraphy, but section 15 provides that they can carry on the business of wireless telegraphy or telegraphy by any other system.

Mr. BELCOURT. Section 15 was struck out of the Bill.

Mr. BARKER. Even if it is struck out, why should this company have power to acquire the stock of any other company chartered for similar purposes ?

Mr. WADE. It is put in every charter.

Mr. BARKER. In the Railway Act, by section 276, no railway company can employ any of its funds for the acquisition of stock in another railway company, and by section 277, a heavy penalty is imposed upon the directors of any railway company which authorizes the purchase of stock in the shares of another company. What is the distinction between a telegraph company and a railway company, so far as the public utility is concerned ? I contend, as a matter of principle, that any company that is created by this parliament for the purpose of any public utility should not be authorized by a general provision of this kind to acquire the control of another company of a similar character.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This subject was fully discussed before the Railway Committee in connection with this Bill, and it was not the opinion of the committee that the clause was objectionable. After all, it is only a question of means. If any company has the means to obtain control of the stock of another company, it could accomplish its aim indirectly, if not directly. It is practically impossible, by any known method of legislation, to prevent that sort of thing being done. But after all, is there any reason why there should be a positive bar placed against a combination of two or three telegraph companies if they wish to combine ? They are not monopolies in a very large sense, but only in a very limited sense. My hon. friend puts them upon the same footing as railways, but there is a broad distinction. You can multiply telegraph lines, but not railways. You can not lay railways down and operate them without covering a good deal of ground, and without very seriously interfering with

the public, and the use of property in various ways. But telegraph lines may be strung all over the country and no serious hazards would arise or injury be done. It was not thought in the committee that there was any sound objection against allowing the clause to pass, particularly as it is one which is almost invariably included in any Bill which is granted for the same purposes as this.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to say, in answer to the hon. member for Ottawa, that when I said section 15, I was mistaken in the number, and what I intended referring to is section 12, which allows this company to carry on the business of telegraphic communication by means of wireless or other system of telegraph. This covers all telegraphic business of any kind in the Dominion. With regard to what the hon. Minister of Railways has said, I would reply that so desirable was it considered by parliament to prevent one railway company from acquiring the control of another by the purchase of its stock or the majority of its stock, that two clauses were inserted in the general Railway Act to prevent anything of the kind being done unless in particular instances expressely authorized by statute. These clauses were passed after full consideration and after a great many evils had occurred in this country through the acquisition and control of one railway by another, contrary to the intention of the Dominion and provincial legislatures. Section 276 of the Railway Act expressly provides that no railway company shall expend its funds in the acquisition of the shares of any other railway; and in order to get over the difficulty which the hon. Minister of Railways has pointed out, this provision was put in the Act:

> Every director of a railway company who knowingly permits the funds of any such company to be applied in violation of the next preceding sections shall incur a penalty of $1,000 for each such violation.

Therefore, every railway director who authorizes the purchase of a share of stock in any other railway company renders himself liable to a fine of $1,000. It was a serious evil which caused such a provision to be inserted in the general Railway Act; and when we are considering Bills of this kind—whether dealing with railways, telegraphs or telephones, and we have heard lately a great deal about telegraphs and telephones—we should take care not to authorize what is so particularly guarded against in the Railway Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a difference of opinion on the subject, and the hon. gentleman is entitled to his opinion, but other people are equally entitled to theirs. I did not suggest that, in the face of that clause in the Railway Act which the hon. gentleman has read, a railway company could out of its own means buy stock in any other company, but I did say that in this particular case there are large and wealthy stockholders who, if they felt that it would be a very great advantage to them to acquire the control of one or more telegraph companies, could take their means and buy the stock and operate these other companies in co-operation with the one we are now incorporating. There is no law you could pass which would prevent that being done. It is only one remove farther away. If these things are in the interest of capitalists, they will accomplish them in spite of any legislation we can pass. It is quite true that the Railway Act contains a general clause of the character the hon. gentleman has stated, but while that is the case, what do we find? There is not a Bill that comes up for the incorporation of a railway company in which we do not find a clause authorizing the acquiring of other roads.

Mr. BARKER. By name. The hon. gentleman insists in every case that the name of the company to be acquired shall be put in the Bill, so that the committee may consider whether that particular company shall be amalgamated or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is true, but all the same there is the general Act which imposes a penalty for doing that. I think, without a single exception, where the other company can be named, the company wishing to purchase is allowed to do so. There are only, after all, one or two great institutions which we would not allow to combine their interests. It is thought to be in the general interests that the larger roads should buy up the smaller ones, because they can work them to better advantage, give better service and afford better accommodation to the general public. In the case of the wireless company now under discussion, it became clear to the committee that Mr. Marconi might find it necessary, in order to give the public a better service, to make connections with telegraph lines. One can very well conceive that there might be obstacles raised to their working unless they had the power of using their means to obtain the control of some other lines which they could connect with their ocean cables, and it would be very unwise for us to say that they should not do any other business than a wireless telegraph business. They might, in the ordinary course, require to do ordinary telegraph business. The extent to which they can do that you cannot very well limit. But you can scarcely conceive of their going in to buy out all the telegraphs of Canada. If they failed to give the public a satisfactory service, how long would it be before other telegraph companies would be incorporated and compete with them for public patronage? I think that we are magnifying the possibility of any ill effects resulting from legislation of this kind. While I would not hesi-

tate to place every obstacle in the way of any amalgamation of these great interests which could be detrimental to the public interest, I do not see why we should place any obstacle in the way, when the result would not be harmful.

Mr. SPROULE. If we do allow amalgamation, it seems to me that we should make provision to prevent what takes place every day in connection with the two telegraph companies which amalgamated in Canada some years ago; I refer to the Dominion and the Montreal Telegraph Companies. The Dominion line was projected for the purpose of giving competition to the public. It succeeded for a length of time, but getting somewhat financially embarassed, the Montreal Company got control of it, and what has been the result? One company now controls the lines of both companies and does the work of both. But if you wish to send a message to a certain point, and go to the office of the Montreal Company you are told that the office at the other point is a Dominion office. The result is although one company controls both offices and manages both, you have to pay a double rate, because you are told that the message has to go over both lines. Had these companies remained separate, there is no doubt that both companies would have offices at these various places, and you would save the double expense which is now incurred. It seems to me that there ought to be some provision to prevent that kind of thing. That is one of the evils that result from amalgamation.

Mr. WADE. When this Bill was before the Railway Committee, it was very carefully considered, especially this clause in its bearing on the other parts of the Bill. At the suggestion of some members of the committee, certain words in this clause were struck out, so that it was left in exactly the same shape as the clauses usually put in Bills of this sort. There was before the House last session a Bill relating to the Canadian Northern Telegraph Company. It was very vigorously contested by many members of this House, and it was referred by the Railway Committee to a sub-committee. There it was considered and discussed, and finally it was reported to this House; and that Bill contains exactly the same clause as this. I understand that it is a rule of the House, when a Bill is reported from the Railway Committee, not to disturb it unless for some very good reason. If we have granted a similar clause to other companies, I do not see why it should not be granted to this one. I do not apprehend any of the difficulties which the hon. member for Hamilton suggests, and I agree with the hon. Minister of Railways that it is absolutely impossible to prevent the amalgamation of these companies. I think we might very well adopt a model clause on this point, and apply it to every company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I hardly agree with the view entertained by the minister that because you cannot prevent one company controlling another, that is a good reason why this clause should be retained. Of course, you cannot prevent men getting stock in different companies, and in that way controlling them; but if that control cannot be prevented by legislation, that is no reason you should expressly authorize something still worse. A director of one company may acquire a controlling interest in another, but that is a very different thing from the case where the company of which he is a director obtains such control; and the very best reason against the hon. gentleman's argument is the general clause to which he refers. What is the use of having that clause in the statute if the hon. gentleman's argument is correct? If it is a sound argument, it is a good ground for striking out the clause in another measure that we were discussing at six o'clock for preventing the Canadian Northern Railway from amalgamating with the Canadian Pacific Railway; but I can scarcely think he would use that as an argument for eliminating that clause. I think the point to which the hon. member for Hamilton has drawn attention, is a very important one, and the committee should pause before assenting to a clause of that kind in this Bill.

Section agreed to.

Mr. BARKER. I beg to move that section 24 be struck out.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 21; nays, 38.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to call the attention of the minister to section 22. That seems to give power to the company to enter upon lands and take possession of them without in the first place paying compensation. Is it desirable to give these special powers of expropriation? Why would it not be better in all these cases to refer to the terms of the General Expropriation Act. There is such an Act on the statute-book, or there used to be. I know there was a good deal of amendment to the Act in connection with the establishment of the Exchequer Court, but surely the Act itself remains. Why is it necessary to give these special powers of expropriation to these companies? Will the hon. minister say that the rights of landowners are properly preserved under this section? The company may enter into possession of the land without giving any security, and have the question of compensation determined afterwards. That is not very fair to the landowners. The general rule of expropriation is that the compensation shall be fixed and the money paid into court before the company expropriating shall enter into possession of the land. The terms of this section are very comprehensive, and, though I have not had the opportunity of

reading it very carefully, I should think it gave power to enter upon lands and to pay afterwards, and payment need not be made until, in case of disagreement, there has been an arbitration to fix the compensation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The two clauses of section 22 as we have them here give powers that are to be found ordinarily in legislation of this character. I agree with what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has said that they could be much improved, not only in the particulars to which he referred, but in others. But this has been the course of legislation. Two or three questions were referred to in the committee when the matter was pointed out, and this is one that we would probably do well to consider and have it provided for by some general legislation. I am not sure, but I think the same provision is in the Act relating to public works. I know they read the sections from other Acts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is far better, it seems to me, both in the interest of the public and in the interest of the company that you should have a carefully thought out Act for the purpose of expropriation, and when any company comes to this parliament and asks to acquire lands by expropriation, let it be referred to the general Act for that purpose. It is not in the interests of the companies to confer powers in sections, such as these, that are not very carefully worded. They are fruitful in litigation, and sometimes may not be in the interest of the public, and result in general dissatisfaction. For my part, I do not see why reference could not have been made either to the Railway Act or to the Act now on the statute-book, called the Expropriation Act, where you could find much more carefully thought-out provisions than these expressed in section 22.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I do not know whether the general law controls under section 22, but, if not in my opinion, section 22 should not be sanctioned by this House. Under this section it is provided——

> The new company may enter upon the lands of His Majesty and of any person or corporation——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). 'His Majesty' is struck out.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But the rest stands. So, section 22 would provide :

> The new company may enter upon the lands of any person or corporation whatsoever, and survey the same, and set out and ascertain such parts thereof as it thinks necessary and proper for the construction and erection of the works of the new company or its lines of telegraph or system, and take possession of and use the same for such purpose.

And they can construct works and fell trees on the property. But I see no provision here requiring security for damages, tender in advance or any of the safeguards thrown around the owners of land when expropriation under the system is sought. Under the railway system, an order of court may be obtained authorizing possession in advance of payment, but only upon the court ordering security to be given. I see no such security provided for in this Bill. For one, I could not sanction such a provision as this. This company may or may not be solvent; and I am dealing with it in the abstract. But I do not think we should sanction the principle of any corporation or person taking away another's property without indemnifying him in advance. Who is going to look after the rights of individuals if this parliament does not ?

An hon. MEMBER. Nine o'clock.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be well, Mr. Chairman, before you leave the Chair, to refer this Bill back to the committee to have it further considered ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). It can be done without that. We can make applicable to this company certain provisions of the General Expropriation Act.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 122) respecting the Rathbun Company.—Mr. Harty.

Bill (No. 195) for the relief of James Reid Steele.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 196) for the relief of William Allen.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 97) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Power Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY—GUARANTEE OF SECURITIES.

House again in committee on the proposed resolution (page 4363) regarding aid to the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When the committee rose at six o'clock, I was asking some questions with regard to this road. How far is Erwood north of the main line of the Canadian Northern Railway ?

Mr. DAVIS. I have here a map which I shall be glad to show the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and which will give him all that information.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Now that we understand it, this point, Erwood, is on the

old line of the Hudson Bay Railway, 320 miles from where that road connects with the Canadian Northern. Then it is virtually not a branch at all of the Canadian Northern ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is called the Prince Albert branch.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is an extension of the old Hudson Bay Railway. There was a branch from the Hudson Bay Railway that diverged to the west, to Erwood. The Hudson Bay Railway was subsidized by a land grant from the local government. From reading the resolutions and from the observations of the Minister of Railways, I was led to believe that this Prince Albert branch was within 180 miles of the main line and intended to connect with it. It does not connect at all with the main line of the Canadian Northern, it connects with the old Hudson Bay Railway which crosses the main line of the Canadian Northern 320 miles from Erwood. I asked the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), and he told me that Erwood was 320 miles along the Hudson Bay Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Canadian Northern as originally laid out, deflects to the west from Erwood and when completed will extend to Prince Albert. That was part of the original main line, and that is what I stated to the hon. gentleman. But when they looked the ground over, they started out from the Gilbert Plains district and constructed to Grandview, and they are now proposing to make that their main line through to Edmonton. This line, however, is called the Prince Albert branch, and it is part of the Canadian Northern system, and when it is built from Prince Albert will be part of the Canadian Northern system from Prince Albert through the Swan River district and down to where it touches the main line.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The original intention of building the Canadian Northern Railway was to utilize that portion of the Hudson Bay Railway which turned westerly and went over to Erwood. But the present line which the hon. gentleman is asking this country to subsidize is not a new line. From the Gilbert Plains up to Edmonton where it crosses the Hudson Bay Railway is 320 miles, and 420 miles from Prince Albert. What I understood from the resolutions was that this branch from the Canadian Northern is a branch from the Canadian Northern to connect with Prince Albert.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That brought you to Erwood, whatever the distance is.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, I understood that it brought us to the line of railway which the hon. gentleman is proposing to subsidize. Instead of that, we are not subsidizing part of the main line to connect with Prince Albert, but we are subsidizing an extension of the Hudson Bay Railway which extends from Erwood up to Prince Albert, not a branch at all of the Canadian Northern, because if it was a branch of the Canadian Northern it would go direct to that railway and reach it within 180 miles. Instead of that it does not reach it within 420 miles; that is why we are misled by the resolutions. Why, does not the hon. gentleman, when he puts these resolutions on the paper, bring us a map showing the road which he proposes to subsidize, so that we can understand him ? I do not think there is an hon. gentleman in the House but understood that this Prince Albert branch was a branch of the Canadian Northern.

Mr. SCOTT. So it is.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is a branch of the Canadian Northern Railway, it is an extension of the old Hudson Bay railroad.

Mr. SCOTT. It connects with the Northern.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It connects with Erwood.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is the Canadian Northern all the way.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But in order to reach the Canada Northern it goes 320 mines from that point.

Mr. DAVIS. I will explain the whole situation. The original line of the Canadian Northern Railway followed that colonization road that was supposed to run to the Saskatchewan, and which was subsidized with land grant by the late government and a guarantee of bonds by the local government, and was called the Hudson Bay road. After they had been working on that road for several years, and since I came to this House I think it was, the Canadian Northern people came back here and got a charter to build a branch from this Hudson Bay road running towards Prince Albert, and as a matter of fact to the Pacific ocean. They have built that road farther than Erwood, but they do not claim to have done so. After looking over the ground some two years ago they came to the conclusion that they could get a more direct and better route by branching off below Dauphin at Gilbert Plains and running in a direct line as closely as they could to Edmonton. On account of the first road having been projected through the Carrot River Valley, people have crowded into that district until there is hardly a homestead left to be taken up that is of any value. The railway lands are all sold. There is a congestion and the people must have some way of getting their produce out. Some of the

farmers informed me last winter that they had a portion of three years crop on hand that they could not get out and that in consequence they required this road. For that reason, I suppose the government is seeking to give this assistance towards helping these people to build that road, because if they do not get the road the people will leave.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman tell me how far the line of the Canadian Northern extends ?

Mr. DAVIS. The part of the road, that is the Hudson's Bay road, is already built to the north-east corner of the province, and there is a portion of the road which runs past Erwood which is built.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How far is it from Erwood down to Gilbert Plains—320 miles ?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know the exact mileage, but it is a long distance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, I was perfectly correct in my statement. The proposed Canadian Northern Railway will run from Gilbert Plains to Edmonton. This proposed branch is a branch from Prince Albert to Erwood. We were led to believe that there would be a branch of the proposed line to Edmonton which we are assisting constructed to Prince Albert, but instead of that it is an extension of the old, abandoned line of the Hudson's Bay Railway, or the Canadian Northern Railway, as it was afterwards called, and which they are now extending to Prince Albert.

Mr. SCOTT. That is fair enough.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And perhaps the hon. gentleman may be aware that legislation of this very parliament has declared all these railways to belong to the system of the Canadian Northern. The railway which he describes as the old Hudson's Bay Railway is a part of the Canadian Northern Railway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand that fully.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AN CANALS. And was intended to be the main line.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is abandoned as the main line now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. After they had considered the question of getting to Edmonton by the shortest route they started off from their main line in the neighbourhood of Gilbert Plains and they have now built to Grandview.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do the committee understand that this road has been bonused by land grants from the local government ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are no land grants towards this road that we have in contemplation now.

Mr. DAVIS. There are no land grants at all.

Mr. COCHRANE. Not to the original Hudson's Bay line ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is no part of the original Hudson's Bay line. We have looked into the question of land grants and I am in a position to state that there is no land grant at all applicable to this portion of the line we are covering under subsidy or any portion of it beyond Erwood.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Or through Erwood ?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was there not a subsidy by this government or the Manitoba government ?

Mr. DAVIS. Within the boundaries of Manitoba there was a land subsidy by this government and also a guarantee of bonds by the Manitoba government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, by the government of Canada.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How far is Erwood outside of the boundary of Manitoba ?

Mr. DAVIS. Between twenty-five and thirty miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, there are only twenty-five or thirty miles of the road that have not been subsidized by the local government up to Erwood, and by this government, from which there is a land grant. What I am complaining of is that the resolution speaks of this branch as a branch of the road which we are pretending to subsidize.

Mr. SCOTT. So it is. It is a long branch.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Hudson's Bay road is built to the boundary of Manitoba. It is extended up to Erwood twenty-five or thirty miles beyond the boundary of Manitoba, making 320 miles in all. It was intended to extend the Canadian Northern Railway by extending that road up to Edmonton. The Hudson's Bay road has been abandoned altogether and the proposed resolution is for the purpose of giving so much per mile for a road from Gilbert Plains onwards.

Mr. SCOTT. And to extend the road from Erwood to Prince Albert.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. From Gilbert Plains to Edmonton and besides that a branch to Prince Albert, but we find that it is the extension of the old Canadian Northern Railway to Prince Albert. We supposed that it was a branch line of this new road to Prince Albert that the hon. minis-

ter proposed to subsidize. He is not only subsidizing the main line to aid in its construction through that country to Edmonton, but he is subsidizing, to the extent of $13,000 a mile, a road which is to connect with that abandoned branch line which was proposed to be built towards the Pacific to assist in the extension of that line to Prince Albert.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope the hon. gentleman is not allowing himself to run away with the idea that this is an abandoned railway. It is not an abandoned railway; it is a live railway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I did not say it was an abandoned railway. I said it was abandoned as the main line of railway. The hon. minister said that they had abandoned that portion, that they had intended to construct it as a part of the Canadian Northern Railway, that they had abandoned their design, and started a new road from Gilbert Plains up to Edmonton ; so that this instead of being a branch of the road that we are proposing to subsidize at the present moment, or a branch of the main line of the road, is an extension of the abandoned Hudson's Bay road. Whatever justification there may be for the expenditure of $13,000 a mile on the main line, there is no justification for the extension of what was proposed to be the main line through Prince Albert and then abandoned. That is my argument.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What difference does it make to the section of the country proposed to be traversed by this hundred miles branch, whether it is an extension or branch of the main line, or whether it should have been the main line itself ? In either case it will give railway facilities to the district in question and whether it is a main line or a branch of the main line is a matter of no importance. If it is meritorious to build the railway there, does the hon. gentleman say that it should not be built because it is not a part of the main line ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We are giving an abnormal subsidy to this road.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No subsidy at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is virtually a subsidy.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You may call it anything you like, but it is a subsidy to the road. You give them a grant of so much per mile payable in fifty years and pay 3 per cent interest to the company upon the construction of the road. You may call it what you like; I call it a subsidy to the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The company are engaging to pay three per cent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You guarantee the bonds at the rate of three per cent to the extent of $13,000 per mile, and you promise to pay a subsidy, the total amount to be paid at the end of fifty years. You become responsible for it. You guarantee the amount of $13,000 per mile and you——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is confused.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will read the resolution. You offer the guarantee of this country to the extent of $13,000 a mile, or 3 per cent interest on it, and you guarantee to pay the amount at the end of fifty years. If the company do not meet their obligations the government of this country pledges itself to pay the amount. That is a departure from the usual system of subsidies.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A good and a wise departure.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought the minister justified it because this was the main line between the east and the Pacific coast.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never said a word to that effect.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is it the intention of the government to apply this principle to every branch line in Manitoba and the North-west, instead of giving a cash grant of $3,200 or $6,400 a mile, as the case may be ? Here you are giving this guarantee to a road running into Prince Albert, which has already a railway running into it, and which the Canadian Pacific Railway is pledged to reach with another railway within three years.

Mr. DAVIS. At that rate of going they have been pledged for twenty years.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Canadian Pacific Railway only acquired that road two years ago, and since that they have laid rails on thirty-two miles, graded thirty miles further, and promised they would build thirty more miles.

Mr. DAVIS. They abandoned their other Bill before they would undertake to build anything on that road.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They abandoned it because you wanted to make it a condition that they would build on the other line pari passu with the line they were applying for a charter for. You are subsidizing a branch road to a town which already has a railway and which the Canadian Pacific Railway have also promised to reach.

Mr. DAVIS. The road that the Canadian Pacific Railway proposed to build is not within ninety miles of this other road.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does it not go to Prince Albert ?

Mr. DAVIS. What has that to do with it ; how many railways are running into Montreal ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have one road finished into Prince Albert, you have another promised to be finished in 1906, and you are subsidizing—the Postmaster General objects to the word 'subsidizing,' but I think it is the proper term—you are subsidizing another road to the extent of $13,000 a mile.

Mr. DAVIS. The settlers of that district will be much edified when they read the speech of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and know of his intense desire to give them relief. We have a railway that was built into Prince Albert when the Conservatives were in power, by a grant of our lands, and without any government control. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the people are paying twenty-nine cents a hundred for hauling their wheat to Fort William, while the same company only charges the people of Edmonton thirty cents a hundred, although it is 600 miles further away. The road that charges such rates is not of much benefit to the people there. As the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Haggart) appears to be very friendly to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I may tell him that they haul wheat from Calgary to Fort William for twenty-six cents, while they charge the people of Prince Albert, who are 300 miles nearer to Fort William, twenty-nine cents. I cannot understand that kind of long haul and short haul arrangement. The Manitoba and North-western Railway has been projecting towards Prince Albert for twenty years, and not one shovel full of dirt was turned on it for ten years, until last year, when the Canadian Pacific Railway were forced to pledge themselves to do that work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How long have the Canadian Pacific Railway had that railway ?

Mr. DAVIS. They had it long enough to be sixty miles in default on construction. When the Canadian Pacific Railway took over the charter they were under an obligation to build twenty miles a year, and they had it for three years without doing anything, until, when they applied for an extension of time the committee insisted that they should build a certain portion of the line. We have no pledge that they will turn another shovel of dirt for the next four years, and the very best proof that they will not is that when we made the proposition the other day that they should build as much towards Prince Albert as towards Edmonton, they withdrew their Bill rather than do it. Now, coming to the Canadian Northern Railway from Erwood towards Prince Albert, and you may call it a branch line or the main line, if you like—even supposing the Canadian Pacific Railway road was built, this Erwood road is 100 miles away from the Canadian Pacific Railway in one place and sixty miles further on the proposed extension, it is ninety miles away, and, of course, as they are both running to Prince Albert, they have to centre there. Both roads are needed in that district. For 100 miles from Prince Albert eastward on that road there is a thick settlement and there is not a homestead to be taken within ten miles on each side of the road that is of any use. It is all settled. Does the ex-Minister of Railways propose to force the people to move out of that fertile country because they cannot market their produce ? Talk about a carping policy, but that is a tu-penny ha-penny policy indeed. If these people do not get a railroad they will have to abandon their homes or go to some place where there is a railway. If the Canadian Pacific Railway do build a line there it will serve one portion of the country, but the road we have already serves a different portion of the country hundreds of miles away. This road which the government now propose to assist with a guarantee of bonds is to serve a different portion of the country entirely. The people have been there for a good many years, and they informed me, when I held a meeting there this year, that they had some grain stored in their granaries for three years, and if Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann had not come there and bought some of it, they would have had to leave the country. If they do not get this road, they will not stay in that part of the country ; they will have to move out, though it is well known that this Carrot River valley is the finest and most fertile part of the whole country.

Mr. PUTTEE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that all the sections within ten miles on each side of the railway are taken up ?

Mr. DAVIS. That is, the homesteads that are fit to take.

Mr. PUTTEE. Does the hon. gentleman not think that ought to be sufficient guarantee to build a railway without going any further ?

Mr. DAVIS. If you can get them to do it. They cannot borrow money on that ; but that is sufficient for the government to guarantee the bonds, because it shows that they will never be called on to pay one cent of interest. The settlers will get relief, and there will be no charge on the country.

Mr. CLARKE. I feel very friendly disposed towards this proposition. In view of the requirements of the western part of our country, I think it is absolutely necessary that additional railway accommodation should be provided; but I wish to tell the Minister of Railways and Canals, with the greatest possible respect, that I

have not yet been able, probably from lack of intelligence, to get this scheme into my mind. The other day when it was before the committee, we had to insist on the estimates of the railway engineers being placed before us. I think the minister also promised to bring down a map showing the location of the projected lines. We have what may be called a map, but it is not such a map as this committee should have before it to enable us to judge intelligently just what the scheme is. I am not opposing this resolution at all. I think that the firm who are to receive this guarantee are worthy of the commendation and support of the people of Canada, and that in their struggle to construct a transcontinental line they should be reasonably assisted; but I think the proposition has been placed before us in anything but a businesslike shape, and if the discussion has been lengthened, it is not to impede the progress of the measure through the committee, but because members have been groping in the dark in their efforts to understand it. We shall have to give an account to our constituents of this measure, and as one member of the committee I must say that I have not been able, from the discussion that has taken place, to inform myself as I think I should be informed in order to give an intelligent vote upon it. I enter a protest against the meagre, half-baked way in which this matter is being presented to us. It is not fair to the committee or to those who have to give a vote upon a matter of such importance.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT. I do not know whether I shall succeed, but I will attempt to simplify the matter to the hon. gentleman. The Canadian Northern Railway commences at Port Arthur, which is its eastern terminus, and runs to Winnipeg, and from there to Portage la Prairie, and thence north-westward. Perhaps the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) can tell us the exact distance from Portage la Prairie to the point where the road forks.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Thirty-five miles.

Mr. SCOTT. At this point the road diverges. One fork runs to Erwood through the extreme north-west corner of the province of Manitoba, a distance of probably 200 miles from the junction of the forks. The other fork runs to Grandview. The proposition before the House is that both of these forks be aided—the Erwood line to Prince Albert——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not to Prince Albert, but from Prince Albert for 100 miles to the east.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman is not very well posted.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the simpler way is to say that the Erwood line shall be extended to Prince Albert. The proposition is that the government shall aid the company in pushing the northern fork through to Prince Albert and the southern fork, which is spoken of as the main line, through to Edmonton.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I think the reason the committee has been misled is that the resolution has not been made plain enough. As the minister has explained it was the original intention to make this Erwood line the main line; but the company have made the Gilbert Plains line the main line because of its being shorter, and they have made the Erwood line a branch to Prince Albert. I would ask the minister what estimate per mile has he that this road from Erwood will cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $18,800 a mile.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I think that is a pretty high estimate for the construction of that line.

Mr. DAVIS. There is an expensive bridge.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I am aware that Mr. Greenway's government aided the Mackenzie & Mann roads through the province of Manitoba to the extent of $8,000 per mile. This aid extended for twenty or thirty miles into the territories on this Erwood branch. Mr. Roblin, the present premier of Manitoba, has further aided Mackenzie & Mann in the construction of branch lines in the province; and in granting that aid, he has had the aid which Mr Greenway granted to the line in the territories transferred to the province of Manitoba. Mackenzie & Mann are now appealing to the Dominion government for aid over this same line which Mr. Greenway's government aided.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did Mr. Greenway give any subsidy for the 100 miles east of Prince Albert?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). He guaranteed the bonds to the extent of $8,000 per mile on this same line west of the boundary line running towards Prince Albert for a distance of twenty or thirty miles.

Mr. DAVIS. That would leave about 180 miles.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Yes, I am not complaining of that. I am not complaining at all of the government aiding this line. But what I do say is, that the people of Prince Albert and the people of the Carrot River country between Prince Albert and Erwood are very desirous of railway accommodation; and I congratulate the Dominion government on imitating the Manitoba government in granting this kind of aid rather than aid in the form of a cash bonus or land grant. Since the provin-

cial government have granted aid to Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie in Manitoba and since the North-west Territories are not granted provincial or local autonomy and are not in a position to build their own road, it is the duty of this government to come to the relief of the North-west Territories and assist in constructing this line of railway. I am going to support these resolutions. I congratulate the government on utilizing a portion of this for rolling stock. The Mackenzie & Mann system had their bonds guaranteed during the past session of the provincial parliament to the extent of $10,000, which is $2,000 more than the other guarantee, but with the stipulation that the $2,000 of excess are to be applied towards the improvement of their rolling stock. Under the circumstances I will support the resolutions, particularly with the understanding that this government shall have absolute control of the rates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This one hundred miles is to complete the line to Prince Albert, and the other is to extend the Gilbert Plains branch to Edmonton ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

On resolution 3,

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that the minister has presented to the House a statement of the present indebtedness on this line ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I read it to the House and it is in 'Hansard.'

On resolution 4,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. minister give us some general information as to the terms of the mortgage in respect of the matters which I brought to his attention the other day ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not gone into the subject of the precise details as to the mortgage. We shall of course follow what is usual and customary in such cases. There have been mortgages which have been given to the Manitoba government and there are other mortgages which have been perhaps given in other parts of Canada. We will see what these mortgages are like and come to a conclusion as soon as we can. But I have not, nor has the Department of Justice, which will have charge of that branch of the subject, given that matter any consideration yet. In a general way we propose to embody all the clauses necessary to have the guarantee secured on the property which belongs to this company—all its property of every kind and description. I do not think that I could give the hon. gentleman any information beyond that at present.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette).

On resolution 5,

Mr. CLARKE. At the end of the fifty years the government is liable for the principal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But it will have the property.

Mr. CLARKE. It would be more satisfactory if some arrangement could be made for the extinction of the debt at the end of the fifty years. I brought that matter to the attention of the hon. minister this afternoon and he promised to consider it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not unwilling to do so. It would not be in the interests of the country that the character of the road, its maintainance and betterment and the efficiency of the service, should be impaired by unduly enlarging the fixed charges on the undertaking in its early stages. It is very important that all the earnings they will be able to apply towards improving their road, increasing their equipment and otherwise adding to the efficiency of the road, should be devoted to these purposes, and the question of guarantee is not so urgent a matter as it appears to the hon. gentleman. However, I am quite free to say that his suggestion is worthy of consideration and it will receive the attention of the government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this all the distance over which the firm of Mackenzie & Mann have asked for a guarantee of bonds, or have they made any request for a similar guarantee should their road be extended to the coast ? If this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway road should go through to the coast and be given a bonus or a guarantee on their bonds, in what position would that place the Canadian Northern ? There would then be two transcontinental lines—the Canadian Pacific Railway and The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. In what position would the Canadian Northern Railway be then, because these men, Mann & Mackenzie, are the pioneers of the second transcontinental road, and although we may vote these resolutions through, we may be called on in a few days to grant a subsidy to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I trust the hon. gentleman will not think I am discourteous, because I should be very sorry to appear so to my hon. friend, but I am bound to say that he has introduced so many 'ifs' in his question that it is impossible for me to give a definite answer. Hypothetical questions are questions to which governments are not extremely anxious, under any circumstances, to reply, and this is a hypothetical question which has so many 'ifs' in it, that I am unable to answer my hon. friend. There are so many suppositions in his question that it would not perhaps be of any advantage if I were able to reply, which I am not.

I may say, however, that there have been no negotiations whatever between the government and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, beyond what are to be found within these resolutions.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would the government have any objection to add to these resolutions a guarantee of bonds through to the coast or would they support such a resolution if I were to propose it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will say to him that we must have a proposition before us, before we can decide on it. I could not say what we would do in the event of somebody making an application, and consequently it would not be possible for me to answer my hon. friend's question, but I can assure him that no member of the government has had any such question under consideration, as far as I know.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Has this firm requested for a guarantee to the coast ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There has been no communication of any kind at all in that connection.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it fair to ask if any negotiations have been going on between the government and any of the parties concerned looking to the absorption of the Mackenzie & Mann railways by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can only say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is as well informed as I am on that subject. He reads the newspapers ; and, if you can rely upon the newspapers' statements, evidently, there has been some attempt on the part of these corporations to approach one another ; and, if you can rely on the newspapers, these attempts have failed.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the government a party ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not in the slightest degree.

Mr. CLARKE. No pressure brought to bear upon the Mackenzie and Mann establishment to compel them to merge with the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. REID (Grenville). My only desire in mentioning this was to point out that these men are Canadians and that they deserve great credit for the pioneer work they have done on this section of a transcontinental road. I believe that they can push the road through just as well as the Grand Trunk Pacific or any other people can, and in mentioning that this guarantee of bonds be extended through to the coast, it would be merely to protect these people in case that the Grand Trunk Pacific went through. I think that this road is a good transcontinental road, if the government intend subsidizing a transcontinental road.

On section 6,

Resolved, that the rates and tolls to be charged for the transfer and carriage of freight and passengers upon the lines of railway so aided and upon the lines owned by the Canadian Northern Railway shall be under the control of the Governor in Council or of such authority, commission or tribunal as is designated or constituted under any Act of the parliament of Canada for the regulation or control of the business of railways.

Mr. PUTTEE. What is the quality of this control ? Is it different from what we have in the General Railway Act ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The General Railway Act, or if the Railway Commission Bill passes, the Railway Commission Law, will certainly, I think, afford very ample control. But it is always thought desirable that we should embody it in the contract, simply by reason of its being part of the law of the land. A contractual relation would exist between the railway and the government with this incorporated in the contract.

Mr. PUTTEE. Will the government have any power to limit the fixed charges, and, for that purpose to limit the capitalization, in order to make the control of rates of some use ? If you could get the fixed charges down to a low figure that would be a very material element of control.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Parliament has already specified the quantity of bonds to be issued.

Mr. PUTTEE. What is the quantity ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member (Mr. Puttee) will remember that a general Act passed this parliament bringing all the lines they had acquired and built under one control and management, called the Canadian Northern, and the capitalization on these lines is limited to $24,000,000, if my memory serves me well.

Mr. SCOTT. Would the hon. minister state whether, in his opinion, the Railway Committee which it is proposed to constitute will have the right, with regard to these lines we are aiding, to consider the matter and the amount of the aid in fixing the charges the company may levy upon the traffic ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it would always be a matter within the discretion of the railway board to consider the cost of operation and maintenance, and generally the cost of carrying the traffic, and an element in that consideration, probably, would be what this road cost the company. They are going to be enabled to build the road with lower

fixed charges by reason of the government guarantee. I am not at all clear but that it would be proper for the Railway Commission to consider that as an element in deciding what would be a reasonable tariff.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Is there likely to arise any clash of authority between the Dominion and the provincial governments in reference to this matter of control of rates ? The hon. minister is aware that the provincial government exercises the control of rates over the road in the province of Manitoba. The rates on this line that is being extended into the territories would be under control of the Dominion government. The minister will see that there is a possibility of having some clash of authority.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not able to see why any conflict of authority should arise. The hon. member (Mr. Roche) will remember that when the Manitoba arrangement was brought up for the confirmation of this parliament, that question was discussed, and I think it was the opinion of both sides that no conflict of serious import could arise between the two authorities. If there should be a conflict, the government of Canada must prevail ; the decision of the Governor in Council must necessarily govern.

Mr. SCOTT. With regard to the point I mentioned, let us suppose a case, a perfectly possible case. This Canadian Northern line will be built with public aid into Prince Albert. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company may carry the Manitoba and North Western Railway into Prince Albert, and, if so, we understand they will build into Prince Albert without aid. Would it be the duty of the commission to fix lower rates on the Canadian Northern on account of the aid given them than that they would fix on the Canadian Pacific, a road built without aid ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) means without direct contribution from this parliament.

Mr. SCOTT. Without public aid.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would hardly be correct to say that the Canadian Pacific is building without aid under all the circumstances. As a matter of fact, we know that enormous land sales are of great financial assistance to the company, and that has been a grant of aid to the Canadian Pacific. They are able to use the proceeds of these sales of land, which aggregate such large sums, to extend their branches and improve their road. So, practically, they are getting aid just as much as this company is, which is getting it in more direct form.

Mr. SCOTT. What the minister says is that my supposititious case is not on all fours with the other. Well, let us suppose the case of a road that is built without any public assistance as we understand it, and this road aided by the government. In that case, would it be the duty or the right of the commission to establish lower rates on one line than on the other, or should they fix equal rates on both lines ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to undertake to define what the duty of the commission would be, except in a most general way. It would depend upon circumstances, and the circumstances would have to be weighed at the time the question arose and a decision arrived at according to the best judgment of those officials. I could not undertake to pass upon a matter which has not come up,—no facts, no circumstances, no material on which I could form an opinion.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not sure whether I understand this or not. The rate and tolls to be charged on this road are to be controlled by the government in some way. Does that apply to the whole line of railway, that is to all lines owned by the Canadian Northern ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt the resolution which is dealing simply with these miles of railway that are being aided, only applies to these lines.

Mr. LENNOX. I think it applies to more than that. It says :

> The rates and tolls to be charged for the transfer and carriage of freight and passengers upon the lines of railway so aided, and upon the lines owned by the Canadian Northern Railway, shall be under the control of the Governor in Council.

That would appear to cover the whole, would it not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps it would. The following words are somewhat broader than I thought they were. But there is now the same control over the other portions of the line. We have declared it, and we have conferred it upon the Board of Railway Commissioners as well. So that in every possible way, so far as general legislation goes, I think we have covered the ground.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does not add anything, I suppose, to the general law ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, only it becomes part of the contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The clause in the contract between the Canadian Northern and the province of Manitoba is a little more explicit than this. It reads :

The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall from time to time fix the rates to be charged and demanded by the company for the carriage of all freight from all points of the companies' lines.

And so on.

Provided always that before any rates are so fixed the company shall be heard and their interests taken into consideration.

In one case you have control; in the other case there is an expressed provision that the Governor in Council shall fix the rates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The commission will have power to fix the rates.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Will the minister say that the commission will actually exercise their power? In Manitoba the rate on grain was fourteen cents per 100 pounds before that contract was made, and it has been reduced two cents per 100 pounds by the government. The premier has announced that another reduction of two cents per 100 pounds will go into effect after the 1st of July. So they are actually controlling the rates. The minister states that under this resolution the railway commission will have power, but will they exercise that power?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is proper to assume that in accordance with the object of our legislation they will exercise the powers which are conferred upon them in all proper cases.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Roche) ought to explain the whole transaction. If there is a loss on the carriage of grain by the road by reason of the government having reduced the rates below the figure at which grain can be carried, the government of Manitoba have got to make good that loss on the earnings of that road every two years.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). So far, I can assure the House and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), the road is not being run at a loss. The best evidence is that the latest statements put forth by the company show that they have had a surplus every year, and the government has not been called upon thus far, and the premier states that he is confident they will not be called upon to pay a single cent of liability.

Mr. McCREARY. Of course, we know as much about it as the premier. If the country continues to produce such crops as we have had the last year or two there is no danger of any default. But let there be a short crop and there would be a danger. In the event of their being a shortage of crops for a year or two, there might be a default, and the government of Manitoba would have to pay. In that respect the resolutions now before the House differ from those of the Manitoba government. I wanted to point out all the facts.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). And I presume the hon. gentleman supported that contract.

On section 8,

Resolved, that it shall be unlawful for the Canadian Northern Railway to lease or sell any of its lines or any portion thereof to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or to amalgamate with the said company or enter into any agreement with the said company whereby rates upon freight or passengers shall be pooled; but this provision shall not extend to traffic or running arrangements made with the assent of the Governor in Council.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). In reference to this clause, the minister stated in discussing this question yesterday that even if this road amalgamated with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway it would be a benefit to that country, as it would then provide a second transcontinental line. As the hon. gentleman is aware, there are rumours at present, whether well founded or ill-founded, I do not know, pointing towards negotiations being carried on to have an amalgamation, or the taking over by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway of the Mackenzie & Mann railway system. Now this clause specially debars this railway from being purchased or leased by the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is quite justifiable, and in the interest of that country. The people don't want to see this road fall into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They wish to see them kept separate, and they feel confident that in the future they will have plenty of produce for two or three transcontinental lines, and they do not desire any railway monopoly. But I feel confident that I am voicing the opinions of practically all the people of that country when I say that they are just as anxious that this road should not fall into the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The minister stated that he wished to see a second transcontinental line, and that this would possibly be the best way to secure it. I agree with him that an amalgamation would be desirable if it was at all probable that the Mackenzie & Mann were not able to carry through to a successful issue the prosecution of their enterprise. But thus far they have kept faith with the people of this country, they have shown themselves to be railway constructors, not railway exploiters. I wish to do that justice to them. In every respect they have kept their contracts with the provincial and Dominion governments, so far as the construction of their lines is concerned. Now what I fear, and what the people object to, is that if this road should fall into the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway it will prevent the construction of a third transcontinental line. The Minister of Railways, in committee the other day, stated that if this charter was granted to

the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway their road would not be constructed within thirty miles of any other transcontinental main line. So that if the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway secure their charter, their road must traverse an entirely different section of the country and develop a portion of that country that will not be opened up by the Canadian Northern Railway or by the Canadian Pacific Railway. There must at least be thirty miles between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern Railway. So I feel convinced that the people will object to an amalgamation or purchase of the Canadian Northern Railway system by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, though possibly not so much as they would object to an amalgamation with the Canadian Pacific Railway. We desire to see three transcontinental lines in the near future, there will be abundance of room for them. I fear that if we do not put a provision in here to prevent an amalgamation, either by the Canadian Pacific Railway or by any other railway that may be chartered by this parliament in future, probably we are going to create a regrettable condition of affairs, and that the government will see, when it is too late the error of their way, that they have been throwing this whole northern country under the control of one company instead of two or more distinct companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the Canadian Northern line should be built through the Rockies, and if the Grand Trunk Pacific should be built through, they would have, either of them, or both of them, to come to parliament to get permission to unite or either to sell to the other. Parliament would then be in a position to judge whether or not it was judicious to allow any such transfer, or sale, or amalgamation, to take place. We have not either of these lines built through yet, and I think we need not give ourselves a great deal of undue concern upon that subject. If the Grand Trunk Pacific should be able to come to an understanding, if they desire to do so, and if there are efforts being made in that direction to-day, of which I have no present knowledge, they will have to come to an understanding before they proceed to build any portion of their railway at all. If they are going to get that line, they will get it at once, or they will not get it all. The moment they commence to construct another line through, there is an end to any attempt on their part to acquire the Canadian Northern. It would be only for the purpose of getting the benefit of the Canadian Northern business, locations and charters, that they would seek to become possessed of that system. I think we can make our minds perfectly free on that subject. I do not believe my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) will find that the contingency that he anticipates will arise. If it should, the union cannot be effectuated until parliament so decides.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Why have the Canadian Pacific Railway specified ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had to put this in here so that we might have it in the form of an absolute contract and have a positive affirmation that they would not do so.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). That is just exactly why I say that we should guard against amalgamation with any road built in the future. The hon. gentleman could put in a general clause. Does the hon. minister not think himself, in view of his declaration to the House that he thought it would be a benefit if they did amalgamate with the Grand Trunk Pacific, that they will be inclined to take advantage of that declaration of a minister of the Crown and complete negotiations ? Afterwards coming to this parliament and seeking legislation authorizing them to amalgamate, feeling sure they will be ratified after this declaration on the part of the government.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the suggestion which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) has made is entirely impracticable. If we adopt it we will be cancelling a good deal of the private legislation that we have been putting through this session. I imagine that there must be half a dozen railway Bills that have gone through or are going through this session that provide specifically that the company being incorporated shall have the right to amalgamate with the Canadian Pacific Railway. There are also two or three cases, I think, or perhaps more, where it is provided that the company being incorporated may amalgamate with the Canadian Northern. I think the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is quite impracticable. Of course, it would be perfectly practicable to specify that this company shall never amalgamate with any company that may be incorporated under the name of the Grand Trunk Pacific, in the same way in which we are providing against amalgamating with the Canadian Pacific Railway. As a representative of the North-west, I may say that I think there would be a unanimous and very strong sentiment in that country against permitting the Canadian Northern to have the privilege of amalgamating with the Canalian Pacific Railway, but I doubt very much if there is one man out of a hundred who would have any feeling against a suggestion that the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific should amalgamate.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Then, the hon. gentleman takes the position that the people of the west only want one line.

On section 9,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. Minister of Justice says

that in drafting the resolution the words 'subrogated in' are used because that is the form in which they always use the term. With us, of course, it is quite different. We would use the expression 'subrogated to.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not wedded to that. That is the way our code uses it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not get up for the purpose of criticising the language. In my own province we usually adopt the expression 'subrogated to.' In connection with the preparation of the mortgage, which we have not before the House, and as to which I may say we have the very vaguest possible information from the hon. minister, if we could call it information at all—and I think I am paying a compliment to the hon. gentleman by suggesting that he has conveyed any information to the House or the committee—what will be your position if you adopt the scheme proposed by the hon. minister? You will have these bonds guaranteed as to principal and interest by the government by some contract which will appear on the face of the bond, then you will have a mortgage, not indemnifying the government against its guarantee, but a mortgage to the trustee charging the principal and interest of these bonds upon the undertaking of the company. I suggest to the hon. minister that it would be better, from the standpoint of the government, and possibly no less in the interest of the company, to have a mortgage indemnifying the government against its guarantee, and I say that for this reason, which occurs to me at the moment: Suppose the company makes default in its interest, what is the position of the government in case it should want to acquire the road or to exercise its rights, either by way of sale or otherwise? The government cannot take over the bonds, because the principal of these bonds is still vested in the persons who are the holders. The company is liable to these persons in respect to the principal of the bonds and it is liable to the government in respect to the interest on the bonds which is defaulted and which the government has been obliged to pay. It seems to me that it would be rather awkward to work that out in such a way that the government could exercise the rights which it ought to have in respect to foreclosing the mortgage. I dare say, of course, that it can be accomplished, but it would be a simpler course for the government to have a mortgage on the undertaking and property of the company indemnifying the government against any moneys which it might be called upon to pay under the terms of this guarantee. Of course, that is a question for my hon. friend the Minister of Justice when the document comes to be drawn.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not thought the matter out very much, but I apprehend that there would be given a second mortgage as it were to the government which would practically be very much as the hon. gentleman suggests. Under that, the government could take any steps necessary to take possession of the property, subject of course to its liability for the bonded obligation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It adds nothing to the value of the bonds to prepare a mortgage such as the hon. gentleman suggests. Of course, if it would add to the security of the bonds it would be an answer to any observations I made on the subject, but inasmuch as the bonds are to have the whole security of the Dominion of Canada——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would be for our own protection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as your protection is concerned it seems to me you can accomplish that better by having a mortgage indemnifying the government against any loss which it may sustain by reason of giving this guarantee. Then you do not have the situation complicated by the fact that a part of the liability of the company, the principal and the interest to accrue, will be owing to the holders of the bonds, whereas the interest that has been defaulted and paid by the government would be owing to the government. I hope I make myself clear to the Minister of Railways and to the Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Perfectly. The question is whether the government ought not to be a party to the original document. That is my view at present.

Resolutions reported, read a second time, and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We desire the committee to give their attention to the special items which were under consideration last evening with the view to an early Supply Bill.

Further amount required for salaries and disbursements of fishery officers, $30,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have a letter from one of my constituents which says that the inspection of lobster factories in the county of Halifax is not carried out in a very efficient manner. I am not going to use any names, but I can give the names to the minister privately if he desires me to do so. The allegation is that lobsters are being used which are not of the regulation size and that when the inspector makes his visit, information is in some way communicated to the proprietors of the lobster factories, and the lobsters whch are under the size prescribed by law are concealed in some manner. The suggestion is made that

the visits of the inspector should be made more frequently than they are at present. The names and the details are given in the letter I have, but perhaps it may not be advisable for me to state them to the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would be most happy to have the information and I can assure my hon. friend that attention will be paid to it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. J. M. Hurley, of Belleville, is drawing a salary of $1,200 and $235.51 travelling allowance, making a total of $1,435.51. I would like the minister to explain what Mr. Hurley has done for this money. Some of us know pretty well that Mr. Hurley is drawing his salary, but we do not know what his duties are except to draw his salary.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Hurley is one of the three fishery inspectors in Ontario and the officials of the department inform me that he performs his duties ?

Mr. TAYLOR. What are his duties ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Fishery inspector.

Mr. TAYLOR. What are the duties of a fishery inspector ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He travels from one place to another to see that the law is observed.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is given a salary of $100 a month to devote his whole time to the duties of fishery overseer ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is brought to Ottawa once a month to make a report.

Mr. TAYLOR. He comes down and makes his report personally without sending it by mail ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He reports himself personally to the office once a month. He has special duties to perform as he has charge of the pond where we propagate black bass.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice that Mr. Hurley, while being fishery officer, was appointed census commissioner, and drew $155.37 for expenses, besides a large sum for reviewing the work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It must have been during the winter.

Mr. TAYLOR. The census was not taken in the winter ; it was taken in the spring. Did the hon. minister give him leave of absence while he was attending to the census ? Mr. Hurley got $178 for revising the returns and $155 for expenses, making $333, which he got from another branch of the government while he was employed at $100 a month the year round, and drawing his salary as fishery inspector. Did he lose one or two months of time while he was doing the census work ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are satisfied in the department that Mr. Hurley has done his duty. It is probable that he would require to do some special census work because he was a fishery inspector, and to make special returns relating to the fishing industry.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman kindly lay on the Table Mr. Hurley's monthly reports ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are no monthly reports. He does the same work as an ordinary fishery inspector, and he comes here and gets his instructions from the department, and goes back.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely this officer makes reports to the department of what work he is doing, and we would like to see his reports.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has special duties to perform, and he reports verbally to the department what he is doing, and receives instructions, the same as the other officials of the department.

Mr. COCHRANE. We would like to know what those special duties are ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To see that the laws are observed.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the minister does not know what they are, he had better inform himself.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I beg pardon. I am perfectly informed.

Mr. COCHRANE. Will the minister, then, be kind enough to tell the committee something about it ? We understand that the Ontario government has control of the fisheries and issues the licenses. Is that not a fact ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then what is Mr. Hurley attending to, if the Ontario government issues the licenses and gets the fees ? I do not know what our officer duties are, and I would like the minister to explain.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are responsible for the administration of the laws governing the fisheries. We have three inspectors in Ontario to see that these laws are observed, and Mr. Hurley is one of them.

Mr. COCHRANE. What law is there for Mr. Hurley to see observed when the Ontario government has control of the fisheries and issues the licenses ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will send the hon. gentleman a brand new copy of the Fisheries Act.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is no information about what he is doing now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The question of jurisdiction with regard to the fisheries as between the Dominion government and the provincial government has been the subject of a decision of the Privy Council. That decision is not just as clear as the legal profession or even the Supreme Court would desire, and it would be very hazardous for any person in an off-hand way to attempt to expound it. But I think it is conceded that there is joint jurisdiction. The Dominion government retains jurisdiction to a certain extent. It may, for example, pass regulations declaring under what conditions fishing may take place, and the provincial government may regulate the fishing in accordance with the general regulations prescribed by the Dominion government. That is, I think, as near as you can get to the meaning of the decision of the Privy Council. Under the division of jurisdiction, I think the provincial governments now appoint local officers, while it is still the duty of the Dominion government to see that its general regulations are observed by the local officers.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why should the Dominion government be so anxious about that, and appoint a fishery inspector to carry out instructions which are so mystified that the Postmaster General can hardly understand them ? Then, how can a gentleman of Mr. Hurley's capabilities understand them ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman did not appreciate what I said.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the hon. Postmaster General is coming to the rescue of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I would ask him why should we expend so much money to inspect and be so anxious about the fisheries when they do not belong to us, and when the revenues derived from the use of the licenses go to the provincial exchequer ? The local government should be the party interested, and see that the regulations are carried out. That is the way it strikes me, and that is, I think, what any business government, as this government claims to be, would say. The local government issues the licenses and gets all the money out of the job, and why should they not attend to the protection of the fisheries ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The inspector appointed by the provincial government does not pass the regulations. The general policy for making use of the fisheries rests with the Dominion government.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why ? When we do not get anything out of them ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why, is another question. For many years the Dominion government did issue the licenses and appointed the officers ; but in consequence of the decision in question, which gave a measure of jurisdiction to the provincial governments, the Dominion government has gradually ceased to exercise that control, leaving the provincial governments to do so. But the two governments work in harmony, the Dominion government having this policy, and the provincial government appointing the officers to see that the policy is maintained.

Mr. COCHRANE. And getting the money.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL. The officers appointed by the provincial government have not to construe the law. They have simply to see that the policy of the Dominion government is lived up to.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the policy of the Dominion government ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is different according to the different waters, and in the different provinces and localities.

Mr. COCHRANE. It looks to me not like a business proposition at all, and the hon. Postmaster General has not explained it, why the Dominion government should make laws to regulate the fisheries when it does not make any money out of them. I understand that the local governments appoint fishery inspectors too. Why do you want gentlemen running around to see that something is done without anybody knowing what their business is ? It just looks to me as though the government wanted to give a defeated candidate a good job. The idea of paying a man from $1,500 to $1,600 for travelling around the country without anybody having any definite idea of what he is doing. The Minister of Marine does not know, and the Postmaster General is just as much at fault in coming to his rescue as I am when I try to get information. The local legislature issues licenses and appoints inspectors and there is no need for the Dominion government to appoint any except they want to give a job to some broken-down politician. And not satisfied with giving him $1,500 or $1,600 per year, they make him census commissioner as well. Does the hon. Postmaster General think that that is a business transaction for a business government ?

Mr. LENNOX. It is all right for the man.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, it was a good thing for him that he was defeated, for he has got a better job. We are paying him something like $1,500.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Twelve hundred dollars.

Mr. COCHRANE. With his expenses, $1,435. Will the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries tell us what he is doing? His deputy who is here, could tell him, if this man were doing anything.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Who is the fishery inspector of Manitoba?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is one at Selkirk, Mr. Young, who gets $1,200.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Who is in charge of the fish hatchery at Selkirk?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On page 251 of the departmental report the hon. gentleman will find all the particulars. Mr. William Parker and his assistant, Mr. Samuel Adamson, have charge of the fish hatchery.

Mr. TAYLOR. I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Gilmour, that this item be reduced by the amount of $4,415.93, being the amount of salary and expenses to Archibald Duncan, D. M. Hurley and B. Shepherd as fishery overseers.

As this work is done by the officers of the Ontario government, this expenditure is unnecessary and useless. The eastern part of Ontario is covered by the official from the Ontario government, who draws $1,600 for doing as little as Mr. Hurley does. This money is thrown away, and as a representative of the people living in the section where the work is done, I could not vote for this expenditure. We have asked what Mr. Hurley's duties are, what waters he has charge of, and where he makes special visits, but could get no information. I know that he runs from Belleville down here to talk to the minister once a month and that is about all he does. When the decision, to which the Postmaster General referred, was given, all the fishery overseers in Ontario were dismissed en bloc but the government then went to work and appointed three politicians just to give them something to do. Mr. Shepherd is an active politician in Toronto, Mr. Hurley is an ex-M.P., and not satisfied with giving him $1,200 and some $300 expenses, they made him census commissioner.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have here Mr. Hurley's report on page xli of the blue-book, and if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble of reading it, he will find there what Mr. Hurley does.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would like to understand on what principle my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) proposes to deduct this amount. These gentlemen although they are not engaged in the task of watching the different waters, yet they have jurisdiction over a large area of this large province; and, if I understand the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries there are only three of these superintendents for the whole province. Mr. Hurley was a useful member of this House. He did not take an active part in debate but he was a member of most excellent judgment. He is in every respect a reliable man, and his acceptance of this office was a decided advantage to the public. Mr. Hurley is a man of exceptional ability and most conscientious in every respect. I am satisfied that he would not consent to fill a public office and receive its emoluments unless he felt that he was earning the money that was paid to him. As an old colleague of our own in this House, one who was well known to us all, I hope the committee will not cast reflection upon him by assuming that he would draw a salary that he did not earn. As to the other officers, I think it could be assumed that they also are earning their pay. If I remember rightly the late government assigned a sum of $1,500 instead of $1,200 to these officers. The present government, in pursuance of the principle of economy which characterizes all their acts, has reduced the amount by 20 per cent. That reduction, I suppose, was made partly in consequence of the transfer of a portion of the duties of these officers to the local government. I am only assuming that, but I think I am right. I wish my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) could see his way not to press his motion, particularly in the case of Mr. Hurley, who had many friends in this House, and who, when he went away carried with him the respect of hon. members on both sides.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would like to be a little logical and understand how the hon. gentleman has arrived at this sum. I want to be sure, as a financial matter, that he has got it right. He proposes to reduce the amount by $4,415.93, being for salaries and expenses of the three gentlemen named. How does he reach that amount?

Mr. TAYLOR. From the Auditor General's Report. The total expenditure is $4,445.93, but $30 was paid to E. H. Sills, of Napanee, being for storage of gill-nets, $20, and removing corks and leads $10.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Surely, the hon. gentleman is not going to cut off any expenditure for the removal of corks.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister knows what corks are used for in the gill-nets—for floaters. I deduct that $30 from the total, leaving an amount of $4,415.93, by which I have moved to reduce this item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As to the cork, I am somewhat like my Irish friend who said he had never been in Cork but had seen many drawings of it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is trying to cut down the amount expended to the 30th of June last. But that is already paid, and

you cannot well reduce that. Or, if he takes that as a fair average for the current year and seeks to cut down for this year, I will call his attention to the fact that these gentlemen have been in office during this financial year which is now all but ended. I take it that, like other civil servants, they have received the amount of their pay, at any rate that there is not more than two or three months' pay due them. Surely, the hon. gentleman is not going to deprive them of their salaries. The cutting off of these salaries might be a matter of consideration in the estimates of next year, but these gentlemen have done the work, and surely the hon. gentleman would not be so unjust as to refuse to pay them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If I remember rightly there was some discussion in the House with reference to Mr. Hurley last session. I think the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) claimed that Mr. Hurley had arranged a protest against him through a Mr. Collins. An affidavit was produced from Mr. Hurley that he had taken no part in it whatever. It had been claimed that Mr. Collins was to get $100 for attending to some buoys or something of that kind. Mr. Hurley made affidavit that that was not the case. But I am told that in the Auditor's General's Report it appears that Mr. Collins received that $100 since that time. I would like to know from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Mr. Collins did receive that money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to the accusation made against Mr. Hurley, I think the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) will admit, if he has not done so in the House before, that there in not the slightest foundation for the rumour that he had heard. Not only the other evidence, but the sworn testimony of both parties was taken to the effect that they had never made any agreement or even spoken about the matter—that they had had nothing to do with it. Even if they had, I do not know what crime it would be, except that Mr. Hurley. occupying a public office should not be mixed up in politics. Criticisms of the conduct of our officials is quite proper ; but when a man conducts himself properly and rumours injurious to him that are started are shown beyond all question to be entirely without foundation, I think that it is most unfair that those rumours should be repeated. As to Mr. Hurley's performance of the duties of the office, I can say that when I was in the department, I was assured by the officials that Mr. Hurley had done faithful and effective service, and that there had been splendid results in his district, especially in the breeding of bass, car loads of which were sent to different parts of the country as far west as British Columbia—a very useful work, I believe. In view of the criticism I think it only fair to say that whatever duty has been assigned to Mr. Hurley he has conducted it faithfully and to the entire satisfaction of the head of his department. I am sorry again to hear, after this matter had been so clearly disposed of, that insinuations are made in regard to the same matter which was referred to on a previous occasion, based on a mere street rumour started by some evil-disposed person.

Mr. REID (Grenville). All I know about it is this : I happened to be speaking with the member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) this evening, and he told me that this affidavit had been produced, and that since then this man Collins had told his partner that he had made an affidavit that Hurley did promise him $100 and that he had got the $100 as agreed to from Hprley, notwithstanding the fact that Hurley made this affidavit. And for the purpose of ascertaining whether Collins is right or Hurley is right, I simply asked the question whether Collins got the $100. That was told me this afternoon, and I am satisfied the hon. member for Hastings will back it up in this House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All I can say is that I never heard of it except when the member for West Hastings last session brought it up. I was under the impression that he had afterwards brought it up in the House. If anything has developed since then, I have nothing more to say about it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Public Works will understand that it was after my hon. friend from Hastings said he was going to bring it up in this House that an affidavit was submitted here by Mr. Hurley, and that he was prepared to take this matter up and prove, notwihstanding the affidavit of Mr. Hurley, that Collins had made an affidavit that he had been promised $100 and that he had since received it. Now will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries state whether Collins received $100 ? I think it was for placing buoys or something of that kind.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed that Collins had a contract, or had something to do with placing buoys in the Bay of Quinté, and that he was paid $100 for his services. We have four or five hundred buoys, and they are placed some by contract, some by day's work and some by harbour masters.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Now the minister will see that we are perfectly justified in criticising Mr. Hurley for making an affidavit of that kind. It is now proved that the $100 has been paid.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That has nothing whatever to do with the affidavit of Mr. Hurley. Mr. Collins was paid, if I understand right, for services he rendered to the department for inspection of buoys in the Bay of Quinté.

Mr. BENNETT. That cannot be the same Collins, as the lighthouse keeper at Christian island, who I see in the report was paid $6 for putting a buoy on a shoal. That was up on Georgian bay, this is on Lake Ontario.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understood the hon. member for West Hastings, there is an affidavit in the 'Hansard' that Hurley did negotiate with Collins in regard to entering a protest against his election, and that he was to receive $100 for placing those buoys. Since then that $100 has been paid to Collins.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Finance Minister made an appeal not to have this amount struck out because these gentlemen had done the work. There is something in the appeal, of course. But the members of the opposition opposed these appointments, and discussed them last year, and stated the money was wasted. That is the only way possible by which we can protest against this expenditure.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What I object to is this: That Mr. Hurley should not interfere in politics, and if he is active enough to go and get a man to enter a protest against a gentleman that has been elected and pledges that he will get $100, and makes an affidavit afterwards that he had nothing to do with it, and the $100 is paid, it is certainly not creditable for an officer of the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was no knowledge in the department that he had been a contractor in any way for the department. But I can say for myself that I never directly or indirectly had any intimation that there was any person connected with politics in any way, or that there was anything irregular in granting this to any person in that constituency in connection with provincial politics. If anything of that kind was done, it was without my knowledge, and without any official of the department knowing anything about it. If the services rendered were not worth the money, that is a different thing.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Certainly I am not reflecting on the minister while he was in charge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is the christian name of this Mr. Collins?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not remember, I was not told.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is one Collins employed at Christian island, and his name is Allan.

Mr. BENNETT. That is on Georgian bay.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, from information that he got from his officer a few moments ago, that Mr. Collins did have a contract with the government and was paid $100. Now what Collins was that he referred to?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The information my officers give me is to the effect that we have now at that island as lighthouse keeper a man named Allan Collins. He is the only one of that name.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is not the information the minister gave a few moments ago. He told us that this Collins we are discussing did have a contract for putting out buoys, and that he was paid $100. Now I want to ask the Minister of Public Works if this Mr. Collins to whom reference has been made did have a contract with the government for placing buoys, and did he get $100 for it, and was that contract let by Mr. Hurley?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would not be let by Mr. Hurley. My recollection is that the person mentioned, whose name I forget now, to whom Mr. Hurley was said to have spoken, was a man who had a contract with the department. It seems the man referred to had a contract with the department for placing buoys. I remember that from the discussion. But I want to assure the committee that there is no knowledge on my part about it, and no representation was made to any person in the department that there was anything excessive in the contract, or that it had any connection with provincial politics. It went through the department in the usual way. I should be surprised to learn, from my personal knowledge of Mr. Hurley, that he would make any representation that was not strictly true. When the matter was brought up in the House I wrote him a letter at once, and got his reply, accompanied with an affidavit which I showed to the hon. member for West Hastings. The matter was then allowed to drop, and I understood that the explanation was considered perfectly satisfactory, and that there was no foundation for the charge. There is no connection whatever between the contract this man had at the time and the incident that was reported to the House.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I may say to the hon. Minister of Public Works that the hon. member for West Hastings did not intend to reflect on him as a minister, but it was in regard to Mr. Hurley that he was raising the question, and in regard to Mr. Hurley making an affidavit of this kind, and that afterwards Collins told his partner that he had got $100. I may be wrong when I say that he made an affidavit, but Collins told his partner that he had been promised this, and that he had got the $100. If such is the case, Mr. Hurley is certainly wrong in making the affidavit he did, and I simply asked the question to see if it were true that he did get the $100. If the hon. minister

states that he did not get the $100, the hon. member for West Hastings can bring the question up at a later date, when he is in the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not find any record of the payment of $100. I will make the necessary inquiries as to whether any such thing took place.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Do the officers not know whether there has been $100 paid ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the evidence by which the committee is asked to be satisfied that $100 was paid can be characterized as secondary evidence. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) says that the hon member for West Hastings said that the partner of John Collins said that John Collins said that Mr. Hurley said he would give him $100.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member for West Hastings said he saw it in the Auditor General's Report himself.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Here is the book. That would be better evidence.

Mr. COCHRANE. I want to state that I have no intention to reflect upon Mr. Hurley at all, who, the hon. Postmaster General said, is a very worthy man. I do not dispute that, but we cannot give every worthy man in Ontario $1,500 a year simply because he is a worthy man. I have tried to get some information in reference to Mr. Hurley's duties. I tried to get it from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and failed, and then the hon. Postmaster General came to his rescue, and he told us that he was a very worthy man.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So he is.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have no doubt about that. I will not contradict the hon. Postmaster General at all. Although he may be a worthy man, there are hundreds of worthy men in Ontario, but, as I said, we cannot afford to give every worthy man in Ontario $1,500 or $1,600 a year. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) has come in, and he knows perhaps what Mr. Hurley's duties are. I was saying to the committee before the hon. gentleman came in that I thought it was not like a business transaction on the part of a business government to pay officers $1,500 or $2,000 a year for one job or another when the local legislature has the right to issue the licenses and keep the money. I refer to Mr. Hurley, because I know him better than anybody else I want to satisfy my mind so that I can give information to the electors in the constituency which I have the honour to represent when they ask me what these inspectors are doing. What earthly use is there in having these officers to supervise the fisheries, when the local legislature is making all the money out of it ? They are the parties who are interested. They have their own officers attending to that duty, and we are appointing officials to go over the same ground exactly. I suppose it is the duty of our officials to see that the officials of the legislature are doing their duty, but they are getting the money. I cannot see any use of the Dominion government paying out this money, not that it is an enormous sum, but that is how money is frittered away.

Mr. DYMENT. I understand that——

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dyment) for information.

Mr. DYMENT. I do not know that the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) has a monopoly of the time of this committee.

Mr. COCHRANE. I was asking for some information, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to get it.

Mr. DYMENT. The hon. gentleman has asked several times, and if he will permit me, I will try to give him a little information in regard to the duties of the fishery inspector on the Georgian bay and Lake Superior.

Mr. COCHRANE. I guess the hon. gentleman is interested in that job.

Mr. DYMENT. The hon. member need not listen to this if he does not wish to. I understand that under the decision given by the Privy Council in regard to the fisheries this government has power to see that the close season is observed, to define the waters where the nets shall be placed, the size of the mesh that shall be used and the kind of net that shall be used. I know that the inspector, Mr. Duncan, whom I am more particularly interested in, spends a great deal of his time in seeing that the nets are in the proper places and not on the spawning grounds, because if the nets were allowed to be placed there for fishing purposes the fish while spawning would be taken and the increase in the number of fish would be affected. I know also that he spends a good deal of his time, and with good results, in seeing that the Americans do not come over and fish about St. Joseph's island, Cockburn island and in the St. Mary's river. He has many a time chased these illegal fishermen out of the country, and, as far as he is concerned, I can assure the hon. member for Northumberland that his time is well spent, and that he earns every dollar that is paid to him.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would recommend that the hon. gentleman be appointed Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He appears to know more about it than any of the ministers from whom I have asked information to-night.

Amendment (Mr. Taylor) negatived, and item voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. Had we not better adjourn now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would it not be better to dispose of the supplementary estimates with the understanding that everything can be discussed in the main estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let us go on until 12 o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR. All right, go ahead.

Additional amount required for printing and engraving Dominion notes, $30,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item is dependent entirely on the amount of notes circulated. We have been increasing the circulation very largely owing to the increased business of the country. There was a general expression of desire that we should withdraw outstanding notes that were not in good condition and we have been encouraging the banks to send in the old notes and receive clean ones. That accounts for some of the expenses. The result is that our note circulation is in better condition than ever before.

Regina jail—purchase of additional land, $4,800.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the land been purchased ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. More ground is absolutely required there, and the intention is to buy part of a quarter section which is immediately east of the jail and we are getting it for $30 an acre, and I understand it is a great bargain at that price.

Mr. LENNOX. We are to understand that all these items can be discussed again on the main estimates ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly, without any hesitation. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. We have done a good evening's work, and I am much obliged to hon. gentlemen opposite for their courtesy.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. minister state what the business will be on Monday ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Several Bills—one in the name of the Minister of Agriculture and one in the name of the Minister of Justice, and then we will take up supply, disposing of the supplementary estimates if we can. We are more anxious to have them passed than the main estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Railway Bill will not be taken up ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It may be ; I am not prepared to say. We will take the minor Bills first, and if the Railway Bill is introduced later, it will be by agreement.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

INDEX.

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT, 1903.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved. Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward.*

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Appnmt. as Fruit Inspector (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

Binder Twine Inspection, Method of Collection, &c. (Ques.) 14684 (vi).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 12703 ; Neg. (Y. 35 ; N. 75) 12705 (v).

——— Pets *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections 13274 (vi).

Picton Mail Service, Irregular Delivery, &c. (remarks) 13134 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Buildings—B. C. (Rossland, armoury) 13133 ; Dom. (rentals, &c.) 13133 ; Man. (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13129 ; Ont. (Cobourg, P.O. 13118 ; (Deseronto, P. O.) 13113 ; (Picton, P.O.) 13113 (vi).

Angers, Mr. C., *Charlevoix.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5192 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10349 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6493 (iii).

Archambault, Mr. J. E., *Berthier.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co's. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10071 (iv).

Avery, Mr. M. *Addington.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5461 (iii).

Avery, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Enterprise Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14007 (vi).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4710 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11606 (v).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4107 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wolfe Island, shoal) 13252 (vi) : Que. (Crane Island, wharf) 1513 ; (Grande Valleé, pier) 1515 ; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 : St. Alexis Bay) 2290 (i) ; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13345 (vi).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5500 (iii).

Ball, Mr. G., *Nicolet.*

Atlantic & Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 446 ; 2° m., 852, 1505 (i).

Budget, The, 2234 (i).

Chambly Canal Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 12497 (v).

Drill Hall, St. Johns, Que., Contract, &c. (Ques.) 12496 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10165 (v)

Moreau, H., Collector, Chambly Canal, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 12497 (v).

Ottawa & Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) M. to ref. back to Com., 6617 (iii).

St. Johns, Que., Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 12496 (v).

Barker, Mr. S., *Hamilton.*

Audit Act. Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11163 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*

Auditor General and Civil Service Amt. B. (remarks) in Com., 13808 (vi).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (v).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) in Com., 5987 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7426 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4368, 4963 (ii) 5623, 5634, 5786 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5883 (iii).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4420 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 830 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com on Res., 12521 (ii), in Com. on B., 13808 (vi).

Desjardins Canal B. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 3394 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act (Compulsory Voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 899; in Com., 909 (i), 14416 (vi).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12296 (v).

G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2410 (i).

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 258: *See* 'Ry. Act' B.

Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11181 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5156 (iii), 7852; on M. for 3°, 8062 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8593 (iv); in Com., 10446, 11190, 11249, 11377, 11835, 11918, 11972, 11999, 12187, 12263 (v); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12768 (vi).

G. T. Pacific, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to read Affidavits (remarks) 14848 (vi).

Halifax Cotton Co., Loan of Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) 14478 (vi).

I. C. R., Expenditure Chargeable to Capital (remarks) 14107 (vi).

——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3669 (ii).

——— Gross Earnings, Interim Reps. (Ques.) 4444 (ii).

——— Locomotives, Cars, &c., in Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4361 (ii).

——— Trackmen: *See* 'Trackmen.'

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10762, 11410 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5093 (ii).

Montreal Terminal Co. (remarks) 6097 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12326 (v).

Ont. & Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2716 (ii).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Over-Expenditures by Depts.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iii).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10796 (v).

Public Accounts Com., producing census schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iii).

Public Works Dept. Control and Management B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14741 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1336 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 251 (i); on M. for Com., 2590; in Com., 2598, 3563, 3723, 3833, 3887 (ii); 5252, 5569, 5682, 5768, 6073, 6087, 6179, 6214, 6244 (iii), 8153 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13841; (remarks) *re* Free Conference, 14760 (vi).

Ry. Act (supplies to I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12576 (v); in Com. on B., 12952 (vi).

Railway Appropriations, Transfer, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on Sen. Amets., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14475 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1241 (i); in Com. (Brant) 11101, 11032; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12438 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6521 (iii).

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act, B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census schedules) 7063 (iii); (contingencies) 4353; (postage, &c.) 4355 (ii).

Canals: Trent (Corry & Laverdure, contract) 7558 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Finance (Insurance) 12586 (v).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7782 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 6000 (iii).

Militia (Hamilton drill hall) 6950 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Art Gallery) 12589; (Dom. and Prov. arbitration) 12591; (Paris agency) 12589 (v).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 5841; N.S. (Arichat) 5830; (Middleton armoury) 5841; (Military college) 5842; Toronto post office) 5842 (iii); Ottawa (census building) 991; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 998; Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 435 (i).

Barker, Mr. Saml—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 1454; Generally (dredges, repairs) 2615; Man. (Lake Francis outlet) 1449; Ont. (Burlington channel) 1359; (Wendover wharf) 1435 (i); Que. (Hull wharf) 5901; (Isle Grosbois) 5902 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A.) 2726; (engineers' salaries) 2726; (surveys, &c.) 2721 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2691(ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Mar. Provs., cables) 2709 (ii); (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5826 (iii).

Railways: G.T.R. (rentals) 12890 (vi).

I.C.R. (air brakes, freights) 8282; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (v); (bridge strengthening) 3699 (ii), 8272 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 12602 (v), 14094 (vi); (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8315 (iv), 12594 (v); (Connolly's claim, &c.) 14103; (double tracking, &c.) 14062 (vi); (draw-bars, exchange) 8288 (iv); (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 (v); (general vote) 12873; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14095 (vi); (Lévis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (Miramichi bridge) 8309 (iv); (Moncton accommodation) 12599 (v); (Moncton, station) 14090 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8312 (iv); (original construction) 3698 (ii); (Ouelle River, spur line) 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 14088 (vi); (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291 (iv); (power saw) 12607 (v); (Restigouche bridge) 8304; (Rivière du Loup work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8310; (rolling stock) 8292 (iv), 14101 (vi); (St. John, accommodation) 8315 (iv), 12596 (v); (sidings, additional) 14055, 14081; (steel rails, &c.) 14098 (vi); (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii); (Truro accommodation) 12603 (v).

Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A.) 2726 (ii).

P. E. I. (Charlottetown station) 14131 (vi); (general vote) 12608 (v); (Hillsborough bridge) 14108, 14116 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7530 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9419 (iv).

Trackmen on I. C. R., Wages Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14087 (vi).

Transportation Commission, Sir Wm. Van Horne's Views, &c. (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).

Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14475 (vi).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9152 (iv).

Beith, Mr. R., *Durham W.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Bowmanville) 511 (i).

Beland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Chicoutimi and North-eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. (B. 168) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10224 (v).

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342. (iii).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 118) 1°*, 1643 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12337, 12505, 12567 (v); on M. for 3°, 13947 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com.. 7508 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14418 (vi).

Dom. Gas Improvement Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 1193 (i).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8246 (iv).

Federal Oil Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 367 (i).

G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. (Mr. *Monk*) that Committee not properly constituted and 'Debates' not being reported (ruling) 10633 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry., Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14849 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 758 (i),

Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3259 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Wade*) to conc., 8042 (iv).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 2° m., 1512.

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 3° m., 4869 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 1378 (i).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1318 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6809 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5864, 5868 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1023 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6302 (iii).

Ry. Debts. Bill: *See* 'Exchequer,' &c.

SUPPLY:

Post Office (letter carriers, salaries) 6027; (ry. mail clerks) 6027 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Ottawa post-office) 438 (i).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).

Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13796 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Lord Alverstone's Communication, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* 13671 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Alaskan Boundary Commission, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14819 (vi).
Amherst Postoffice, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 1591 (i).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4249 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay of Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14193 (vi).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°*, 11170 (v).
Auditor General and Civil Service Bill (remarks) 13811 (vi).
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6360 (iii).
Budget, The, 1907 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5053, 5074 (ii), 5432 (iii).
Canadian Mail via New York, Tons, &c. (Ques.) 10713 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co. Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4367 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) 267 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 368 (i).
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13740 (vi).
See : Supply—Agriculture.'
Chamberlain, Mr.: *See* 'Militia Act.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13811 (vi).
Clergue Co. and Govt. Contract *re* Steel Rails (remarks) 14098 (vi).
Commanders of Govt. Steamers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).
Conciliation Boards, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3628 (ii.)
Conciliators, Settlement of Labour Disputes, &c. (Ques.) 4003 (ii).
Customs Act (Surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3076 (ii).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 583 (i).
Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 3, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to ref. to Sel. Com., 3003 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6913 (iii).
Electoral Lists, N.S., Changes *re* Printing, &c. (Ques.) 8331 (iv).
Financial Review (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y. 30, N. 68) 14642 (vi).
Fire at Mortimer & Co.'s, Govt. property destroyed (Ques.) 4836 (ii).
Fishing within Three-Mile Limit, Guysboro, N. S. (remarks) 4179 (ii).
Govt. Rys. Act Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12583 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Names of Commanders, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Order for Com., 4132 (ii); in Com., 5167 (iii); on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9784 (iv), 11213, 11243, 11368, 11936, 11991 (v); on M. for 3° (Amt.) 12772 (vi).
———Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13287 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order, 13286 (vi).
See 'Ry. Policy.'
Halifax Marine and Fishery Offices, Resolution of City Council, Tel. (read) 14279 (vi).
House of Commons, Clerks, &c.: *see* 'Civil Service B.'
Hurley, Mr. (remarks) 13744 (vi).
Hydraulic Dredge, Mar. Provs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13319 (vi).
Hydraulic Leases, Yukon Ter. (M. for cor.*) 288 (i).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6577 (iii).
I.C.R., Free Transportation, Names, &c. (M. for ret.) 2337 (i).
General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3687 (ii).
——— Lorne Siding, Ry. Traffic, &c. (Ques.) 2918 (ii).
——— Rates for Cattle and Coal, &c. (Ques.) 1857 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 2338 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 3712 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7975 (iv).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).
Labour Disputes, Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 4003 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8213 (iv).
Librarians of Parlt., Salary B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13833 (vi).
Lime Rock, N.S., Postmaster, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).
Mail *via* New York : *see* 'Can. Mail,' &c.
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, sent from H. of C., 14536, 14574 (vi).
Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5995 (iii).
Militia Act. Amt. and Mr. Chamberlain's Suggestions (remarks) 6540 (iii).
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 186 (i).
Minto, Govt. Steamer, Passengers, &c. (Ques.) 3631 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 12811 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Nova Scotia Bank, Customs Duty *re* Safe (remarks) 13988 (vi).

N. S. and Can., Financial Terms, &c. (Ques.) 3001 (i).

Parliamentary Librarians : *see* 'Librarians.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep. Distribution, &c. (remarks) 879 (i).

Pugwash, N.S. Lighthouse-keeper (Ques.) 1856 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidies B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14696 (vi).

'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134 (ii).

Railway Policy of Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7121 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14370 (vi).

Railway Subsidies *re* Provinces, &c. (remarks) 14687 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11028 ; in Com. (N.S.) 11809 (v).

Safe purchased by Bank of N. S., Customs Duties *re* (remarks) 13988 (vi).

Scotch Hill Station, Pets, *re* (Ques.) 872 (i).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6494, 7214 (iii).

Springhill, N.S., Armouries, Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 1856 (i).

Steel Rails : *See* 'Clergue,' &c.

Supplies for I. C. R. : *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 258.'

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (census, Coté's circular) 4661 ; (general statistics) 4429 (ii).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes) 12585 (v) ; (public dept) 14204 (vi).

Civil Government ; Customs (salaries) 325 (i).

Customs (preferential tariff) 3937 (ii).

Excise (adulteration of food, &c.,) 5389 ; (analysts, &c.) 5389 (iii).

Fisheries (fish-breeding establishments) 4175 ; (fishways) 4174 (ii).

Geological Survey (Bell, Dr. appnmt.) 6818 ; (explorations, &c.) 6818 (iii).

Indians : Mar. Provs. (schools) 6414 (iii).

Inland Revenue (wood alcohol) 241 (i).

Legislation : H. of C. (sessional clerks) 14113 (vi) ; (voters' lists) 5276 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers, salaries) 4132 ; (Montreal pilot commission) 4173 ; (St. Lawrence navigation) 4159 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6000 (iii) ; (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14250 (vi).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590 ; (Art Gallery) 12589 ; (Mining Institute) 12591 (vi.)

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4078 (ii).

Post Office (arrears of salaries, postmasters) 5922 ; (Dawson and Eagle City) 5923 ; (salaries, &c.) 5924 (iii).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works : Buildings, N.B. (St. John drill hall) 13044 (vi) ; Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 982 (i) ; (ventilation of Chamber) 13007 ; Quebec (hospital for trachoma) 14245 ; (military iron foundry) 14247 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176 ; N.S. (Drumhead breakwater) 1083 ; (Glace Bay) 1094 ; (Meteghan Cove) 1137 (i) ; Ont. (Port Arthur dredging) 13021 (vi).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2680 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917.

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3700 ; (Lévis accommodation) 3703 (ii) ; (New Glasgow freight shed) 14096 ; (Pictou accommodation) 14088 ; (rolling stock) 14101 ; (steel rails) 14098 (vi) ; (Stellarton accommodation) 8299 (iv).

Yukon Ter. (govtl. expenses) 6802 (iii).

Tariff Policy of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4912 (ii).

Thanksgiving Day, Adjournment (remarks) 13379.

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3497 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, Free Representations, &c. (Ques.) 5990 (iii).

——— Hydraulic Leases, &c. (M. for cor.*) 288.

——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 5242 (iii).

——— Tel. from Dawson Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 1195 (i).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796 (ii).

Voters' Lists, N.S. : *See* 'Electoral.'

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1044 (i).

Yukon, Hydraulic Leases : *See* 'Hydraulic.'

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *E. Simcoe.*

Alaska, Str., Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 6629 (iii).

Ashcroft-Barkerville Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Bayfield, Str., Reps. of Mr. Evans and others (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5742 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7379 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) 12761 (vi).

Brunet, Arthur and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., &c., 108 (i).

Cane Bros., Timber License, &c. (Ques.) 2757 (ii).

Collingwood Dock, Estimated Cost (remarks) 5871 (iii).

Collingwood Harbour Dry Dock, &c. : Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4016 (ii).

Cutler, Gore Bay Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 2308.

Cutler, Spanish Mills, &c., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2308 (i).

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserves, Complaints *re* trespassing (Ques.) 7914 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 895; in Com., 902 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3007, 4679 (ii).

Georgian Bay Islands, Timber Licenses, &c. (Ques,) 2757 (ii).

Grain Importation through Western Lake Ports (Ques.) 97 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9198 (iv); in Com. on B., 10607, 11372, 11871, 12076; on M. for 3°, 12761; (amt.) 12767 (v).

G. T. Pacific Bill, Pets., *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13268, 13276 (vi).

Grant, J. G., Barrie, Customs Collector, Sureties, &c. (Ques.) 5991 (iii).

Huron Judgeship, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt (remarks) 207, 215 (i).

I.C.R., Stations, Restaurants, Fire Protection, &c. (Ques.) 14663 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7925, 7970 (iv).

Judges appointed from Local Bar: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10765, 10771; in Com. on B., 11420 (vi).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8089 (iv).

Longford, Output of Wood Alcohol, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7918 (iv).

Mail Bags, Repairs, &c., in Aurora, Remarks in Com. of Sup, 6139 (iii).

Midland Water Front *re* Lease to Pratt & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanations, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 173 (i).

Moose Deer Point Islands, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

Newmarket Office Specialty Co., *re* Personal Explanation (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).

Orillia Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

Ottawa Supply Co., *re* P.O. Contracts, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

Pratt & Co., Lease of Water Front at Midland: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5294 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11564 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5779 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11467, 11611, 11617, 12294 (v).

Ronan, W. and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sales, &c. (Ques.) 2502 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Action (remarks) 12719 (vi).

Soulanges Canal, Stewart *vs.* King (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).

Standard Chemical Company, Purchase of Wood Alcohol, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i) 5363 (iii).

Stewart *vs.* King, Litigation Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, cost, &c.) 4816; (census, Cote's circular) 4667; (Simcoe census) 4825: (Diamond Baker Lumber Co.'s exhibit) 4613; (St. Louis exhibition) 4612 (ii).

Canals—Peterborough (lift lock) 12927 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7556 (iii).

Civil Government: Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 207; Railways (salaries) 340 (i).

Customs (Midland collector) 3912; (salaries) 3911 (ii).

Dom. Lands (inspector's expenses) 6768; (land guides) 6768 (iii).

Electric Light (inspectors) 5408 (iii).

Excise (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373; (Standard Chemical Co.) 5373; (wood alcohol) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5285; (Collins, inspector, &c.) 5131; (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5131; (steamers, &c.) 5283; (water front lease, Midland) 5294 (iii).

Indians: Generally (legal expenses) 6419; Man., &c. (agricultural implements) 6423; (medical attendance) 6329; N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 6348; (supplies) 6423; Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6339; (survey reserves) 6410; Que. (Waby trial) 6419 (iii).

Inland Revenue (excise examinations) 5363; (Standard Chemical Co.) 227 (i), 5363 (iii).

Justice (Regina jail, land purchase) 5135 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5735 (iii).

Militia (Martineau investigation) 3753; (Valleyfield strike) 3593, 3754 (ii).

Post Office (jubilee stamps) 6060; (mail bag repairs) 6139; (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6146 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (Rossland armoury) 13133; (Rossland P.O.) 13131; (Vancouver P. O.) 13132 (vi); **Dom.** (Orillia, caretaker) 1016; Generally (armouries) 968 (i); **N.B.** (Marysville) 5835 (iii); **N.W.T.** (Macleod, court house) 959; (Red Deer, court house) 960 (i); **N.S.** (Arichat) 5827; (Guysborough) 5839; (Middleton armoury) 5841 (iii); **Ont.** (Alexandria P.O.) 488 (i); (Deseronto P.O.) 13112 (vi); (Midland) 5832 (iii); (Orillia armoury) 968; (Orillia, caretaker) 1007, 1016 (i); (Oshawa P.O.) 13110, (vi); (Owen Sound) 5832 (iii); (St. Mary's P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie P.O.) 13107; (Wingham P. O.) 13122 (vi); **Ottawa** (caretakers, &c.) 982; (census building) 990; (elevators) 1012; (furniture, &c.) 973; (rentals, &c.) 990; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1006; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 998; (Royal mint) 345 (i); (steel shelving) 13088 (vi); (telephones) 1014 (i); **Que.** (Acton Vale P.O.) 13059 (vi); (L'Assomption) 429 (i); (Longueuil P.O.) 13069; (Magog P.O.) 13081 (vi), (Montmagny) 5842 (iii) 13066; (St. John's;

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

examining warehouse) 13069; (St. Louis de Mile End, P.O.) 13080; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi); Yukon (White Horse, P.O.) 13133 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1164; (Caraquet wharf) 1175 (i); (Miscou, wharf) 13234; (Petit Rocher, breakwater) 13234; **N.S.** (Fort Lawrence pier) 13181; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182; (Grand Narrows, wharf) 13198; (Indian Harbour, wharf) 13199; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 13201; (McKay's Point, wharf) 13201; (Middle river dam) 13202; (Morrison's Point wharf) 13203 (vi); (New Harbour) 1143 (i); (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi); (Tiverton breakwater) 1149; (West Baccaro channel) 1151 (i); **Ont.** (Blind River wharf) 13235; (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bruce Mines) 5911 (iii); (Collingwood, improvements) 13239 (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland, wharf) 13239 (vi); (Goderich harbour) 1367 (i); (Gore's wharf) 13244 (vi); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Midland harbour) 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246; (Parry Sound, wharf) 13248; (Port Arthur, dredging) 13012 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3368 (ii); (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431 (i); (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254; (Victoria harbour) 13255; (Wiarton, wharf) 13256 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallee pier) 1517; (Murray Bay wharf) 2268 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3310 (ii).

Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13365 (vi).

Railways and Canals: Generally (litigation expenses) 12912 (vi); I.C.R. (Chapman ball-bearing apparatus) 8283 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7520 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7277 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry., Govt. Policy, &c. (Ques.) 2308 (i).

Transportation Commissioners and Tariff Inquiry (remarks) 855, 862 (i).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13365 (vi).

Trent Canal Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2319 (i).

Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ques.) 284 (i).

Wood Alcohol manufactured at Longford, Output, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Wood Alcohol, Purchase, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i) 5363 (iii).

Yukon Stenographers, Appnmt. of Mr. J. A. Valiquette (Ques.) 4005 (ii).

Bernier, Hon. M. E., (Minister of Inland Revenue) *St. Hyacinthe.*

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 881 (i).

Chabot, Mr. F. X., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2015 (i).

Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. (B. 187) 1°*, 3708; 2° m., 4007 (ii).

Bernier, Hon. M. E.—*Con.*

Excise Taxation, Revenue for 1896 and 1903 (Ans.) 14284 (vi).

Grain Weighing in Man and N.W.T. in Com. on B. 188 (remarks) 4189 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act. Amt. (B. 186) 1° *, 3708; in Com., 4007 (ii).

Inland Revenue Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

Milk Can Bill: *See* Weights and Measures B. 20.

O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory (remark) 13979 (vi).

Postal Scales Bill: *See* Weights and Measures B.

Standard Chemical Co., Purchase of Wood Alcohol, Remarks in Com. of Sup. 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (salaries) 227 (i).

Electric Light (inspectors) 5407 (iii).

Excise (adulteration of food, &c.) 5389; (analysts) 5389; (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5381; (grain weighing machines) 5382; (inspectors' salaries) 5381 (iii) 13974 (vi); (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373 (iii); (Prescott, salaries) 13968; (salaries *re* C. S. Act) 13967 (vi); (Standard Chemical Co.) 5373; (tobacco stamps) 5373; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373, 5404; (wood alcohol) 5373 (iii).

Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., shortage guarantee) 5405, 5407; (excise examinations) 5363; (Ferguson, Mr., legal services) 5412; (Guay, Mr., compensation, &c.) 5407; (Keilty, Mr., appnmt.) 5365, 5378; (Kelly, Mr., refund, &c.) 5404; (minor revenues) 5404; (Montreal office, reimbursement) 5405 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Que. (St. Hyacinthe) 440 (i).

Tobacco Duties collected, 1902 (Ans.) 2104 (i).

Tobacco, Duty on raw Leaf, &c. (Ans.) 446 (i).

Trottier, Louis M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8488 (iv).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2340 (i).

——— (Postal scales) Amt. (B. 188) 1°*, 3708 in Com., 4009, 4187, 4189 (ii).

Wood Alcohol, Purchase, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup. 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Bank of Montreal Co.'s (B 72) 1°*, 814 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of (prop. res.) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition (B. 133) 1° m., 2014 (i), 2° m., 3286 (ii).

See 'Supply-Excise.'

Companies, Incorporated Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 1193 (i).

Dom. Burglarly Guarantee Co.'s Change of Name (B. 92) 1°*, 1193 (i).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3581 (ii).

Imperial Co.'s incorp. (B. 71) 1°*, 814 (i); in Com., 3170 (ii).

Incorporated Companies (B 94) 2° m., 3257 (ii).

Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507.

Bickerdike, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4459 (ii).

Montreal Savings Bank incorp. (B. 153) 1°*, 2501 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6109 (iii).

Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 113) in Com., 3225 (ii).

Shipping Federation of Can. incorp. (B. 93) 1°*, 1193 ; 2° m., 1328 (i).

SUPPLY :

Excise (cigarettes analysis) 5394 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7594 (iiii).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3483 (ii).

Birkett, Mr, Thos., *Ottawa.*

Blind River Wharf, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 1298 (i).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 189) 1°*, 3864 (ii); in Com. 7479; 3° m., 7485.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12335 ; (amt.) 12349, 12370, 12500 ; (amt.) 12510, 12570 (v) ; 13812 (vi).

Geological Museum, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 11188 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10216 (iv).

Nepean Point Improvement, &c. (Ques.) 11829 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6808 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5859 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4168 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4093 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings—Ottawa (electric lighting transformers) 5844 (iii) ; (geological museum) 352 (i) ; (post office elevator) 5844 (iii) ; (Royal Mint) 347 (i) ; (steel drawers, &c.) 13087 ; (Victoria museum) 14244 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen & Co.'s Deposit, 6969 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7319, 7361 (iii).

Binder Twine, Cost in 1901-2, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).

——— Names of Purchasers (Ques.) 3798 (ii).

——— Prices for current year, &c. (Ques.) 203 (i).

See 'Supply—Justice.'

Blankets, Web Cloth, &c., purchased by Govt. (Ques.) 10101, 10714, 10954 (v).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10732 (v).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).

Bruce Mines Shed, architect : *See* 'Gordon,' &c.

Budget, The, 1785 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5853 (iii).

——— (remarks *re* Irish butter) in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).

Cable Press Despatches from England : *See* 'British Cable.'

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).

Census Expenditure (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 13699 ; Neg. (Y. 35 ; N. 69) 13759 (vi).

Census Schedules, Halton, Cardwell and Peel for 1891 (Ques.) 6894 (iii).

Census Schedules, 1891-1901, Questions *re* Peel, Halton, &c. (Ques.) 11425 (v).

See 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c., 'Halton,' &c.

Civil Servants, Interference in Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3169 (ii).

Compulsory Voting. *See* 'Dom. Election B. 3,'

Criminal Code Amt. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).

Country Postmasters' Salaries : *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

Crown Tailoring Co., Toronto, Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup , 6152 (iii).

Cummings, James, Payments to, by Govt. (Ques.) 9458 (iv).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3053, 4038 (ii).

Debates Translators, Rental of Offices, &c. (Ques.) 3799 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13594 (vi).

Doukhobors, Pilgrimage, Govt. Action, &c. (Ques.) 1030 (i).

Dredges, New, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 1856.

Election Printing in *Advocate*, Prince Albert, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

Fishing Industry of N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13165 (vi).

German Goods, 'Teapot,' Importation under Preferential Tariff (remarks) in Customs Act Amt. B., 3056 (ii).

Gordon & Hellowell, Architects, *re* Bruce Mines Shed (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 5914 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9495 (iv) ; in Com., 10709, 12100, 12280 (v) ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12724 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13273 (vi).

——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14650 (vi).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Halton, Cardwell and Peel, Census Schedules (Ques.) 6436 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).

——— *See* 'Census.'

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928 (iv).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10774 (v).

Kelly, Wm., Census Account, &c., Letter *re* (read) 13705 (vi).

Census Commissioner for N. Hastings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).

Latour, L. J., Leave of Absence, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8214 (iv).

Lunenburg Co., Assistance to Fishermen, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vi).

Macpherson, D. F., Census Enumerator: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).

Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9351 (iv).

Maps, Printing and Publishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

Milk Can Bill : *See* 'Weights,' &c.

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12325 (v).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2718 (ii).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13627.

Postmasters Bonds and Insurance Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

Postmasters in Rural District, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 5863 (iii) 14039 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5863 (iii).

Post Office Insurance Fund, Rep. (remarks) 14660.

——— *See* 'Supply—Postoffice.'

Post Office Savings Bank Defalcations, &c., in Com., of Sup., 14655 (vi).

Press Despatches B.: *See* 'British Cable, &c.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Talbot*) 3127 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B.21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3737 (ii), 6101, 6256 (iii).

——— (Supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B.258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12969 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14380.

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11623, 12293; (Toronto) 11742 (v).

St. Peters and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi); (census enumerators) 4646, 4820; (census, land, &c.) 4638; (census schedules) 7054 (iii); (Clinton, census, &c.) 4820 (ii); (cold storage) 7626; (creameries, N. W. T.) 7633 (iv); (exhibitions, furniture, &c.) 4604; (exhibition, Treadgold exhibit) 4612; (experimental farms) 4553; (Japan exhibition) 4635 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7647 (iv).

Canals: Farran's Point (acetylene gas plant) 14155 (vi); Galops (deepening, &c.) 8268 (iv); Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (O'Leary's claims) 14651; Welland (mitre sills lowering) 14148 (vi).

Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (salaries) 231 (i).

Customs (Bracebridge custom house) 3960; (contingent expenses) 3897; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3958; (legal expenses) 3963; (linseed oil fraud) 3934; (preferential tariff) 3945; (salaries, &c.) 3897 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (tree culture) 6779 (iii).

Excise (methylated spirits contract) 5378; (Standard Chemical Co.) 5378 (iii).

Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658 (vi).

Immigration (expenditure) 6868; (Lake St. John Col. Co.) 6888; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6848; (U.S. agents) 6848 (iii).

Indians: B. C. (expenditure generally) 7266; (industrial schools) 7256; (surveys, &c.) 7269; Generally (legal expenses) 6416; N. W. T. (supplies) 6425; (Stewart, E., travelling expenses) 6416; Yukon (education) 7274 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7764, 7772; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7764 (iv).

Interior (Amos Barnes, claim) 6924; (Banff museum) 6927; (Howie, F. W., legal expenses) 6795 (iii).

Justice: Miscellaneous (Statutes, Revision) 14643 (vi); (Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3515 (ii).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268, 14652 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour buoys) 13638; (Marconi stations) 13641 (vi); (St. Lawrence route, insurance) 5761 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 13680 (vi); (Can. and S. Africa) 5879 (iii) 7749; (G. B. and Can.) 7728; (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7738 (iv).

Miscellaneous (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14268, 14652 (vi); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6986; (Martineau defalcations) 6991; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6969 (iii); (Post Office Savings Bank, defalcations) 14655 (vi).

N. W. M. Police (Yukon) 5005 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, supplies, &c.) 4061, 4104, 5039 (ii); (life-saving awards) 13544; (masters and mates examination) 13531 (vi).

Post Office (box rents, &c.) 6139; (country postmasters) 6053; (mail service) 6065, (superannuations) 5932; (supplies, &c.) 6151 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (Rossland, P. O.) 13161; (Vancouver, P. O.) 13132 (vi); Dom. (heating, &c.) 1065; Generally (Brampton armoury) 966; (experimental farms) 973 (i); N.B. (St. John drill hall) 13051 (vi); N.S. (Arichat) 5829; (Guysborough) 5840 (iii); (Sydney Mines) 13028; Ont. (Belleville, armoury) 13083; (Guelph, armoury) 13084, 13085; (Hawkesbury, P. O) 13119; (Oshawa, P. O.) 13111; (St. Mary's, P. O.) 13110;

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

(Sarnia, P. O.) 13117; (Stratford, armoury) 13125; (Windsor, P. O) 13113; (Woodstock, armoury) 13125 (vi); **Ottawa** (census building) 993 (i); (coal sheds) 13117 (vi); (furniture, &c.) 980 (i); (gas, &c.) 5845 (iii); (heating, &c.) 1010; (lighting, &c.) 974 (i); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1006; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 997 (i); (steel shelving) 13089; **Que.** (Acton Vale, P.O.) 13063; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13071; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 13059; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13068; (St. Johns, examining warehouse) 13069; (St. Johns, P. O.) 13060 (vi); Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978 (ii);

Dredging (new dredges) 2674 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Esquimalt, graving dock) 5919 (iii); Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3365 (ii); **N.B.** (Dipper Harbour, breakwater) 13233; (Hopewell Cape, wharf) 13234; (Petit Rocher) 13234 (vi); **N. S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1069 (i); (Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217; (Chegoggin, pier) 13179; (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Frudes Point, wharf); 13180; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1088 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13188(vi); (Green Cove, harbour) 1100; (Grand Narrows wharf) 1094 (i); (Iona, harbour) 13200 (Jeddore, wharf) 13179; (Margaretville, breakwater) 13202; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203; (Middle River, dam) 13202; (Morrison's Point, wharf) 13203 (vi); (Neil's Harbour) 1140 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Poirierville, wharf) 13205; (Port George, breakwater) 13210 (vi); (Port Hawkesbury) 1147 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13209; (Porter's channel) 13206; (Prospect, wharf) 13205; (St. Ann, wharf) 13203; (Spry Bay, wharf) 13213; (Swim Point, wharf) 13211; (Victoria beach wharf) 13216; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13314; **Ont.** (Amherstburg dredging) 13235; (Barry's Bay) 13236; (Blind River wharf) 13236; (Bronte, improvements) 13236 (vi); (Bruce mines) 5912 (iii); (Cumberland wharf) 13239 (vi); (general repairs) 1374; (Orillia wharf) 1377; (Petewawa Narrows) 1443; (Pickering harbour) 1377 (i); (Port Arthur) 3344 (ii); (Port Credit) 13251 (vi); (Wendover wharf) 1438 (i); **Que.** (Cacouna wharf) 5897 (iii); (dredging plant) 2674 (ii); (Grande Vallee pier) 1533; (Murray Bay wharf) 2268; (Pointe St. Pierre) 2278 (i); (Rivière du Nord) 5909 (iii); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2260 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3311 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration and awards) 13339; (Ottawa river surveys) 13342 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2698; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2679 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, B.C. (Alberni Clayoquot) 5918; (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5827(iii); Generally (Marconi system) 2712 (ii); N.W.T. (Alexander Indian agency) 5918 (iii); (Wood mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi); Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii); (Belle Isle) 2712 (ii); (Yukon, construction) 14042 (vi); (Yukon) 2994 (ii).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5501; (Rutherford, Dr., duties, &c.) 5509 (iii); (small-pox) 5010 (ii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways: I.C.R. (air brakes, &c.) 8287 (iv); (car shops machinery) 14106 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7523 (iii); (Miramichi bridge) 8308 (iv); (Moncton locomotive works) 14090 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8312; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Rivière du Loup yards) 8310; (rolling stock) 8294 (iv); (sidings, additional) 14060, 14107 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8302 (iv); P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14108; (Murray Harbour branch) 14120 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7761; (international customs bureau) 7760 (iv).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276, 7286 (iv).

'Teapot,' German, purchased in N.W.T.: *See* 'German,' &c.

Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9421 (iv).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Web cloth, blankets, &c. (Ques.) 10410 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i).

Wood Alcohol, purchased, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).

See 'Supply—Excise.'

Yukon, Mail Deficit, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).

Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *St. John City.*

Alberton Ry, Station, P.E.I. (Ans.) 2503 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1510 (i).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Subsidy, Claims, &c. (remarks) 3201 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation (explanation) 6736 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14440 (vi).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5068 (ii).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Canadian Freight Classification, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

——— O.C., *re* (remarks) 3302 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Securities B. 209 (prop. Res.) 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5101 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; in Com., 5589, 5786,

Canadian Northern Ry. Co., Ret. *re* Estimate of Cost laid on Table, 5052 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3227, 3982 (ii).

C. P. Ry. and Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ans.) 2306 (i).

C. P. Ry. Expenditure for Rolling Stock, 1902-3 (Ans.) 2311 (i).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5556 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*
Canal Employees, Wages, &c. (remarks) 2303 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Appnmt. of Geo. Robertson (Ans.) 668 (i).
——— Names, &c. (Ans.) 875 (i).
——— Rep. to Govt. (Ans.) 669 (i).
——— Rep., &c. (remarks) 1199 (i).
——— Withdrawal of Mr. Robertson, &c. (Ans.) 1034 (i).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Charlottetown P. E. I. Ry. Station, &c. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).
Commercial Travellers, Fares, &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5680 (iii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Election B.'
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1325 (i) 3237 (ii).
Demurrage on Cars, I.C.R., collected, &c. (Ans.) 3672, 4959 (ii).
Dixon, F. A., Chief Cor. Clerk, &c. (Ans.) 5319 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13609, 14425 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3007 (ii).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578, 3982 (ii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 293, 615 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5139 (iii) 7823 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8406; ('Senator Cox cannot wait') 8410 (iv).
G. T. Transcontinental Ry. and Govt. Subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 675, 1031 (i).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental.'
Hamilton Electric Light, &c., Power, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3803 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Agreement, &c., Amt. paid (Ans.) 2758 (ii).
——— Contractor's Name, &c. (Ans.) 2584 (ii).
——— Preparation of Contract (Ans.) 4444 (ii).
Hudson's Bay, Change of Name B. 173 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 1°, 2795 (ii).
Immigrants for Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 1855 (i).
I. C. R. and G. T. R. Terminal Facilities at Bonaventure, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).
——— Traffic Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).
I. C. Ry., Coal Rates (Ans.) 6167 (iii).
——— Demurrage Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 4672, 4952 (ii).
——— Free Passes, Names, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337 (i).
——— General Statement, on M. for Sup., 3633 (ii).
——— Gross Earnings, Interim Reps., &c. (Ans.) 4445 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 3538 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*
I. C. Ry., Locomotives, Cars, purchased, &c. (Ans.) 4361 (ii).
——— Lorne Siding (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
——— Official Guide, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3535 (ii.)
——— Ouelle River Spur Line, &c. (Ans.) 541 (i).
——— Private Cars (Ans.) 2309 (i).
——— Rates for Live Stock and Coal, &c. (Ans.) 1857 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Pottinger, on M. (Mr. *Haggart*) for Copy, 3806 (ii).
——— Scotch Hill Station (Ans.) 872 (i).
——— Sussex, N.B., Roundhouse, Gates, &c. (Ans.) 4673 (ii).
——— Trackmen's Wages, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).
——— Traffic Rates, on Inquiry for Papers, 3712 (ii).
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3301 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 932 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 873 (i).
Lévis Land Purchase, I.C.R., Payment, &c. (Ans.) 3631 (ii).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2512.
Lorne Siding, I.C.R., Ry. Traffic, &c. (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
Man. and N. W. T. Ry. Co.'s Land Subsidies granted by Govt. (Ans.) 1197 (i).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Ministerial Changes, on Mr. Tarte's Resignation (explanation) 145 (i).
——— on Mr. Blair's Resignation (explanation) 6736 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (*Mr. Fielding*) in Com., 4454 (ii).
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 6080 (iii).
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (*Mr. Lemieux*) in Com., 3222 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston & St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (*Mr. German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
O'Leary Station, P.E.I., Branch Line (Ans.) 6168 (iii).
P.E.I. Ry., Sale of Tickets (Ans.) 2503 (ii).
——— Total Cost, Misrepresentation, &c. (remarks) 1680 (i).
Private Cars, I.C.R., &c. (Ans.) 2309 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4206 (ii).
Pugwash, N.S., Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 1856 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14728 (vi).
Railway Accidents, Duties of Public Officials (Ans.) 1032 (i).
——— Investigations, &c. (remarks) 1331 (i).
——— Loss of Life (Ans.) 873 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 561 (i); (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c. (agreed to Y. 99: N. 53) 565 (i).

Railway Act (Consolidation) Amt. (B. 21) 1° m., 244 (i) on M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591, 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728, 4743 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5561, 5680, 5765, 6071, 6173, 6206, 6273 (iii), 8139 (iv).

——— Conference with Senate *re* Amts. to B. 21 (remarks) 14763 (vi).

—— (telephones) 5534 (iii).

Railways and Canals Deptl. Rep. (presented) 92.

Ry. Commissioners' Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv).

Ry. Land Grants voted by Parlt., &c. (Ans.) 1678 (i).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546 (i).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14440 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies, Interest payable, &c. (Ans.) 3971.

Ry. Subsidies in Land and Money in Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 1677 (i).

Ry. Subsidies (money) paid by Govt. in Provs. (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Ry. Subsidies paid by Govt. since Confederation (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Ry. Subsidies voted and paid, 1901-3 (Ans.) 2306.

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 5892 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (N.B.) 11812 (v).

Resignation as Minister: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Scotch Hill Station, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 872 (i).

Semaphore Lights, P.E.I., Discontinuance, &c. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 452 (i).

Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2584 (ii).

South Shore Ry., Complaints *re* Safety (remarks) 206 (i).

——— Working of, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 450 (i).

Station Agents, P.E.I., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 4361.

Steel Rails, Contract, Price, &c. (Ans.) 285 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Railways (salaries) 333 (i).

Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (St. John and Belfast) 7733 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (St. John quarantine water service) 419 (i).

Railways: I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3699; (general statement) 3633; (Levis accommodation) 3703; (original construction) 3698; (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii).

Telephone Cos. in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2585 (ii).

Ties on Govt. Rys., Importation, &c. (Ans.) 1679.

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii), on M. to resume adjnd. deb., 6198 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Application for Govt. Aid, &c. (Ans.) 1026 (i).

——— Contract with Govt. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).

——— (personal explanation) 2794 (ii).

——— Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 672 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., G. T. P. R., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 447 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., Proposals to Govt. (Ans.) 874 (i).

——— *See* G. T. P. Bill.

Treadgold Concessions, Appmnt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2863, 4513 (ii).

——— Appmnt. of Commission (remarks) 3878.

Trent Canal, Hastings and Trenton, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 129 (i).

——— Surveys at Rice Lake, on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2317, 2327 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2345 (i).

Welland Canal Water Power and St. Catharines Board of Trade, &c. (Ans.) 668 (i).

——— O. Cs. *re* (Ans.) 1859 (i).

West Lorne Accident, Commissioners (Ans.) 6168 (iii).

——— Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 5088 (ii).

——— on inquiry for Rep., 5242 (iii).

——— Verdict, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).

White, Albert S., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4673 (ii).

Windsor Junction Ry. Accident, Papers laid on table, 3712 (ii).

Winter Communication with P. E. I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1048, 1053 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick W., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *Kings, (N.S.)*.

Blankets, Web Cloth, &c., Dates of Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 10954 (v).

Brigade Camp, Sussex, N.B. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

Canadian (3rd) Mounted Rifles, Medals, &c. (Ans.) 1675 (i).

Can. S. A. Constabulary, Attestation, Discharge, &c. (Ans.) 14287 (vi).

Cartoons in *Military Gazette*, &c. (Ans.) 2103 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646 (iii).

Dixon, Capt., Rep. *re* S. Africa War (Ans.) 7914 (iv).

Dundonald, G.O.C., Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2404 (i).

Fishery Guardian, J. M. DesRoches, Alleged Fraud, &c. (Ans.) 10955 (v).

G. O. C. Commanding, Rep., &c., Suppression of (Ans.) 670 (i).

Gordon Highlanders' Trophy (remarks) 7253 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co., Par. in *Globe*, 5894 (iii).

Hutton, Maj. Gen., on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 207 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*
King's S. A. Medals, Pet. from N.C.Os., &c. (Ans.) 10491 (v).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Payment of Militia, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3802 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. and Mr. Chamberlain's Suggestions (remarks) 6540 (iii).
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction (Ans.) 669 (i).
Militia Deptl. Rep. (presented) 283 (i).
Militia Pay and Allowance, General Statement in Com. of Sup., 13379 (vi).
Militia Pensions Act Amt. (B. 78) 1°m., 872 (i); and in Com., 2°m., 1116, 2240 (i).
Militia Reserve at Port Moody, &c. (Ans.) 447.
Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville (Ans.) 8616 (iv).
Military Stores, Erection of Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13055 (vi).
Mills, Mr., Annapolis, Claims against (Ans.) 6167 (iii).
Ninety-fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (iv).
Permanent Corps Officers, Qualifications, Certificates (Ans.) 4443 (ii) 6434 (iii).
Permanent Force, Increase of Pay (Ans.) 13372 (vi).
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades, &c. (Ans.) 3234 (ii).
'Ragging' in the British Army, on M. for Sup., 3132 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Royal Canadian Regiment, Strength, &c. (Ans.) 3802 (ii).
St. Johns Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 12497 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Action (remarks) 12718 (vi).
——Par. in 'Star' *re* Militia (remarks) 12939.(vi).
S. A. Constabulary, Complaints *re* Grievances, &c. (Ans.) 1028 (i).
S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, Reinstated, &c. (Ans.) 1027 (i).
——Medals, Regulations, &c. (remarks) 8319.(iv).
———Pensions to Canadians (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
———Saddles and Bridles (Ans.) 1675 (i).
See 'Canadian,' &c.
Springhill Armouries, Caretaker, &c. (Ans.) 1857 (i).
Sussex Armoury, Construction, &c., Overseer's Qualifications (Ans.) 8332 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Militia (salaries) 221 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 3603; (Association grants) 3767; (contingencies) 3778 (ii); (Cook *vs.* Cole, costs) 6950; (coronation contingent) 6950 (iii); (defence scheme) 3763 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (Esquimalt defences) 3778; (G. O. C.) 3781 (ii); (Hamilton drill hall) 6949 (iii); (Martineau commission) 3585, 3752; (Military college) 3778; (military stores branch) 3608; (pay and allowance) 3584 (ii); (pay and allowance general statement) 13379 (vi); (paving streets, Winnipeg barracks) 6949 (iii); (properties) 3611; (Toronto, drill shed) 3618; (transport and freight) 3752; (Valleyfield strike) 3587, 3753 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (armouries) 970 (i); Man. (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13127; N. B. (military buildings) 13041; (St. John, drill hall) 13043; N. S. (Middleton, armoury) 970 (i); N. W. T. (Strathcona Horse, barracks) 13130; Ont. (armouries, generally) 13084; (Belleville, armoury) 970 (i) 13082; (Military College, Kingston) 13094; (Toronto, drill hall) 13086; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086 (vi); Ottawa (desks, &c.) 986; (Royal Mint) 346 (i); Que. (citadel, drill shed) 13056 (vi); (L'Assomption) 430 (i); (military buildings) 13054; (Montreal, barracks) 13076; (Quebec, drill hall addition) 13077; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Kingsport, pier) 1103 (i).
Tents for N. W. Mounted Police, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3804 (ii).
——— *See* 'Woods,' &c.
Transcontinental (Can.) Ry., Representations *re* Military Purposes (Ans.) 541 (i).
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Payment of Militia (Ans.) 13371 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia,' &c.
Veterans, Pet. *re* Indemnity for Military Service (Ans.) 11189 (v).
Volunteers Man. and N. W. T., Land Scrip, &c. (Ans.) 820 (i).
Woods, J. W., Amount paid for tents, &c. 5764 (iii).
——— *See* 'Tents,' &c.

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*
Address, on The, 23 (i).
Colonial Conference, 25; Conference between Colonies, 24; Discrimination by Germany, 29; Relations with Newfoundland and French Shore Question, 30; Alaska Boundary, and Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, 31; Naval Reserve, 36; Transportation Question, 37; Tariff Revision, 38; Chinese Immigration Policy, 39 (i).
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6637 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Award, Alleged Interview with Mr. Aylesworth (remarks) 13667, 13958 (vi).
——— remarks *re* Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).
——— Alverstone, Lord, Criticism *re* Award, 13958, 13963 (vi).
——— Alverstone, Lord, Telegram (remarks) 13806 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Bond-Hay Treaty, Inquiry for Papers *re* (remarks) 878 (i), 14521 (vi).

——— convention respecting (remarks) 480 (i).

——— Notice of Remarks, 14765 (vi).

——— Official Information, Cor., &c. (remarks) 14521 (vi).

——— Mr. Sifton's Telegram *re*, 14530 (vi).

——— Protest of Canadian Commissioners, Cor. *re*, 14689 (vi).

American Cattle purchased for British Govt., Par. in Montreal *Gazette*, 5414 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4244 (ii).

Apples, Canadian Packing, &c., on Ques. of Order, 11185 (v).

Arsenault, Capt., Compensation for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5966 (iii)

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. *re* Debts, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 155, 14771 (vi).

Atlantic Fast ss. Service (remarks) on Notice of M., 13948 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., &c. (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 14159; (Neg. Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

Requirements of present age, 14159; average time from Can. to G.B. 9, 10 and 11 days; forty years ago, logs of Str. *Asia*, stmt. of mercantile journal, 14159; records, &c. 14159; Sir Chas. Tupper's contract, 1896, 14161; Petersen, Tate & Co.'s tender, 1896, 14161; Allan's contract, Sir Wilfrid's reasons for non-acceptance, 14161; Toronto speech of Sir Wilfrid, 'Economical Govt.,' 14162; deposit returned to Petersen & Co., 14163; unpopularity, &c., 14164; prophecy, 14165; 21-knot service, no 2nd class service, 14166; New York route supplying boats, 14166; Govt. not enthusiastic, inspiration in Ottawa *Free Press*, 14167; tenders from Allan and British North Atlantic ss. Co., 14168; development of western country, willing to assist in giving aid, 14169; freight carried, 14169; cost of building, 14169; negotiations for short periods, 14170.

Atlantic Fast Service, Govt. Policy (remarks) 4007 (ii).

——— Tenders, &c. (remarks) 3882, 4120, 4445 (ii).

——— Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
See "Supply—Mail Subsides", &c.

Atlantic, North Trading Co.'s Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

——— *See* 'North.'

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11163 (v).

——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 13258 (vi).

——— Inquiry for Cor., &c., 11427, 11692 (v).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N. W. T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 884 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Autonomy of the N.W.T. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

——— O.C.'s, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 2778 (ii).

——— inquiry for ret., 5083 (ii).

——— Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6891 (iii).

——— Return *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 256,' &c., 'Provincial,' &c.

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6365 (iii)).

Binder Twine Bounties Res., on Ques. of Order, 7305 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6757 (iii).

——— (remarks) 6522 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) 12758. vi

Bopp, Mr., German Consul, Cor. with Germany and Dom. Govt. &c. (remarks) 12218 (v),

——— *See* 'Budget,' &c.

B.C. Canners: *See* 'Salmon,' &c.

B.C. Statutes, Disallowance of, &c. (M. for O.C.'s, &c*) 706 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i).

——— (M.) to print cor., 2675 (ii).

Brunet, Arthur and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., O.Cs., &c., 106 (i).

Budget, The, 1462 (i).

Prosperity of Canada and former declarations of ministers, 1463; imports and exports, 1476, 1491; taxation, former utterances by ministers, 1465; expenditures, comparisons with former govts., 1468; per capita expenditure, 1470; capital and revenue expenditure of different depts., 1471; Public debt, 1472; surpluses and former utterances of ministers, 1473; Colonial Conference, Mr. Chamberlain's speech *re* preference, 1480; post office revenue, letter carrier's salaries, 1483; I.C.R. 'alleged' surplus, 1483; trade negotiations with other countries, 1484; cor. with Herr Bopp, &c. (remarks) 1484; German surtax former amt. *re*, 1485; Preferential trade, attitude of Govt., 1487–1490; tariff revision, 1493; policy should be, 1494; Canada as an agricultural country, adequate protection, 1495, 1500; and relations with U.S., 1496; fiscal policy of govt. and free trade utterances, 1498; protection to the farmers, 1500; protection to Can. industries, 1501; tariff relations with U.S., 1502; Res. *re* tariff policy 'adequate protection,' 1503; editorial of N.S. paper *re* coal duty, 1503 (i).

Budget, The,—Report of Winnipeg Speech *re* Agricultural Implements, 2192 (i).

——— Amt., Neg. (Y. 54; N. 107) 2235 (i).

Business of the Hse., Announcement *re* Further Govt. Business (remarks) 13667 (vi).

——— (remarks) 1110 (i), 3794 (ii),

——— Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Late Sittings (remarks) 3207 (ii).

——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4347 (ii).

——— on M. to take in Mondays, 3708 (ii).

——— Procedure on Order Paper (remarks) 2302.

——— Suppl. Estimates (remarks) 4957 (ii).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5062 (ii).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial Explanation.'
Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8234 (iv).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian-German Fiscal Policy, Cor. with Herr Bopp (remarks) 12218 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4371, 4398, 4999, 5091, 5111, (ii), 5590, 5788 (iii).
C. P. R. Lands Exempt from Taxes in Man. and N. W. T. (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5557 (iii).
Capital Cases, Commutation of Sentences, &c. (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4591 (ii).
Cargill, Henry, late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 12938 (vi).
Carlin, Peter J., Postmaster at Whitney Pier, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 130, 668 (i).
Carver *vs.* King, Commutation, &c., Reps. *re* (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) 267 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Rep., &c. (remarks) 1199 (i).
——— *See* 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Census, &c. (remarks) 13672 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture, Census, &c.'
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5960, 6201 (iii).
Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 601 (i).
Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3191 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12505, 12539 (v).
Civil Service (superannuation) Act Amt. B. 49 in Com. on prop. res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 594 (i).
Clayton-Pulwer Treaty, Cor., &c., Inquiry for Papers *re* Alaskan Boundary, 14521 (vi).
——— *See* 'Alaskan,' &c.
Colonial Conference, Rep. *re* (remarks) 3632 (ii), 7923 (iv).
Columbia River Improvement Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. *Galliher*) on Sen. Amts., 6894 (iii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Election B. 3.
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7492 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3045, in Com. on B., 4010; on M. for 3°, 4187 (ii).
——— B. 273 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 14757 (vi).
Dawson Board of Trade, Communication *re* Treadgold Concessions (read) 1024 (i).
——— *See* 'Treadgold,' &c.
Debates, Official (remarks) 6 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Desjardins Canal B. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4213 (ii).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) 13683 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 899; in Com., 907 (i); (compulsory voting) 13584; on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to dischg. Order, 14769 (vi).
——— Govtl. Intention (remarks) 12218 (v); 12719 (vi).
——— B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 95, in Com., 635, 1115; (objection) 945 (i).
——— B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com., 1064 (i).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6440 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3023, 3036, 4680 (ii).
Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).
Election Law, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12218 (v).
——— *See* 'Dom. Election Bills.'
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8244 (iv), on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 93; in Com., 620 (i).
Farquharson, Mr., Decease of (remarks) 5513 (iii).
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
Ferries, Control of, in Com. of Sup., 13697 (vi).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6538; in Com., 6896, 6910 (iii).
Fishing Industry, N.S., Harbour Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vi).
See 'Privilege,' &c.
France and Canada, SS. Service (telegram read) 4957 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt, B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3820 (ii).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).
General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).
German Consul Bopp, Cor. with Can. Govt., &c. (remarks) 12218 (v).
German Surtax, in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).
——— *See* 'Customs Bills,' 'Budget,' &c.
'Gerrymander' Bill: *See* 'Representation B 66.'
Good Shepherd Reformatory B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 4178; in Com., 4842 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1114 (i).
——— Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).
——— Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).
——— Redistribution Bill (remarks) 204 (i).
——— *See* 'Business,' &c.
Govt. Ry. Policy (remarks) *re* Delay, 7298 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Grain Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 13807 (vi).

Grain Standards, Samples *re* &c. (remarks) 11180 (v).

Grain Weighing in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4189 (ii).

——— *See* 'Automatic,' 'Weights and Measures,' 'Man. Grain B.' &c.

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii); in Com., 5137 (iii); 7816, 7842; on M. for 3°, 8059 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Bill Subsidy 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8961; on M. for 1°, 7697; 'Alternative Policy,' 8988, 8994, 9005 (iv); in Com. on B., 11190, 11204, 11240, 11263, 11308, 11395, 12075; in Com. (Amts.) 11833, 11890; in Com. (Amt. *re* securities 11959, 12015 (v); on M. for 3°, 12612; (amt.) 12642; Neg. (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690; on M. for 3°, 12755, 12770; on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Bill, Pets. *re* Authenticity, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Privs. and Elections Com., 13267 (vi).

——— (remarks) 13559 (vi).

——— Meetings of Com.. (remarks) 13671 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to read Affidavits, Ques. of Order 14846 (vi).

G. T. P. Ry. Bill, Customs Duties, Legal Opinions (read) 11337 (v).

——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399, 8086 (iv).

——— Plans presented (remarks) 8082 (iv).

——— Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 14765 (vi).

Halifax Common, Rights of City, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).

Halifax Museum, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).

Halifax P. O. Employees, Pet. *re* Salaries (remarks) on Conc., 14759 (vi).

Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4587 (ii).

Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks(in Com. of Sup., 13764 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).

——— (remarks) 1057 (i).

Hides Inspection: *See* 'Gen. Inspection B. 48.'

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 782 (i).

Huron, Erie and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1131 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Imperial Conference Cor., Can. Govt's. Refusal, &c. (remarks) 9457 (iv).

——— Report *re* (remarks) 3632 (ii) 7923 (iv).

——— *See* 'Alaskan,' &c., 'Colonial,' &c.

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2385 (i), 2788 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927, 930 (i).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928 (iv).

——— on M. for Sup. (remarks) 4040 (ii).

——— (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

——— Tariff Protection (notice of amt.) 3864 (ii).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).

Judges of N.W. Ters. Act. Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 12610 (vi).

Judges of Provincial Courts B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11406 (v).

Judges of Provincial Courts and Sup. Courts, Quebec (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 11821 (v).

Judges Retiring Allowances B (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8093 (iv).

Judges of the Superior Court (Retiring Allowance) B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 93 (i).

Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 94 (i).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 2778 (ii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 955 (i).

Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Cor., 100 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8197 (iv).

Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).

Librarians of Parlt., Salary B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res. 13832 (vi).

Lt. Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administration (remarks) 112 (i).

Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2349 (i).

Long Lake & Sas. Ry. Surveys: *See* 'Supply—Dom. Lands.'

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2676 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Privs. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8048 (iv).

Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1586 (i).

Lumber Trade in B.C., Tel. from Manufacturing Industry *re* U.S. Duty, &c., Importations, 14766 (vi).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Stmnt. *re* Certain Rooms in H. of C. (remarks) 14530 (vi).

———Forwarding, &c. (remarks) 14569, 14682 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Threats to Express Cos. (remarks) 14851 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8005 (iv.); on Sen. Amts., 13624 (vi).

Man. Judgeship, Delay of Appnmt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).

Man. School Lands, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).

Marconi System of Wireless Telegraphy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com. 5098 (ii).

Master and Mates B. 226 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6544 (iii).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand) 5720 (iii).

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) in Com., 1117 (i).

Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures B. 20.

Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of (remarks) 2794 (ii).

Mining Cos. Incorporation B. (remarks) 14850 (vi).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 148 (i) 6757 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).

Ministers, Reduction in Number of Depts.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5417 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt. Governor of Ontario, Decease of (remarks) 1578 (i).

——— *See* 'Lt. Gov.,' &c.

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14595 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779 (vi).

Newspaper Despatches from G. B.: *See* 'Cable,' &c.

Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6428 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

———Inquiry for Papers, 13667, 13933 (vi).

N.W. Ter. Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 13856 (vi).

——— Govt. Financial Aid B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12843 (vi).

——— Naturalization Returns (M. for Stmnt.*) 3804 (ii).

——— Prov. Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com,, 2719 (ii).

Order in the House (remarks) 12723 (vi).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452, 6807.

Pacific Cable, Concessions by Australia to Eastern Tel. Co. (remarks) 2675 (ii).

B

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Pardons, Preogative of His Ex., &c., on M. (Mr *Casgrain*) for Ret., 567 (i).

Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14857.

——— *See* 'Sessions,' &c.

Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3625; in Com., 4213, 4676 (ii).

Peggy's Cove Lighthouse, Retirement of Geo. Swinehammer (Ques.) 2312 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and *Le Canada* Canvassing (remarks) 13985 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261 (iv).

Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4177 (ii); in Com., 6456 (iii).

Pension for S. A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14595 (vi).

Petersen, Tate & Co., Ref. to in Deb. on Atlantic Fast ss. Service, 14159 (vi).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., on Res., 12782; on M. for 2°, 12984 (vi).

——— *See* 'Shipping,' &c.

Posters, Indecent, Handbills, Exclusion, &c., in Com, on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14676 (vi).

Postoffice Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5657; in Com., 5667 (ii).

Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'Cable,' &c.

Private Bills, Pets.: *See* 'Rules,' &c.

Privilege, Ques of (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) *re* 'Outskirts of Civilization,' Ques. of Order, 13374 (vi).

——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11565 (v).

Provincial Autonomy, Further Cor,, &c. (remarks) 7296 (iii).

——— in N.W.T. (M.) to print ret., 5582 (iii).

——— Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii).

——— *See* 'Autonomy.'

Public Accounts Com., Addition of Name (M.) 3431 (ii).

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4204 (ii).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4221 (ii).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com.. 14749 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. *Power*) in Com., 4586 (iii).

Questions by Members, Answers *re* (remarks) 544 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).

——— Consolidation Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 245 (i); in Com., 2599, 3714, 3746, 3841, 3886, 3974, 3985, 4128, 4564, 4693 (ii); 5699, 5770, 6076 (iii), 8131 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13835 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14520 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr, *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2786 (ii).

——— (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1060 (i).

——— (supplies for Govt. rys.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12946 (vi).

Ry. Debts B.: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2545 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14514, 14735; (auditing by Aud. Gen.) 14516; (location of rys., &c.) 14514; (payments, &c.) Suggestions *re* Safeguarding (remarks) 14512; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14515 (vi).

Ry. Mail Clerks, &c., in Com. on Postoffice Bill, 5667 (iii).

Ry. Mail Service, N. W. T., Overcrowding of Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5933 (iii).

Railway Policy of Govt., Delay in bringing down (M. to adjn. Hse.) 7109 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies voted for 1900, 1901, 1902 (remarks) 12805, 12843, 13005 (vi).

Rainy River Mail Service, Tel. (read) 6889 (iii).

Redistribution B.: *See* 'Representation B. 66.'

Reformatory Prisons, B. 221 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8087 (iv).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 715; on M. for 2°, 1207, 1265; on Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1290 (i); in Com., 11439, 11589; (Dauphin) 11759; (N.S.) 11793; (Quebec) 11793; (Toronto) 11695; (Waterloo) 11645; on M. for 3°, 12481 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 11618 (v).

——— Evidence laid on Table, &c. (remarks) 11423 (v).

——— N.B., Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Pugsley, 941 (i).

——— P.E.I. and N.B., Cor. respecting (remarks) 876 (i).

——— Printing of Amendments, &c. (remarks) 11423 (v).

——— Schedules, Maps, &c. (remarks) 877 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5413 (iii).

——— Complaint *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

Rules, Revision, &c. *re* Pets. for Private Bills, 4441 (ii).

St. Chrysostome Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 6999 (iii) 13303, 13377 (vi).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4589 (ii).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 3298 (ii); in Com., 6920 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Salmon Industry, B.C., Tel. from Fraser River Canners Ass'on (read) 9970 (iv).

Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).

Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Govt. Proposals (remarks) 12717 (vi).

——— and Militi a(remarks) 12941 (vi).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 467 (i).

——— *See* 'Parliament.'

Settlers' Claim *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Com. of Sup., 13954 (vi).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12802; in Com. on B., 12994; on M. for 3°, 13560 (vi).

——— *See* 'Safety' &c.

Sorel, Deep Water Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12845 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours, &c., Quebec.'

South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8267 (iv).

S. A. War, Purchase of Supplies by Imp. Govt. (M. for copies of O. Cs., &c.) 2760 (i).

——— *See* 'Hay and Oats,' &c.

Stanley and *Lansdowne*, Strs., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 13519 (vi).

Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 13667 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6543; in Com. on B. 6916 (iii).

——— B. 237 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12777 (vi).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7029 (iii).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7204 (iii).

Stuart, Capt. D. C.: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture,'

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 250,' &c.

Supply Bill in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5996 (iii).

——— (remarks) *re* Prop. Res., 6003 (iii).

Supply Bill, 218, in Com., 6170 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, &c.) 4643, 4801; (census tabulators) 4656; (dairying branch) 4671; (Japan exhibition) 4626; (Stuart, Capt., dismissal, &c.) 4353 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (electric stations by-wash) 12906; (tow paths) 12907 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Finance (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 225 (i); Geological Survey (Low, Mr., salary) 13771; (salaries) 13770 (vi); Gov. Gen's Office (salaries) 207; Indian Affairs (salaries) 274; Inland Rev. (salaries) 227 (i); Interior (clerical assistance) 13769 (vi); (salaries) 268 (i), 13762; (Mines branch, salaries) 13763 (vi); Justice (salaries) 212 (i); N. W. Mounted Police (Drake, E. F., salary) 13761; (salaries) 13761 (vi).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3782 (ii); (salaries, overtime) 13985 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13955 (vi); (boundary delimitations) 6790; (homestead entries) 6773; (homestead inspectors) 6767; (inspector's expenses) 6766; (Long Lake and Saskatchewan ry. survey) 6941 (iii); (salaries, outside service) 13773 (vi); (surveys) 6939 (iii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 13776; (tree planting) 13775 (vi).

Electric Light (inspectors) 5407, 5410 (iii).

Excise (Montreal office, reimbursement) 5405; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5404 (iii).

Fisheries (fishery officers salaries) 5122; (lobster factories inspection) 5122 (ii).

Geological Survey (metallurgical, salaries) 13778 (vi); (plans, plotting, &c.) 6826 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6709; (repatriation, &c.) 6709 (iii).

Indians—B. C. (medical attendance) 13785; (salaries) 13785; Man. and N.W.T. (surveys, &c.) 13784; N.S. (land purchase) 13781 (vi).

Inland Revenue (Mr. Bourassa, shortage) 5408 (Mr. Ferguson, legal services) 5412; (Mr. Kelly, refund) 5406 (iii); (wood alcohol) 231 (i).

Interior (Amos Barnes, claims) 6923; (astronomical observatory) 6793; (astronomical work) 6790; (Banff museum) 6927; (Liard River miners, relief) 6926 (iii).

Justice, Administration of (Ad Hoc judges allowances) 3402; B.C. (judges travelling allowances) 3399; Exchequer Court (Admiralty, accommodation) 3408; (Admiralty registrar) 3408; Man. (judges' travelling allowance) 3399; Miscellaneous (prisoners in N.W.T.) 3399 (ii); (Statutes, Revision) 14644 (vi); N.B. (divorce court) 3400; Supreme Court (law books) 3405; (library) 3402; (Yukon law books) 3506; (police magistrates) 3422; (sheriff Eilbeck, salary) 3410; (stenographers) 3411; (travelling allowance) 3409.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str., &c.) 5746 (iii); (St. Lawrence route) 4157 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 5997 (iii), 7606 (iv), 13673 (vi); Can. and S. Africa) 7752; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756; (Grand Manan and mainland) 7742 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str.) 6003 (iii); Magdalen islands) 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi); Manchester and Montreal) 7745; (P. E. I. and G. B.) 7744; (P. E. I. and mainland) 7742 (iv); (P. E. I. and Newfoundland) 13676; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13695; (St. John, N. B. and Glasgow) 13674 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740 (iv); (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 13695; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677 (vi); (Victoria and San Francisco) 7741 (iv).

Militia (Cooke *vs.* Cole, costs) 6951 (iii); (Valleyfield strike) 3759 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13958; (Canadian Mining Institute) 13965 (vi); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984; (naturalization Act, expenses) 6952; (Petersen, Tate & Co., deposit) 6953 (iii); (salaries) 13966 (vi); (unforeseen expenses) 6952 (iii).

N.W.T., Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6946 (iii); (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 4116; (Govt. steamers, repairs, supplies, &c.) 4074 (ii), 13519; (masters and mates examination) 13524 (vi); (meteorological service) 4118; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4114 (ii).

Post Office (Halifax) 6004; (P. E. I. winter service) 5943; (ry. mail clerks) 5933; (salaries) 5924 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (architect's staff) 962; (armouries) 967; (clerks of works) 963; (heating, &c.) 1065; (lighting) 1067; (water supply) 1067 (i); N.B. (Moncton, P.O.) 13038; (St. John, immigrant shed) 13040; (quarantine station, water service) 13041; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13041 (vi); N.W.T. (courthouses, &c.) 958; (Dom. buildings, repairs) 959; (Macleod, court-house) 959; (Yorkton, court-house) 961 (i); N.S. (Halifax, custom house) 13031; (Halifax immigration shed) 13033; (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 13030 (vi); (Middleton armoury) 969 (i); (Sydney Mines) 13028; (Sydney, post office) 13035 (vi); Ont. (Alexandria, P.O.) 488 (i); (Belleville, armoury) 13082; (Brantford, drill hall) 13108 (vi); (Clinton, P.O.) 518, 528 (i); (St. Catherines drill hall) 13106; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13110; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086; (Toronto, P.O., addition) 13101; Ottawa (additional rooms) 13007 (vi); (census buildings) 992; (elevators) 1011; (heating, &c.) 1009; (lighting) 1012; (Major's Hill park) 1015; (repairs, &c.) 987; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996 (i); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 13087; (steel shelving) 13093; P.E.I. (Charlottetown, Dom. Buildings) 13036; Que. (Acton Vale, P.O.) 13061; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13076; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 13058; (Montreal, postal station) 13081; (Quebec, drill hall) 13078; (citadel drill shed) 13054, 13056; (military buildings) 13054; (St. John's, P.O.) 13050; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi).

Dredging (new dredging plant) 2673 (ii).

Generally (transportation facilities, Port Colborne) 13024.

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 13304 (vi); Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3358; Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); N.B. (Arsenault, Capt., compensation) 13231; (Campbellton wharf) 13005; N.S. (Abbott's harbour) 13141 (vi); (Amagandus wharf) 1068; (Bailey's Brook wharf) 1072 (i); (Baxter's breakwater) 13143; (Baxter's Cove) 13143; (Bayfield wharf) 13141; (Big harbour wharf) 13143 (vi); (Big Pond wharf) 1073 (i); (Breton's Cove) 13153 (vi); (Campbellton wharf) 1142; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1079 (i), 13178 (vi); (Digby pier) 1083; (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Economy wharf) 1087; (Fort Lawrence pier) 1087 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay wharf) 1087 (i), 13184 (vi); (Grand River entrance) 1094; (Green Cove harbour) 1100; (Herring Cove breakwater) 1102 (i); (Janvrin's Island wharf) 1102 (i); (Jeddore, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Judique, breakwater) 1103; (Kingsport pier) 1103; (Lingan beach) 1105; (Lunenburg harbour) 1110; (Margaree wharf) 1133; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Necum Teuch wharf) 1137; (New harbour) 1145; (Ogden's Pond) 1145; (Petit de Grat) 1146; (Port George breakwater) 1146; (Port Hawkesbury) 1146; (Sandy Cove breakwater) 1149; (Short Beach breakwater) 1149 (i); (Summerville wharf) 13213; (Swim's Point wharf) 13211; (Tenecape breakwater) 13213 (vi); (Three Fathoms harbour) 1149 (i); (Victoria beach wharf) 13215; (Wallace harbour) 13216 (vi); (Washabuck wharf) 1150 (i); (Wentworth wharf) 13216 (vi); (West Bay wharf) 13217 (vi); Ont. (Belle Rivière) 1191 (i); (Kingston graving

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
dock) 13023; (Midland) 13248 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3344 (ii); (Port Arthur dredging) 13012; (Port Perry) 13249 (vi); **Que.** (Bonaventure East breakwater) 13446; (Cacouna wharf) 13448 (vi); (Chateauguay river) 3210 (ii); (Grand Valley pier) conc., 6070 (iii); (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Lake St. John dredging) 13459; (Lotbinière wharf) 13460 (vi); (Magdalen islands) 2265 (i); (Maguasha pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Mistook wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay wharf) 2266, 2270 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13465 (vi); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279; (Rivière du Loup, wharf) 2281 (i), 13476; (Rivière Verte) 13471 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3308 (ii); (St. Louis river) 13474; (Sacre-Cœur wharf) 13479 (vi); (Sorel wharf) 2296 (i); (Sorel deep water wharf) 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi); (Touladie river) 2287 (i).
Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (Art gallery) 2725; (surveys, &c.) 2724; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2663 (ii).
Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2695.
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2680 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 2992; (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2997; (N.W.T.) 2991 (ii); Que. (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332; (Petite Riviere, St. Agnes) 13334; (Ste. Anne de Saguenay) 13331 (vi).
Railways—Generally (Dixon, F. A.) 2730; I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3700 (ii); (Halifax accommodation) 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi); (Lévis accommodation) 3704 (ii), 7520 (iii); (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7760; (international customs bureau) 7760; (iron and steel bounties) 7762 (iv).
Unprovided Items, 6993 (iii).
Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 6940, 7282; (Lithgow, Mr., controller, &c.) 7287; (roads and bridges) 7286 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2366 (i).
Swinehammer, Geo., Light-Keeper at Peggy's Cove, Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 2312 (i).
Swing Bridges B.: *See* 'Navigable.'
Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt, (B. 262) in Com. on Res., 12800; in Com. on B., 12993.
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4931 (ii).
Tariff Negotiations with France, Telegram read, 4957 (ii).
Tarte, Mr., Resignation of: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9425 (iv).
Toronto Post Office, Tender of Mr. Coleman (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13101 (vi).
Trans-continental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 7697 (iv).
——— *See* 'G. T. P. R.'
Transportation Commission, &c. (remarks) 1199.
——— Formation, Personnel, &c. (remarks) 4727, (ii), 7206 (iii), 9819 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Transportation Commission, Further Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 9458 (iv).
——— Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3432 (ii).
——— Instructions, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).
——— Inquiry *re*, 4840 (ii).
Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 854 (i).
——— *re* Speech from Throne remarks) 3129 (ii).
——— Sir Van Horne's Acceptation (remarks) 7297 (iii).
Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 3298, 3303, 3713, 3872, 4727 (ii), 6638, 7297 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) Com of Sup., 2887 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4509 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Rep., 3397, 4840 (ii), 13134, 13258 (vi).
Treadgold Concessions and Dawson Board of Trade (remarks) 1024 (i).
Treadgold Concessions, Free Representations, Tel. *re*, 6427 (iii).
——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 4564 (ii).
——— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).
——— Representations, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).
——— Sec. 14, &c. (remarks) 4593 (ii).
——— Tel. from W. A. Beddoe, *re* Commissioner's Refusal to produce Files, &c. (remarks) 9818 (iv).
——— Tel. from Board of Trade *re* Scope (remarks) 8086 (iv).
——— Telegram *re* Charges (remarks) 9979 (iv).
——— Terms of Commission (remarks) 4120 (ii).
United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).
U. S. Coasting Laws, Regulations *re* Bonding Privileges (remarks) 13137 (vi).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Vankleek Hill Postal Service, Complaint *re*, on Conc., 14764 (vi).
Vegetables imported from the U. S., Duty collected at Toronto and Montreal (M. fo ret.*) 1058 (i).
Ways and Means *re* G. T. Pacific Survey, in Com., 14765 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2347 (i).
——— (scales for grain) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4189 (ii).
Whitney Pier Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 130 (i).
——— Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).
Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1056 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Wood Alcohol purchased from Standard Chemical Co.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).

Woodmen of the World B. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 1854 (i).

Woodstock Post Office, N.B., Inquiry for Ret., 4563, 4593 (ii), 5735 (iii).

Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, &c., in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 94 (i).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*

Address, on The, 75 (i).

Alaskan Boundary Commission, History of the Case, &c., 14773 (vi).

——— (remarks) 14764 (vi).

See 'Clayton-Bulwer,' &c.

Business of the House (remarks) 2395 (i).

Canadian Cattle Embargo in G. B. (M. for cor.*) 110 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4383 (ii).

Chambers of Congress Banquet, Speech of Gov. Gen. (Ques.) 10100 (v).

Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Abrogaton, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 109 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 7297 (iii).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. (translators), on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) 111 (i).

Dundonald, Earl, G.O.C., Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).

Fire Sufferers in Ottawa Valley, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3133 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup. 4768 (ii).

G.O.C.: *See* 'Dundonald.'

Gov. General's Speech at Chambers of Commerce Banquet (Ques.) 10100 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5145 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9666 (iv).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Gov., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 689 (i).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 763 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 289 (i).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2373 (i).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4329 (ii).

Militia Force, Condition, &c. on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5722 (iii).

Minto, Earl of, Speech at Montreal, 10100 (v).

Naval Reserve, &c., in Can., Cor. between G. B. and Can. (M. for copies*) 110 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 7298 (iii).

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Ottawa Valley Fire Sufferers, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3133 (ii).

Personal Explanation *re* Stock Gambling, 7204 (iii).

Procedure *re* Adjournment of House (remarks) 6634 (iii).

Speech of Gov. Gen.: *See* 'Gov. Gen.'

Stock Exchange Speculations (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).

——— (personal explanation) 7204 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2362 (i).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6669; (expenditure) 6616 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4945 (ii).

Veterans, Pet. *re* Indemnity for Military Services, &c. (Ques.) 11188 (v).

Boyd, Mr. N., *Macdonald.*

Assiniboine and Red Rivers, Navigation, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 12:8 (i).

Automatic Grain Weighers, N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 849 (i).

Business of the House (remarks) 5051 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5073, 5081 (ii).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4393 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 397 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *Wm. Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12367, 12532 (v).

Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3172 (ii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3280 (ii).

Fyfe, Mr., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5384 (iii).

Grain Weighing for Threshing in Man and N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. on Weights and Measures Act Amt. B., 4191 (ii).

See 'Automatic.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10076 (iv); in Com. on B., 10153, 12094, 12269 (v).

Immigrants, Accommodations for Settlers, Par in Winnipeg *Telegram*, 1119 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14233 (vi).

Man. and N. W. T. Senators, Increased Representation, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7992, 8004 (iv).

Man., Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 216 (i).

N. W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 263 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12320 (v).

Boyd, Mr. N.—*Con.*

N. W. Provincial Autonomy, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1296 (i).

Parliament, Date of Convening (remarks) *re* Delay, 462 (i), 14853 (vi).

Postmasters' Association of Man., Memorial *re* Salaries (remarks) 14026 (vi).

Postmasters' Salaries, Increase to Rural Offices (remark) 14026 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2465 (i).

St. Louis Exposition, Live Stock Exhibit, &c. (Ques.) 4837 (ii).

Schooley, W. F. Relief (B. 128) 1°*, 2100; 2°m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223 (ii).

——— (M.) to return Evidence to Senate, 3224.

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting (M.) 462 (i), 14853 (v).

Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13953 (vi).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reps., (remarks) 11824 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census schedules) 4636; (St. Louis, exhibition) 4608; (Treadgold exhibits) 4621.
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 216 (i).
Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5384; (liquor inspection) 5401 (iii).
Justice, Administration of—Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3423; (living allowances) 3418; (telegraph operators) 3418 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13536 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings, Man. (generally) 442; Ont. (rural mail delivery) 514; Que. (Thetford Mines) 442 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3211 (ii); Telegraph Lines (Yukon, working expenses) 14041 (vi).

Telegraph Operators—Yukon: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr, *Bernier*) in Com., 4187, 4191 (ii).

Brock, Mr. W. R., *Centre Toronto.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7330 (iii).

Book-keeping on G. T. R. & C. P. R.: *See* 'G. T. R.,' &c.

Butter Adulteration Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5851 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5635 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5886 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 844 (i).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3262, 3271 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6641 (iii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. (B. 15) in Com., 3239 (ii).

Brock, Mr. W. R.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. (B. 39) 1°*, 541; in Com., 1324 (i), 2779 (ii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3058, 3071 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 300 (i).

France and Can. ss. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12299 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9871; in Com., 10544, 11903, 12012, 12140 (v).

G. T. Ry. and C. P. R. Fiscal Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).

International Ry. Appliances Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 40) 1°*, 591 (i).

Irondale, Bancroft & Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14394 (vi).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).
See Toronto and James' Bay.

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8092 (iv).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2510 (ii).

Patent Act Relief: *See* 'International Ry. Appliances Co.'

Printing Bureau and Union Organizations, &c. (Ques.) 4179 (ii).

Railway Commission (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 14352 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 253 (i); in Com. (drainage) 4747 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2554 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14352 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) 14352 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Toronto) 11705 (v).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Grenville (guide pier) 12909 (vi); Trent (construction) 7551 (iii).
Customs (preferential tariff) 3946 (ii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6684; (U.S. agent) 6877 (iii).
Indians: B.C. (schools, industrial, &c.) 7259 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence route) 4155 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5881 (iii); (Can. and G. B.) 7600 (iv).
Public Works: Buildings—N. B. (quarantine station, drainage, &c.) 487; Ont., (Alexandria P.O.); (Bowmanville) 507; (Clinton P.O.) 526; (Ft. William) 636 (i); (Toronto, branch office) 5920 (iii); Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 985; (Royal Mint) 354; Que.: (L'Assomption) 427 (i).
Harbours and Rivers: B. C. (Esquimalt graving dock) 5919 (iii); N. B. (St. John river, wharfs) 1179 (i); Ont. (Bruce Mines) 5911; (Cobourg, repairs) 5909 (iii); (Port

Brock, Mr. W. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi); Que. (Cacouna wharf) 5896; (Grosbois Isle) 5903; (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Sorel wharf) 12849, 12869 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5905 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13349.

Telegraph Lines:—N.W.T. (Edmonton and Athabasca) 13335; (Wood Mountain Post) 13336; (Victoria to Andrews) 13335 (vi); Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii).

Railways: I.C.R. (general vote) 12884; (G.T.R. rental) 12889 (vi); (Ouelle river branch) 7526 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4880 (ii).

——Govt. Policy, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6684 (iii).

Textile Fabrics Inspection: *See* 'Customs,' &c.

Tilsonburg & Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14383 (vi).

Toronto & James Bay Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14358 (vi).

See "James Bay."

Transportation Commission, Appnmt. of, &c., (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 14352 (vi).

——(Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4241 (ii).

Budget, The, 2119 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5454, 5853 (iii).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canal Employees, Wages, &c. (remarks) 2303 (i).

Cattle Purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5478 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 839 (i).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14641 (vi).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for Com. on Res., 9394 (iv) Com. on B., 10702 (v); on M. for 3°, 12695 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 754 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10783 (v).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14543 (vi).

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom, Govt. (remarks) 14590 (vi).

S.A.War, Pensions by Govt.(remarks) 14590 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7616 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 492; (Morrisburg) 492 (i).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 540 (i).

St. Chrysóstome Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 158) 1°*, 2582 (ii); M. to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii); in Com., 7771 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Quebec (Chateauguay river) 3209 (ii).

Bruce, Mr. F. C., *Hamilton.*

Mutual Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 707 (i).

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7219 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Hamilton P.O.) 439; (Hamilton public buildings) 13113 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington channel) 1359; (Hamilton, dredging) 2638 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep-water wharf) 12857 (vi).

Bureau, Mr. J., *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7379 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 838 (i).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3537 (ii).

Fielding, Dredge, Plans, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 14283 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9906 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Sheds, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).

Public Debt, Amount of Decrease, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4173 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4093 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 988 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3217 (ii); (St. Maurice River) 2286 (i) 5904 (iii); (St. Maurice River, dredging) 13469 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2297 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 100) 1°*, 1295 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7362 (iii).

Birkett, Mr. T., M.P., Lease of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Brockville and North-west Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89) 1°m., 1193 (i).

Canadian Order of Woodmen of World (B.31) 1°*, 367; in Com., 1854 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 121) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Empire Accident and Surety Co.'s incorp. (B. 107) 1°*, 1378 (i); in Com., 2755 (ii).

Halton, Peel and Cardwell, Schedules for 1891-1901 (Ques.) 7092 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11584 (v).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 203) 1°*, 4727 (ii).

Calvin, Mr. H. A., *Frontenac.*

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11909 (v).

Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14657 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Galops (channel completion) 14645 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 (iii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *W. York, Ont.*

Business of the House, on M. to take in Mondays, 3710 (ii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6200 (iii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B., 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3113 (ii).

Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s (B. 27) 1°*, 367 (i).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360 (iii).

Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 13686 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. 14423 (vi).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Supt., 4792 (ii).

Grain Weighers: *See* 'Inspection.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12044, 12185 (v).

Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14312 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).

Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights and Measures Act.'

Mount Royal Savings Bank incorp. B. 153 (M.) to withdraw Bill, 10831 (v).

Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 210) 1°*, 5679 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3561 (ii), 6105, 6290 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14468 (vi).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11007, 11115; (Kent) 11580; (Toronto) 11701; (York) 11667; on M. for 3°, 12461 (v).

Sault Ste. Louis Light and Power Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 1462 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 5835; N.S. (Arichat) 5835 (iii); Ont., (post offices) 511; (rural mail delivery) 511; (Toronto Junction, post office) 651 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (St. John, accommodation) 14069 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 147) 1°*, 2396; in Com., 4868; M. for Com., 4672 (ii); Resuming adjnd. deb., 5555 (iii); in Com., 7812, 9419 (iv).

——— (remarks) on adjnd. Deb., 5555, 5883 (iii).

——— (remarks) 6105 (iii).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14468 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. (B. 20) 1° m., 203; 2° m., 2338 (i); on M. for 2°, 3245; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 205) 1°*, 5238 (iii).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief (B. 228) M. for Com., 9149 (iv).

Cargill, Mr. H., *E. Bruce.*

Animals Contagious Disease B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. on M. for Com. of Sup., 395 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10146 (v).

——— Remarks *re* Vote, (remarks) 10538 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephones, &c.) 5521 (iii).

Railways, Comparison of Different Systems (remarks in Com. of Sup., 12891 (v).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10940, 10998 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Touladie river) 2287 (i).

Railways—P.E.I. (book keeping) 12891 (vi).

Carroll, Hon. H. G. (Solicitor General) *Kamouraska.*

Binder Twine, Cost of in 1901-2 (Ans.) 447 (i).

——— Name of Purchasers (Ans.) 3798 (ii).

——— Prices fixed, &c. (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Duchesneau, Dr., Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 286 (i).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 925 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul, Resignation of Warden (Ans.) 286 (i).

Statutes Revision Commission, Names, Progress, &c. (Ans.) 1030 (i).

Carroll, Hon. H. G.—*Con.*
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2358 (i).
Tobacco Combine, Rep. of Commissioner (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Carscallen, Mr. A. W., *N. Hastings.*
Canadian Mint, Erection, &c. (Ques.) 10955 (v).
International Congress of Geology, Visit to Can. (Ques.) 8116 (iv).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8227 (iv).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G., (Minister of Trade and Commerce) *S. Oxford.*
Alaskan Boundary Commission, Opinion of Lord Alverstone, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 13671 (vi).
Allan Line Steamers, Rate of Speed (remarks) 13672 (vi).
Atlantic Fast Line, Tenders, &c. (remarks) 3882, 4727 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).
Binder Twine Inspection, Method of Inspection (Ans.) 14685 (vi).
——— Inspector Haycock, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5588 (iii).
Budget, The, 1596 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *Wm. Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12535 (v).
Commercial Agencies, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 4360 (ii).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels, Provisions (read) 13681 (vi).
——— (remarks) 7583 (iv).
France and Canada ss. Service Subsidy B. 252 (prop. res.) 10410; in Com. on Res., 11422; in Com., 12295 (v).
Grain Inspection Act (weighmasters) Amt. (B. 266) in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808 (vi).
Grain Inspection, Cost per Car, &c. (Ans.) 4837 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9622 (iv).
——— Pets. *re* Irregularities, Meetings of Com. (remarks) 13671 (vi).
Haycock, Joseph, Inspector of Binder Twine (Ans.) 4959 (ii).
Hides Inspector, Geo. Roy, Appmnt., &c. (Ans.) 3627 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties paid 1890–1903 (Ans.) 11556 (v).
——— *See* 'Supply—Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Japan Trade, Customs Duties *re* (Ans.) 8617 (iv).
Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i),
Murray Bay and St. Denis Wharf, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 10496 (v).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard—*Con.*
N. W. T., Provincial Autonomy (remarks) *re* Ret., 5088 (ii).
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 475 (i), 14858 (vi).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 11447 (v).
Rideau Canal Employés, Delay in Paying (remarks) 13302 (vi).
St. James Division, Electoral District (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Sessions of the House, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i), 14858 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Indian Affairs (salaries) 274 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 7573 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7763; (Man. Grain Act) 7762 (iv), 13698 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada; and G.B.) 5997, (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672 (vi); (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi); (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv); (freight rates, &c.) 7583 (iii); (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756; (Grand Manan and mainland) 7742 (iv); (Halifax and Canso) 6002 (iii); (Halifax and Liverpool) 7730 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str.) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi); (Magdalen islands) 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi); (Manchester and Montreal) 7745 (iv); (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 13694 (vi); (P. E. I. and G. B.) 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv); (P E. I. and mainland) 7741 (iv); (P. E. I. and Newfoundland) 13676; (St. Catharine's Bay and Tadousac) 13695 (vi); (St. John and Belfast) 7731; (St. John and Digby) 7739; (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7737; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740; (St. Stephen and Back Bay) 7759 (iv), 13695; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677 (vi); (Victoria and San Francisco) 7741 (iv); (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694; (wrecking plant) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Lake St. John, wharf) 2246 (i).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7760; (international customs bureau) 7760; (iron and steel bounties) 7762 (iv).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 92 (i).
Treadgold Commission, *re* Tel. from Dawson (remarks) 9980 (iv).
Trent Canal Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2321 (i).
Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ans.) 284 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. Th. Chase, *Montmorency.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 4224 (ii).
Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Elections Acts (M.) for Pets., O. Cs., &c., 101 (i).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bills, 483 (i).
———(Remarks) 2395 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G. B,, on M. for Com. of Sup., 385 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt, B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 95 (i).

Ellis, Dr., Immigration Medical Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).

Gaynor & Greene, Extradition (M. for copies of cor., &c.) 109 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12117, 12122, 12165 (v).
See 'Transcontinental,' &c.

Hides Inspector, Geo. Roy, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 3627 (ii).

I.C.R. River Ouelle Spur Line, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).

Judgeship offered by Mr. Dansereau to Conservative (remarks) 13806 (vi).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10760 (v).

Judges' Salaries, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 95 (i).

Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., Cor., &c. (M.) for copies, 98 (i).

Levis, Land Purchase for I.C.R. (M for O. Cs., &c.) 3806 (ii).

——(Ques.) 3631 (ii).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2505 (ii).

Patent Relief B. (remarks) 2397 (i).

Medical Examiner of Immigrants, Quebec (Ques.) 3536 (ii).

N.W.Ter. Act Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) 13855 (vi).

Orleans, Island of, Mail Service, &c. (Ques) 670 (i).

Pardons, Prerogative of His Ex., O. Cs., &c. (M. for ret.) 567 (i).

——Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 96 (i).
See 'Ticket of Leave,' &c.

Patent Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 97 (i).

Pilotage Act (Quebec and Montreal) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 3°, 13937 (vi).

Plains of Abraham and Military Parades, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

Quebec Harbour Pier, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).

Quebec Harbour, Wharf Construction, Contract, &c., Par. in *Le Soleil* (remarks) 2237 (i).

Railway Commission B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2594 (ii).

Ross Rifle Factory, Establishment at Quebec (M. for ret.*) 109 (i).

——Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2109 (i).

Royal Trust Co.'s (B. 103), 1°*, 1295 (i).

South Shore Ry. Working, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 449 (i).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4084; (tidal survey) 4115 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; Ottawa (geological museum) 363; (Royal Mint) 346; Que. (Lévis) 431; (St. Hyacinthe) 439; (Thetford Mines) 441 (i). Docks (commissioner's report) 2984; (Lévis graving dock) 2978; (Montreal dry dock) 2983 (ii).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers: Generally (dredges, repairs, &c.) 2632; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2632; Ont. (Port Arthur) 3351 (ii). Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2632, 2953 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Belle Isle station) 2990 (ii).

Ticket of Leave Act, Releases, &c. (M. for ret.) 566 (i).

——(Ques.) 96 (i),
See 'Pardons,' &c.

Transcontinental (Canadian) Ry., Representation *re* Military Purposes (Ques.) 541 (i).
See "G. T. P. R."

Translation of Parliamentary Papers, &c. (remarks) 545 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
See 'Supply—Public Works, &c.

Treadgold Concession (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95) 2914 (ii).

——Appnmt. of Commission (M. to adjn.) 3864 (ii).

——Appnmt. of Special Com. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4486, (amt.) 4498; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4516 (ii).

——(Remarks) 2394, 2424 (i).

Champagne, Mr. L. N., *Wright.*

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7513 (iii).

Debates, Official, Sel. Com. 1st Rep. (presented) 654 (i).

—— 1st Rep. Conc. (M.) 814 (i).

—— 2nd Rep. (presented) 939 (i).

—— 2nd Rep. (translator) Conc. (M.) 1111 (i).

—— 3rd Rep. of Com. Conc. (M.) 1764 (i).

—— 4th Rep. of Com. (presented) 1674 (i).

—— 4th Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 1936 (i).

—— 5th Rep. (M.) to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii).

—— 6th Rep. of Com. (presented) 7658 (iv).

—— 6th Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 7922; (Amt.) 9349 (iv).

—— 8th Rep. of Com. (presented) 12216 (vi).

—— 7th and 8th Reps., Conc. (M.) 14053 (vi).

Charlton, Mr. J., *N. Norfolk.*

Address, on The, 67 (i).

Alien (Restriction) Labour Act Amt. (B. 106) 1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i). 3282 (ii).

Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5874 (iii).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks) 12805 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7315 (iii).

Budget, The, 1643 (i).

Business of the House, Procedure on Order Papers (remarks) 2300 (i).

Charlton, Mr. John—*Con.*
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Elections B. 3,' &c.
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3268 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7503 (iii).
Divorce Court in Can. (prop. res.) 568; (M. wthdn.) 588 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 3) 1°*, 92; 2°m., 885; in Com., 905, 1200 (i); (compulsory voting) 13560 (vi).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6442 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3033 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8467 8489, (iv); in Com. on B., 10445, 10594, 11879, 11906, 12124, 12232, (v); on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 734 (i).
Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 948 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2508 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).
Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp, (B. 68) 1°*, 813 (i).
McDermid, Ellen Relief B. 229 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for Com., 9148 (iv).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Grant to, &c. (remarks) 12805 (vi).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c., on M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1305 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6453 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5864 (iii).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G.B. (remarks) 3221 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Lennox) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11562 (v).
'Ragging' in the British Army, on M. for Sup., 3130 (ii).
Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. (B. 2) 1°, 92; 2°m., 545; in Com., 550, 1059; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 700; 3°m., 1199 (i).
Ry. Act (supplies to I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. 12964 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11613; on M. for 3°, 12399, 12426 (v).
Salmon Industry, B. C., Complaint, &c. (remarks) 9972 (iv).

Charlton, Mr. John—*Con.*
Schooley, Wm. F. Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for 2°, 2305 (i); in Com., 3224 (ii).
Sessions of the Hse. Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 470 (i).
Snow Storms in N. W. T., False Reports (remarks) 11828 (v).
Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (ventilation of Chamber) 13009; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3459 (ii).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9149 (iii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11168 (v).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (vi.)
Bills of the Hse., Delay in Printing (remarks) 482 (i).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7319, 7359, 7383 (iii).
See 'Supply—Justice,' &c.
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10737 (v).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7425; on Ques. of Order, 7341 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).
Budget, The, 1681 (i).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Bridge Co. and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).
C.P.R. (Kirkella and Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14498 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 398 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 14758 (vi).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13755 (vi).
——— Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 289 (i).
——— Cost of (remarks) 205 (i).
——— Payment to Date, &c. (Ques.) 286 (i).
See 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c., 'Pub. Accts.' &c.

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).

Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup. 3189.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12502, 12552 (v).

Country Postmasters, Salaries : *See* 'Postmasters.'

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3094, 4012 (ii).

Customs Salaries, Montreal (Ques.) 8115 (iv.)

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

Dom. Elections Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 904 (i) ; (compulsory voting) 14425 (vi).

——— (B. 15) 2° m., 704, 1061 ; in Com., 1062 (i), 3237 (ii).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6442 (iii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 302, 616 (i).

Election Printing in Prince Albert *Advocate*, in Com. of Sup., 14653 (vi).

Ferries on Navigable Waters : *See* 'Navigable,' &c.

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14633 (vi).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6905 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7911 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9683 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10554, 10618, 10690, 11221, 11873, 11974, 12077 (v).

——— on M. to adjn. Debate (remarks) 8807 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets., 13265 (vi).

——— Surveys, Expenses, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14649 (vi).

Halifax and South-western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).

Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup. 3685 (ii).

International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7926, 7982 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).

ames Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Joggin's to Minudie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8104 (iv).

Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10743 (v).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Lake Superior, &c., Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).

Lambton Postmistress, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (ii), 14278, 14657 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

Lobster Factory in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1589 (i).

McNulty : *See* "Lambton."

Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14326 (vi).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, *re* (remarks) 14235 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).

Members Rights to speak on Questions before the Chair (remarks) 10535 (v).

Middleton and Victoria Beach, N.S., Ry. Subsidy in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12985 (vi).

Nepigon Ry, Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14396 (vi).

News Cable from England : *See* "British," &c.

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

N. W. Ters. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12319 (v).

Postmasters and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14679 (vi).

Postmasters' Salaries, Increase *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14032 (vi).

Post office Removal, Pet. *re* (remarks) 14661 (vi).

Post office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

Privilege, Ques., of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., "Grafters," 10529 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Meeting concurrently with Sittings of Hse. (remarks) 8334 (iv).

——— Producing Census Schedules, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7066 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14697 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14450 (vi).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3727, 4706 (ii) 6183; (telephones) 5535 (iii).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14321 ; (auditing books by Aud. Gen.) 14518 (vi).

——— (supplies for I.C R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12963 (vi).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c., Res. of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1894 (remarks) 14365 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10963, 11115, 11438, 11624; (Kent) 11567; (Toronto) 11744; on M. for 3°, 12419; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 12486 (v).

Revenue and Expenditure, Amount for 1903 (Ques.) 12715, 13370 (vi).

Ronan, W., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. John Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323.

St. John Valley, Fredericton to Woodstock Ry., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

St. Peters and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Sand, Indian Boy, adopted by Mr. Johnston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6473, 7212 (iii).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co's Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14325 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (aids to societies) 4432; (archives) 4429; (census) 4594, 4800; (census, cost, &c.) 4816; (census schedules) 4635 (ii), 7066 (iii); (classification of patents) 4433 (ii); (cold storage) 7088, 7623; (creameries, N.W.T.) 7632 (iv); (dep. minister) 4357; (exhibitions) 4600; (experimental farms) 4551; (fumigating stations) 4434; (general statistics) 4430; (health act) 4440; (imperial institute) 4436; (Japan exhibition) 4631 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7646 (iv); (prof. Shutt's rep.) 4556; (San José scale) 4434; (St. Louis exhibition) 4600; (Tracadie lazaretto) 4439; (Treadgold exhibit) 4614; (Washington, Mr., Rep., &c.) 4430; (*Year Book*) 4429 (ii).

Canals, Generally (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (toll collectors) 12929; Chambly (tow paths) 12906; Rideau (Hog's Back, swing bridge) 12904 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 332; (salaries) 323 (i); Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 235, 241; Interior (salaries) 271; Public Works (salaries) 333; Railways (salaries) 334 (i).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3783 (ii); (Dresden, port of entry) 3960; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3950; (salaries, &c.) 3909; (Walpole office) 3961; (Yukon expenditure) 3968 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Long Lake & Saskatchewan ry. surveys) 6941; (Teulon road) 6927 (iii).

Immigration (on ques. of order) 6855 (iii).

Indians (St. Regis lock-up) 6415; (Walpole islands) 6412 (iii).

Justice—Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3532; (Manitoba) 3534 (ii).

Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).

Miscellaneous (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14653 (vi); (arbitration, Dom. and

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—Con.

Provs.) 12590; (Micmac dictionary) 12592 (v); (naturalization act, expenses) 6953; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6957 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6947.

Ocean and River Service (St. Lawrence transportation) 4043 (ii).

Post Office (country postmasters) 6033; (Lambton postmaster, dismissal) 6166; (letter carriers, salaries) 6033; (mail bag repairs) 6148; (Ottawa Supply Co., &c.) 6148 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (architect's office) 961; (caretakers, &c.) 1018; (clerks of works) 964; **N.B.** (Richibucto) 412; (St. John, quarantine water service) 420; **N.W.T.** (Red Deer, court house) 960; **N.S.** (Halifax) 412; **Ont.** (Ft. William) 636; (renewals) 636; (Toronto Dom. buildings, renewals) 650; (Toronto post office) 957; (Toronto Junction post office) 650; (Wallaceburg) 505; **Ottawa** (astronomical observatory) 344; (Major's Hill Park) 1016; (Royal Mint) 351; (telephones) 1014; **Que.** (Grosse Isle) 426 (i).

Dredging (dredges, repairs) 2619 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665; (ii); (repairs, &c.) 1185; **N.B.** (Shippegan harbour) 1183; (Negro Point breakwater) 1182 (i); **N.S.** (Big Harbour, wharf) 13143; (Breton Cove) 13151 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102; **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185; (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1191 (i); (Pembroke, wharf) 13248; (Point Edward, dredging) 13249; (Sydenham river) 13250 (vi); **Que.** (Chateauguay river) 3209; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2644 (ii).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (clerical assistance) 2753; (engineers, salaries) 2726 (ii); (Ottawa river surveys) 13342 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2720; (temporary clerks) 2733 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2690.

Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2993; (Magdalen islands) 2714 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 5507; (hog cholera) 5507 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3699; (Levis accommodation) 3706 (ii); (North Sydney improvements) 12598; (power saw) 12607; (Rivière du Loup, engine houses) 12593; (St. John, increased accommodation) 12596 (v); Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12920 (vi).

Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6932 (iii).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Timegami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco, Duty on foreign Leaf (Ques.) 446 (i).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

Walpole Islands, Adoption of Boy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Yukon Post Office, Deficit (remarks) 14015 (vi).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *S. Waterloo.*

Ayr Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1195 (i).

Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85) 1°*, 1023 (i).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10736 (iv).

Free List, Changes in Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10060 (iv).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Waterloo) 11641 (v).

Robson, Michael, Dismissal from Ayr Post Office (Ques.) 1195 (i).

SUPPLY:

Customs (salaries at ports, &c.) 3917 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3531 (ii).
Post office (country postmasters) 6056 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (coal contract 1066; Ottawa (astronomical observatory, 343; (census building) 991; (furniture, &c.) 984; (rentals, &c.) 989; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 1071; (Church Point breakwater) 1078; (Drumhead breakwater) 1085; (Glace Bay) 1093 (i); Ont. (Port Arthur) 3353 (ii); Que. (Father Point, pier) 1513 (i); (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 3326 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 8271 (iv).

Tariff Changes, Free List, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *W. Toronto.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Publication of Cor., Objection (remarks) 14690 (vi).

——— Summary published, &c. (remarks) 10536 (v).

Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 1296; on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).

American Exporters, Discriminating Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13674, 13681 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5963 (iii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies, &c., Miscellaneous, &c,'

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11166 (v).

Audit Act *re* Civil Servants, Extra Work (remarks) 13992 (vi).

Auditing Deptl. Finances, System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Barr Colony, Mr. Haultain's Speech (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6354 (iii).

Bayfield and Can. Navy: *See* 'Navy.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7303, 7313 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Binder Twine, Average Price for Sisal, &c. (Ques.) 7566, 8085 (iv).

——— Quantity imported from U. S. (Ques.) 7566 (iv).
See Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B. B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8236 (iv), 10719 (v).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7412; on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7346 (iii).

Budget, The, 2206 (i).

Business of the House, &c. (remarks) 2301 (i).

Cable News from England: *See* 'British,' &c.

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Associated Press: *See* 'British,' &c.

Can. Iron Foundry Strike, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res,, 4368, 4961, 5089, 5108 (ii); in Com. on B., 5597 (iii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; in Com., 2303.

Can. and S. Africa SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on Can. and France Subsidy, 10820 (v).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company's incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com. (amt.) 7479; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7485; Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).

Census Expenditure 1901, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13708 (vi).

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 55) 1°*, 707 (i).

Chambers of Commerce Delegates: *See* 'Delegates,' &c.

Cigarettes: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 215,' &c.

Citizens' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 213) 1°*, 5679; in Com., 7478 (iii).

Civil Servants, Canvassing for Outside Business, &c. (remarks 13992 (vi).

——— and Guarantee Companies, &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

——— Imperial Decorations: *See* 'Imperial,' &c.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12510, 12535 (v), 13822; on M. for 3°, 13946 (vi).

Coal imported in Ont. from June 1901 to March 1903, and June 1902 to March 1903 (Ques.) 669 (i).

Coleman, Mr. A. B., Tender *re* Toronto P. O., Mr. Gouinlock's Letter (read) 13096 (vi).

Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4685 (ii).

Commercial Travellers, Reduced Ry. Fares, &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5689 (iii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3263, 3274 (ii).

Corn Duties, Abolition by Imp. Parlt. (remarks) 1681 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 5582; in Com., 6640, 7491 (iii); (cigarettes) 10750 (v).
Current Wages and P. O. Contracts: *See* P. O. 'Supplies.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3045, 3088, 4012 (ii).
Customs and Excise, *per capita* Revenue from 1896 to 1903 (Ques.) 13935, 14284 (vi).
Debates, Translators, Rent of Building, &c. (Ques.) 2311 (i).
Delegates from Chambers of Commerce, Ill-treatment at Newport, Vt., Par. in Newspapers, &c. (read) 12495 (v).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) 13674, 13681 (vi).
Dom. Day, Adjnmt. (remarks) *re* Business for Thursday, 5589 (iii).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr *Fielding*) in Com., 6914 (iii).
Dredges building at Sorel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012, 4680 (ii).
Dundonald: *See* 'G. O. C.'
Electric Lighting of Chamber, Change of Lamps, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).
Excise Taxation, Revenue 1896 and 1903 (Ques.) 13935, 14284 (vi).
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6899 (iii).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10814; in Com. on B., 12295 (v).
Freight Rates Discrimination against Canadians. *See*: 'Discriminating,' &c.
Fuel Contracts, Interest on unpaid Accounts, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).
G. O. C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2417 (i).
German Surtax: *See* 'Customs,' &c.
Good Shepherd Reformatory, St. John, N.B., B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4840 (ii).
Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re*, Par. in Ottawa *Free Press* (remarks) 8405 (iv).
Grain Inspection, Cost per Car, &c. (Ques.) 4837.
Grain Inspection, Toronto Board of Trade, Res. *re* Grain Standards (remarks) 11177, 12535 (v).
G. T. Ry. Rates, Discrimination between Americans and Canadians, Tel. read, 10745 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5139 (iii), 7820, 7829, 7846 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10308, 10317; in Com. on B., 10453, 11192, 11294, 12076, 12143, 12241 (v).
G. T. P. Bill and Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections (amt.) 13272 (vi).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Ry., Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 14765 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677.
Hibernian SS., Wreck: *See* 'Shipping,' &c.
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 794 (i).
Immigration, Medical Inspection, Appnmts. by Govt. (Ques.) 2756 (ii).
Immigration Office in Ireland, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 1031 (i).
Imperial Service Orders to Civil Service (Ques.) 12715, 13669, 13936 (vi).
Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3257 (ii).
Insurance Rates *re* Ocean Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3677 (ii).
——— Official Guide, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
——— Passes issued, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 9582.
——— Private Cars: *See* 'Official.'
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3301, 3398 (ii).
See 'Windsor.'
Japan Trade *re* Customs Duties (Ques,) 8617 (iv).
——— *re* U.S. Products (Ques.) 9217 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12301 (v).
——— B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10764, 10776 (v).
King's S. A. Medal, Pet. from N.C.Os., &c. (Ques.) 10491 (v).
Kingston Locomotive Works, Purchase of Engines for I.C.R.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7537 (iii).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10489 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8197 (iv).
Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
Letter Carriers, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5672. *See* 'Supply—Postoffice,' &c.
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13833 (vi).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 663 (i).
See 'Mowat.'
Listowel Postoffice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2504, 2518 (ii).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14222, 14542 (vi).
——— Special Trains, &c. (remarks) 14680, 14688.
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5100 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Tel. System, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vi).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 226 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6917 (iii).

Meteorological Service, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 6435 (iii).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5729 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt.-Gov. of Ont., Decease of (remarks) 1579 (i).
See 'Lt.-Gov.'

Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 4700 (ii), 6081, 6112 (iii).

Murray, Immigration Agent, Scotland (cor. &c.) in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).

Naval Defence, Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 949 (i).

Navy Training Ships, Establishment, &c : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5295 (iii).

Nelson Postoffice, B. C., Racine Bros. Claim (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iii), 8126 (iv).

Newspaper Despatches from G.B : *See* 'British,' &c.

N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10742 (v).

Official. &c., Cars, Haulage paid, &c. (Ques.) 9682 (iv).

Owen Sound, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup.. 13065 (vi).

Parliament Buildings, Ottawa, Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).
See 'Supply—Public Works. Buildings,' &c.

Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i).

Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4220, 4675 (ii).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8262 (iv).

Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit: *See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'

Pilotage Act Amt. B. (remarks) on M. to wthdr. Res., 12493 (v),

Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Matters (remarks) 13999 (vi).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5658 ; in Com. 5659 (iii).

Post Office Clerks, Promotions, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).

P.O. Supplies and Current Wages, Declaration, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iii).

Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Origin (remarks) 3583 (ii).

Preston, W. T. R., Suit by Can. Employment Bureau (remarks) 12220 (v).

Printing Bureau and Typographical Union, &c. (Ques.) 4182, 4444 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafters,' 10517 (v).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5972; in Com., 5979 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt B. 21 (Mr, *Blair*) in Com., 3988, 4697, 4728 (ii), 5326, 5680, 6080, 7300 (iii), 7610, 8126 (iv) ; (telephones) 5538 (iii), 8142 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* 2 cent fares, to M. for 3°, 8349 (iv) ; on Sen. Amts., 13836.

Railway Accidents, Duties of Public Officials (Ques.) 1032 (i).

Railway Accidents in Canada, Official Inquiry, &c. (Ques.) 9217 (iv).
See 'West Lorne,' &c., 'Windsor,' &c.

Ry. Accidents. Investigation, &c. (remarks) 1329.

——Loss of Life, &c. (Ques.) 873 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2575 ; in Com., 2580 ; on M. for 3°, 3004, (ii).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).

Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7132 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10899 ; 10958, 11125, 11431, 11503 ; (Kent) 11579 ; (Toronto) 11693, 11732 ; (York) 11665 ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12459; on M. for 3°, 12438 (v).

Ronan, W., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v).

St. Lawrence Navigation, Quotations from London Newspapers ; in Com. of Sup., 4133 (ii).

Salmon Canning Industry, B. C. (remarks) 10241 (v).

——Complaints *re* (remarks) 9978 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Transportation (remarks) 12940 (vi).

Scotch Iron Moulders and Toronto Strike (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12994 (vi).

Sisal, Price per Pound for Binder Twine, &c. (Ques.) 8085 (iv).
See 'Binder Twine.'

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11827 (v).

S. Africa and Can. SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on France and Can. Subsidy, 10820 (v).

S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, &c. (remarks) 1027 (i).

South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv) 10491 (v).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).

——B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6915 (iii).

——B. 237 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 12494 (v).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Stock Gambling, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7204 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Poultry Farming) 7649 (iv.)

Canals: Galops (deepening, &c.) 8269 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (Thompson, Mr. P., remuneration) 7152 (iii); Post Office (promotion, &c.) 13998 (vi).

Customs (contingent expenses, Toronto, &c.) 3901; (preferential tariff) 3926; (salaries, &c.) 3901 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Teulon, North road) 6930 (iii).

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., rep.) 5382 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5295, 5299; (Ottawa) exhibit) 5308 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6669; (agents, old country, &c.) 6726; (exodus to U. S.) 6727, 6874; (Galicians) 6863; Glockling's Mr. Robert, cor., &c.) 6728; (Murray, agent, Scotland) 6827; (settlers' effects) 6727; (trachoma, &c.) 6696; (Ques. of Order *re* quoting Speeches) 6873 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7784 (iv); (Man. Grain Act) 13698 (vi).

Justice, Administration of: Exchequer Court (salaries) 3406 (ii); Miscellaneous (revision of statutes) 14643 (vi); Supreme Court (law books, purchase) 3405; (reps. binding, &c.) 3405; Yukon (Dugas, judge) 3413; judges' living allowance) 3413; (sheriffs' salaries, &c.) 3410; (living allowances, &c.) 3509; (telegraph operators) 3419, 3509; Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3516; (general expenses) 3511 (ii).

Labour Dept. (fair wage schedule) 7174; (Racine Bros. claim) 7174 (iii).

Legislation: H. of C. (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence, improvement) 4133; (St. Lawrence, lighting, &c.) 4133 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13677 (vi); (Can. and G. B.) 5997, (iii) 7573; (Can. and S. Africa) 7747 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str.) 6003 (iii), 13697; (Magdalen Islands) 13676; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 13694; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi); (St. John and Digby) 7739 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13674 (vi); (St. John and London) 7739; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740 (iv); (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694 (vi); (wrecking plant) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

Militia (grants to associations) 3773; (pay and allowance) 3590; (Toronto drill shed) 3614 (ii), 13086 (vi); (Valleyfield strike) 3590, 3754 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit 6966 (iii).

N.W.M. Police, (compensation for injuries) 5264; (pay of force) 5262; (Yukon, salaries) 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (St. Lawrence transportation) 4044 (ii).

Post Office (affidavits *re* supplies) 6138; (automobiles, &c.) 6050; (boots, &c., purchased in Aurora) 6142 (iii); (cities, promotions, &c.) 14009; (inspectors' salaries) 14001 (vi); (letter box collections) 6139; (letter carriers, Toronto) 6005; (mail bag repairs, &c.) 6142; (mail service) 6065; (ry. transfer agents) 6136 (iii); (statutory increases) 14006 (vi); (superannuation, letter carriers) 6113 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (architect's staff) 963; (caretakers) 1022; (Toronto armoury) 972 (i); **N.B.** (Campbellton P.O.) 13037; (St. John, drill hall) 13042; (St. John, immigrant shed) 13040; (quarantine station, water service) 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039; (Woodstock, armoury) 13040; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13041; **N.S.** (Antigonish, post office) 13034; (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 13030; (Halifax custom house) 13031; (Halifax. immigration shed) 13033; (Sydney Mines) 13029; (Sydney, post office) 13035; **Ont.** (Belleville, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Bowmanville) 510; (Clinton P.O.) 534 (i); (Cobourg P.O.) 13118 (vi); (Dom. exhibition) 534 (i); (Guelph, armoury) 13083; (Kingston, barracks) 13119; (Kingston, military college) 13094 (vi); (Kingston, military stables) 639 (London, drill hall) 646 (i); (Peterborough, armoury) 13083; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P.O.) 13107 (vi); (Toronto, custom house) 648, 957; (Toronto, Dom. exhibition) 534; (Toronto, drill hall) 3614 (ii), 13086; (Toronto, examining warehouse) 13118; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086, 13115; (Toronto P.O., addition) 13096; (Toronto, postal station) 13112 (vi); (Toronto, renewals) 956, 957 (i); **Ottawa** (additional rooms) 13006; (coal sheds) 13115, 13116 (vi); (elevators) 1012; (grounds) 1015; (heating, &c.) 1008; (lighting, &c.) 975; (Major's Hill Park) 1015 (i); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996 (i); (steel shelving) 13089 (vi); (telephones) 1013 (i); **P.E.I.** (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; (Charlottetown, Dom. buildings) 13036; **Que.**, (Levis, P.O.) 13053; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13070; (Magog, P.O.) 13081; (Montmagny, P.O.) 13066; (Montreal, barracks) 13077; (Que. Citadel drill hall) 13053, 13057, 13078; (Que., military buildings) 13054; (St. John's, P.O.) 13060; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (Three Rivers, heating, &c.) 13069 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Anderson Lake) 1451; (Columbia river) 1451 (i); (dredging, plant, &c.) 13311 (vi); (Mr. Sinclair's dismissal) 1451 (i); **Generally** (dredges, repairs) 2619; **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2668 (ii); (hydraulic dredge) 13312; **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 13006; (Dalhousie wharf) 13233; **N.S.** (Abbot's Harbour) 13141; (Abram's river, wharf) 13141; (Bayfield, wharf) 13142; (Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; (Breton's Cove, 13151, 13152 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1077 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Pembroke, breakwater) 13205; (Pleasant Bay) 13205; (Port Hood, pier) 13206 (vi); **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191; (Bowmanville, pier) 1352; (Burk's Falls) 1359; (Depot Harbour) 1364; (general repairs) 1373 (i); (Goderich, breakwater) 13242 (vi) (Goderich harbour) 1365 (i); (Kaministiquia river, dredging) 13013; (Kingston graving dock) 13024; (Little Current) 13245; (Magann & Phinn, claims) 13255 (vi); (Midland Harbour) 1376; (Petewawa narrows) 1427 (i); (Port Arthur) 2636, 3350 (ii); (Point au Baril route) 1365; (St. Lawrence, dredging) 1442; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1432 (i); (Toronto, Magann & Phinn claims) 13255; (Toronto, pier) 13254 (vi); (Wendover, wharf) 1441 (i); **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13313; (Skinner's Pond) 13309 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallee, pier) 1520 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3320 (ii);

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys, &c.) 13340.
Telegraph Lines, N.W.T. (Edmonton and Athabaska) 13335; (Edmonton agency) 13334; P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13327 (vi).
Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5492; (smallpox) 5492 (iii).
Railways (Murray Harbour branch) 7537 (iii).
Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations) 6933 (iii).
Surtax: *See* 'Customs,' &c.
Tariff and N.W.T. Immigration, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iii).
Telegraph Operators, Yukon, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3419, 3509 (ii).
Telephone Cos. in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2585 (ii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii), 5555 (iii); in Com., 9421 (iv).
——— on M. to resume adjnd. deb., 6198 (iii).
——— on M. to ref. back to Com., 7813 (iv).
——— (Remarks) 6102 (iii).
Toronto and Niagara Power Co., 6116 (iii).
Toronto Island, Damage by Storms, &c. (Ques.) 5589 (iii).
Toronto, Labour Council and Tel. *re* Mechanics from Eng. (Ques.) 1854 (i).
——— Military Stores Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i), 3614 (ii), 13055, 13086, 13115, (vi).
——— Post Office, A. B. Coleman's Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
——— Toronto St. Ry. (remarks) 4700 (ii), 6082 (iii).
——— Public Works Employees, Delay in Payment, &c. (Ques.) 5588 (iii).
Transportation Commission, Meetings, Business transacted, &c. (Ques.) 13027 (vi).
U. S. Immigration Officers at Newport, Treatment of English Delegates (remarks) 12495 (v).
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Payment of Militia (Ques.) 13371 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'
Valleyfield Post Office, Tenders *re* (remarks) 11187 (v).
West Lorne Investigation, Commissioners, &c. (Ques.) 6168 (iii).
——— Jury's Verdict, &c. (Ques.) 3231 (ii).
——— Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4726 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Accidents.'
Windsor Junction Ry. Accident, Rep. of Commissioner, Inquiry for, 3496, 3712 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'

Cochrane, Mr. E., *E. Northumberland, Ont.*
Allan SS. Co., Reductions of Sailings from St. John (remarks) 14077 (vi).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4236 (ii).
Apples, Canadian Packing, Mr. Preston's Interview, &c. (remarks) 11184 (v).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11176 (v).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bill (remarks) 485 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5059 (ii), 5424, 5072 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Campbellford Post Office, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Public Works,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5103 (ii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3227 (ii).
Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5483 (iii).
Chickens, Fattening of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Cobourg Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13084 (vi).
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.
Cumberland Ry. & Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14426 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3026 (ii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 293, 625 (i).
Ferries: *See* 'Navigable.'
Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11180 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5167 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10440, 11190, 11362 (v).
G. T. P. Bill, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13280 (vi).
Johnson, W. H., Purchase of House on Murray Canal (remarks) in Com of Sup., 14143, 14147 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B, 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759 (v).
Le Journal, Canvassing for: *See* 'Pelletier,' 'Political,' &c.
Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14551 (vi).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights & Measures B. 20.'
Murray Canal, Supt.'s duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12780, 12987 (vi).

Owen Sound, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13064 (vi).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L. and Canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13982 (vi).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13630 (vi).

Political Partisanship *re* Govt. Officials (remarks) 13991 (vi).

Postal Scales: *See* 'Weights & Measures B. 188.'

Postmasters in Rural Districts, Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

Preston, Mr. and Can. Apples: *See* 'Apples,' &c.

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4212 (ii).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4222 (ii).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14755 (vi).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5981.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3833, 4706 (ii), 6210 (iii), 8130 (iv); (drainage) 4756 (ii).

Ry. Act (supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12962 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14464, 14506 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10979, 11139, 11468, 11625; (Toronto) 11720 (v).

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7221 (iii).

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (aids to societies) 4433; (census enumerators) 4817; (census, Haldimand) 4822 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7641 (iv).

Canals: Generally (toll collectors) 12931; (Johnson, W. H., purchase of house) 14143, 14147; (wire fencing) 14151 (vi); Welland (Dunnville dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Interior (Mines branch, salaries) 13769 (vi).

Customs (Campbellford collector) 3913; (salaries) 3913 (ii).

Dom. Lands (tree culture) 6780 (iii).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., fishery inspector) 5124; (steamers, B. C.) 5278 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6699; (agents' expenses) 6887; (Cory, W. W., &c.) 6853; (White, W. J., agent) 6853 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6345; (medical attendance) 6345 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7768; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7768 (iv).

Legislation: House of Commons (*Montreal Herald*, printing) 5271; (printing, &c.) 5271 (voters' lists) 5275 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str.) 5745 (iii); (Marconi stations) 13645 (vi).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7581 (iii); (freight rates, &c.) 7586 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13675 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7737 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt steamers, supplies, &c.) 4086 (ii); (masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi).

Public Works: Buildings, N. B. (St. John, drill hall) 13044 (vi); Ont. (Campbellford) 504; Ottawa (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1002 (i); Que. (hospital for trachoma) 14245; (military buildings) 13054 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton, wharf) 13230; (damages to schooner) 13231 (vi); **N.S.** (Amagandus wharf) 1069 (i); (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146 (vi); (Big Pond, wharf) 1073; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Cow bay) 1079; (Economy wharf) 1087 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182; (Glace Bay, wharf) 13190 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1095; (Green Cove harbour) 1101; (Kingsport pier) 1104; (Larry's River) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Necum Teuch wharf) 1139; **Ont.** (Bronte harbour) 1355; (Depot Harbour) 1362 (i); (Moira river, flooding) 13470 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3346 (ii); (Trenton, dredging) 1434; (Wendover wharf) 1436 (i); **Que.** (Cacouna wharf) 5898 (iii); (Chateauguay river) 3211 (ii); (Grand Vallee pier) 1515 (i); (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13465; (Port Daniel wharf) 13468; (Rimouski pier, &c.) 13469; (Rivière Verte) 13470; (St. Andre de Kamouraska pier) 13492; (Ste. Anne de la Perade) 13488; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 13497 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3219, 3308, 3327 (ii); (Sabrevois wharf) 13485; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12855 (vi).

Miscellaneous (engineers, salaries) 13340; (Ottawa river surveys) 13345 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2715 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2692 (ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2689 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Magdalen islands) 2714; (Mar. Provs. cable lines) 2701 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (general vote) 12881; (Moncton, locomotives, &c.) 14093; (Pictou accommodation) 14089; (sidings, additional) 14057, 14082; P. E. I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14110, 14116; (Murray Harbour branch) 12832 (vi),

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).

Treadgold Commission, par. in Dawson newspapers (remarks) 11082 (v).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i).

——— (postal scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4188 (ii).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby.*

County Court Judges, N. S., Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

Dodd, Judge of County Court No. 7, N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13505 (vi).
Fisheries (fish hatcheries) 13660 ; (sardine industry) 13653 (vi).
Justice, Administration of: N.S. (county court judges) 14259 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lurcher's shoal lightship) 4173 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14251 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Meteghan Cove) 1135 (i); (Victoria beach wharf) 13214 (vi).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Civil Service (superannuation) Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 597 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9064 (iv).
Home Rule for Ireland (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 720; Agreed to (Y. 102, N. 41) 812 (i).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com. (objection) 5971 ; in Com., 5978, 6399 (iii).
Rocky Mountain Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 197) 1°*, 4262 (ii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 367 ; on M. for 2°, 630 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com. on Private Bills, 664 (i).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *S. Essex.*
Detroit River, &c., International Waters, &c., U. S. Govt. Work (M. for. cor.*) 2778 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 894 ; in Com., 908 (i).
Drainage across Ry. Properties (B. 19) 1° m., 202. *See* 'Ry. Act. B. 21.'
Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 149) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Huron, Erie and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 123) 1°*, 1764 (i); in Com., 4588 (ii).
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 1°*, 1675 (i).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2718 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 254 (i) ; in Com., 4726 ; (drainage) Amt., 4729 (ii) ; 5325, 6178 ; (farm crossings) 5774 ; (screens, &c., 6072 ; (Toronto and Niagara Power Co.) 6115 (iii) ; (race horse *Henry R.*) 8191 (iv).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 102) 1°*, 1295 ; 2° m., 1812 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10883 ; in Com., 10993 (v).

Cowan, Mr. M. K.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (exhibitions) 4624 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (transfer Marine Dept.) 2947 (ii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry., 6118 (iii).
Treadgold Commission, Pars. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Culbert, Mr. J., *Brockville.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11485 (v).

Davis, Mr. T. O., *Saskatchewan.*
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5877 (iii).
Autonomy for N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13896 (vi).
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6391 (iii).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 157) 1°*, 2582 (ii) ; (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 5238 ; 3° m., 5988 (iii).
Budget, The, 1715 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (Ques.) 14286 (vi.)
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 1462.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4371, 5100 (ii); in Com. on B., 5611, 5650, 5799 (iii).
Canadian Yukon Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 159) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
Canals in Ont. and Que., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).
Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3179 (ii).
Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13567 (vi).
Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 707 (i).
Grain Blockade : *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11181.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5145 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10019 ; ('red headed boy') 10020, 10035 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 11250, 11989, 12048, 12231, 12268 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry., Alternative Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 13028 (vi).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6571, 6596 (iii).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1580 (i).
Mailing and Franking Privilege: *See* 'Campaign.'
Man. and N.W.T., Ry. Co.'s. Land Subsidies granted by Govt. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7993 (iv)

Davis, Mr. T. O.—*Con.*
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12321 (v).
Public Works, Generally, Amount expended in Provs. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Ry., &c., on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10501, 10507 (v).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5682, 6274 (iii); (amt. *re* fire-guards) 8173 (iv).
Railway Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* received (Ques.) 13028 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies (money) paid by Govt. in Provs. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
See 'Man. & N.W.T.' &c.
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2455 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11033, 11115, 11460, 11718; (Dauphin) 11757; (Macdonald) 11781; (Winnipeg) 11787; (York) 11688 (v).
Senate Representation in N. W. T., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 471 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
Stewart River Development Co.'s incorp. (B. 160) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6687 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (post offices) 532 (i).
Tariff Protection, Govt. Policy: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6691 (iii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11086 (v).
——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4544 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Delisle, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*
Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 3°, 13940 (vi).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St. John and Iberville.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (seconded) 18 (i).
C.P.R. car 001, Improvements to, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 837 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7505 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13571, 14410 (vi).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. (B. 155) 1°m., 2501 (ii), 2°m, 8243; in Com., 8244, 8361 (iv).

Demers, Mr. L. P.—*Con.*
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4784 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 928 (i).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 654 (i).
Private Bills, Notices, &c., Rep. of Com. *re* Revision of Rules (M.) 12216, 13547 (vi).
See 'Rules,' &c.
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (drainage) 4752 (ii); (fire indemnification) 6299 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8349 (iv).
Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. (B. 23) 1°m., 283 (i); 2°m., 2780 (ii).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1257 (i); in Com., 11034.
Rules of the Hse. (M.) to amend, 12216 (v), 13547 (vi).
Rules, Revision, &c. *re* Pets. for Private Bills (M.) for Sel. Com., 4441 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (experimental farms) 4548 (ii).
Supreme Court Act Amt. (B. 22) 1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4901 (ii).
Tarte, Hon. J. I., and C.P.R. Car 001, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).

Desjardins, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Terrebonne (M. for cor.*) 288 (i).
Jesus River, Deepening, &c. (M. for cor.*) 289.
Terrebonne Post Office Buildings, &c. (M. for cor.*) 289 (i).

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 8th Rep. (M.) to conc., 13788 (vi).
——— 8th Rep. (binder twine) M. to conc., 14043, 14047 (vi).
Binder Twine Inspector's Rep., Distribution, &c. (M.) 13788 (vi).
——— Rep. of Com. on Ag., Distribution of Copies (M.) to conc., 14043 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5812 (iii).
C. P. Ry. and Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 2306 (i).
Elevator Rates, Advance, &c. (remarks) 11062.
Great North-west Central and C. P. R. Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 2306 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7994 (iv); on Sen. Amts. (amt.) 13625.
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5785, 6233 (iii).
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2478 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algoma.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie incorp. (B. 104) 1°*, 1295 (i); in Com., 6655 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 1204 (i).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 1204 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14399 (vi).

Nepigon Iron Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 170) Pet. (presented) 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14399, 14436 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Duncan, Mr., inspector, Georgian Bay) 5134 (ii).

Quarantine (small-pox) 5015 (ii).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*

B. C. Fisheries Commission, Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 1199 (i).

Canning Industry in B. C. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).

See 'Salmon,' &c.

Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal of Flagship (remarks) 10957 (v).

False Creek Lease, Cor., &c., (M. for copies*) 2337 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3129 (ii); 5513, 6354.

——— Lease to Kelly and Burnett (Ques.) 7565.

Flagship at Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal, &c. (remarks) 10957 (v).

Fraser River Canning Industry, &c. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).

Kelly & Burnett, Lease of False Creek, &c. (Ques.) 7565 (iv).

See 'False Creek.'

Labour Commission B.C., Rep. *re* (Ques.) 8116.

Port Moody, Military Reserve, &c. (Ques.) 446.

Quesnel Dam, B.C., Obstructions *re* (Ques.) 11557 (v).

Salmon Canning Industry in B. C. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).

Salmon Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 12073 (v).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, Letter from Canners Ass'n. (read) 9968 (iv).

Salmon shipped to France, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (exhibitions, Treadgold exhibit) 4614 (ii).

Fisheries (steamers, B.C.) 5278 (iii).

Indians—B.C. (agents, travelling expenses) 7262; (Clayoquot school) 7269; (fishing, &c., investigation *re*) 7264; (reserves, re-allotment, &c.) 7263; (reserves, sale of, &c.) 7268; (Songhees, removal, &c.) 7258 (iii).

Earle, Mr. T.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 5050 (ii),

Post Office (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6151 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Esquimalt graving dock) 5919; (Hardy Bay wharf) 5916; Que. (Cacouna wharf) 5899; Telegraph Lines, B. C (Alberni Clayoquot) 5918; (Quesnel Atlin branch) 5827 (iii).

Trade and Commerce (preferential tariff in France) 7799 (iv).

Emmerson, Mr. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12570 (v).

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 1115 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 14409 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5190 (iii), 7891 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8706, 8718 (iv); in Com. on B., 11389 (v); on M. for 3°, 12731 (vi).

Harvey and Salisbury Ry. Subsidy, Remarks, &c. 14471 (vi).

Immigrants for Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 1855 (i).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2375 (i).

I. C. R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3682 (ii).

International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).

Pensions to S. A. Veterans, by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14599 (vi).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12798 (vi).

Postmasters and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14679 (vi).

P. E. I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. (B. 180) 1°*, 3391 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914 (iv).

P. E. I. Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1049 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (N.B.) 11818 (v).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).

St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14324 (vi).

St. John Valley, Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14325 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3596 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton, P.O.) 13038; (St. John, drill hall) 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039 (vi).

Railways: I. C. R. (Eel River, agent's house) 12600; (Metis station) 12605; (Moncton accommodation) 12599; (Truro accommodation) 12604 (v).

Emmerson, Mr. H. R.—*Con.*
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).
Ties on Govt. Rys., Importations, &c. (Ques.) 1679 (i).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Erb, Mr. D. K., *S. Perth.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com,, 5441 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6216 (iii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4777 (ii).
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 264) 1°*, 12993 (vi).
Rivière du Nord Fish Ladders, &c. (M. for copies of reps., &c.) 2778 (ii).
Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, Ques. of Privilege, 7567 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6637 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, on Notice of M. (Mr. *Borden*) 14765 (vi).
——— *See* 'Joint-High,' &c.
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).
Allan SS. Co., Reduction in Sailings from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13937, 14064.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1509 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1897 (i).
Audit Act Amt. (B. 251) 1°m., 11159 (v).
——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 13258 (vi).
Auditing Deptl. Finances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).
Auditor General and Finance Dept. (remarks) 11423 (v).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circulars, &c. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Auditor General and Treasury Board *re* Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (v).
Auditor General, on Inquiry for Cor., 11427 (v).
Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Bankers' Association, Inspection Duties, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).
Bankers, Private, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 285 (i).
Bank Failures since Confederation, &c. (Ans.) 6435 (iii).
Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Rep. (presented) 3804 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Bass River, N.S., Marine Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
Beersville Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Belmont Disaster Victims, Compensation *re* Injuries (remarks) 14156 (vi).
See 'Crandall.'
Binder Twine Bounties (B. 233) prop. Res., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300; 1°*, 7382; 2°*, 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii).
———on Ques. of Order, 7308 (iii).
———Inspection and Penalties collected, &c. (remarks) 14048 (vi).
Birkett, Mr. T., M.P., Lease of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 12217 (v).
Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 6522 (iii).
Boyd, Sir John, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 5990 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7400 (iii).
———on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7342 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Budget, The, Financial Statement, 1378 (i).
Condition of Country, 1378; Details of Revenue, comparison with 1900-1, 1379; Excise, 1379; Post Office Dept., 1381; I.C.R. Revenue and Expenditure, Consolidated Fund, 1382; Capital and Consolidated Fund, Expenditures, 1383; Revenue for 1902-3, Estimate of, 1385; Public Debt, 1897-1903, 1385; Public Debt, reduction of, 1387; Surpluses, 1387, 1390; Net Debt. per capita, 1388; Chartered Banks Deposits, 1389; Increase in paid up capital and note circulation, 1395; Total Trade, Tables, 1389; Public Accounts, 1391; Iron Bounties, 1391; Reasons for borrowing while Finances are prosperous, 1392; Redemption of Treasury Bills before maturity, 1392; Loans, maturing, 1392; New sources of revenue by sale of C.P.R. lands, 1394; Increase in circulation of Dominion notes, amts. to Currency Act, 1396; Tariff amts. and free list not practicable at present, 1398; Trade Relations with England, Preference should be reciprocal, 1400; Preferential trade, memo. of Mr. Gerald Balfour, 1402; memo of Can. Ministers at Colonial Conference, 1404; Colonial Conference, 1400-1406; U.S. relations, 1406; Cor. between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and U.S. Senator Fairbanks *re* Joint High Commission and Alaskan Boundary, 1407; Tariff Policy of Govt., 1409; German Surtax, 1412-1418; Cor. with Mr. Bopp, 1414; Steel Rail industry and Sault Ste. Marie works, bounties to, 1419; Lead Industry of B.C., 1419; Binder Twine, 1420; Foreign Built Ships, and registration in Can., coasting privileges, 1420; Beet Root Sugar Machinery, 1421; Alluvial Gold Mining Machinery, 1421; Transportation Problem, Canal tolls, 1422; Resolutions *re* Customs Tariff Amt., 1423 (i).
Budget, The (remarks) 410, 1114 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order, 1743 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 871, 1110, 2395, 2501 (i), 3969, 5051 (ii), 5510, 5581, 5959, 6352, 7090, 7201 (iii), 7728, 7812 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Business of the House. Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 484 (i).
——— Late Sittings (remarks) 3207 (ii).
——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4347 (ii).
——— *re* Suppl. Estimates (remarks) 4957 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Butter sold at Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1593, 1857 (i).
Cable News Service between Can. and G. B. (B. 240) prop. Res., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of Bill, 8243 (iv); 2° m., 10715; in Com., 10718 (v).
——— Brierly, Jas. S., Letter read, 10739 (v).
Canada Central Ry. and Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Amalgamation, Compensation to Municipalities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5613 (iii).
Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2304 (i).
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
C. P. R. (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
C. P. R. Steamers sailing from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
C. P. R., Transcontinental Ry. Trains, Water Supply (remarks) 9457 (iv).
Canadian Press Despatches: *See* 'Cable,' &c.
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5556, 5884 (iii).
Canals in Ont. and Que., Amount expended (Ans.) 1594 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 375 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (papers laid on Table) 591 (i).
——— (remarks) 267 (i), 14054 (vi).
Cattle-Guard Commission, Rep. laid on Table, 14758 (vi).
——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 14686 (vi).
Census of 1901, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 203,286, 1593 (i).
——— (remarks) 204 (i).
——— Cost, on M, for Ret. (amt.) 289 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 479 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5960, 6199 (iii).
Chambers of Commerce, Delegates, Treatment by U. S. Immigration Officers at Newport (remarks) 12496 (v).
Chambly Canal, Collector, Superannuation (Ans,) 7203 (iii).
——— *See* 'Moreau.'
Chartered Banks, List of Shareholders (presented) 1575 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c, (remarks) 4427 (ii).
Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).
Civil Service Act (general increase) Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12494, 12538 (v).
——— (superannuation) Amt. (B. 49) prop. Res., 204; in Com. on Res., 593; 1°* of B,, 597; 2° m., 1116 (i).
Civil Service Employees, Classification, Salary, &c. (Ans,) 9682 (iv).
——— Temporary, &c, (remarks) in Com. on P. O, Bill, 5869 (iii).
Civil Service Examiners List (presented) 479 (i).
Clergue Steel Works at the Sault, Contract, &c. (Ans,) 13668 (vi).
——— *See* 'Steel.'
Cochrane, Hon. Senator, Tel. *re* (read) 3000 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4681 (ii).
——— *See* 'Dry Docks Bill.'
Colonial Conference, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 853 (i).
——— *See* 'Alaskan.'
Congratulations to Prime Minister *re* Twenty-five years as Member, 11690 (v),
Consolidated Revenue: *See* 'Audit,' &c.
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. B. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) in Com., 3223 (ii).
Corry & Laverdure, Award, &c., *re* Trent Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
Crandall, Brakeman on I. C. R., injured at Belmont (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
——— *See* 'Belmont.'
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s (Parrsboro) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Cummings, Jas., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 9458 (iv).
Customs Act Amt, (The Tariff) Prop. Res., 1423 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3058; in Com. on B., 4038 (ii).
——— (B. 273)—(surtax) in Com., 14755 (vi).
Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 9349 (iv).
Debert Coal Mines and I. C. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14328 (vi).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 587.
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 914 (i); M. for Sel. Com., 3001 (ii); in Com., 13591 (vi).
——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 12720 (vi).
——— (M.) to add Name *re* Sel. Com., 6734 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 704 (i).
Dom. Notes Security (B. 222) prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; in Com., 6913 (iii).
Drummondville Siding Accommodation (remarks) 14081 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction (B. 178) prop. Res., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; in Com., 4678 (ii), 5871 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.' Subsidy, in Com. on Res,, 14341 (vi).
Election Law, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12218 (vi).
——— *See* 'Dom. Elections.'
Election Printing in *Advocate*, Prince Albert, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. (Ans.) 288 (i).
Electric Lighting, Cardinal and Iroquois Canals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).
Estimates, The (presented) 90 (i).
——— Suppl., 1903 (presented) 707 (i), 4956 (ii).
——— Suppl., 1904 (presented) 12868 (vi).
——— Further Suppl. (presented) 14042, 14662 (vi).
——— (remarks) 5002, 5122 (ii).
Experimental Farms Report (presented) 1937 (i).
See 'Butter, &c.'
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic.'
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14617 (vi).
Fisher, Chas. A. L., Inspector of Public Works, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1592 (i).
Fishing Industry in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vi).
France and Canada ss. Service (remarks) 4958 (ii).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2100 (i).
Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i), 2789 (ii).
——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3285 (ii).
Galops Rapids, Deepening (M.) to conc., agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4785 (ii).
German Surtax, in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).
——— *See* 'Budget.'
——— Cor., &c., papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).
Govt. Business (remarks) 13547 (vi).
——— *See* 'Business of the House.'
Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8405 (iv).
Govt. Official Cars, Amounts paid for Haulage (Ans.) 9682 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Order for Com., 4132 (ii); in Com., 5147, 5236 (iii), 7901; on M. for 3°, 8328 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 235) prop. Res., 7915; on. M. for 1°, 7725; on M. for Com. on Res., 8546 (iv); in Com. on Res., 10420; in Com. on B. 10588, 10614, 11191, 11302, 11838, 12076, 12168 (v); on M. for 3°, 12694 (vi).
G.T. Pacific Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections (Ans.) 13027 (vi).
——— Parishes crossed, Levis to Temiscouata (Ans.) 8117 (iv).
——— Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (remarks) 5734 (iii).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
——— Surveys, Reps., &c, (remarks) 8231 (iv).
——— Ways and Means *re* Surveys (M.) for Com., 14765 (vi).
G. T. Ry., and C. P. Ry. Fiscal Bookkeeping, Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12880 (vi).
G. T. Ry. Rates, Discrimination between Americans and Canadians (remarks) 10745 (v).
——— Loans by Govt. (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
——— and Two Cent Rate, *re* Original Charter (Ans.) 11556, 11828 (v).
Halifax Cotton Co., Loan of Rails, &c. (remarks) 14478 (vi).
——— Elevator, Land Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).
——— Marine and Fishery Office, Removal, &c. (remarks) 14279 (vi).
——— Museum, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— P. O., Pet. *re* Salaries of Employees (remarks) on Conc., 14759 (vi).
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi)
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 676, 1057 (i).
Herald Printing Co., Montreal, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 8330 (iv).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).
Imperial Defence *re* Lord Rosebery's prop. Res. (remarks) 411 (i).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2373 (i).
Insurance Cos. of Canada, Abstract of Statements (presented) 1025 (i).
——— Rep. of Supt. (presented) 9350 (iv).
I.C.R., Pension System, &c. (Ans.) 9216 (iv.)
——— *See* 'Trackmen.'
——— Stations, Restaurants, &c., Fire Protection (Ans.) 14664 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 705 (i).

Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. (B. 238) prop. Res., 6629 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7923; 1°*, of B., 7988 (iv); 2°m., and in Com., 10799 (v).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4278 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4040 (ii).

——— Bounty Payments (Ans.) 6435 (iii).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).

Japanese Tariff *re* U. S. Products (Ans.) 9217 (iv).

Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).

Joint High Commission *re* Par. in Toronto *World* (remarks) 14054 (vi).

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) wthdn., 634 (i).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (Dawson) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14518; (Amt.) 14519 (vi).

Lachine Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Supply., 14140 (vi).

Lake Superior Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).

Lead Bounties (B. 239) prop. Res., 6169; in Com. on Res., 8195 (iv); in Com. on B., 10798 (v).

Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14300 (vi).

Lime Ridge, Megantic Co. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2350 (i).

Locomotive Contracts *re* I. C. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).

Long Wharf, St. John, Lease by Govt. (Ans,) 11829 (v).

Lumber Combines, N.W.T., Investigation (Ans.) 6168 (iii).

——— (remarks) 1580 (i).

Lumber Trade in B. C. and U. S. Importations (remarks) 14766 (vi).

Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14326 (vi).

Manufacturers' Delegation *re* Tariff (remarks) 266 (i).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).

Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iii).

——— Rep. of Commission, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 90,707 (i), 4956 (ii), 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Middleton and Victoria Beach Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).

Midland Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

Militia Defalcation, Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iii).

Militia Estimates (remarks) 13369 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 5719 (iii).

Milk Can. Bill: *See* 'Weights.'

Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c. (remarks) 90 (i).

——— on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 164. (i).

Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan (B. 201) prop. Res., 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445 (ii); in Com., 5417; 3°m., 5657 (iii).

Montreal Locomotive Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

Moreau, H., Salary as Collector on Chambly Canal (Ans.) 8488 (iii), 12497 (v).

——— *See* 'Chambly.'

Napanee and Deseronto Ry. Co.'s Charter (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Newspaper Despatches from England B.: *See* 'Cable.'

N. S. and Dom., Financial Terms, &c. (Ans.) 3001 (ii).

Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).

N. W. T., Financial Aid (B. 256) prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°*, of B., 12330 (v); in Com., 12843 (vi).

——— Autonomy to N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13918 (vi).

——— *See* 'Provincial.'

North-west Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2754 (ii).

Ottawa Experimental Farm: *See* 'Butter.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. (B. 223) prop. Res., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6449; 1°*, of B., 6456; in Com., 6806 (iii).

Ottawa, Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14319 (vi).

Ouelle River, I. C. R. Branch Line, Total Cost (Ans.) 10491 (vi).

Patent Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 97 (i).

Patent Relief Bill (remarks) 2397 (i).

Penny Banks (B. 198) 1°m., 4175 (ii); in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793 (v).

Posters, Handbills, Exclusion, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5240; in Com., 5662, 5869 (iii).

P. O. Savings Bank (B. 220) 1°m., 6353; in Com., 6814 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
P. O. Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations of Postmasters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14276, 14655 (vi).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G. B. (remarks) 3220 (ii).
Preferential Trade and Mr. Chamberlain's Proposals (remarks) 13936 (vi).
Press Gallery Representatives, Payment as Sessional Clerks (remarks) 14114 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate : See* 'Election Printing.'
P. E. I. Ry. Subsidies to Branch Lines (remarks) 14474 (vi).
Printing Bureau and Union Organizations (Ans.) 4180 (ii).
Private Cars : *See* 'Govt. Official,' &c.
Prorogation (remarks) 14763 (vi).
Provincial Autonomy, N. W. T., Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6892 (iii).
——— *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.
Public Accounts (presented) 89 (i).
Public Debts, Amount of Decrease (Ans.) 14665 (vi).
Public Works, Preservation of Health, Regulation, &c. (Ans.) 1858 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidies Agreement (B. 272) in Com. on Res., 14690 ; 1°* of B., 14734 : 2° m., 14734 (vi).
——— Papers laid on Table, 14521 (vi).
——— Application for Further Aid (Ans.) 10496.
——— Subsidy paid by Govt. (Ans.) 10496 (v).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14450 (vi).
Quesnel, Jules, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iii).
Questions by Members, Answers *re* (remarks) 544 (i).
Railway Accidents in Canada, Official Inquiry, &c. (Ans.) 9218 (iv).
Ry. Act (consolidation) B. 21 (M.) for Com. to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14520 (vi).
——— (M.) to appoint Managers to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14690 (vi).
——— Rep. of Special Com. (presented) 14663.
——— (remarks) *re* Conference with Senate, 14740.
Ry. Act (fire guards) Amt. B. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, 871 (i).
Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. B, 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1060 (i).
Railway Appropriations *re* Expenditure, Transfer to other Votes (remarks) 14055 (vi).
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8124 (iv).
Railways constructed without Govt. Aid, Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 8488 (iv).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Ry. Policy, Govt. Announcement (remarks) 6426.
Railway Subsidies (B. 270) prop. Res., 13549 ; M. for Com. on Res., 14053 ; in Com. on Res., 14314, 14428 ; (auditing Co.'s books, &c.) 14516 ; (location of rys.) 14514 ; (payment of subsidies, &c.) 14511 ; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14515 ; 1°* of B., 14519 ; 2°m. and in Com., 14735 ; (Amts.) 14740 (vi).
——— Cost of Bridges, Safeguard *re* (remarks) 14512 (vi).
——— granted to provs., Amounts to each, &c. (remarks) 14484, 14687 ; Stmnt. (presented) 14852 (vi).
——— Payments of, Safeguarding, &c. (remarks) 14513 (vi).
——— voted by Govt., 1900-1902 (Ans.) 13027, 13259 (vi).
——— in 1901-2-3, &c. (Ans.) 13934 (vi).
——— Amounts paid since 1900 to 1903 (Ans.) 12842, 13370 (vi).
——— voted for past ten Years, &c. (Ans. 13934.
Railway Act (Supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. (B. 258) prop. Res., 8332 (iv) ; 10715, 11189 ; in Com. on Res., 12574 ; 1°* of B., 12584 (v) ; in Com., 12944 (vi).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1812 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11032 ; (N. S.) 11800 ; on M. for 3°, 12482 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12445 (v).
——— (remarks) 408 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (remarks) 544 (i).
Revenue and Expenditure, Amounts collected, &c., for 1903 (Ans.) 12715, 13370 (vi).
Rideau Canal Employees, Delay in Paying (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Roberval to James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Rosebery and Imperial Defence : *See* 'Imperial.'
St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
St. John, Long Wharf : *See* 'Long.'
See 'Allan,' 'C.P.R.', &c.
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).
St. Lawrence Islands, Improvements, in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
St. Louis Exposition, Canadian Exhibits (Ans.) 3001 (ii).
St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4589 (ii).
St. Peter's and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).
Salmon Industry, Fraser River, &c. (remarks) 9970 (iv).
Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com, on Res., 14325 (vi).
Sinclair, James : *See* 'Patent.'
South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8266 (iv).
S. A. War, Supplies purchased by Imp. Gov., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for O. Cs., &c., 2761.
See 'Hay,' &c.

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Steel Rails and Clergue Govt. contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

See 'Clergue,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7028 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Supplies to I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

Supply (M.) for Com., 89 (i).

Supply (B. 206) 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 5243 (iii).

Supply (B. 218) prop. Res., 6003; conc. (M.) 6069; in Com., 6170 (iii).

Supply Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5995 (iii).

——— (remarks) *re* one-fifth Vote, 6408 (iii).

——— (B. 241) 1°m., 8404 (iv).

——— (B. 271) prop. Res., 14767; 1°* of B., 14768.

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census) 4597, 4644, 4801; (census, N.B., religions) 4810; (gold exhibits) 4617; (Stuart, Capt. dismissal) 4353 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (electric station by-wash) 12906; (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12908; (macadamizing tow path) 14151; (tow paths) 12906 (vi); **Cornwall** (electric equipment) 14134; (enlargement) 12895; **Farran's Point** (acetylene gas plant) 14155 (vi); (enlargement) 7565 (iii); 12898, 14150; **Galops** (channel completion) 14644 (vi); (deepening, &c.) 8268; conc., 8374; (enlargement) 7804 (iv); 12899, 14141 (vi); (north channel) 7803 (iv); 14142 (vi); **Generally** (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157; (operating expenses) 12920; (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (surveys, &c.) 12900; (tolls, collectors) 12929; **Grenville** (guide pier) 12909; (investigation *re* supt.) 14157 (vi); **Lachine** (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv); 14142; (enlargement, &c.) 12903; (hydrographic surveys) 12904; (lock gate protection) 14142; (masonry walls) 12906; (Mill Street paving) 14153; (Lake St. Francis dam) 14152; **Miscellaneous** (engineers, &c., salaries) 12910; (general vote) 12910; (Heath, Geo., compensation) 14155; (litigation expenses) 12911; **Murray** (Johnson's purchase of house) 14145; (wire fencing) 14151 (vi); **North Channel** (dam construction) 7803; **Rideau** (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); (Hog's Back, swing bridge) 12904; (swing bridge at Concession St., Ottawa) 14150; **St. Ours** Lock (stop logs) 12908 (vi); **Sault Ste. Marie** (construction) 7560 (iii); 12904; **Soulanges** (bank repairing) 14154 (vi); (construction) 7549 (iii); (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (O'Leary's claims) 14651 (vi); **Trent** (construction) 7551 (iii); 14645; (Corry & Laverdure claims) 14651; (Peterborough pier) 14645 (vi); **Welland** (deepening, &c.) 7804 (iv); (deepening long level) 14148; (drainage) 12905 (vi); (Dunnville dam) 7809 (iv); (electric lighting) 12900, 14148; (elevator foundations) 14149 (vi); (land damages) 7805 (iv); (land surveys) 12905 (vi); (mitre sills) 7804 (iv); 14148; (Port Colborne improvements) 12902; (Port Colborne, rock cut) 14148; (protection walls) 12905 (Ramy's Point obstruction) 12902; (summit level) 12903; (Townsend valve, lock gates) 12905; **Williamsburg** (gate lifter) 14149; (scow) 14154; (overseer's house) 14150 (vi).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes, printing, &c.) 5135 (ii), 14252 (vi); (Receiver General) 12584 (v).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.: Aud. General (promotion) 14255, (vi); Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 320; Finance (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 224 (i); (Insurance) 12586; Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries, &c.) 207 (i); (High Commissioner's Office) 12586 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239; Interior (salaries) 269 (i); Railways and Canals (2nd-class clerk) 14055 (vi); (salaries) 335; Sec. of State (printing, &c.) 223 (i); (2nd-class clerks) 14254 (vi); (salaries) 222 (i).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (miscellaneous expenditure, &c.) 3967; (preferential tariff) 3940 (ii).

Fisheries (fishery officers) 5050; (inspectors' salaries) 5128 (ii); (lighthouses, &c.) 5312 (iii); (lobster hatcheries) 13661 (vi); (salaries) conc., 6070 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6668; (exodus, &c.) 6729 (iii); (general expenses) 2299 (i); (repatriation, &c.) 6716 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7772; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).

Justice, Administration of (Henry, Justice, retiring allowance) 14662 (vi).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 4173 (ii); (Halifax harbour buoys) 13638 (Marconi stations) 13647 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 5005 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan Boundary commission) 2299 (i); (arbitration, Dom. and Prov.) 12590 (Art Gallery) 12589 (v); (Barton, Sir Edmund, expenses, &c.) 6952 (iii); (classifying records) 12592 (v); (Martineau defalcations) 6991 (iii); (Micmac Dictionary, printing) 12592; (Mining Institute) 12591 (v); (naturalization act, expenses) 6952 (iii); (Paris agency) 12589 (v); Petersen, Tate & Co., deposit) 6953 (iii); (Prince Albert *Advocate*, printing) 14652 (vi); (Printing Bureau plant) 12587 (v); (St. Lawrence Islands, improvements) 14661 (vi); (S. African memorial association) 6992 (iii); (tobacco commission) 8267 (iv); (trade combinations investigation) 14654 (vi); (unforeseen expenses) 6951 (iii), 12588 (v); (Victoria Memorial, Can. contribution) 14655); Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce, compensation) 14274 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. (general expenses) 6889 (iii); (salaries, &c.) 13787 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4043; (St. Lawrence, transportation) 4044; (supplies) 5046 (ii).

Post Office: Outside Service (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works. Buildings, N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i); (Halifax custom house) 13031; (Halifax, immigration shed) 13033 (vi); **Ont.** (rural mail delivery) 515 (i); **Ottawa** (buildings) 5007 (ii); (census building) 992 (i); (Rideau Hall grounds) 5006 (ii); (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996; (Royal mint) 346 (i)

Docks (commission's rep.) 2982 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2644 (ii); **N.B.** (St. John River, wharfs) 1180; **N.S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1071 (i); (Breton's Cove) 13167 (vi); (Cow Bay) 1079; (Drumhead Breakwater) 1087 (i); (Frudes Point, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1088 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1096; (Green Cove, harbour) 1100; (Kingsport, pier) 1104; (Lunenburg, harbour)

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

1108; (Three Fathoms, harbour) 1149 (i); (Victoria Beach, wharf) 13125 (vi); (West Baccaro, channel) 1150; **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191; **Que.** (Grande Vallee, pier) 1552 (i); conc., 6070 (iii); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2271 (i).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (Dixon, F. A.) 2729; (temporary clerks) 2732 (ii).

Slides and Booms (repairs) 2980 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Belle Isle) 2712; (Marconi system) 2712; (Mar. provs.) 2711; (telegraph lines, St. Lawrence) 5007 (ii).

Quarantine (small-pox) 5011 (ii).

Railways—G. T. Pacific (surveys) 14646; (G.T. R., rental) 12887 (vi); **I.C.R.** (air brakes, freight) 7527 (iii), 8281; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (v); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093; (car shops, machinery) 14106 (vi); ('Chapman' ball-bearing apparatus) 8283: (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8315 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi); ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8284 (iv); (Connolly's claim and interest) 14103; (double tracking, &c.) 14062 (vi); (draw bars) 7520 (ii), 8288 (iv); (Eastern Extension, award, &c.) 7529 (iii); (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 (v); (general vote) 12873; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14094 (vi); (Halifax accommodation) 7522 (iii), 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080; (Halifax terminus) 14646 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7520 (iii); (machinery for shops) 8290 (iv), 14106; (Metapedia station) 14096 (vi); (Metis station and road) 12604 (v), 12828 (vi); (Miramichi bridge) 8307 (iv); (Moncton accommodation) 12600; (Moncton, freight sheds) 14090 (vi); (Moncton workshops) 8312; (Muhlfeld's rep. *re* 'Cleveland' cylinder) 8284 (iv); (New Glasgow, freight shed) 14095 (vi); (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v); (North Sydney, station) 14089 (vi); (operating expenses) 7811 (iv); (Ouelle river branch) 7526 (iii), 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi); (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Point Tupper improvements) 8309 (iv); (power saw) 12607 (v); (Restigouche bridge) 8304 (iv); (Riviere du Loup engine house) 12593 (v); (Rivière du Loup, work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8309 (iv); (River Ouelle, spur line) 7526 (iii), 12599 (v); (rolling stock) 8292 (iv), 14100; (St. Flavie. accommodation) 12602 (v); (St. John, accommodation) 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063; (*Scotia* Str., salvage) 14107 (vi); (steel rails) 5005 (ii); (Stellarton, increased accommodation) 8296 (iv); (sidings, additional) 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi); (Truro, accommodation) 12603 (v); (vestibule equipment) 7529 (iii), 12600 (v); (Windsor station) 14097 (vi)

Miscellaneous (gratuities) 14155; (ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

P.E.I. (Albany station) 14133; (Alberton station) 14132 (vi); (Blue Shank line, straightening) 7530 (iii), 14133; (Charlottetown station) 14131; (general vote) 12891; (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 14115; (Kensington accommodation) 12840; (Kinkora accommodation) 12841; (Montague bridge) 14132 (vi); (Mount Stewart, freight house) 7530; (Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge) 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108; (Northam and Richmond stations) 12841 (vi); (steel rails) 7803 (iv); (Summerside, coal sheds) 12828; (water service) 12841 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).

Superannuations (Casselman, W. J., lockmaster) 14272 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7795; (preferential tariff in France) 7799 (iii).

Unprovided Items, 6993 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Court Act Amt, B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2369 (i).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4920, 4937 (ii).

Tariff Act Amt. B. 273 (surtax) in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

——— Revision, Inquiry for Cor., &c., 3003 (ii). *See* 'Budget,' &c., 'Customs,' &c.

Telephone Legislation (remarks), 409 (i).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314, 14380 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco Excise Duties, Par. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks), 5702 (iii).

Tobacco in Foreign Countries, &c., Amt. paid to Mr. Blaise Dugas *re* Trip (Ans.), 1035 (i).

Tobin Co. and Subsidy to Trois Pistoles Ry. (remarks) 14462 (vi).

Trackmen on Govt. Rys., Increase of Salaries (remarks), in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14086 (vi).

Transcontinental Ry., &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*), 7727 (iv).

——— *See* 'G.T. Pacific.'

Transportation Commission, Formation, &c., (remarks), 9819 (iv).

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, *re* Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks), 854 (i).

Treadgold Commission, Tel. from W. A. Beddoe *re* Refusal of Commissioner to produce Files (remarks) 9818 (iv).

Trent Canal, Medical Officer (Ans.) 8117 (iv).

——— Payment to Thos. Dodds (Ans.), 8118 (iv).

——— Rep. of W. McLeod *re* Route, &c. (Ans.) 12716 (v).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Tyerman, P. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.), 286 (i).

United Empire Life Insurance Co,'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*), in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*), in Com., 4587 (ii).

Veterinary Inspectors, Salaries, &c. (Ans.), 1591 (i).

Voters' Lists: *See* 'Electora..,' &c.

Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Ways and Means (Res. for Com.), 89 (i).

——— The Tariff (M.), 1378 (i).

See 'Customs,' 'Budget,' &c.

Ways and Means re G.T.P. Surveys, in Com., 14765 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans), Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2341 (i).

Welland Canal, Lock Tenders (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 12923 (vi).

Wheat Freight Rates for Export to Montreal, &c. (Ans.), 11188 (v), 11426 (v).

Wheat Freight Rates, Res. of Morden Board of Trade (Ans.), 12074 (v).

Williamsburg Canal, Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12928 (vi).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Mackinnon*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Wood Alcohol manufactured, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

See 'Supply—Civil Govt., Inland Revenue.'

Yukon Supplies, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4071 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*

Agricultural Lecturers, Names, &c. (Ans.), 8615 (iv).

American Cattle purchased for British Govt. (remarks, 5415 (iii).

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Allegations *re* Inspection of Fruit (remarks), 13508 (vi).

——— Appnmt. as Fruit Inspector (Ans.) 13372 (vi).

Animals Contagious Diseases (B. 194), 1° *, 4003; 2° m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690 (ii).

Archives, Rep. (presented), 5417 (iii).

Art Gallery and Can. Artists, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13515 (vi).

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14050 (vi).

Burrard, B.C., Census, McCraney's Letter *re* Enumerators (remarks), in Com of Sup., 7079 (iii).

Business of the House, Misleading Statements (remarks), 4348 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention (B. 207) prop. Res., 4960; in Com. on Res., 5052; 1° m., 5240; in Com., 5419, 5846 (iii).

Butter and Cheese Weighing, Rep. *re* (Ans.), 5414 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, &c., (remarks), 10746 (v).

Canadian Exhibit at Imp. Institute, London (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13509 (vi).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*), to Com. of Sup., 5467 (iii).

Census, Burrard: *See* 'Burrard.'

Census, Carleton, &c., N.B., Classification, &c. (Ans.), 4004 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13707 (vi).

——— Grand Manan, N.B., Religious denominations, &c. (Ans.) 3801 (ii).

——— 1901, New Basis *re* Work of Staff (Ans.) 13936 (vi).

——— St. John, N.B., Religious Denominations, &c. (Ans.) 3801 (ii).

——— Schedules, Halton, Cardwell and Peel, for 1891 (Ans.) 6894 (iii).

——— *See* 'Halton,' &c.

——— Sunbury, &c., N.B., Religious Classification (Ans.) 4005 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture,' 'Pub. Accts.' &c.

Fruit Inspector Anderson: *See* 'Anderson.'

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3810 (ii).

——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3826 (ii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9512 (iv); in Com. on B., 11296 (v).

Hagar, Miss, Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 5316 (iii).

Halton, Cardwell and Peel, Census Schedules (Ans.) 6436, 7092 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).

Herald Co., Ques. of Privilege, 5314 (iii).

Imperial Institute Exhibit: *See* 'Can. Exhibit.'

Kelly, Wm., Census Commissioner for N. Hastings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).

Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).

Patent Act Amt. (B. 184) 1° m., 3622; in Com., 4213, 4674 (ii).

Preston, Mr., and Can. Butter: *See* 'Butter,' &c.

Privilege (Ques. of), Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 5314 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Production of Census Schedules, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

Roach, Mr., Census Enumerator for N. Ontario (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

St. Louis Exposition, Live Stock Exhibit (Ans.) 4837 (ii).

San José Scale, *re* Nursery Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13502 (vi).

Schell, J. T., M.P., Goods supplied to Govt. (Ans.) 4959 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale (B. 200) in Com. on Res., 5084; 1° m., 4442 (ii); in Com. on B., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn., 12493 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Acadian historical data) 13505 (vi); (aid to societies) 4432; (archives) 4429 (ii), 13503 (vi); (Canadian exhibit at Imperia Institute) 4435 (ii), 13509 (vi); (census) 45941 (census, Côté circular) 4657; (census enumerators) 4646; (census, N.B.) 4801; (census

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Agriculture—Con.

schedules) 4635 (ii), 7053 (census, total cost) 7053 (iii); (classification of patents) 4433 (ii); (cold storage) 7086 (iii), 7670; (creameries, N.W.T.) 7632 (iv); (criminal statistics) 4429; (dairying branch) 4671; (exhibitions) 4599; (experimental farms) 4548; (fumigating stations) 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi); (general statistics) 4429; (Health Act) 4440, 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii); (Japan Exhibition) 4626; (patent branch, salaries) 4350 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7641 (iv); (Prof. Shutt's report) 4556; (St. Louis exhibition) 4599; (San José scale) 4434; (Stuart, Capt., dismissal) 4354 (ii); (Toronto Industrial exhibition) 13501 (vi); (Tracadie lazaretto) 4439; (Treadgold exhibit) 4612 (ii); (tuberculosis, aid to Can. Association) 13517 (vi); (*Year Book*) 4429 (ii).

Immigration (exodus to U.S.) 6875; (repatriation, &c.) 6713 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (freight rates, &c.) 7583 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Magog P.O.) 13081 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5502; (diseased immigrants) 5492; (hog cholera) 5505 (iii); (public health) 4440 (ii), 5490 (iii); (public health, small-pox) 5007 (ii); (small-pox) 5491 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14308 (vi).

Tuberculosis, Aid to Can. Association, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles (Minister of Justice), *Quebec County.*

Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) in Com., 5361 (iii).

Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5875 (iii).

Anglo-American Cable Co. and P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13332, 13338 (vi).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. (remarks) in Com. on B. 155, 14771 (vi).

Binder Twine, Average Price, &c. (Ans.), 7566 (iv).

——— Average Price for Sisal, &c. (Ans.), 8085 (iv).

——— Circular *re* Sales, &c. (Ans.), 4182 (ii).

——— Cost, &c. (Ans.), 2311 (i).

——— Mr. Haycock's Powers under Act (remarks) 14047 (vi).

——— Residences of Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 4183 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries,' &c.

Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., O. Cs., &c., 105 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan. B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5121 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Lands, School Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360, 5556 (iii).

Capital Cases, Commutations, &c. (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Carver *vs.* King, Commutation of, Reps. *re* (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 604 (i).

Columbia River Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 150) in Com., 5559 (iii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3281 (ii).

County Court Judges, Appnmt. from local Bars (remarks) 5582 (iii).

——— Appnmts., Retirements, &c. (Ans.), 4960 (ii).

——— *See* 'Judges'.

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Act Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 95; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i).

——— (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 2779, 3242 (ii).

——— (general) Amt. (B. 215) 1° m., 5581; 2° m., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746; (cigarettes), 10748 (v); Order dschgd., 14768 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4023 (ii).

Desjardins Canal (B. 183) 1° m., 3393; in Com., 4213 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 906 (i); (compulsory voting), 13583, 14405 (vi).

——— Controverted Elections Act Am. (B. 13) 1° m. 95; 2° m., 635; in Com., 1115, 2239 (i).

——— Elections Act Amt., B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 1061; in Com., 1062 (i); Amt., 3236 (ii).

Dorchester Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Fuel (Ans. 10101 (v).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 109) 1° *, 1378 (i).

Election Bills: *See* 'Dom.' &c.

Empire Accident Surety Co.'s incorp. B. 107 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 2755 (ii).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8244, 8360 (iv).

Expropriation Act Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 93; in Com., 291, 613, 634 (i).

Gagetown, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.), 1676 (i).

Good Shepherd Reformatory N.B. (B. 199) 1° m., 4178; in Com., 4840 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5216 (iii); 7817, 7824, 7845 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9006 (iv); in Com. on B., 10424, 10568, 10619, 10649, 11190, 11210, 11319, 11833, 11864, 12063, 12074, 12164; (amt. to amt. *re* securities), 11963 (v).
——— Legal Opinions (read) 11335 (v).
——— Pets. *re* on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13269 (vi).
——— 2-cent a mile rate, 10465, 12225 (v).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Taylor, 10564 (v).
Haycock: *See* 'Binder Twine.'
Hêtu, R., Pardon, &c. (Ans.), 7915 (iv).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*), 788 (i).
Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3258 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927 (i).
Judges appointed from Local Bars: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 208 (i).
Judges of the Superior Courts, Retiring Allowance (B. 7), 1° m., 93; prop. Res., 203 (i); (M.) to discharge Res., 2582 (ii).
Judges Retiring Allowance (B. 243) prop. Res., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8087, 8369; 1° * of B., 8372 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14296 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 250), prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 10759; 1° *, 2° *, and in Com., 10792, 11406 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (Quebec) B. 255, in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° of Res. m., 11833; in Com. on B., 12301 (v).
Judges of N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 259) 1° m., 12610; in Com., 13853, 14287 (vi).
Judges of Ont., Judges' Salaries, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 96 (i).
——— of County Courts, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3628 (ii).
——— *See* 'County,' &c.
Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented), 90 (i).
Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. (B. 10) 1° m., 94; in Com., 314 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Groceries, &c. (Ans.), 10100 (v).
Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for cor., 100 (i).
Librarians of Parlt. (B. 267) prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com., 14299 (vi).
Lt.-Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113, 661 (i).
Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
Man. Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
See 'Myers.'

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5100 (ii).
Miller Bros., P.O. Saving Bank Deposits, Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14659 (vi).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4465 (ii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113, 661 (i).
Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada's B. 65 (Mr. *Bruce*) in Com., 2304 (i).
Myers, Appnmt. as Judge in Man. (Ans.) 285 (i).
See 'Man.,' &c.
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) M. to ref. back to Com., 2753 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6432 (iii).
N.W.T. Representation in Senate (B. 253) 1° m., 11691; in Com., 12302 (v).
Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. 2717 (ii).
Pardons, Prerogatives, &c. of His Ex., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Ret., 567 (i).
———Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 96 (i).
Penitentiary Act Amt. (B. 217) 1° m., 5763 (iii) 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v).
Penitentiaries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. (B. 182) 1° m., 3392, 4203 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii).
Public Works Dept., Control and Transfer (B. 269) 1° m., 14281; in Com., 14741; (Amt.) 14755 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. *Power*) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14705 (vi).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14455 (vi).
Quebec Judges and Legal Business, &c. (Ans.) 14665 (vi).
See 'Judges' B. 255.'
Ry. Act (commission) Amt. B. 21, Salaries (prop. Res.) 8085; (M.) for Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).
Ry Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2599, 3847, 3886, 4126, 4578 (ii) 5780, 7299, 7609, 8125 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Two Cent Rate to M. for 3°, 8357 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13834 (vi).
——— on Conference with Senate Managers *re* Amts., Report of Progress, 14740, 14761; Rep. (read) 14844; M. to conc., 14844 (vi).
Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, Iberville) on M. for 2°, 2784 (i).
Ry. Debts Bill; *See* 'Exchequer,' &c.
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14429, 14507; in Com. on B., 14736 (vi).
Reformatory Prisons (B. 221) 1° m., 6427 (iii); in Com., 8087 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

Registrar of Supreme Court Salary (B. 268) in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com. on B., 14300; (Amt.) 14403 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 719; on M. for 2°, 1230 (i); in Com., 10943, 10976, 11490; (Quebec) 11792; (Toronto) 11735; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12435 (v).

Representation of P.E.I. and N.B. (Ans.) 5316 (iii).

———Papers *re* N.B. (remarks) 1110 (i).

———*Re* P. E. I. and N. B., Cor. respecting (remarks) 876 (i).

Revised Statutes; *See* 'Statutes,' 'Supply—Justice, Miscellaneous.'

St. James Division (Electoral) Vacancy (remarks) 409 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Acting Warden, &c. (Ans.) 10832 (iv).

———Hospital, &c. (Ans.) 13669 (vi).

———Investigation of 1898 (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

Schell, Mr., M.P., (M.) to ref. Stmnt. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 5417 (iii).

Saunders, Mr. C. E., Appnmt. at Experimental Farm, &c. (Ans.) 1676 (i).

Scotia, Str. Salvage Claims, &c. (remarks) 7206 (iii) 14107 (vi).

Senate Representation of N.W.T.: *see* 'N.W.T.'

Seven Islands Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13000 (vi).

South Shore Ry., Working, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 450 (i).

Statutes, Revised, Publication, Act Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 94; in Com., 634 (i).

Statutes, Revision (B. 265) 1° m., 13667; in Com., 14297 (vi).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7034, 7047 (iii).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14429 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143 (vi).

Charges of Management (public debt) 14253 (vi).

Civil Govt.: Customs (salaries) 321; Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 208 (i); (McGillivray, A. J.) 14255; (Morris, Thos.) 14255; (Messrs. Power and Fraser) 14255; (Miss Quain) 14255 (vi); (salaries) 207 (i).

Customs (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3951 (ii).

Indians (legal expenses) 6418; (Waby trial) 6418 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7776; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).

Justice, Administration of (Ad Hoc Judges) 3402; **B.C.** (judges' travelling allowances) 3400; **Exchequer Court** (Admiralty accommodation) 3409; (Admiralty, registrar) 3408; (reports) 3407; (registrar) 3407; (salaries) 3406; (travelling expenses) 3407; (execution

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.

expenditure) 3401; **Man.** (judge's travelling expenses) 3399 (ii); **Miscellaneous** (Statutes, revision) 14643; **N.B.** (divorce court) 3401 (ii); **N. W. T.** (fees, &c.) 14257 (vi); (Prince Albert court, clerk) 3401; (prisoners in N.W.T.) 3398; (Regina jail, land purchase) 5135 (ii); (Supreme Court judge) 14257 (vi); **N. S.** (county court judge Dodd) 14259; **Ont.** (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); **Supreme Court** (contingencies) 3404; (law books) 3405; (library) 3403 (ii); (reports) 14257 (vi); (Reps., binding, &c.) 3405; (reporter) 3402 (ii); (Taschereau, E. R. A.) 14257 (vi); **Yukon** (clerk of court) 3411; (Dugas, judge) 3411; (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3410, 3414, 3507; (judges living allowances) 3411; (law library) 3506 (ii), 14267 (vi); (police magistrates) 3416; (Taylor, Geo. L.) 3416; (travelling allowances) 3409 (ii).

Dom. Police (salaries) 3511 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3511; (general expenses) 3511; (Kingston) 3511; (Manitoba) 3534; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3534 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4171; (pilotage *re* St. Lawrence) 4144; (St. Lawrence, improvements) 4144 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi).

Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3589, 3600 (ii).

Miscellaneous (British American Bank Note Co.) 14279; (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election pet.) 14251 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4068 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Levis) 431 (i); Harbours and Rivers: Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633; Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); N. S. (Neil's Harbour) 1141; Que. (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Chateau Richer) 13456 (vi); (Le Tableau wharf) 2254 (i); (Ste. Anne de la Perade, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Famille pier) 13489; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 13495; (St. Louis River, improvements) 13473; (Seven Islands wharf) 13480 (vi); Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2688 (ii); Telegraph Lines, Que. (Belle Isle system) 13332; (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332 (vi).

Rys. and Canals: Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A. D.) 2729 (ii); (litigation expenses) 12911; (Stewart *vs.* King) 12913 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (iron bounties, legal expenses) 7797 (iv).

Supreme Court of Ontario, Judges' Salaries B., prop. Res., 10102 (iv).
See 'Judges' B. 250.'

Supreme Court Registrar (B. 268); in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com., 14300 (Amt.) 14403 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12305 (v).

Ticket-of-Leave System, Releases, &c. (Ans.) 96.

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4533 (ii).

Two-cent Ry. Rate: *See* 'G. T. P. R.,' &c., 'Ry. B. 21.'

Valiquette, Mr. J. A., Appnmt. as Stenographer, Yukon (Ans.) 4005 (ii).

Yukon Ter. Act (summoning of jurors) Amt. (B. 9) 1°m., 94; in Com., 313 (i).

——— (Court of Appeal—quorum)—(B. 254) 1°m., 11692 (v).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's (N.B.)*
Albert, N.B., Harbour Master, Capt. Bishop, Dismissal (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
Allan Line Steamships, Withdrawal from St. John (remarks) 13937 (vi).
——— Reduction of Sailings from St. John, N.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14064 (vi).
Aylesworth, Mr. A. B., Reported Interview *re* Alaskan Boundary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi)
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6384 (iii).
Bathurst, N.B., Fishery Overseer, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14686 (vi).
See 'Daly.'
Beersville Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).
Belmont Disaster Victims, Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
See 'Crandall.'
Bishop, Capt., Harbour Master at Albert, N.B., Dismissal (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
Bloomfield Postmaster, N.B., Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 818 (i).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).
C.P.R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
C.P.R. (Medicine Hat) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii).
Charbonneau, Miss Edna, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12498, 12716, 13968 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12336, 12500; I. C. R. trackmen, 12561 (v); on M. for 3°, 13942 (vi).
Crandall, Brakeman on I. C. R., Inquiries at Belmont (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
See 'Belmont.'
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s (Parrsboro') Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Daly, M. T., Bathurst, Harbour Master, N.B. (Ques.) 2919 (ii).
See 'Bathurst.'
Demurrage Regulations, I.C.R. (Ques.) 4672, 4952 (ii).
Digby Port Wharf, Extension, &c. (Ques.) 2101.
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7604 (iii), 13687 (vi).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13570, 14405 (vi).
Elgin and Havelock Ry. Co.'s (B. 142) 1°*, 2237.
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8255, 8257 (iv).
Ferries on St. John River: in Com. of Sup., 13696 (vi).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Freight Rates on Ocean Vessels, Discrimination: *See* 'Discriminating.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5173 (iii); in Com., 7844, 7883; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8055, 8067, 8321 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10243; in Com. on B., 10670, 11215, 11876, 12045 (v); on M. for 3°, 12744; (amt.) 12709 (vi).
Hatfield's Point, Lighthouse-keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
House of Commons Officials, Salaries: *See* Civil Service B. 257.'
Indian Medical Attendant, Kings, N.B. (Ques.) 2502 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
I. C. R. Demurrage of Cars, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 4672, 4959 (ii).
——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3675 (ii).
——— Private Cars: *See* 'Private.'
——— Supplies entered Duty Free (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
See 'Trackmen.'
International, Dredge leased by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 12218 (v).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8110 (iv).
Kars, Census Enumeration, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3804 (ii).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).
Lake Superior, &c., Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Long Wharf, St. John, Lease by Govt. (Ques.) 11828 (v).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
Nobles, Israel, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory (remarks) 13979 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6457 (iii).
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. 5659 (iii).
Post Office Revenue, Increase, &c. (remarks) 14019 (vi).
Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14658 (vi).
P.E.I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7914 (iv).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Private Cars, I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 2309 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14708, 14717 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5329, 5566 (iii).
Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 2924 (ii).
Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5630 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).
Ry. Wrecks, in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10953, (N.B.) 11809; on M. for 3°, 12490 (v).
St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).
St. John, Long Wharf: *See* 'Long Wharf.'
——— Allan Line, &c., Withdrawal: *See* 'Allan.'
St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).
Schell, J. T., M.P., Goods supplied to Govt. (Ques.) 4959 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale, B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6474 (iii).
Small-Pox Patients, Gloucester, N.B., Contribution by Govt. towards Expenses *re* (remarks) 14688.
Springhill Public Building, Explosion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice—N.W.T. (fees, &c.) 14257; N. S. (county court Judge Dodd) 14259; Ont. (Nipissing Judgeship) 14258; Supreme Court (salaries) 14257; Yukon (law library) 14267 (vi).
Agriculture (census, N.B., religions) 4801 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7647 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (landing wharfs) 12908; Grenville (Tucker, Henry, services *re* investigation) 14157 (vi); Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (promotions) 14256; Public Works (architect's salary) 13499; (contingencies) 13500; (Hunter, J. B., salary) 13499 (vi).
Dom. Lands—(Banff bath house) 13956 (vi).
Excise (analysts, &c.) 5399 (iii); (inspectors salaries) 13974 (vi); (liquor inspection) 5399 (iii); (salary of private sec.) 13968 (vi).
Immigration (Barr colonists) 6696 (iii).
Indians—Mar. Provs. (schools) 6409 (iii).
Legislation—Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14269 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7604 (iv); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696; (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 13695 (vi).
Militia (rifle associations) 3768 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13957; (Miller Bros., P. O. Savings Bank defalcations) 14658 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 13543; (life-saving awards) 13544; (masters and mates examination) 13524; (naval militia reserve and school of navigation) 13545; (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 13545 (vi).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (architect's staff) 961; (dismissals, &c.) 1019; (furniture) 1006; Generally (armouries) 965; (clerks of works) 963; (experimental farms) 973; (Nappan farm) 973; (Sussex armoury) 965 (i); **N. S.** (Arichat) 5828 (iii); **Ottawa** (census building) 982; (furniture, &c.) 974, 979; (heating, &c.) 1010; (ventilation, &c.) 974 (i); **Que.** (trachoma hospital) 14245 (vi).
Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Windsor, sheer dam) 14248 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallée pier) 1523; (Le Tableau wharf) 2250 (i); (Mont Louis wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13462; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463; Notre Dame du Portage) 13463 (vi); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 (i); (St. André de Kamouraska pier) 13492; (Ste. Anne de la Pérade) 13488; (Ste. Anne de Sorel) 13489; (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491; (St. Gédéon Islands, wharf) 13491; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13490; (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 (vi); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2263 (i); (St. Maurice, dam) 13492; (St. Michel de Bellechasse, pier) 13494; (St. Simeon, wharf) 13493 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2298 (i).
Slides and Booms (Gagner, Mr., salary) 2976; (Gatineau River) 2977; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (Marconi stations) 2991 (ii).
Railways—Generally (wrecks, investigations *re*) 14154; I.C.R. (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (vi); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Eel river, agent's house) 12600; (Halifax accommodation) 12597; (Métis station) 12604; (v); (North Sydney improvements) 12598; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8292 (iv); (Rivière Ouelle, spur line) 12599 (v); (rolling stock) 8293 (iv); (St. John accommodation) 12597 (v); (St. John accommodation) 14063 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8296 (iv); (Sussex accommodation) 12601 (v); P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7539 (iii).
Sussex Armoury, Overseer's Qualifications *re* Constructions, &c. (Ques.) 8331 (iv).
——— Brigade Camp (Ques.) 3235 (ii).
——— I.C.R. Roundhouse, Gates, &c. (Ques.) 4672 (ii).
——— Station Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).
Tiffin, Genl. Manager, I.C.R., and Private Cars (Ques.) 2309 (i).
Trackmen on I.C.R., &c.: *See* 'Civil Service B. 257.'
White, Albert S., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4673 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*
Alliance Bank of Canada Incorp. B 212 (Mr *Russell*) in Com., 7477 (iii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5969 (iii).
Beauharnois Electoral District, Rep. of Com. (presented) 7202 (iii).

Fraser Mr. D. C.—*Con.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7330 (iii).
Brockville, Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*), M. for Com., 7339 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7340 (iii).
Budget, The, 2131 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5079 (ii); in Com. on B., 5453 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry, Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5631, 5820 (iii).
Canadian Steel Co.'s (B. 185) 1°*, 3708 (ii).
Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., Ques. of Order, 7483 (iii).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5557 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7495 (iii); in Com. (cigarettes) 10749 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1203 (i), 13579, 14407 (vi).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6443 (iii).
Erie, Ontario, Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3580 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8254, 8361 (iv).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6908 (iii).
Fishing Industry N.S., Accommodation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13159 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5229 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7829.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10643, 12236 (v).
Loy, Geo. M., M.P., Beauharnois, Rep. of Com. (presented) 7202 (iii).
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
Privileges and Elections Com., M. to employ stenographer, 7202 (iii).
Public Accounts Com. (M.) 367 (i).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5977; in Com., 5983 (iii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3731 (ii), 5776 (iii) 8128, 8170.
Ry. Debts. B.: *See* 'Exchequer.'
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14327.
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11115, 11501 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7249 (iii).
Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. 14297 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Public Works (architects' salary) 13499 (vi).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (repatriation, &c.) 6718 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7788 (iv).
Justice—Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3517 (ii).
Legislation—House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5270 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings—N.S. (Guysborough) 5839 (iii); Ottawa (electric lighting) 988; Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176 (i); N.S. (Big Harbour wharf) 13147; (Breton's Cove) 13159 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1076; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Larry's River) 1104; (New Harbour) 1145 (i); (Paspebiac, landing pier) 13467 (vi).
Yukon Govt. (hospital grants) 7293 (iii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9421 (iv).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9151 (iv).

Gallery, Mr. D., *Montreal, St. Anne.*
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 227 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13825 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507.
Macdougall, James Sinclair, Patent Relief (B. 169) Pet. presented, 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675 (ii).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12783 (vi).
Postmasters Salaries, Increase of 10 per cent (remarks) 14025 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13506 (vi).
Canals—Generally (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157 (vi).
Excise (liquor analysis) 5393 (iii).
Militia (military properties) 3620 (ii).
Public Works—Docks (Montreal dry dock) 2987; Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 3376 (ii).

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Yale and Cariboo.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7313, 7326 (iii).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to ref. back to Com., 5239; in Com., 5986 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7143, 7403; 3° m., 7468 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).
Budget, The, 2062 (i).
Columbia River Improvement Co.'s Limited incorp. (B. 150) 1°*, 2396 (i); on Sen. Amts., 6847; (amt.) 6894 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14415 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5228 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10464, 10690 (v).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8096 (iv).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8203 (iii).

Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.'s (B. 216) 1°*, 5679 (iii).

Midway to Vernon Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14594 (vi).

Nelson Post Office, Claims of Racine Bros. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7170 (iii), 8126 (iv).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal Co.'s B. (M.) to receive Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 3°m., 6428, 6432 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Pacific Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 164) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14677 (vi).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5661, 5862 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5341, 5570, 5766 (iii), 8126 (iv).

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2784 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2553 (ii).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5661 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14337, 14489 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (Racine Bros. claim) 7170 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5290 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6726; (on ques. of order) 6873 (iii).

Indians: B.C. (Agassiz reserve, &c.) 7266; Ont., (Dr. Secord) 6341; Ont. (medical attendance) 6341 (iii)

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6989 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 1451; (Sinclair's dismissal) 1451 (i); Generally (dredging) 2650 (ii).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11085 (v).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Cattle Guard Commission, Appnmt. of Mr. Geo. Robertson, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Census, Grand Manan, N.B., Religion, &c. (Ques.) 3801 (ii).

——— St. John, N.B., Religious Denominations, &c. (Ques.) 3800 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9327 (iv).

Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (St. Stephen and Back Bay) 7759 (iv).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Arsenault, Capt., damages, &c.) 13231; (Black Brook) 13227; (Campobello, breakwater) 13228; (Campbellton, wharf) 13229; (Cocagne wharf) 13231; (Grand Manan, wharf) 13234; (Richibucto, pier) 13235 (vi).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Gaspé & Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 166) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

I. C. R., Shops at Rivière du Loup, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 12497 (v).

Lighthouse Keepers, Pets. *re* Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivière du Loup) 13477 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*

Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 29) 1°*, 367 (i).

Montreal and Longueuil Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 156) 1°*, 2582 (ii); in Com., 5558 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3216 (ii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12856 (vi); Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2970 (ii).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 452.

South Shore Ry., Complaint *re* Safety (remarks) 205 (i).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5807 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 3126 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7500 (iii).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 2100; in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9708 (iv,)

Hamilton, Lake Erie Power Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*. 2582 (ii).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 707 (i).

Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 154) 1°*, 2501 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3574, 4577 (ii), 5259, 5778, 6071, 6243 (iii).

Ry. Act (fire compensation) Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 3291 (ii)

German, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7561 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredges, repairs) 2619 ; Ont. (Port Colborne) 3371 (ii).

Gibson, Mr. A., Jr., *York, N.B.*

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14342, 14488 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John river wharfs) 1180 (i).

York and Carleton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., on Res., 14488 (vi).

Gilmour, Mr. J., *E. Middlesex.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5421, 5432 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3822, 3827 (ii).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8097 (iv),

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12311 (v).

Permanent Force, Increase of Pay (Ques.) 13371.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4573 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10879; in Com., 10975, 11585 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12467 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6478, 7213 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (creameries) 7635 (iv).

Public Works : Buildings, Ont. (London, magazine) 13115 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5502 (iii).

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9992 (iii).

Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 56) 1° *, 707 (i).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6487 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. John) 2245 (i).

Gould, Mr. I. J., *W. Ontario.*

Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 165) 1° *, 2582 (ii), in Com., 5361 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10896 (v).

Gourley, Mr. S. E., *Colchester.*

Accommodation for Members in H. of C. (remarks) 14577 (vi).

Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*), 14824 (vi).

——— Reported Interview of Mr. Aylesworth (remarks), 13961 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay, &c., by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14204 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6369 (iii).

Bass River, N.S., Marine Light (remarks) in Com, of Sup., 14248 (vi).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks), 12816 (vi).

Brookfield Station Enlargement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

Budget, The, 1657 (i).

Campaign Literature : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., in Com. on Res., 4975 (ii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*), to Com. of Sup., 5469 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), in Com., 10747 ; (cigarettes) 10749 (v).

Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).

Customs Tariff Act (surtax) Amt. B. 273 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 14756 (vi).

Debert Coal Mine Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14328 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*), in Com., 13615 (vi).

Door-keeper of H. of C., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

Election Pamphlets : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 308 (i).

Govt. Officials canvassing for newspapers : *See* 'Political,' &c.

G.T. Pacific Ry, Co.'s incorp, B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5164 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com on Res., 10353 ; in Com. on B., 10674, 11234, 11385, 11977 ; 'Shadow of Cox,' &c., 11859, 12056, 12146 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13282 (vi).

——— on M. to adjn. debate (remarks) 8807 (iv). *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14335 (vi).

House of Commons, Door-keeper's Salary : *See* 'Door-keeper.'

I.C.R. Pension System, &c. (Ques.), 9216 (iv).

——— (remarks) 14727 (vi).

——— Trackmen and Labourers, Increased Wages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

Gourley, Mr. S. E.—*Con.*

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7944, 7972 (iv).

James Bay Ry Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14317 (vi).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759, 10769; in Com. on B., 11416 (v).

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8100 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14294 (vi).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14542, 14577 (vi),

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13626 (vi).

Maps, Printing and Publishing for Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand), 5717 (iii).

North Pole Expedition: *See* 'Bernier, Capt.'

N. W. T. Act Amt B. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14288 (vi).

Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi)

Parrsboro to Truro, Ry. Subsidy: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'

Political Partisanship *re* Govt. Officials canvassing, &c. (remarks) 13983 (vi).

Post Office Revenue, on Statement of P.M.G. (remarks), 14022 vi).

P. O. Savings Banks, Defalcations of Postmaster (remark) in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14708, 14726 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5779, 6308 (iii), 8178 (iv).

Ry. Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7135 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14317, 14491 (vi).

——— General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14377 (vi).

——— for N. S., Colchester County (remarks) 14491 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11618 (v).

Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 473 (i).

Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14297 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: N.S. (county court judges) 14265 (vi).

Canals: Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv); Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143 (vi).

Dom. Lands (maps, printing) 14272 (vi).

Gourley, Mr. S. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Fisheries (dog-fish pest) 13656; hatcheries 13661; (steamers, new) 13569 (vi).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7787; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268; H. of C. (door-keeper's salary) 14115 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 13642 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and London) 7736; (St. John and Halifax) 7743 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13961 (vi).

Public Works: Buildings, generally (immigrant buildings) 14247 (vi); Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 490 (i); Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Five Islands, wharf) 13180; (Georgeville, wharf) 13198; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203; (Port au Pique, wharf) 13210; (Port Hood, pier) 13209; (Swim's Point, wharf) 13212; Ont. (Burlington channel, piers) 13237; (Goderich, breakwater) 13241; Que. (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461; (Newport breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (Perce pier) 13467; (River du Loup) 13477; (Saguenay dredging) 13473; (Seven Islands wharf) 13480; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13355 (vi).

Railways: I. C. R. (siding facilities) 14083 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8298 (iv); (Truro accommodation) 12603 (v).

Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7796 (iv).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).

Tariff (N. S. steel industry) Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4919 (ii).

Tatamagouche Postmaster, Letter *re* Insurance Fund (remarks) 14660 (vi).

Truro to Parrsboro Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14492 (vi).

Grant, Mr. G. D., *N. Ontario.*

Budget, The, 2109 (i).

Eureka, str., Loaned by Govt. (Ques.) 14285 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections, &c. (Ques.) 13027 (vi).

Judges in Quebec as Bank Directors, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands (M. for copies of reps., &c.) 2762 (ii).

Quebec Judges and Legal Business, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10993 (v).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Investigation, 1898 (Ques.) 14284 (vi).

Toronto Public Works, Amount expended since 1890 (M. for stmnt.*) 1203 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections (Ques.) 13027 (vi).

Guthrie, Mr., H., *S. Wellington.*

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3277 (ii).

Crown Bank of Canada (B. 129) 1°*, 1936 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H.—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9082 (iv).
Guelph and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 1764 (i).
Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3251 (ii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8113 (iv).
Niagara Welland Power Co.'s Limited, Change of Name (B. 90) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 7610, 8145, (amt.) 8153 (iv).
——— (employees) Amt. (B. 74) 2°m., 3247 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Guelph, armoury) 13083 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E., *W. Prince, (P.E.I.)*
Alberton Ry. Station, P.E.I. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., P.E.I. and the Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vi).
Annandale Pier, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c. (Ques) 2921 (ii).
——— Range Lights, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).
Archives and Mr. Casey: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Art Gallery and Can. Artists (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
Ballot Boxes in P.E.I.: *See* 'Latour.'
Bonded Warehouses, P.E.I., Rental, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 12073 (v).
Brecken, Mr., P.O. Inspector, P.E I. (remarks) 14001 (vi).
Brennan, Mr. J. P., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13994 (vi).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10725 (v).
Budget, The, 2017 (i).
Buote, Mr. J., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 405 (i).
Charlottetown, P.E.I., Free Mail Delivery (remarks) 13806, 14010 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12535 (v); in Com. on B., 13824; on M. for 3°, 13947 (vi).
Conroy, Mr., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13993 (vi).
Currie, Mr. James, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13992 (vi).
DesRoches, John M., Alleged Fraud *re* Fishing Bounties (Ques.) 10955 (v).
Dominion Elections Act, Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 901 (i); in Com., (compulsory voting) 13569 (vi).
Fishery Guardian, John M. DesRoches, Alleged Fraud, &c. (Ques.) 10955 (v).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Frozen Fish, &c., Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7880; (amt.) 7909; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8326 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9459 (iv); in Com., 10637 (v); on M. for 3°, 12740 (vi).
G.T.P. Bill, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13270 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Agreement, &c., Amt. paid (Ques.) 2758 (ii).
——— Preparation of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4444 (ii).
See 'Supply—Railways.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 731 (i).
——— (remarks) 13894 (vi).
House of Commons, Official's Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service B.'
Keith, Mr., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).
Larkin, Capt. W. S., Complaints against (Ques.) 2922 (ii).
Latour, Mr., Absence from Dept. to canvas for *Le Canada* (remarks) 14006 (vi).
Mutch, Mr. H. W., P.E.I., Increase of Salaries (remarks) 13824 (vi).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks) 12822 (vi).
O'Leary Station, P.E.I., Branch Line (Ques.) 6168 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory, P.E.I. (remarks) 13978 (vi).
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Portage, P.E.I., Opening of Post Office (remarks) 14008 (vi).
Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British,' &c.
P.E.I. Coal Fields, &c. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
Prince Edward Island Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).
P.E.I, Fishing Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vi).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
See 'Winter,' &c. 'Supply—Ocean and River Service,' &c.
P.E.I. Ry., Sale of Tickets, &c. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
P.E.I. Telegraph System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii); 13333 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Roche*, Hfx.) *re* Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization,' 13375 (vi).
Queens, West, P. E. I., Representation in Parlt. (remarks) 13378 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10900; in Com., 11030; (amt.) 12432 (v).
Representation in the Cabinet from P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, P.E.I., par. in Charlottetown *Patriot*, 13806 (vi).
See 'Charlottetown.'
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday (Ques.) 1858 (i).
Semaphore Lights, P.E.I. Ry., Discontinuance, &c. (Ques.) 4443 (ii).
Skinner's Pond, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 13445 (vi).
Station Agents, P.E.I. Ry., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4361 (ii).
Telegraph Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii), 13333 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13505; (archives) 13504 (vi); (Census, Cote's circular 4657; (census, P.E.I.) 4656 (ii).
Civil Govt., Indian Affairs (salaries) 282 (i).
Customs (Curry, Mr., superannuation, &c.) 3918; (salaries, &c.), 3918 (ii).
Excise (salaries, P.E.I.) 13978 (vi).
Fisheries (Provincial claims) 5311 (iii).
Immigration (agents, P.E.I.) 6884 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6001; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 6001 (iii); (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 13676 (vi).
Militia (pay and allowance) 13442 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13534; (Govt. Strs., repairs, &c.) 13519 (vi); (Govt. steamers, service, &c.) 4059; (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4081 (ii).
Post Office (letter carriers, P.E.I.) 6058; (mail service) 6066; (P.E.I. winter service) 5944 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, P.E.I., (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi); **N.S.** (Big Pond wharf) 1072 (i); (Breton Cove) 13152; (Broad Cove) 13200; (Duncan's Cove, wharf) 13179; (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge) 1095; (Green Cove Harbour) 1101 (i); (Kingsport, pier) 13202; (L'Ardoise, breakwater) 13201; (Livingstone Cove) 13201; (Margaretsville, breakwater) 13202; (Middle river, dam) 13202; (Ogden's Pond) 13204; (Oyster Pond) 13204; (Pleasant Bay) 13205; (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1151; **P. E. I.** (Aitkin's wharf) 1159 (i); (Beach Point) 13218 (vi); (Belfast Pier) 1153 (i); (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Carleton Point) 13220 (vi); (Cascumpec Harbour) 1153; (Cove Head Harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber, &c.) 1155 (i); (dredging, &c.) 13310; (dredging plant) 13313 (vi); (Gaspereaux Harbour) 1155; (Higgin's shore pier) 1159 (i), 13222 (vi); (New London) 1160; (piers, repairs) 1161 (i); (Richmond Bay) 13223; (Skinner's Pond) 13308; (Summerside breakwater) 13226 (vi); (Tignish breakwater) 1162 (i); **Que.** (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13448; (Caplin breakwater) 13448 (vi); (Father Point pier) 1513; (Grand Vallee pier) 1515 (i); (Mont Louis wharf) 13462; (Newport breakwater) 13463; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463); (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; **Yukon** (Lewes and Yukon river) 13306 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Miscellaneous (Ottawa River surveys) 13341.
Roads and Bridges (Bryson, approaches) 13321 (vi).
Telegraph Lines—P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13326 (vi); (P.E.I. tel. lines) 2707 (ii); (P.E.I. and mainland) 5917 (iii); Que. (Marconi, Murray Bay, &c.) 13326 (vi).
Quarantine (Pethick, Dr., expenses) 5505; (veterinary division) 5504 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8275 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 12603; (Metis, station) 12604 (v); **P. E. I.** (general vote) 12891; (Hillsborough bridge) 12833; (Kinkora, accommodation) 12841 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7534 (iii), 12833; (Northam and Richmond stations) 12841 (vi); (O'Leary's station) 7538 (iii).
Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes*) for Cor., 1040 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply,' &c.
Winter Navigation, P.E.I., Construction of Str. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Haggart, Hon. John, *South Lanark.*
Alaskan Boundry Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14778 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14287 (vi).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5873 (iii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5962 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7392 (iii).
——— Res., on Ques. of Order, 7308 (iii).
Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) in Com. on G.T.P. Ry. Bill, 12751 (vi).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342, 7352 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Budget, The, Rep. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks) 410 (i).
Business of the House, on M. to take in Mondays, 3711 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7812 (iv).
——— *See* 'Govt.'
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5846 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4962, 4993, 5090 (ii), 5590, 5786 (iii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr *Oliver*) in Com., 3226, 3982 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Chapman Double Ball-Bearing Co., &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4424 (ii).
Chinese Restriction Act Amt. B. 82 (Sir *Wilfrid*

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Laurier) in Com. on Res., 610; in Com. on B. 2241 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12337 (v); in Com. on B., 13810 (vi).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4680 (ii).
Corry & Laverdure, Contracts *re* Trent Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. (immoral entertainments) B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 316 (i), 7514 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3065, 4024 (ii).
Dom. Coal Co. and Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13192 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1202 (i), 13561, 14406 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3024; in Com. on B., 4680 (ii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8250, 8360 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 291, 618 (i).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12295 (v).
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 5890 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal. *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 940 (i).
——— *See* Business.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5159 (iii), 7816, 7845, 7867 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*), 7827 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8680; on M. for 1°, 7717 (iv); in Com. on B., 12096, 12289 (v); on M. for 3°, 12676, 12757 (vi).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Par. in Toronto *Globe re* Scheme, 5892 (iii).
——— Surveys, Information, &c. (remarks), 8230 (iv).
——— Transcontinental Ry., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for cor., 448 (i).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental'.
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14331 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
I. C. R., Book-keeping: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'
——— Freight Cars on connecting Lines, &c. (M. for ret. *) 3805 (ii).
——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3657 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
——— Inquiry for Papers, 3537 (ii).
I.C.R., Mr. Pottinger's Rep. (M. for copy) 3806(ii).
——— Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'
——— Ties issued, purchased, used, &c. (M. for ret.*), 3805 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7926 (iv).
Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14317 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt, B. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (Quebec) 12301 (v).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).
Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 315 (i).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks), 658 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks), 2523 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8041 (iv).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks), 1590 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks), 14543 (vi).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13626 (vi).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 78 (Mr. *Borden*, Kings) in Com., 1117, 2240 (i).
Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) on M. to introduce, Ques. of Order, 14281 (vi).
Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. 3221 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. of Res., 14337 (vi).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6433 (iii).
N.W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12313 (v).
——— Sen. Representation B.: *See* 'Senate.'
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res,, 14327 (vi).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1311 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6809 (iii).

Ottawa, Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

——— *See* 'Waltham.'

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14461 (vi).

Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3623 (ii).

Perth Public Building, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5240, 5661; on M. for 2°, 5658; in Com., 5854 (iii).

Procedure, Ques. of, 5892 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Res., 14691 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14419 (vi).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5972; in Com., 5984 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt B 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 250 (i); in Com., 2597, 3542, 3720, 3830, 3885, 3975, 3985, 4124, 4573, 4696 (ii), 5256, 5681, 6197 (iii), 8125, 8133 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13836 (vi).

——— Commissioners' Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8120 (iv).

——— *See* Ry. Act (consolidation).

——— Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2577 (ii).

——— (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546; in Com., 550, 1059; on M. for 3°, 1199 (i).

——— Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14314, 14428 (vi).

——— (supplies for Govt. rys.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12944 (vi).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 5892 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 720; on M. for 2°, 1259 (i); on M. for Com., 10885; in Com., 10975, 12294; (Kent) 11577; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12404, 12427; neg. (Y. 28; N. 65) 12431 (v).

——— (remarks) 408 (i).

Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry. Fredericton to Woodstock, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Sault Ste. Marie Labour Disturbances and Militia (remarks) 12940 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6469 (iii).

Senate Representation in N.W.Ter., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry. Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 454, 458 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6542 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Supplies to I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census enumerators) 4656 (ii).

Canals—Galops (deepening) 8268; conc., 8374; (enlargement) 7803; Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806; North channel (dam) 7803; Rideau (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563; (construction) 7560; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7557; (Corry & Laverdure, contract) 7557 (iii); Welland (deepening, &c.) 7804; (Dunnville bridge) 7809; (land damages) 7805; (mitre sills) 7804 (iv).

Charges of Management (public debt) 14253 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (promotions) 14255 (vi); Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 322; Interior (salaries) 270 (i); Justice (salaries) 14255 (vi); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342; (salaries) 341 (i); Public Works (contingencies) 5824 (iii); Railways (salaries) 334 (i); Sec. of State (2nd class clerks) 14254 (vi).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7799 (iv).

Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 6762 (iii).

Excise (Perth, salaries) 13969 (vi).

Inspection of Staples (Man. Grain Act) 7798.

Justice, Administration of: N.S. (county court judges) 14261; Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Yukon (Dugas, Judge) 3430; (sheriffs' salaries) 3410 (ii).

Legislation: H. of C. (debates, amamuenses) 14243; (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii), 13693 (vi); (Can. and G. B.) 5998; (Can. and S. Africa) 5578 (iii); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249; (St. Catharine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election pet.) 14252 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268.

Public Works: Buildings—N.B. (Richibucto) 412; (St. John, immigration) 413; (St. John, quarantine water service) 415 (i); **N.S.** (Halifax) 411 (i); **Ont.** (Guelph armoury) 13084 (vi); **Ottawa** (Royal mint) 349 (i); (steel shelving) 13094 (vi); (Victoria museum) 366 (i), 14243 (vi); **Que.** (citadel, drill shed) 13057; (Longueuil P.O.) 13075 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. Andrew's wharf) 5894, (St. John tributaries) 5895 (iii); **N.S.** (Glace Bay wharf) 13192 (vi); (Necum Teuch wharf) 1137; (Neil's Harbour) 1141; **Que.** (Isle aux Coudres) 2242; (Lake St. John wharf) 2243; (Laprairie ice piers) 2249; (Le Tableau wharf) 2249; (L'Ile d'Alma) 2257; (repairs, improvements) 2242 (i); (rivière du Nord) 5908; (St. Laurent wharf) 5906 (iii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2257 (i); (St. Lawrence

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
ship channel) 3307 (ii); (St. Maurice river) 5904 (iii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12848 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5906 (iii).
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2678; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (air brakes to freight cars) 7528 (iii); 8281; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (book keeping) 12876 (vi); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii); (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8314; ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8285; (draw bars, exchange) 8289 (iv); (Eastern Extension, award, &c.) 7528 (iii); (G. T. R. rental) 12887 (vi); (Halifax, accommodation) 8316 (iv); (Lévis, accommodation) 7522 (iii); (machinery for shops) 8291; (Miramichi bridge) 8307; (Moncton workshops) 8312; (operating expenses) 7811 (iv); (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii); (Pictou, accommodation) 8317; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Restigouche bridge) 8304; (Rivière du Loup, work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8309; (rolling stock) 8293; (St. John, accommodation) 8315; (Stellarton accommodation) 8296 (iv).
P. E. I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7530 (iii) 7801; (steel rails) 7802 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7796 (iv).
Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301, 14403 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314, 14382 (vi).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M for Com., 4672 (ii).
Transcontinental Ry. and Sir William Mulock's Speech (remarks) 367 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M, for Com. of Sup., 3444 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Sorel Wharf, 12854 (vi).
——— *re* Speech from the Throne (remarks) 6404 (iii).
Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4536 (ii).
United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).
Waltham to Ferguson, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. to refer to Com., 664 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).
Yamaska to Lotbinière Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14318 (vi).

Hale, Mr. F. H., *Carleton (N.B.)*
Census, Carleton, &c., N.B., Religious Classification, &c. (Ques.) 4004 (ii).

Hale, Mr. F. H.—*Con.*
Drill Shed, Woodstock, N.B., Purchase of Site, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3236 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5191 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3°, 12733 (vi).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3734 (ii); (telephones) 5534 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7230 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).
Woodstock, N.B., Post Office, Repairs, &c. (Ques,) 672 (i).
——— Retaining Wall, &c. (M. for ret.*) 705 (i).

Harty, Mr. Wm., *Kingston.*
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 591 (i).
Queen's College of Kingston (B. 190) 1°*, 3864 (ii),
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4169 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Alliance Bank of Can. incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) on M. for 2°, 5585; in Com., 7470 (iii) (amt.) 7477 (iii).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4224 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec & Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1806 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circular from Aud. Gen. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 234) 1° m., 7565 (iv).
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6404 (iii).
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks) 12813 (vi).
Binder Twine Inspector, Authority as to Penalties, &c. (remarks) 14048 (vi).
Brandon, Saskatchewan & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to ref. back to Com,, 5239; in Com., 5985; on M. for 3° (amt.) 5988 (iii).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10721 (v).
Brockville & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7464; on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7345 (iii).
Bruce Mines & Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).
Budget, The, 2076 (i).
Burrard, B.C., Census, Letter of Mr. McCraney *re* Enumerators (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7077 (iii).
Business of the House *re* Printing of Bills (remarks) 2394 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5062 (ii); in Com. on B., 5422, 5452, 5850 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, &c. (remarks) 10712, 10745 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5626 (iii).

C.P.R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Can. Associated Press Despatches B.: *See* 'British.'

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5584 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5468 (iii).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13730 (vi).

See 'Burrard,' &c., 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c.

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5969, 6199 (iii).

Citizen's Bank of Canada incorp. B. 214 (Mr. *Clarke*) 7478; (amt.) 7479 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12359 (v).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3261 (ii).

Country Postmasters, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5676 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5582, 6654, 7503 (iii); (cigarettes) 10756 (v).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com, on Res., 3050; in Com. on B., 4036 (ii).

See 'German,'

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. 1062 (i); (compulsory voting) 13575, 14423 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3009 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) 4782 (ii).

German Surtax, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).

See 'Customs.'

Govt. Railways Act (supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12582 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7820, 7856 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9942 (iv); in Com. on B., 10687, 11911, 11934 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12770 (vi).

———Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13271 (vi).

Imports for 1903, Duty collected and Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 13935 (vi).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 3297 (ii).

I.C.R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Govt.,' &c.

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7974 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties paid 1890-1903 (Ques.) 11556 (v).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8111 (iv).

Lac Bouchette Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8007 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14400 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).

Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights.'

Niagara, Queenston & St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).

Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6431 (iii).

North-West Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2753 (ii).

N.W.T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12327 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4871 (ii).

Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6457 (iii).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13631 (vi).

Postmasters and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14680 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5676, 5859 (iii).

Preferential Tariff Imports: *See* 'Imports.'

Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British,' &c.

P. E. I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4223 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14711, 14731; on M. for 2°, 14734 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14454 (vi).

Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3737 (ii), 6102, 6119, 6173, 6323; (telephones) 5553 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14315, 14428, 14736 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14347 (vi).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s P. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1812 (i).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10851; in Com., 11541, 11584, 12294; (Brant) 11111, 11152; (Toronto) 11747; (Waterloo) 11643, 11652 (v).

Seeds Inspection and Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5085 (ii); in Com. on B., 6470 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5845 (iii).

Seven Islands Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14457 (vi).

Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 634 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7040 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14315 (vi).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14428 (vi).

Sugar entered for Home Consumption, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 14285 (vi).

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi); (census schedules) 7076 (iii); (deputy minister) 4356; (experimental farms) 4557 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7653 (iv); (Shutt's, prof., report) 4557 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Public Works (contingencies) 5824.

Excise (liquor inspection) 5402 (iii).

Fisheries (bait freezers) 13655 (vi).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6707 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7765 (iv).

Justice, Administration of: Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3415; Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3525 (ii).

Legislation (voters' lists) 5276 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Bronte lighthouse) 5755 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 7754 (iv).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590; (Printing Bureau plant) 12587; (unforseen expenses) 12588 (v).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4088; (meteorological service) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4116 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Man. (immigration building) 5844 (iii); N. B. (Campbellton, P.O.) 13037 (vi); N. S. (Arichat) 5833; Ont. (Clinton, P. O.) 519 (i), 5834 (iii); (Guelph) 638; (London drill hall) 642 (i); Ottawa (electric lighting, transformers) 5843; Que. (Montmagny) 5841 (iii).

Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte harbour) 1355 (i); (Burlington channel piers) 13238 (vi); (general repairs) 1374 (i); (Kaministiquia river) 5425 (iii); (Oakville pier) 1376 (i); P. E. I. (Summerside, breakwater) 13227 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river) surveys) 13357; (transportation commission) 13363 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2691 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways: I.C.R. (Canso ferry service) 12603 (v).

Tariff and Taxation *re* N. W. Immigration: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6866 (iii).

Tariff Policy of Govt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iii).

———*See* 'Customs,' &c.

Textile Fabrics B.: *See* 'Inspection.'

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14737; (amt.) 14739 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco Duties collected, 1902 (Ques.) 2103 (i).

——— 1903 (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Tobacco Excise Duties, Par. in *Globe* (remarks) 5701 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) Inquiry *re* resuming adjnd. deb., 5882 (iii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13363 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14465 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2341 (i).

Halliday, Mr. J., *N. Bruce.*

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10952 (v).

Heyd, Mr. C. B., *S. Brant.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7319, 7361, 7391 (iii).

Binder Twine, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2311 (i).

Budget, The, 1764 (i),

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5073, 5082 (ii).

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. on Sup., 13724 (vi).

——— New Basis *re* Work of Staff (Ques.) 13935 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 838 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8323 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9305 (iv); in Com. on B., 10556, 10669, 11969, 12032, 12242 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 13286 (vi).

———*See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7975 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4338 (ii).

Loan Companies, Extension of Powers B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2350 (i).

Heyd, Mr. C. B.—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2523 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8055 (iv).

National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P. R.'

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6433 (iii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4746 (ii), 5554, 6127, 6274 (iii), 8168 (iv), 12964 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* 2 cent fares, to M. for 3°, 8346 (iv).

Railway Policy of Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7126 (iii).

Railway Subsidies for past ten Years, voted by Parlt. (Ques.) 13934 (vi).

Rathbun Co.'s (B. 122) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10893, 10922, 11088, 11657 (v).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5087 (ii); in Com. on B., 7219 (iii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Railways (salaries) 338 (i).
Customs (contingent expenses) 3794 (ii).
Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6334; (medical attendance) 6334 (iii).
Inland Revenue (wood alcohol) 239 (i); (Keilty, Mr., appnmt.) 5370 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7768, 7773 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7603 (iv).
Post Office (letter carriers, salaries) 6022 (iii).
Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 8276 (iv).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9427 (iv).

Two cent Ry. Passenger Fares: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Holmes, Mr. R., *W. Huron.*

British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8239 (iv).

Budget, The, 1953 (i),

Can. Associated Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'British,' &c.

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13733 (vi).

Chickens, Fattening of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 824 (i).
See 'Criminal,' &c.

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3266 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes), 10752 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13570 (vi).

Holmes, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3014 (i).

Fattening of Chickens: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Fire Protection of Parliament Buildings: *See* 'Ottawa.'

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth) on M. for 2°, 3819 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*), to Com. of Sup., 4771 (ii).

Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ques.) 542 (i).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10049 (iv).

——— Member (Mr. *Taylor*) asked to keep to Clause under Discussion, 10565 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Kemp, 11987 (v).

Huron Judgeship, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt (remarks), 220 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks), 12814 (vi).

Ottawa Govt. Buildings, Rep. *re* Martineau Investigation and Security from Fire (Ques.) 4673 (ii).

Press Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (under-crossings, &c.), 6202 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Huron), 11003 (v).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7038 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (*Poultry Farming*) 7644 (iv),
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 220 (i).
Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.), 5288 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7778 (iv).
Legislation—House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5272 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Clinton, P.O.) 520 (i); N.S. (Breton's Cove), 13164 (vi); Ont. (Goderich, breakwater), 13241 (vi).

Vegetable Duties: *See* 'Garden,' &c,

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's* (*P.E.I.*).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10731 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*), on M. for 3°, 13944 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting) 13590 (vi).

Elmira Branch Line on P.E.I. Ry. (marks), in Com. of Sup., 12836 (vi).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com., 6903 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*), on M. for 3°, 8329 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for Com. on Res., 9183 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*

Post Office Revenue, on Postmaster General's Statement (remarks), 14021 (vi).

P.E.I. Ry., Total Cost, Misrepresentation, &c. (remarks), 1679 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for 3°, 12451 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale, B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7235 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Post Office—Outside Service (P.E.I. winter service) 5948 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside breakwater) 13227 (vi); Telegraph Lines (P.E.I. cables), 2710 (ii).

Railways—P.E.I. (Elmira Line), 12836; (Murray Harbour branch), 12832 (vi).

Winter Communication with P.E.I., Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies), 1036, 1051 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S., *N. Victoria (O.).*

Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*), 14786 (vi).

Art Gallery, Expenditure on Paintings, &c. (Ques.), 12717 (vi).

See 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*), in Com., 5970 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11165 (v).

Bedford Basin, I.C.R., Land acquired (remarks), 14062 (vi).

Belmont Disaster, Widows' Gratuities (remarks), 14157 (vi).

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties collected (remarks), 14048 (vi).

Bracebridge, Post Office Building (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi),

Bridges over Canals, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 10716 (v).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Artists and King Edward's Portrait, &c. (Ques.), 13026 (vi).

Canadian Beef supplied to British Troops (remarks), 483 (i).

Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).

Can. Central and O. & B. Ry. Amalgamation, Compensation, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

Can. Foundry Co.'s strike: *See* 'Scotch,' &c.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii); 5648 (iii).

C.P.R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).

C.P.R. (Medicine Hat) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).

C.P.R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Can. Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'British.'

Can. S.A. Constabulary, Attestation, Discharge, &c. (Ques.), 14287 (vi).

Canal Locks, Opening, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 14158 (vi).

Cartoons in *Military Gazette*, &c. (Ques.), 2103 (i).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 400 (i).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).

Civil Service B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res. (M.) that Com. rise, 12562 (v).

Coldstream Guards Band, Arrangements *re*, &c. (Ques.) 9683 (iv).

Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4687 (ii).

Clergue Steel Works, Labour Disturbance (remarks) 12610 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7501 (iii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3065 (ii).

Debert Coal Mines Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).

Dixon, Capt., Rep. *re* Canadians in S.A. (Ques.) 7914 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Sel. Com., 3002 (ii); in Com., 14422 (vi).

Dom. Lands, Sale, Locations, Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 670 (i).

Drill Sheds established, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13068 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4687 (ii).

Dundonald, Lord: *See* 'G.O.C.'

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Election Printing in Prince Albert *Advocate*, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

Elevator Accident, &c. (remarks) 5417 (iii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 615 (i).

False Creek, B.C., Agreement, &c. (remarks) 2758 (ii).

Ferries Regulation B.: *See* 'Navigable.'

Franking of Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Freight Rates, Discrimination: *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'

Furniture Trade with Australia, 13679 (vi).

G.O.C., Rep., &c., Publishing of (Ques.) 669 (i).

——— Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton *re* Defence Scheme, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2406 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'

Good Shepherd Reformatory, N.B., B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4841 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Gordon Highlanders' Trophy (remarks) 7253 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5152 (ii), 5171 (iii), 7816, 7880; on M. for 3° (amt.) 8065 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Wilmot's Amendment, 8067 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 7826 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8874 (iv); in Com. on B., 10421, 10586, 11238, 11887, 11346, 11887, 11901, 11950 (v); on M. for 3°, 12736, 12762 (vi).
G.T.P. Ry., Mr. Hays' Statement *re* Plans for Completion, &c., 14648 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Privs. and Elections Com., 13272 (vi).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt. for S.A. War, Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).
Hides, Trade with Australia. *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 769 (i).
——— (personal explanation) 871 (i),
House of Commons Elevator: *See* 'Elevator.'
Hutton, Maj.-Gen., Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 206 (i).
Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14447 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (Dawson) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14300 (vi).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 146) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Lindsay Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2530 (ii).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14239 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14540 (vi).
Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands, on M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Copies of Reps., &c., 2764 (ii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7992 (iv).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14399 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Military Gazette Cartoons: *See* 'Cartoons.'
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction (Ques.) 669 (i).
——— Estimates (remarks) 13368 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia,' &c., 'Personal,'&c.
Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12985 (vi).
Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).
Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'
Nicola, Kamloops and Similakameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
N.W.M. Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10741 (v).
——— Appnmts, Promotions, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).
Ninety-fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (iv).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
Painting of King: *See* 'Portrait.'
Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14461 (vi).
Patent Act. Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4674 (ii).
Patent Relief Bills (remarks) 2397 (i).
Pensions to S.A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14597 (vi).
——— *See* 'S. A.,' &c.
Personal Explanation, *re* Misprint in Speech on Militia Service, 14850 (vi).
Portrait of His Majesty, King Edward VII and Canadian Artists (Ques.) 13026 (vi).
Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).
Press Despatches from G. B.: *See* 'British.'
Press Gallery Representatives, Payment as Sessional Clerks (remarks) 14114, 14242 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate*, Printing, &c.: *See* 'Election.'
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134, 3136 (ii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3728, 3750, 4124, 4703, 4728 (drainage) 4752 (ii); 5354 (iii).
Ry. Rates, Control by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14502 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order, Ruling asked for, 14360 (vi).
Ry. Wrecks Investigation: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10892; in Com., 10951, 10957, 11439, 11505; on M. for 3°, 12478 (v).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Roach, Mr., Census Enumerator for N. Ontario (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 6997 (iii).

St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13265 (vi).

Sault Ste. Marie Disturbances, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 12610 (vi).

Scotch Labourers, &c., Return to Old Country (remarks) 7206 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7238 (iii).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reps., &c. (remarks) 11823 (v).

S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, reinstated, &c. (Ques.) 1026 (i).

——— Hay: *See* 'Hay and Oats.'

——— Pensions to Canadians (Ques.) 2920 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pensions.'

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).

——— B. 225 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6916 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7038 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census enumerators) 7083 (iii); (census, N. Ont.) 4826; (imperial institute) 4437; (patent branch, salaries) 4350 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing tow path) 14152; Cornwall (electric lighting) 14139: Farran's Point (acetylene gas plant) 14155; Grenville (Tucker, Henry, investigation services) 14157; Lachine (Guilbault, Mr., gratuity) 14157; Lake St. Francis (dam) 14152; Murray (purchase of Supt.'s house) 14146; (wire fencing) 14151; St. Ours (landing wharfs) 14154 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7560; Trent (construction) 7553 (iii); 14645; (Peterborough pier) 14645; Williamsburg (overseer's house) 14150 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Finance (Insurance) 12586; Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 207 (i); High Commissioner's Office, 12585 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 241 (i).

Dom. Lands (fire regulations) 6775; (half-breed schools, salaries) 6772 (iii); (homestead entries) 13966 (vi); (roads, &c.) 6772; (surveys) 6768; (tree culture) 6775; (Winnipeg office) 6767 (iii).

Electric Light (inspections) 5407, 5412 (iii).

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., rep., &c.) 5387; (grain weighing machine) 5387; (liquor inspection) 5401; (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373; (wood alcohol) 5375 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5278, 5288; (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6677; (creed lines) 6698; (mechanics, &c.) 6832; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6849; (tents, &c.)6849; (N.W.T. expenditure, &c.) 6882; (on ques. of order) 6871 (iii).

Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., shortage) 5406; (retirements, &c.) 5404 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7774 (iv).

Interior (Amos Barnes) 6925; (Liard River miners) 6926; (meteorological observatory) 6793; (squatters' claims) 6925 (iii).

Justice Administration of: Miscellaneous (prisoners. N.W.T.) 3398 (ii).

Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7198 (iii).

Legislation—House of Commons (messengers, &c.) 5267 (iii) 14243; (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi); (voters' lists) 5275 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 13678 (vi); (Can. and G.B.) 5998 (iii), 7582; (Can. and S. Africa) 7746; (freight rates, &c.) 7582 (iii); (wrecking plant) 13698 (vi).

Militia (defence scheme) 3763 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (G.O.C.) 3779; (pay and allowance) 3755 (ii), 13434 (vi); (rifle associations) 3767; (target practice) 3772; (Valleyfield strike) 3754 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 12589 (iv); (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14652 (vi); (Art gallery) 12589 (v); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984 (iii); (Paris agency) 12589; (printing bureau plant) 12588 (v); (S. A. memorial association) 6992.

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4078 (ii).

Post Office (letter boxes) 6153; (letter carriers) 6037; (locked boxes, H. of C.) 6026; (Mallon, A. D., retirement, &c.) 6037; (ry. mail clerks) 6026 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Man. (Winnipeg, immigration stations) 13126; **N.B.** (Campbellton, P.O.) 13037, 13040; (military buildings) 13041; (quarantine station, water service) 13042; (St. John drill hall) 13042 (vi); (St. John immigration) 414 (i); (St. John immigration shed) 13040 (vi); (St. John, quarantine water service) 415 (i), 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13038; **N.W.T.** (Strathcona Horse barracks) 13130; (Moosejaw, P.O.) 13130; (Prince Albert court-house) 13129; **Ont.** (Belleville, armoury) 13082 (vi); (Bowmanville) 510; (Guelph, armoury) 13084; (Kingston, barracks) 13118; (Military college, Kingston) 13094; (Peterborough, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 651 (i); (Wingham, P.O.) 13120; (Woodstock armoury) 13125; **Ottawa** (additional (bath rooms, H. of C.) 13006 (vi); (ventilation of Chamber) 13011; (ventilation, lighting, &c. of H. of C.) 13087; (Victoria museum) 14244; **P. E. I.** (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; **Que.** (Levis, P. O.) 13053; (Longueuil, P. O.) 13072; (Magog, P. O.) 13081; (military buildings, arsenals, &c.) 13054; (Montreal, barracks) 13076; (Quebec drill hall addition) 13077; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (St. John's, P. O.) 13059; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 1457 (i); (Victoria harbour, dredging) 13306; **Man.** (dredging plant) 13311 (vi); (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i); **Mar. Prov.** (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); **N.W.T.** (repairs, &c.) 1450 (i); **N.S.** (Abbott's Harbour) 13141;

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
(Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 13235; (Blind river, wharf) 13235 (vi); (Bowmanville pier) 1354 (i); (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bronte harbour) 1357 (i); (Burlington channel, piers) 13237; (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland, wharf) 13239; (Goderich, breakwater) 13240; (Parry Sound) 13248 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3342 (ii); (Port Perry) 13249; (Rosedale, wharf) 13249; (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13314 (vi); **Que.** (Father Point, pier) 1514; (Grande Vallee pier) 1516, 1521 (i); (Quebec harbour improvements) 3341; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3306; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2657 (ii).
Roads and Bridges (Bryson, approaches) 13321; (Edmonton, flooring) 13323; (Moisie Post Road) 13322; (Peace River, pack trail) 13323 (vi).
Telegraph Lines, Que. (Anticosti, Fox River) 13325; Yukon (working expenses) 14041 (vi).
Railways: G. T. Pacific (surveys) 14646 (vi); I. C. R. (air brakes, freight cars) 7527; (Canso ferry service) 12602; (Chaudière Junction, engine house) 12594; (Rivière du Loup, engine houses) 12593; (Halifax accommodation) 12597 (v); (investigation *re* wrecks) 14154 (vi); (Metis station) 12604 (v); (miscellaneous, gratuities) 14155 (vi); (Ouelle River, spur line) 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 14088 (vi); (power saw) 12608 (v); (rolling stock) 14100 (vi); (St. Flavie accommodation) 12602 (v); (sidings, additional) 14058 (vi); (vestibules) 12600 (v); P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14119 (vi).
Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).
Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6932 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4889 (ii).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14381, 14388 (vi).

Trent Canal, Medical Officer, &c. (Ques.) 8117 (iv).
——— Payment to Thos. Dodds (Ques.) 8118 (iv).
——— Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2324 (i).

Toronto Armouries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13085 (vi).

Toronto, Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3456 (ii).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14148 (vi).

Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Yamaska to Lotbinière Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14319 (vi).
Yukon Ry. through Can. Ter. (remarks) 14497 (vi).

Hyman, Mr. C. S., *London.*
Bills withdrawn (M.) 7263 (iii).
Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4591 (ii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.), Meeting concurrently with Sittings of the Hse., 8405 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., &c., 4441 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10860; in Com., 10942, 10958, 11584, 12293; (Brant) 11098; (Toronto) 11698; (Waterloo) 11642; (York) 11682; on M. for 3°, 12408, 12416, 12463 (v).
——— Rep. of Tel. Com. (presented) 7293 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (London drill hall) 641 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *E. Elgin.*
Alien Labour Act, Prosecutions, &c. (Ques.) 3971 (ii).
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 42 8 (ii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1510 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6976 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1808 (i).
Bankers Association, Inspection Duties, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).
Brockville and Sault St. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7340 (iii).
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14499 (vi).
——— (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 401 (i).
Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. in Com. on Res., 611 (i).
Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12494, 12517 (v).
Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3183 (ii).
——— (Ques. of Order) 3107 (ii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i); in Com., 3260 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7519 (iii).
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3243 (ii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3103 ; in Com. on B., 4011 (ii).
Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 896 ; in Com., 905 (i) ; on M. for Sel. Com., 3003 (ii).
——— B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com., 1062 (i).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6914 (iii).
Dorchester Penitentiary, Tenders for Fuel (Ques). 10101 (v).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3009 (ii).
Elgin County, Redistribution, &c., Par. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks) 6540 (iii).
Fast Atlantic : *See* 'Atlantic.'
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6905 (iii).
German Surtax : *See* 'Customs.'
Gerrymander Bill : *See* 'Representation B. 66.'
Glace Bay, N.S., Wharf, Letter of Mr. Shields (read) 13185 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7819, 7843, 784 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10425, 10613, 10671, 11297, 12240 (v).
——— on M. to adjn. Debate (remarks) 8807 (iv).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 68 (i).
Hog Cholera, Outbreak in Yarmouth, Ont. (M. for ret.*) 1058 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 809 (i).
Imperial Building, Ottawa, Govt. Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 3803 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 5172 (ii).
Interior, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).
Judges appointed from Local Bar, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2516, 2532 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, *re* (remarks) 14224 (vi).
Manufacturers' Delegation *re* Tariff (remarks) 265 (i).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3802 (ii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 5725 (iii).
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 1811 (i).
Order, Questions of, on Mr. Speaker's Rulings (remarks) 10537 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6810 (iii).
Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3624 ; in Com., 4217 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8233 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4177 (ii).
Post office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5869 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11563 (v).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys. 'Grafters,' 10521 (v).
Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4212 (ii).
Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1334 (i).
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8122 (iv).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 250 (i) ; in Com., 3839, 3891, 4128 (ii), 5765, 6133, 6217, 6259, 6324 (iii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2 60 ; in Com., 2581, 2924 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14499 (vi).
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., Blockade, &c., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2492.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10879 ; in Com., 10940, 10981, 11014, 11140, 11456, 11496, 11157, 11187, 11224, 11637, 11662 ; (Brant) 11099, 11110 ; (Toronto) 11713 ; (Waterloo) 11662 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) to M. for 3°, 12489 (v).
Rural and Free Mail Delivery (remarks) 516 (i).
St. James Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (remarks) 13378 (vi).
St. Thomas, Armoury Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
Schooley, Wm. Francis, Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com., 3224 (ii).
S. A. Constabulary, Information *re* Grievances, &c. (Ques.), 1027 (i).
Springhill Boiler Explosion (remarks) 13258 (vi).
Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7052 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (patent branch, salaries), 4350 (ii).
Canals—Welland (Dunnville dam) 7810 ; (land damages) 7805 (iv).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 272; Justice (salaries) 211; Militia (salaries) 222; Privy Council Office (salaries) 207 (i).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3785; (salaries, &c.) 3907 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff hot springs) 6789 (iii).

Geological Survey (geologist, international boundary survey) 6825; (new building) 6824 (iii).

Immigration (exodus to U. S.) 6880; (general expenditure) 6880; (on ques. of order) 6862; (Ques. of order, quoting speeches) 6871; (U.S. agents) 6849 (iii).

Labour Dept. (B.C. labour commissioners) 7198 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4172; (lightkeepers, salaries, &c.) 4166; (St. Lawrence navigation) 4150 (ii).

Militia (defence scheme) 3765; (G.O.C.) 3782; (grants to associations) 3770 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13396 (vi); (transport and freight) 3752, 3767 (ii).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6985; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6976 (iii).

N.W. T. Govt. (general expenses) 6858 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4084 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 1068; (furniture) 1006; (heating, &c.) 1066; (postmasters) 1020 (i); **Mar. Provs.** (renewals, &c.) 422 (i); **Ont.** (Alexandria, P. O.) 506; (architects) 524; (Clinton P.O.) 522 (i); (Oshawa P.O.) 13111; (St. Mary's P.O.)13109(vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 651 (i); **Ottawa** (heating) 1009; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1003; (telephones) 1013 (i).

Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 1455 (i); **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 1164; (Caraquet wharf) 1174; (Great Salmon river) 1177; (Negro Point, breakwater) 1181; (Richibucto, pier) 1177; (Shippegan, harbour) 1184 (i); **N.S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1069); (Cow Bay) 1081; (Drumhead, breakwater) 1083 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1037 (i); (Indian harbour, wharf) 13199 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102; (Kingsport, pier) 1103; (Larry's River) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105; (Margaree, wharf) 1133; (Meteghan Cove) 1134; (Neil's Harbour) 1140; (New Harbour) 1144; (Port Hawkesbury) 1148 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13209 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1151 (i); **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185; (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1192 (i); (Burlington channel, piers) 13237 (vi); (Depot Harbour) 1361; (general repairs) 1369; (Goderich harbour) 1368 (i), 13240; (Kingsville) 13244; (Little Bear Creek) 13245; (Port Stanley) 13249 (vi); (Sarnia, dredging) 2638 (ii); (Wendover wharf) 1439 (i); **P.E.I.** (Anderson's Hollow) 1164; (Cove head, harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber) 1155; (New London, wharf) 1160; (piers, repairs, &c.) 1161 (i); **Que.** (Chateauguay River) 3211 (ii); (Cross Point, pier) 1513 (i); (dredging plant) 2674 (ii); (Esquimaux Point) 2278; (Father Point, pier) 1513; (Grande Vallée, pier) 1515; (Murray Bay, wharf 2269; (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Law)rence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St-

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3306 (ii); (St. Maurice River) 2286; (Sorel, wharf) 2295 (i); (Temiscamingue Lake, dredging) 2246 (i); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2639 (ii).

Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2725; (salaries, engineers, &c.) 2731; (temporary clerks, &c.) 2731 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 2700; (Portage du Fort) 2696 (ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2689 (ii).

Tel. Lines (Belle Isle) 2712; (B.C.) 2992; (Magdalen islands) 2714; (Mar. Provs.) 2709 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes, freight cars) 8282 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 3700 (ii); 8270, 8273; ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8284; (draw bars, exchange) 8289 (iv); (Levis accommodation) 3704 (ii); (steel rails) 7803; (Sydney accommodation) 3698 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6993 (iii).

Surtax: *See* 'Customs.'

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14738 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9422 (iv).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspaper (remarks) 11081 (v).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Mackinnon*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Johnston, Mr. A., *Cape Breton.*

Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7476 (iii).

Glace Bay Wharf, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13185 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11348 (v); on M. for 3°, 12700 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, Member reading Speech, 10249 (v).

I.C.R. Extension from N. Sydney Junction to North Sydney (M. for cor.*) 447 (i).

Ry. Act (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12972 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11028, 11534; (N.S.) 11798; on M. for 3°, 12484 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5836 (iii); (Sydney Mines) 13030; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13144; (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi).

Railways—I. C. R. (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v); (Sydney accommodation) 3697 (ii).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4921 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. R., *Cardwell.*

Alton and Caledon Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14019 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7318, 7367 (iii).

Boyd, Chief Justice, Relatives in Govt. Employ (Ques.) 4185 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5080 (ii); in Com., 5436 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10640, 12109, 12252.

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13285 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5732 (iii).

Montreal Northern Ry. and St. Agathe Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 564 (i).

——— (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4711 (ii); 6135, 6217 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14483 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11746; on M. for 3°, 12428.

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census enumerators) 4825 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c. 4114 (ii).

Postoffice (country postmasters) 6037 (iii), 14019.

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4943 (ii).

Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14483 (iii).

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *Lambton, W.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10096 (v).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5435 (iii).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4426 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 839 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).

Cornwall Road and Mahone Bay Postal Service (remarks) 14038 (vi).

Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters.'

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10755 (v).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3099 (ii).

Dog Fish: *See* 'Supply—Fisheries.'

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14423 (vi).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6897 (iv).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E.—*Con.*

Fishing Industry, N.S., Accommodation to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vi).

Glass Factory, Pictou, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7892; on M. for 3°, 8323 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12062, 12254 (v).

Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).

Judge's Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8102 (iv).

Lunenburg Marine School, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13534 (vi).

Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5992 (iii).

Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4176 (ii).

Postmasters in Country Postoffices, in Com. on Postoffice Bill, 5662 (iii).

——— Increase of Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).

Post Office Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. (country postmasters), 5662, 5864 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14699 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6919 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (experimental farms) 4555 (ii).

Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658; (Behring Sea arbitration) 13658; (dog fish pest) 13651; (hatcheries, Lunenburg) 13660 (vi).

Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 6817 (iii).

Immigration (repatriation, N.S.) 6722 (iii).

Indians: Mar. Provs. (schools) 6415 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour lightship) 4165 (ii); (Marconi stations) 13646; (Nfld., aids to Navigation) 13647 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 7751 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Micmac dictionary, printing) 12592 (v).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13532; (naval reserve, school of navigation) 13546 (vi).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—**N.S.** (Breton's Cove) 13167 (vi); (Larry's river) 1104; (Lunenburg harbour) 1106 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206; (Tancock breakwater) 13217; (Victoria, beach wharf) 13214 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1152 (i); (Yarmouth bar) 13218 (vi); **Ont.** (Port Arthur) 3350 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v).

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *E. Toronto.*

Budget, The, 2050 (i).

Canadian Freight Classification, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 3537 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5595 (iii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3046; in Com. on B., 4035.

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Freight Classification (Canadian) O.C., &c. (remarks) 3302 (ii).
See 'Can. freight, &c.' Supply—Mail Subsidies,' 'Ry. Bill 21.'
German Discrimination and Bond-Hay Treaty, Inquiry for Papers, 1324 (i).
German Tariff, Cor., &c., laid on Table (remarks) 1460 (i).
Grain Standards, Samples *re* &c. (remarks) 11179.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5211 (iii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 8066 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9152 (iv); in Com. on B., 10450, 10478, 10538, 10569, 11280, 11310, 11360, 11973, 11984 (v), 12102, 12180, 12274; on M. for 3°, 12729 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order *re* 'Grafter,' 10190 (v).
See 'Privilege.'
G. T. Pacific Subsidy, Par. in Ottawa *Journal*, 5733 (iii).
See 'Ry. Policy.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 766 (i).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
I. C. R. & G. T. R., Traffic Arrangements (Ques.) 2759 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928, 7956 (iv).
Militia Force, Condition, &c. (remarks), 5733 (v).
Milk Can Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 10509 (v).
Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks), 1334 (i).
Ry. Commission B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), on M. for Com., 2589; in Com. (express rates), 2596, 3539 (ii); (freight rates) 5685, 6285 (iii); 8125 (iv).
Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7127 (iii).
Railway Sidings for Private Corporations, &c. (remarks), 14061 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com., 11051; (Toronto) 11695; (Winnipeg) 11791; (York) 11667; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12467 (v).
——— Printing of Amendments, &c. (remarks), 11424 (v).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12851 (vi).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'
SUPPLY:
Customs (contingencies, &c.) 3903; (preferential tariff) 3921; (salaries, &c.) 3911 (ii).
Justice—Penitentiaries (binder twine), 3518 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.), 7574; (freight rates, &c.) 7588 (iv).
Militia (Valleyfield strike, pay), 3602 (ii).
Postoffice (letter carriers, &c.), 6009 (iii).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings (Toronto custom house), 647.
Harbours and Rivers—**Man.** (St. Andrew's Rapids), 3355, 3364 (ii); **Ont.** (Depot Harbour), 1361; (Goderich harbour) 1366; (Toronto, harbour) 1433; (Wendover wharf) **Que.** (Quebec harbour improvements) 1439; 3338; (Sorel, deep water wharf), 3374 (ii); 12851 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (Eastern Extension, fees), 7529 (iii); (sidings, additional) 14061 (vi).
Trade Commissioner in London, Eng. (remarks), 3497 (ii).
Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks), 865 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3470, 3486 (ii); 12851 (vi).
United Counties Ry., Letter of E. D. Lafleur (read) in Com. of Sup., 12852 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*), on M. for 2°, 2340 (i); on M. to refer to Special Com., 3247 (ii).
Wheat, Export Freight Rate to Montreal, &c. (Ques.), 11188, 11425 (v).

Kendall, Mr. A. S., *Cape Breton.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com., 6900 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com., 11298, 12052 (v).
Insurance Rates *re* Ocean Steamers (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 7598 (iv).
I.C.R., Coal Rates, &c. (Ques.), 6167 (iii).
——— Trackmen, Wages, &c. (Ques.), 1297 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Res., 7972 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax), 4288 (ii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8102 (iv).
Labour Commission, 1886, Names, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.), 8083 (iv).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks), 2525 (ii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), in Com., 3744 (ii), 5340 (iii), 8143, 8165 (iv); (telephones) 5521 (iii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com. (N.S.), 11794 (v).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice, N.S. (county court judges), 14267 (vi).
Fisheries (dog-fish pest), 13653 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations), 13646 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.), 7598 (iv); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14250 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination), 13528 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, **N.S.** (Cow Bay), 1082 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1090 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13196 (vi); (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi).
Quarantine (small-pox), 5021 (ii).

Kidd, Mr. E., *Carleton, (O.).*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Montreal harbour), 3367 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4231 (ii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5887 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5816 (iii).
Cattle Guards : *See* 'Ry. B.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup. 3158 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7516 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3063, 3114 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 908 (i), 13577 (vi).
Drainage across Rys. : *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4681 (ii).
Fishing Rights, James and Hudson's Bays, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3815 (ii).
Grand River, Dredging at Dunnville (Ques.) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 7827 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9909 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10627 (v) ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12720 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13293 (vi).
Hamilton Electric Light & Power Co., Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3803 (ii).
Hamilton and Grimsby Electric Line (remarks) 6084 (iii).
James and Hudson's Bays, Fishing Rights, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 3806 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8112 (iv).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario, Appnmt of Administrator (remarks) 112 (i).
Macnee Fishing License, Inquiry for Ret., 4727 (ii).
McDermid, Ellen, Relief (B. 229) in Com., 9148 (iv).
Mowat, Lt.-Gov. : *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
Post Offices, Opening and Closing Hours (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5931 (iii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93 ; 2° m., 552 (i).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. 2591, 3571, 3717, 3881, 3883, 3888, 3974, 4001, 4121, 4565, 4691, 4748 (ii), 5323, 5539, 5563, 5766, 6071, 6084, 6204, 6305 (iii), 8128 (iv) ; (cattle guards) 5774, 6204—6250 (iii) ; (drainage) 4748 (ii) ; (telephones) 5539 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 13845 (vi).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1250 (i) ; in Com., 11157 11435 (v).
Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7232 (iii).
Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 635 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals : Chambly (By-wash station) 12906 ; (tow path) 12907 ; Generally (operating expenses) 12920 ; Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12912 (vi) ; Welland (deepening, &c.) 7804 (iv) ; (drainage improvement) 12905 ; (electric light) 12900 ; (land surveys) 12905 ; (Port Colborne improvements) 12903 ; (protection walls) 12904 ; (Ramy's Point obstruction) 12902 ; (Townsend valve, lock gates) 12905 (vi).
Civil Govt. : Public Works (architect's salary) 13499 (vi).
Customs (inspection, preventive service, &c.) 3953 (ii).
Excise (analysis, food, &c.) 5402 (iii).
Interior (Liard River miners, relief) 6926 (iii).
Justice, Administration of : Yukon (law library) 14268 (vi).
Militia (annual drill) 3604 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3599 (ii).
Post Office (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6151 ; (inspectors' salaries) 5931 ; (ry. mail service) 5956 ; (salaries) 5925 (iii).
Public Works : Buildings, **N.S.** (Arichat) 5829 (iii) ; **Ont.** (Cayuga P.O.) 502 ; (Clinton P.O.) 526 ; (Cobourg armoury) 639 ; (London drill hall) 641 ; **Que.** (L'Assomption) 428 (i). Harbours and Rivers, **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 1164 ; (Caraquet wharf) 1173 (i) ; **N.S.** (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146 (vi) ; **P.E.I.** (New London 1160 (i) ; **Que.** (Rimouski pier, &c.) 13469 ; (Rivière du Loup) 13476 ; (Rivière Verte) 13470 ; (Ste. Famille, pier) 13489 ; (Ste. Fidèle, wharf) 13493 ; (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491 ; (St. Gedeon Islands, wharf) 13491 ; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13489 ; (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 ; (St. Louis river) 13473 ; (St. Maurice, dam) 13491 ; (Sabrevois, wharf) 13488 ; (Sacre-Cœur, wharf) 13478 ; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13482 ; (Shegawake, harbour) 13479. Miscellaneous (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi).
Steamboat Inspection (boiler inspectors) 13649.
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11080 (v).
Welland Canal Lock Tenders, Increase of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— Water Power, O. C.'s *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1859 (i).
——— rep. of Board of Trade of St. Catharines, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Lang, Mr. John, *East Peterborough*.
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11013; (Peterborough) 11625.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher*.
Assiniboine and Red River Nav. Rep. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ques.) 1859 (i).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5558, 5887, 5960 (iii).
Business of the House, *re* Private Bills Procedure (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5852 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5790 (iii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
See 'P. O. Bill,' 'Memorial,' &c.
Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 319 (i).
Customs Warehouse at Winnipeg, &c. (Ques.) 6268 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14406 (vi).
Emerson Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).
German Surtax, Purchases previous to (Ques.) 3394 (ii).
Half Breed Claims, Commissions, Applications for Scrip, &c. (M. for ret.*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).
Interior Dept., Permanent Officials, &c., Date of Appnmt. (M. for list*) 2338 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10791.
Judges' Salaries, County Courts, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3628 (ii).
——— Increases (remarks) 5242 (iii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7919 (iv).
Lumber Combine in N. W. T and Man. (remarks) 1585 (i).
Man. and N. W. T. Postmasters' Association Memorial *re* Remuneration (Ques.) 13259 (vi).
Memorial of Man. Postmasters' Association (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13994, 14020 (vi).
Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 88) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Naturalization Act, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 2015 (i).
Paradis, Amable, Claim against Pub. Works (M. for cor.*) 2337 (i).
Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10794 (v).
Postmasters' Association, Memorial from Man. and N W.T. (Ques.) 125 (i), 13259 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677, 5865 (iii).
Private Bills, Order of Procedure (remarks) 5137.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11034; (Dauphin) 11770; (Portage LaPrairie) 11782 (v).
Roseau River Reserve, Sale of Lots, &c. (Ques.) 5319 (iii).
St. Boniface Money Order Branch, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).
——— Postal Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 13949 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Postoffice (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13996 (vi).
Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13956 (vi).
Post Office (salaries *re* transfers) 13994; (Winnipeg, dead letter branch) 13995 (vi).
Winnipeg P. O.: *See* 'P.O. Bill 208,' 'Supply—'Post Office.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *E. Quebec*.
Address, on The, 40 (i).
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6635 (iii).
Agriculture and Colonization Sel. Com. (M.) to add name, 5679 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission *re* Lord Alverstone (remarks) 13963 (vi).
——— Aylesworth, Mr., Alleged Interviews (remarks) 13668, 13957 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi).
——— Award, Govt. Responsibility, &c., Reply to Mr. Borden, Halifax, 14810 (vi).
——— Official Information (remarks) 14523, 14529 (vi).
——— Award, &c. (remarks) 14280, 14287 (vi).
——— Bond-Hay Treaty, &c., on Inquiry for Papers, 878, 1324 (i).
——— Convention respecting Treaty (remarks) 481 (i).
——— Cor. *re*, Papers laid on Table, 14688 (vi).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to review Case, 14764 (vi).
——— Refusal of Can. Commissioners to sign Award (remarks) 14403, 14689 (vi).
——— Summary published, &c. (remarks) 10536 (v).
——— Tel. from Lord Alverstone (read) 13806 (vi).
——— Tel. from Mr. Sifton (read) 14529 (vi).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5136; in Com., 5872, 5874 (iii); 3°m., 5991 (iii).
Alverstone, Lord: *See* 'Alaska Boundary.'
Ascension Day Adjournment (M.) 3127 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract with Allan Co. (Ans.) 7092 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com of Sup., 14171 (vi).

Lavish expenditure criticised by opposition, 14171 ; not satisfactory service, 14172 ; efforts by former Govts., 14173 ; Mr. Foster's scheme in 1888, 14173 ; no tenders received—offer by Allans, 14174 ; conditions, 14174 ; Petersen, Tate & Co., Tender, 14175 ; obvious reasons for doing nothing 1899 to 1902, 14176 ; negotiations in Eng. with different firms 1902, 14176 ; invitations for tenders in March, 1902, 14176 ; Toronto speech, 14177 (vi).

——— (remarks) notice of M., 13948 (vi).

——— Tenders, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11165 (v) ; wthdn., 13444 (vi).

Aylesworth, &c.: *See* 'Alaska Boundary.'

Banff Coal Reserve, Mining Leases, &c. (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Bass River, N. S., Marine Light (remarks) 14249 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties, on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Binder Twine, Prices for current Year (Ans.) 203 (i).

Beauharnois District, Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 7106 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (announcement) 6540 (iii).

——— (explanation) 6735, 6754 (iii).

Blankets, Web cloth, &c., purchased by Govt. (Ans.) 10101, 10410, 10714 (v).

Bonding Privileges with U.S. : *See* 'Coasting.'

Bopp, Mr.: *See* 'Can. & German,' &c.

Boyd, Chief Justice, Relatives in Govt. Employ (Ans.) 4185 (ii).

B. C. Legislation, Disallowance, on Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7489 (iii).

——— Visit to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 2105 (i).

Business of the Hse. (M.) 3127 (ii).

——— Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4349 (ii).

——— Procedure on Order Paper (remarks) 2302.

——— (remarks) 1204 (i).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Cabinet Changes : *See* 'Ministerial Changes.'

Calgary and Edmonton Mortgage Deed, Regulations *re* Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Campaign Literature : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Can. and German Fiscal Policy, Cor. with Dom. Govt. and Herr Bopp (remarks) 12220 (v).

Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, &c. *re* St. Francis River Bridge, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

Canadian Mails via New York, Tons, &c. (Ans.) 10713 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., 209, in Com. on Res., 4963, 5000 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14500 (vi).

Canals Tonnage Dues, Abolition (Ans.) 874 (i).

Cargill, Henry, late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 12937 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 388 (i).

Cattle Guard Commission, on Inquiry for Rep. (remarks) 3396 (ii).

Census Schedules, Questions in Peel, Halton, &c. (Ans.) 11425 (vi).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, Speech *re* Canadian Tariff 13376 (vi).

Chamber of Commerce at Paris, &c. (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Charbonneau, Miss Edna, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486, 14510 (vi).

Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v), 12716 (vi).

Chinese Restriction Immigration Act Amt. (B. 82) prop. res., 265 ; in Com. on Res., 597 ; 1°*, 945 ; in Com., 2241, 2399 (i) ; on Sen. Amts , 5872 (iii).

Cigarettes Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 1°, 2014 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 845 (i).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3198 (ii).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Companies (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 257) prop. res., 10410 (v) ; on Sen. Amts. 14845 (vi).

Civil Service List (presented) 125 (i).

Clergue Steel Works, Labour Disturbances (remarks) 12611 (v).

——— *See* 'Sault.'

Coasting Laws, U. S. Privileges, &c. (remarks) 12714, 12758 (vi).

——— *See* 'U. S.'

Cold Storage and Fruit : *See* 'Fruit.'

Coldstream Guards Band, Arrangements *re* Visit to Can. (Ans.) 9683 (iv).

Colonial Conference, Report, &c. (remarks) 3633 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial.'

Committee, Joint Printing, List (presented) 244(i).

Committees, Sel. Standing, to prepare Lists (M.) 5 (i).

———Lists presented, 197 (i).

———Meeting concurrently with sitting of (Hse.) (remarks) 8333 (iv).

Corn Duties, Abolition by Imp. Parlt. (remarks) 1681 (i).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Act Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1324 (i).

———(immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 319 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Coal Lands, Application *re* (Ans.) 12217 (v).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 5 (i).
———6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 7922 (iv).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 573 (i).
Dom. Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 5589 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1200 (i); 13583, 14407; M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; Order dschgd., 14769 (vi).
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 945 (i).
Dundonald, Lord: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Easter Adjournment (M.) 1115 (i).
Electoral Lists, N.S., Changes since Printing (Ans.) 8331 (iv).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal of Flagship (remarks) 10957 (v).
Estimates, Suppl., on Inquiry for (remarks) 10832 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) (M.) to place on Govt. Orders, 8115; 2° m., 8243 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
False Creek, Lease, &c. (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
Farquharson, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5512 (iii).
Ferries Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'
France and Canada SS. Service B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10802, 11422 (v).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T., Tel. from Board of Trade, &c. (read) 2106 (i).
———Tel. to Dep. Min. of Int. (read) 2238 (i).
See 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth) on M. for 2°, 3257 (ii).
Fruit Shipments in Cold Storage, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3233 (ii).
General Inspection Act (weigh-masters) Amt. B. (prop. res.) 13264 (vi.)
See 'Inspection.'
G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2420 (i).
German Discrimination and Bond-Hay Treaty, on Inquiry for Papers, 1324 (i).
Germans in Canada, Recruiting for Naval Service (remarks) 8717 (iv).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Monday (M.) 3708 (ii).
———Precedence on Thursdays (M.) 940 (i).
———Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 1114 (i).
———Redistribution Bill (remarks) 204 (i).
———Stmnt. *re* further Business (remarks) 13559 (vi).
Gov. Gen's Speech at Banquet of Chambers of Commerce (Ans.) 10101 (v).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Grain Inspection *re* Standard Samples (remarks) 11179 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5158, 5218 (iii), 7847; on M. for 3°, 8060 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Maclean*) 7815 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 235) M. for Com. on Res., 8406; 1° m., 7658; ('mountains of information') 7679 (iv); in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°* of B. and in Com., 10412; in Com. on B., 10540, 11191, 11247, 11273, 11312, 11969, 12015, 12055; (two-cent rate) 12233 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12644, 12730, 12758; on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 12743; on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
———Alternative Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 13028 (vi).
——— Distribution of Bill among Members (remarks) 8918 (iv).
———Govt's. Intention *re* Quebec to Moncton Scheme, 10537 (v).
———Govt. Policy, &c. (Ans.) 2308 (i).
———Delay, &c. (remarks) 6806, 6922, 7299, 7399, 7488 (iii).
———Papers laid on Table, 11302 (v).
———Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to refer to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13267, 13560 (vi).
———Plans by E. A. Hoare (presented) 8082 (iv).
———Sir William Mulock's Speech, Par. in 'Citizen' (remarks) 368 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. Deb., 8806 (iv).
——— (remarks) 8086 (iv).
See 'Ry. Policy.'
Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13764 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 679 (i).
Herchmer, L. W., Pension, &c. (Ans.) 5322 (iii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 778 (i).
——— Address to His Maj. (M.) 1193 (i).
Imperial Conference Cor., Can. Govt.'s Refusal to publish, &c. (remarks) 3633 (ii), 7923, 8230, 9458 (iv).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 9582 (iv).
Imperial Service Orders to Civil Servants, &c. (Ans.) 12715 (vi).
——— Names of Officials, &c. (Ans.) 13669, 13936 (vi).
I.C.R., Shops at Rivière du Loup, Construction (Ans.) 12497 (v).
——— Lévis Accommodation: *See* 'Lévis.'
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3398 (ii).
Internal Economy Com. (M.) 91 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2787, 3248 (ii).
Insolvenèy Act, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 818 (i).
Inspection General Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) prop. Res., 13264; in Com. on B., 14311 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Japanese Immigration (remarks) 3713 (ii).
Jonquières to Ha Ha Bay, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11408 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Superior Court, Que. (prop. res.) 11426; Res. 2° m., 11833 (v).
Judges Retiring Allowances on Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 4262 (ii); in Com. on Res., 8090 (iv); (M.) to conc. in Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).
— — Increase of, &c. (remarks) 14307 (vi).
Judgeship offered by Mr. Dansereau to Conservative (remarks) 13805 (vi).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 2779 (ii).
Labour Day Adjournment (M.) 10742 (v).
——— (remarks) 10189, 10712 (v).
Lac Bouchette Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
Lake St. John Ry. and La Tuque, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Le Canada, Mr. Latour's Canvass: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Lévis, Land purchased for I.C.R., on M. for O. Cs. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14299 (vi).
Library of Parlt. Com. (M.) 244 (i).
Lt. Governor of Ont. and Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
——— (remarks) 111, 656, 1206 (i).
——— *See* 'Mowat.'
Loan Companies Extension Act Amt. B. 35 (Mr. *Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2504, 2517, 2677 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7918 (iv).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to adjn., 14571 (vi).
——— Refund of Express Charges (remarks) 14684 (vi.)
——— Use of certain Rooms, &c., 14534 (vi).
Man. Grain Act (1900) Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi).
Man. and N.W.T., Increased Representation in the Senate (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Man. School Lands, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 6169 (iii).
Maps for Geological Survey, Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 14272 (vi).
Martineau, Mr. P. R., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 10242 (v).
Matane and Gaspé Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14484 (vi).
Members of H. of C. Appnmts. to Govt. Positions (Ans.) 3632 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1204 (i).
Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of (remarks) 2794 (ii).
Mining Cos. Incorporation (remarks) 14850 (vi).
Ministerial Changes, Explanations, &c. (remarks) 6, 110, 130, 159 (i); 6735 (iii).
Ministers, Reduction of Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).
Minto, Earl of: *See* 'Gov. Gen.'
Montreal and Atlantic and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4470 (ii); in Com. on B., 5419 (iii).
Montreal *Star*, Par. *re* Judgeship: *See* 'Judgeship.'
Morning Sittings (M.) 8333 (iv).
Mortimer & Co.'s Fire, Govt. property destroyed (Ans.) 4836 (ii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt. Governor of Ontario, Decease (remarks) 1575 (i).
See 'Lt.-Gov.'
Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14596 (vi).
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Naturalization of Aliens Act Amt. (B. 204) 1° *, 5136 (iii).
——— *See* 'Aliens.'
Naval Defence, Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 945 (i).
Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 12992; Order dschgd., 14768 (vi).
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for 2°, 1328 (i).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6429 (iii).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
North Atlantic Transportation Co., on Inquiry (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) for Papers, 13667, 13933 (vi).
——— Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 13372 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. (B. 242) 1°m., 8321 (iv); 2°m., and in Com., 10741 (v).
——— Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) M. to introduce, 14281 (vi).
North West Mounted Police, Deptl. Rep. (presented 92 (i).
——— Promotions, &c. (Ans.) 2921 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12321 (v).
North West Provincial Autonomy, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1296 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°* *pro forma*, 4 (i).
Order in the House (remarks) 12723 (vi).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for copies, 1303 (i).
Ottawa Valley Fire Sufferers, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3134 (ii).
Pacific Cable, & Eastern Tel. Co.'s Concessions, &c. (remarks) 2676 (ii).
Paris Chamber of Commerce : *See* 'Chamber.'
Parliament Grounds, Mutilation of Lawn (remarks) 242 (i).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) M. to dschg. Order, 13444 (vi)
Pensions to S. A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14596 (vi).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 138 (M.) to dschg. Order for 2°, 11302 (v).
Post office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5241 (iii).
Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14671 (vi).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G. B. (remarks) 3221 (ii).
——— *See* 'Chamberlain,' &c., 'South Africa,' &c.
Preston, W. T. R., Suit by Can. Employment Bureau (remarks) 12221 (v).
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1192 (i).
Printing Bureau and Indebtedness of Members (Ans.) 4180 (ii).
Printing Bureau and Union Employees (Ans.) 4182 (ii).
Private Bills, on M. to extend Time, 10490 (v).
——— (remarks) 2396 (i) ; 4959 (ii).
——— Order of Procedure (remarks) 5137 (iii).
——— *See* 'Rules,' &c.
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Par. in *La Patrie*, 6803 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors (remarks) 11563 (v).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' &c., Western Rys., 10515 (v).
Provincial Autonomy to N. W. T., Papers laid on Table, 5512 (iii).
——— N. W. T. Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6893 (iii).
——— *See* 'N. W. T. B. 256.'
Provincial Subsidies Increase, &c. (Ans.) 5764 (iii).
Public Documents, Distribution to Boards of Trade (remarks) 1378 (i).
Pulp Wood, Duty by U. S. (remarks) 4363 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Public Works Dept., Transfer of Duties, B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14748 (vi).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Agreement, &c. (prop. res.) 14523 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14280 (vi).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).
Queens, P.E.I., Representation in Parlt. (remarks) 13378 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134 (ii).
Ry. Act B. 21, Salaries of Commissioners, in Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephone, &c.) 5531 (iii) ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8350 (iv).
——— Ry. Conference with Senate (remarks) *re* Procedure, 14760 (vi).
Ry. Debts Bill : *See* 'Exchequer.'
Railway Policy of Govt., Delay in bringing down, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to adjn. Hse., 7115 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 551 (i).
Railway Subsidies (B. 270) in Com. on Res., 14314, 14329 ; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14516 (vi).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10956 (v), 12805 (vi).
Representation in the House of Commons (B. 66) 1°m., 708 ; 2°m., 1207, 1218, Agreed to (Y. 72, N. 37) 1292 (i) ; M. for Com., 10832, 10848 ; in Com., 10912, 10953, 10957, 11114, 11508, 11621, 12293 ; (Kent) 11567 ; (Norfolk) 11427 ; 3°m., 12372 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12432 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1284 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order *re* Mr. *Tisdale*, 11474 (v).
——— Evidence *re*, &c. (remarks) 11423 (iv).
——— Schedules, Maps, &c. (remarks) 877 (i).
——— Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Pugsley *re* N. B., 943 (i).
Returns ordered, Complaint (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 13140 (vi).
River du Loup Ry. Shops : *See* 'I. C. R.'
Roberval to James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Ross Rifles, Examination, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).
Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v).
St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
St. James Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (remarks) 13376 (vi).
——— Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 6998 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday (Ans.) 1858 (i).
Salmon Canning Industry in B.C. (remarks) 10102 (v).
Saturday Sittings (M.) 13264 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Govt. Proposals (remarks) 12718 (vi).
——— Labour Troubles, Wages, &c. (remarks) 12941 (vi).
See 'Clergue.'
Sec. of State Deptl. Rep. (presented) 125 (i).
Senate Representation of N.W.T.: *See* 'Man. and N.W.T.'
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 465 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13952 (vi).
Slater Shoe Co. and Alien Labour, Res. *re* (remarks) 14669 (vi).
Small-pox Patients in Gloucester, N.B. (remarks) 14688 (vi).
Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11826 (v).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12845, 12850 (vi).
S. Africa and Can. SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on France and Can. SS. B., 10821 (v).
S. African Colonies and Preferential Tariff, Res. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ans.) 1679 (i).
——— Hay: *See* 'Hay and Oats.'
South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).
Speech from the Throne (M.) 5 (i).
Steel Industry: *See* 'Iron and Steel.'
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 13772.
Indian Affairs (contingencies) 13760 (vi); (salaries) 274 (i).
Interior (clerical assistance) 13769; (salaries) 13761; (Mines branch, salaries) 13762 (vi).
Geological Survey (A. P. Low, salary) 13770; (salaries) 13769, 13966; (technical officer, salary) 13772 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police (Drake, E. F., salary) 13761; (salaries) 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
Privy Council Office (salaries) 207 (i).
Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13955; homestead entries) 13966; (maps, printing, &c.) 14272, (salaries, outside service) 13773, 13966; (surveys, printing, &c.) 13777; (tree culture) 13775, 14272 (vi).
Geological Survey (maps, lithographing, &c.) 13778; (metallurgical, salaries) 13778 (vi).
Govt. of N. W. T. (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).
Indians—B. C. (Hazelton hospital) 13787; (medical attendance) 13785; (salaries) 13785; (schools) 13786; (steam launch) 13787 (vi).
Man. and N.W.T. (agricultural implements) 13782; (industrial schools) 13784; (medical attendance, Dr. West) 13784; (surveys, &c.) 13784; (triennial clothing) 13783 (vi).
N. B. (fire damages) 13782; (salaries) 13782.
N. S. (land purchase) 13781 (vi).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Indians—Con.
Ont. and Que. (Doncaster reserve, roads) 13779; (Rama reserve, roads, &c.) 13781; (roads, repairs) 13779 (vi).
Justice, Administration of—Miscellaneous (N. W. T., expenditure) 3398 (ii); Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3423 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13957; (Assay Office, B.C.) 13965; (Canadian Mining Institute) 13965; (Turtle Mountain, land slide) 13965 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 5264; (pay of force) 5262 (iii); (Yukon) 5003 (ii); (Yukon, salaries) 5262 (iii).
Pensions (Lady Lafontaine) 14252 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (trachoma hospital) 14246 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12845 (vi).
Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2932 (ii).
Tariff Policy of Gov., Ques. of Order *re* Quotations, 4843 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4263 (ii).
Tarte, Mr., Resignation: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Telephone Legislation (remarks) 291 (i).
Thanksgiving Day Adjournment (M.) 13790 (vi).
——— (remarks) 13379 (vi),
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to refer back to Com., 7813 (iv).
Trans-Canada Ry., Sale to G.T. Pacific (remarks) 7567 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. (B. 235) 1° m., 7658 (iv).
See 'G.T.Pacific.'
——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 5765 (iii).
Translation of Parliamentary Documents (remarks) 545 (i).
Transportation Commission, Appnmt of Commissioners (notification) 5137 (iii).
——— Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 9582 (iv).
——— Appnmt. of Sir Wm. VanHorne (remarks) 7297 (iii).
——— (Ans.) 8330 (iv).
——— Further Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 9458 (iv).
——— O.C., Cor. *re* Appnmts. (M. for copies) 1324 (i).
——— Names of Commissioners (remarks) 4727.
——— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 7206 (iii).
——— Rep. *re* Commission (remarks) 1199 (i), 3129 (ii), 12850 (vi).
Transportation and Treadgold Commissions (remarks) 4840, 4960 (ii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii), 12850 (vi).
Treadgold Commissioners, Appnmt. of (notification) 5136 (iii).
——— Appnmt., &c. (remarks) 3713 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4541 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Treadgold Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2880 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 2424, (i), 3298, 3397, 3870 (ii).
——— and Dawson Board of Trade (remark) 1025 (i).
——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 4120, 4564 (ii).
——— Names of Commissioners (remarks) 4727.
——— Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11065 (v).
——— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).
——— Tel. read from Dawson Board of Trade *re* Scope (Ans.) 1196 (i).
——— (remarks) 8086 (iv).
——— Terms of Commission (remarks) 4120, 4564 (ii).
——— and Transportation Commission (remarks) 4840, 4960 (ii).
——— (remarks) 13792 (vi).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).
Turnpike Trust, Montreal, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Stmnt., 676 (i).
U.S. Coasting Laws, &c., Regulations *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).
See 'Coasting.'
Voters' Lists: *See* 'Electoral.'
Wiallard, Paul, Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 11188 (v).
Woodmen of the World B. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 1854 (i).
Yamaska and Lotbiniére Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14318 (vi).
Yukon Ry. through Can. Ter. (remarks) 14497 (vi).
Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

Lavell, Mr. J. R., *Leeds & Grenville.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in in Com. on Res., 3054 (ii).
G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. No. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9431 (iv); in Com. on B., 10648, 11401, 12186 (v).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3140.
SUPPLY:
Justice, Administration of: Yukon (living allowances) 3419 (ii).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5500 (iii).

Lavergne, Mr. L., *Drummond & Arthabaska.*
Drummondville Ry. Sidings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14081 (vi).
Mathurin, Jos. A., Death Sentence, Judge's Rep., &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
Standard Car Truck Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 105) 1°*, 1295 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (Drummondville sidings) 14055 (vi).

Law, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*
Can. Temperance Act Amt. (B. 14) 1°*, 113 (i).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4101 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers (dredges, repairs) 2629 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *E. Prince* (*P.E.I.*)
Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212) Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7476 (iii).
Anglo-American Tel. Co. and P. E. I. Monopoly (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7380 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7351 (iii).
Cape Tormentine Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
Charlottetown, Ry. Station, P.E.I., Rebuilding, &c. (Ques.) 4442 (ii).
——— Wharf and Dock Accommodation (remarks) 14132 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12537 (v).
Dom. Coal Co., and Glace Bay Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13189 (vi).
Elmira Branch Line on P. E. I. Ry., Res. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
Frozen Fish, &c., P.E.I., Claims for Damages *re* (Ques.) 13373 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13522 (vi).
——— Losses, &c., Pet. *re* (Ques.) 3394 (ii).
Georgetown, P.E.I. Ry. Warehouse Accommodation (remarks) 14088 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9529 (iv); in Com. on B., 10601 (iv).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13275 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Contractor's Name, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
See 'Supply—Rys.'
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
Kinkora Station, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8209, 8223 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, P E I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14126 (vi).
Oyster Fishing, P. E. I., Pet., &c. (Ques.) 2920.
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13522 (vi).
See 'Winter.'
P. E. I. Ry., Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry. Subsidies to Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) 14472 (vi).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

P. E. I., Winter Communication by Str. *Stanley* (Ques.) 4006 (ii).

——— Winter Communication (M.) for Copies of Pets., &c., 2765 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14472 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1269 (i); on M. for 3°, 12432, 12446; (amt.) to M. for 3°, 12454 (v).

Representation in the H. of C. for P. E. I. and N. B. (Ques.) 5316 (iii).

Richmond and Northam Station, P.E.I.Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 472 (i).

Shippers of P. E. I., Claims for Damages (Ques.) 13373 (vi).

See 'Frozen Fish.'

Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., P. E. I., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).

Summerside Breakwater, P.E.I, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5300 (iii).
Geological Survey (explorations) 6824 (iii).
Immigration (repatriation, &c.) 6725 (iii),
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse construction) 5762 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and G. B.) 7744 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4049 (ii); (masters' and mates' examination) 13529 (vi); (*Stanley*, repairs, &c.) 4049 (ii).
Post Office (Kelley's Cross P. O.) 6064; (P.E.I. letter carriers) 6063; (P.E.I. winter service) 5937 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ottawa (coal sheds) 13116; P.E.I. (Charlottetown, Dom. building) 13036 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Cape Tormentine) 13228 (vi); N.S. (Glace Bay, wharf) 13189; P.E.I. (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Cape Traverse, survey) 13219; (Carleton Point) 13219; (North Cardigan) 13223; (Summerside breakwater) 13223 (vi); (Summerside harbour) 3367 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (P. E. I. and mainland) 2988; (P. E. I. cables) 2702 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5505; (Pethick, Dr., allowance) 5505 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8271 (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii), 14094; (Halifax accommodation) 12827; (locomotives, &c.) 14093 (vi); (Moncton accommodation) 12600; (North Sydney station) 12597 (v); 14090; (St. John accommodation) 12823 (vi).
P.E.I. (Alberton station) 14132; (Charlottetown, accommodation) 14131; (Elmira line) 12835; (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 14108, 14111, 14126; (Kensington accommodation) 12840 (vi); (Kinkora accommodation) 12841; (Montague bridge) 14132 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7535 (iii); (Summerside coal sheds) 12828 (vi).

Trackmen on Govt. Rys., Increase of Salaries (remarks) in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14472 (vi).

Winter Communication with P. E. I., Memorial from Emerald, &c. (M. for copies of pets., &c. 2765 (ii).

Lemieux, Mr. R., *Gaspé.*

Agricultural Lecturers, Que., Names, Counties, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (iv).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6962 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 367; M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806 (i).

Aylesworth, Mr. A. B., Reported Interview *re* Alaskan Commission (remarks) 13960 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 5238 (iii).

Budget, The, 2167 (i).

Canadian (New) Company Limited incorp. (B. 83) 2°m., 1328 (i).

——— *See* 'New.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4977 (ii).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J., and Pref. Trade: *See* 'Preferential.'

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6645 (iii).

Dom. Subsidies to Provinces, Increase, &c. (M. for cor.) 691 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iii).

Fishermen in Gulf of St. Lawrence, Pet. (Ques.) 2917 (ii).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c. (Ques.) 665 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8776 (iv).

Lecturers on Agriculture, Names, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (iv).

Lighthouses, Floating, Applications, &c. from Captains (Ques.) 665 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2505 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 1°*, 1023; 2°m., 1328 (i); in Com., 3221 (ii).

Ottawa and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6625 (iii).

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

Pilots on River St. Lawrence, &c. (Ques.) 2915 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5658 (iii).

Lemieux, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Preferential Trade, Mr. Chamberlain's Colonial Scheme, Mr. Fielding's Remarks *re*, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13936 (vi).

Provincial Subsidies, Increase, &c. (M. for cor.) 691 (i).

——— (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6301 (iii).

——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2783 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 7000 (iii).

St. Lawrence Gulf Fishermen, Pet., &c. (Ques.) 2917 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Pilots, &c. (Ques.) 2915 (ii).

St. Louis International Exhibition, Can. Exhibits (Ques.) 3001 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Hospital, &c. (Ques.) 13669 (vi).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., *re*, on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7032, 7045 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6674 ; (Fabre, Mr., salary) 6674 (iii).

Legislation : House of Commons (debates, &c.) 5265 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6956 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, &c.) 4058 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Lake St. John, wharf) 2244 ; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2248 ; (Magdalen island) 2265 ; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2269 ; (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 ; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i) ; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3309 (ii) ; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13480 (vi) ; (Sorel, wharf) 2291 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2950 (ii).

Railways : I. C. R. (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).

U. S. Indemnity to Fishermen, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).

Lennox, Mr. H., *S. Simcoe.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6966 (iii).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6358 (iii).

Barrie Wharf, Govt. Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup , 13452 (vi).

Brockville & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7402 (iii).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1348 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5449 (iii).

Canadian Construction Co. and Farran's Point Contract (M. for ret.*) 1323 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4368, 4973, 5116 (ii) ; in Com. on B., 5632 (iii).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., 7482 (iii).

Cattle Guards Commission, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt and Retirement of Mr. Robertson, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 1059 (i).

———Names, &c. (Ques.) 874 (i).

———Rep., &c. (Ques.) 669 (i).

———Withdrawal of Mr. Robertson, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

———Inquiry for Papers, 3396 (ii).
See 'Ry. Bill.'

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5484 (iii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6200 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 831 (i).

Correspondence Clerk, Ry. Dept., Name, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

Corridors of Hse., and Visitors, Ques. of Priv., 11558 (v).

County Court Judges, Appnmt. from local Bars (remarks) 5582 (iii).

———Appnmts., Retirements, &c. (Ques.) 4960 (ii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3240 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646, 7514 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4027 (ii).

Dixon, F. A., Chief Clerk in Ry. Dept., &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

———Promotion as Chief Clerk, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1058 (i).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 580 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 312 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7888 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8808 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10488, 10583, 10698, 11341, 11394, 11839, 11867, 12006 (vi).

Hawkestone Wharf, Govt. Aid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 681 (i).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3251 (ii).

Insolvency Act, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 818 (i).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7966 (iv).

Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8114; in Com. on B., 11421 (iv).

Judges appointed from Local Bar, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 210 (i).

Labour Gazette Correspondents, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Lt. Governor of Ontario and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 661 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8069 (iv).

Metropolitan Ry. Co., running on highway (remarks) 6099 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt. Gov.'

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11557 (v).

Public Accounts Com., producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7060 (iii).

Public Works, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) 13451 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1341 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4121, 4573, 4712, 4738 (ii), 5251, 5332, 5524, 5560, 5680, 5698, 6080, 6189, 6219, 6298, 7201, 7299 (iii), 8160 (iv); (cattle guards) 6244, 6253; (drainage) 4738 (ii); (telephones, &c.) 5524 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11427; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12488 (v).

———Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Campbell, 11710 (v).

Robertson, Geo. *re* Cattle Guard Commission (Ques.) 874 (i).

———Withdrawal from Cattle Guard Commission (Ques.) 1034 (i).

See 'Cattle Guards,' &c.

Saskatchewan Land Company, Inquiry for Ret., 7108 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5086 (ii); in Com. on B., 7225 (iii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census schedules) 7060 (iii); (general statistics) 4431 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 210; Railways (salaries) 334 (i).

Dom. Lands (homesteads) 6771; (inspector's expenses) 6766; Long Lake, &c. (Saskatchewan Ry. survey) 6942 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5290 (iii); (Hurley, J. M., fishery inspector) 5126 (ii), 5283 (iii).

Indians: Man. and N.W.T (medical attendance) 6350; Ont. (medical attendance) 6327 (iii).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of: Exchequer Court (reports) 3408; Penitentiaries (Kingston, binder twine) 3518; (Regina jail, Land Purchase) 5135; Sup. Court (reps., binding, &c.) 3405; Yukon (judges' living allowances) 3412; (sheriffs' salaries) 3411; (telegraph operators) 3421 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (printing, binding, &c.) 5267; (Room 56, furniture) 5266 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6936 (iii).

Postoffice (Barrie branch) 6062; (rural mails) 6137 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, **Dom.** (electric power) 1068; **Ont.** (Alliston) 495; (Clinton P. O.) 521; Ottawa (census building) 992; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1003; (Royal Mint) 358; **Que.** (Levis) 432; (quarantine, Grosse Isle) 425; (renewals, &c.) 424; (St. Hyacinthe) 439 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, **Man.** (St. Andrews Rapids) 3364 (ii); **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2669 (ii); **N.B.** (Anderson's Hollow) 1163; (Campbellton wharf) 1165; (St. John river wharf) 1178, 1186; **N.S.** (Amagandus wharf) 1069; (Big Pond, wharf) 1072, 1074; (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074; (Cow Bay) 1079; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Neil's Harbour) 1142; **Ont.** (Barrie wharf) 1186; (Petewawa narrows) 1426; (Port Hope, pier) 1425 (i); (Sault Ste. Marie, improvements) 13252 (vi); (Southampton, harbour) 1429; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1432; (Wendover, wharf) 1434; **P.E.I.** (Cascumpec harbour) 1154; (Gaspereaux, harbour) 1156; (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i); **Que.** (Caplan, breakwater) 13451 (vi); (Father Point, pier) 1514; (Grande Vallée, pier) 1515 (i).

Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13364 (vi).

Railways: I.C.R. (Sydney accommodation) 3698 (ii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276; (roads and bridges) 7285 (iii).

Telegraph Operators, Yukon: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13364 (vi).

Wharf Building by Public Works Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Binder Twine, Circular issued *re* Sales, &c (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

——— Residence of Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 4182 (ii).

Civil Service Employees, Classification, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 9681 (iv).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 592 (i).

Duchesneau, Dr., Warden of St. Vincent de Paul, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 286 (i).

Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 288 (i).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100 4799 (ii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry. B. 235, French Translation (remarks) 8118 (iv).
Latour, L. J., Circular issued *re Le Canada*, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Le Canada, Circular issued to Postmasters, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Market Gardeners: *See* 'Garden Products,' &c.
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6531 (iii).
Postal Facilities to Parishes near Montreal, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 12498 (v).
Public Works Employees, Dismissals, Promotions, &c. (M. for ret.) 1058 (i).
St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 7001 (iii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Acting Warden, &c. (Ques.) 10831 (v).
——— Resignation of (Ques.) 286 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Rivière Jesus, dredging) 13470 (vi).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2361 (i).

Logan, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14203 (vi).
Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5475 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4404 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 833 (i).
——— *See* 'Criminal,' &c.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12559 (v).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3279 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10753 (v).
Cumberland Coal & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10813 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5184 (iii); on M. for 3°, 8324 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9238 (iv); in Com. on B., 12043, 12116 (v).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13290 (vi).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Judgeship, Offer by C. A. Dansereau to Conservative, Par. in Montreal *Star* (remarks) 13805.
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10789 (v).

Logan, Mr. H. J.—*Con.*
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2526 (ii).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 141) 1° *, 2237 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act. Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6455 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677 (iii).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 135) 1° *, 2100 (i); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978; (amt.) in Com., 6399 (iii).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2581; in Com., 2923 (ii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3°, 12450 (v).
Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Co.'s (B. 116) 1° *, 1575 (i).
St. Joseph's Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 151) 1° *, 2396 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) 1° *, 2396 (i).
Springhill, N.S., Boiler Explosion in Dom. Building (remarks) 13257 (vi).
Steel Co. of Can., Loan of Rails, &c. (remarks) 14482 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Geological Survey (exploration, information, &c.) 6823 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7602 (iv).
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (Victoria museum) 365; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Victoria beach, wharf) 13214 (vi).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to receive Pet., 4261 (ii).
Trackmen on I.C.R., Salaries, &c., 12559 (vi).
Truro to Parrsboro Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14494 (vi).

Loy, Mr. G. M., *Beauharnois.*
Beauharnois Canal, Damages *re* Floods (remarks, in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Beauharnois Electoral District, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, Statement (read) 7102 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Lake St. Francis (dam *re* flooding) 14153 (vi).
Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3594 (ii).

Mackie, Mr. T., *N. Renfrew.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5426 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9414 (iv).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8107 (iv).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1321 (i).

Mackie, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11157 (v).

Mackinnon, Mr. D. A., *E. Queen's, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7615 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4083, 4105 (ii).
Post Office: Outside Service (P.E.I. winter service) 5940 (iii).
Railways: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7539 (iii).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s (B. 26) 2° m., 630 (i).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *N. Perth.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5075 (ii); in Com. on B., 5426 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9898 (iv).
Listowel Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr *Blair*) in Com. (telephones) 5542 (iii).

SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Goderich, breakwater) 1366 (i); 13242 (vi).

Maclaren, Mr. W. S., *Huntingdon.*
Budget, The, 1937 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5434 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. B 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3086 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10139 (v).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6187, 6307 (iii); (drainage) 4758 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7226 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *E. York (O.)*
Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) in Com., 5361 (iii).
Bell Telephone Agreement: *See* 'Telephone,' 'Ry. B. 21.'
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7304 (iii).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bills (remarks 482 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5431 (iii).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4369, 4379 (ii).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360, 5555 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 381 (i).
Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 318 (i).
Crisis in Ont.: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3045; in Com. on B., 4038 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 308 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7814, 7821; on M. for 3°, 8056 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 7825 (iv).
——— (M.) that Com. rise in order to get Speaker's decision *re* Ques. of Order, 7831, 7832 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10429; (two-cent rate) 10462, 12221 (v).
G. T. R. Transcontinental Ry., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 448 (i).
G. T. Ry. Two-Cent Fare, Repeal of Clause in Original Charter (Ques.) 11556, 11828 (v).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).
Hudson's Bay Change of Name (B. 173) 1°m., 2794 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11416 (v).
Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7991 (iv).
Ministerial Changes, Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 166 (i).
Montreal-Longueuil Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 156 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5558 (iii).
Mowat, Lt. Gov. of Ont.: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6082 (iii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Gallihcr*) on M. for 3°, 6430 (iii).
N. W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12309 (v).
——— Representation in Senate B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12302 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6453 (iii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2597, 3538 (ii), 5344, 5352, 5561, 6082, 6173, 6253, 6271 (iii), 7609, 8126 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5513 (iii); on M. for 3°, 8334; (amt.) *re* two-cent rate, 6271 (iii); 8334; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 45) 8359 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8121 (iv).

Railway Subsidies (B. 270) in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 410 (i).

St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6485 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 478 (i).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 455 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7042 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Excise (liquor analysis) 5395 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7581 (iv).

Militia (pay and allowance) 3592; (Valleyfield strike) 3597 (ii).

Post Office (rural mails) 6137 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (mail delivery) 506; (amt.) 511; Ottawa (additional land) 353; Que. (Montreal renewals) 437; (Valleyfield P. O.) 444 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Arthur) 3352; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3305 (ii).

Telephone, Bell, Agreement with C. P. R., &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5513 (iii).

Telephone Co.'s (B. 4) 1°*, 92; 2°m., 700 (i).

——— (B. 5.) 1°m., 92; 2°m., 701 (i).

Telephone Legislation (remarks) 291, 409 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. (remarks) 6091 (iii).

Toronto, Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Two-cent Ry. Fare: *See* 'G. T. P. Ry. B. 235,' 'Ry. B. 21.'

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G., *Burrard.*

Alaskan Boundary Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14789 (vi).

Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5876 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7353 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com on Res., 4398 (iii).

Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5487 (iii).

Chinese Immigration: *See* 'Aliens,' 'G. T. P. B. 235.'

Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13575, 13593 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. Res., 3014; in Com. on B., 4683 (ii).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup.. 4798 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9218 (iv); in Com. on B., 12046, 12205 (v).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 949 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8209 (iv).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature (remarks) 14232 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9976 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 237 (i).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6685 (iii).

Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1111 (i).

Vancouver Land Acquisition (B. 76) 1°*, 872 (i).

Yukon Coast Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 446 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *N. Simcoe.*

Barrie Wharf, Govt. Aid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Canada Industrial Corporation Limited incorp. (B. 112) 1°*, 1462 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5625 (iii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5584.

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3269 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10753 (v).

Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief (B. 127) 1°*, 1853 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3015 (ii).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. (B. 48) 1°m., 592 (i), 2°m., 2786 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 707 (i), Order for Com., 4132; in Com., 4871 (ii), 5138 (iii), 7814-7913; 3°m., 8055, 8321 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wilmot*) Ques. of Order, 8067 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11358 (v).

Hawkestone Wharf, Govt. Aid (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8108 (iv), 10772, 10777; in Com. on B., 11410 (v).

Lt. Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113 (i).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 707 (i); in Com., 2716 (ii).

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation of Lawn (remarks) 2422 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6237, 6305 (iii); (drainage) 4741 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 136) 1°*, 2100 (i), 2°m., 3288 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Post Office (Barrie, branch P.O.) 6062 (iii).
Winnipeg Western Land Corporation Limited Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 707 (i).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *W. Northumberland (O.)*
Alnwick, Mississaga Indians, Claims, &c. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 121) in Com., 3223 (ii).

McCool, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14446 (vi).
Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 1462 (i).
Nipissing and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 591 (i).
Nipissing Surveys on Ottawa River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Miscellaneous (Ottawa river survey) 13350 (vi).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).
Waltham to Ferguson, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

McCormick, Mr. G., *Muskoka and Parry Sound.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wendover, wharf) 1441 (i); Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 2977; (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).
Yukon Govt. (roads and bridges) 7289 (iii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F., *Selkirk.*
Allen, Wm., Relief (B. 196) 1° m., 4179 (ii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5888, 5961 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7361 (iii).
Binder Twine, Prices fixed (Ques.) 1595 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5846 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 1294 (i).
Canada Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4388, 5117 (ii); in Com. on B., 5806 (iii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3982 (ii).
C.P.R. Expenditure for Rolling Stock in 1902-3 (Ques.) 2311 (i).
Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Fyfe, Mr.: *See* 'Weights B. 188.'
Grain Weighing in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4198 (ii).
G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5151, 5227 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10417 (v); on M. for 3°, 12684 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13279 (vi).
Great North-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 541.
Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1123 (i).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10742 (v).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2523.
Lumber Combine in N.W.T. (remarks) 1585 (i).
Magness, Mr.: *See* 'Weights B. 188.'
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14221 (vi).
Man. School Lands, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 6169 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4481 (ii).
Northern Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 51) in Com., 2753 (ii).
Osler, Mr.: *See* 'Privilege.'
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14856 (vi).
Père Marquette International Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 132) 1°*, 2014 (i).
Postmasters, Country, Salary Increases (remarks) 14011 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafter,' 10523, 10529 (v).
Ry. Act. (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 251 (i); in Com., 3539 (ii), 6275 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14338, 14494 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies for Man. Rys., &c. (remarks) 14494 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11041; (Dauphin) 11774; (Portage La Prairie) 11782; (Toronto) 11743; Winnipeg) 11789 (v.)
Revenue contributed by Man., &c. (remarks) 14495 (vi).
St. Andrews Rapids, Bridge Construction (Ques.) 14284 (vi).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7217 (iii).
S. African Colonies and Preferential Tariff, Res. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ques.) 1678 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).
Steele, James Reid, Relief (B. 195) 1°*, 4178 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Customs (stationery, &c.) 3966 (ii).
Dom. Lands (homestead entries) 13966 (vi).

McCreary, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works: Buildings—**Man.** (Winnipeg, immigrant shed) 13126 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2645 (ii); **Man.** (Dauphin Lake) 1448 (i); (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3356; (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i); **Ont.** (Port Arthur) 3345 (ii).
Quarantine (public health) 5016 (ii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).
Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4009, 4198 (ii).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14388 (vi).

McEwen, Mr. G., *S. Huron.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7362 (iii).
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13753 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10755 (v).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7998 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Joseph wharf) 3382 (ii).

McGowan, Mr. J., *C. Wellington.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).
Bankers, Private, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 285 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5442 (iii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 396 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 930 (i).
Private Bankers: *See* 'Bankers.'
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11027 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6470 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Customs (linseed oil, seizure) 3935 (ii).
Post Office (postal mail service) 6053 (iii).
Public Works: Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2685 (ii).

McGugan, Mr. M., *S. Middlesex.*
London Loan Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 1295 (i).
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s (B. 63) 1°*, 707 (i).

McIntosh, Mr. J., *Sherbrooke.*
Eastern Township's Bank (B. 25) 1°*, 367 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii).
Keller Heating Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 231) M. to rec. Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294 (iii).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F.—*Con.*
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (B. 177) M. to rec. Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 131) 1°*, 2014 (i); in Com., 5093 (ii), 5359 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, **N.S.** (Bayfield, wharf) 13141; (Benoit's Cove) 13143 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallée, pier) 1544 (i).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*
Euxine, Scuttling of Schr. (M. for cor.) 699 (i).
SUPPLY:
Postoffice: Outside Service (ry. mail service, N.S.) 5949; (postal service, Inverness) 6051 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredges, repairs) 2628 (ii); **N.S.** (Broad Cove) 13199 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1095; (Margaree, wharf) 1133 (i); (Pleasant Bay) 13205 (vi); (Port Hawkesbury) 1146 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206 (vi).

Madore, Mr. J. A. C., *Hochelaga.*
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 1461 (i).
Sugar imported into Canada, 1902 (M. for stmnt.*) 3236 (ii).

Malouin, Mr. A., *Centre Quebec.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9882 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1506; (amt.) 664 (i); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6621 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806 (i).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., and Sen. Amts. to Exchequer Court Amt. B. 155 (remarks) 14770 (vi).
——— *See* 'Exchequer B. 155.'
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Subsidy, Claims' &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3299 (ii).
Baie de Chaleur Ry.: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8241 (iv).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342 (iii).
Campaign Literature and Improper Use of Mail Bags, Complaint, &c. (remarks) 14219 (vi).
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1'459 (vi).
Can. Associated Press Despatches: *See* 'British.'
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8259 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9351 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. C.—*Con.*
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 751 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507 (ii).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaint *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 14219 (vi).
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).
Newspaper Despatches from England: *See* 'British.'
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 1327, 1511 (i); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6530, 6621 (iii).
Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British.'
Public Works Dept., Control of, &c.: *See* 'Supply—Public Works'
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi).
Justice, Administration of: Supreme Court (library) 3404 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756 (iv).
Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3754 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446; (Caplan breakwater) 13449 (vi); (Cross Point pier) 1513; (Grande Vallée pier) 1515 (i); (Maguasha pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13463; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle breakwater) 13490; (Shegawake harbour) 13479 (vi); (transfer of works to Marine Dept.) 2649 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Restigouche bridge) 8304 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. J. E., *Bagot.*
G. T. P. Ry. B., Pets. from Bagot (ques. of privilege) 12941 (vi).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6502 (iii).

Matheson, Mr. J., *Richmond (N.S.)*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6911 (iii).
Fishing Industry in N.S., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13172 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11029; (N.S.) 11797 (v).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5828 (iii); Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Breton's Cove) 13172 (vi); (Janvrin's Island wharf) 1102 (i).

Meigs, Mr. D. B., *Missisquoi.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10472 (v).

Monet, Mr. D., *Laprairie and Napierville.*
Pensions to S. A. Contingent by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14598 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3895 (ii).

Monet, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6506 (iii).
Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7035, 7043 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6687; (creed lines) 6698; (repatriation agents) 6700 (iii).
Militia (military properties) 3620; (properties) 3613 (ii).
Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 861 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Address, on The, 55 (ii).
Alaskan Boundary: *See* 'Colonial,' &c.
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 2°m., 664 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iii).
Beauharnois Electoral District Representation, and Independence of Parliament Act (M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com.) 7095 (iii).
Boards of Trade and Distribution of Public Documents (remarks) 1378 (i).
Bonaventure Station, Terminal Facilities, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).
——— (Ques.) 666 (i).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 10715; in Com., 10718 (v).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on M. for 3°, 7468 (iii).
Business of the Hse, Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).
——— Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1343 (i).
——— (remarks) 5051 (ii); 11062 (v).
Butter and Cheese Weighing, Rep. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5414 (iii).
Butter sold at Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1593, 1857 (i).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Canadian Chamber of Commerce at Paris, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).
Can. Press Despatches: *See* 'British,' &c.
Cartierville Workmen, Treatment by Govt. Contractors (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11288 (v). *See* 'Racine,' &c 'Nelson,' &c.
Census Commissioners for Prov. of Que., Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 1058 (i).
Census Expenditure, Notice of M., 13368 (vi).
Census 1901, Cost to Date, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, Speech *re* Canadian Tariff (remarks) 13375 (vi).
Chambly Canal, Collector, &c., Superannuation (Ques.) 7203 (iii).
Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B., on M. (Sir *William Mulock*) to wthdrw., 11301 (v).
Colonial Conference, Bond-Hay Treaty and Alaska, Inquiry for Ret., 853 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Committees meeting concurrently with Sittings of the Hse. (remarks) 8333 (iv).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3261 (ii).
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. B. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) in Com., 3223 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7498 (iii).
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1326 (i), 3241 (ii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3100; in Com. on B., 4010 (ii).
Customs Employes, Transfers, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3006 (ii).
Dugas, Mr. Blaise, Amount paid *re* Trip in Foreign Countries (Ques.) 1034 (i).
Dundonald, Earl: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3582 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry for, 10832 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8360 (iv).
Fair Wage Clause in Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
——— *See* 'Nelson,' &c.
Fisher, Chas. A. L., Inspector of Public Works, Salary, Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).
France and Canada SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10804 (v).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).
G. O. C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2413 (i).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7821, 7858; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8324 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8526 (iv); 10411; in Com. on B., 10412, 10574, 10650, 11287, 11302 (v).
——— on M. for Com. on Res., Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 10315 (v).
——— Order, Ques. of, Ruling asked *re* reporting debates of Com., 10633; Ruling of Chairman (Mr. *Belcourt*) sustained (Y. 52; N. 30) 10634 (v).
——— Govt's Intention *re* Quebec to Moncton scheme, 10537 (v).
——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 5765, 7487 (iii).
——— Subsidy from Govt., &c. (Ques.) 671, 1031 (i).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14647 (vi).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental.'

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
G. T. Ry., Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, &c. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c. (M. for ret.) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 66) 690 (i).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, &c., on M. for Sup., 6612 (iii).
Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3258 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4008 (ii).
Insolvency Act Amt. (B. 53) 1° m., 654 (i); 2° m., 2373 (i), 2787, 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
I. C. R. and G. T. Ry., Terminal Facilities at Bonaventure, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).
——— *See* 'Bonaventure,' 'G.T.R.'
I. C. R., River Ouelle, Branch Line, Total Cost (Ques.) 10490 (v).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 125; 2. m., 566, 705, 916 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7953 (iv); in Com. on B., 10799 (v).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759, 10768 (v).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10712, 10743 (v).
L'Assomption Post Office, Site, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
——— Letters, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
——— Receipts, Cheques, &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10799 (v).
Lévis, Land purchased for I.C.R., on M. for O. Cs. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3806 (ii).
Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 659 (i).
Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Govtl. Action (remarks) 2504 (ii).
——— *See* 'Montreal.'
Loy, Geo. M., M.P., Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) 7095 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com. (amt.) 8008 (iv).
——— (M.) to print Evidence, 7917 (iv).
Martineau, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 10242 (v).
Mayrand, Denis, Petition *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 9082 (iv).
Ménard, Denis, Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Milk Can Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 90, 179 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4448, 4482 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Payment of Militia (Ques.) 4006 (ii).

——— *See* 'Longshoremen.'

Montreal Post Office Buildings, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

——— Investigation *re*, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).

——— *See* 'Post Office.'

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 672 (i).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Murray Bay and St. Denis Wharf SS. Service, Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 10496 (v).

Nelson P.O., B.C., Labourers, Claims *re* Contractors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

——— Agreements between Employees and Contractors (read) 7162 (iii).

——— Letters read from Labour Dept., &c., 7164 (iii).

See 'Cartierville,' &c., 'Racine.'

New Canadian Company, Limited, B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2° m., 1328 (i).

Newspapers in United Kingdom, France and U.S., Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for stmnt.*) 706 (i).

See 'British.'

North Halfway Point, Lightkeeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).

N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10741 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Be'court*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 707; 2°m., 1327 (i); (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87) 6537 (iii).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10794 (v).

Petersen-Tate: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 138, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to wthdrw. B., 11302 (v).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677 (iii).

Post Office Buildings, Montreal, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

See 'Montreal.'

Post Office Employees, Holidays, &c. (Ques.) 4005 (ii).

Post Office Savings Banks B. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6815 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Preferential Tariff, Speech of Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain (remarks) 13375 (vi).

Préfontaine, Mr., and Speech *re* 'Transcontinental Ry.': *See* 'Transportation,' &c.

Printing of Bills: *See* 'Business,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafters,' 10531 (v).

——— (ques. of order) 10505 (v).

Public Accounts Com. producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7059 (iii).

Public Documents, Distribution to Board of Trade (remarks) 1378 (i).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 1°, 3970 (ii).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14746 (vi)

Public Works, Preservation of Health, Regulations *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1857 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14697, 14700 (vi).

Quebec Bridge, Application for Further Aid (Ques.) 10496 (v).

Quesnel, Jules, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Racette, V., Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 3231 (ii).

Racine Bros., Claims against Contractors *re* Nelson Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

See 'Cartierville,' 'Nelson,' &c.

Ry. Commissioners, Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3549, 3832, 4728 (ii), 5694 (iii), 8134, 8170 (iv).

——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2782 (ii).

——— (fire guards) Amt. B. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, 871 (i).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2564 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546; in Com., 550; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 551 (i).

Railway Subsidies, Inquiry for, 10955 (v).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., Grain Blockade, on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. to Sup., 2472 (i).

Richelieu River Inundations, &c. (Ques.) 10496.

Reports, Deptl., French Translation, Delay in Issuing (remarks) 479 (i).

Representations in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10832; in Com., 10958, 11028, 11114 (v).

St. James (Montreal) Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (M.) 707, 940 (i).

——— (remarks) 409 (i), 6995 (iii), 13376 (vi).

St. Mary's Current Wharf, Contract with Poupore & Malone (M. for copy of contract*) 706 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. (M.) that Com. rise, 6496 (iii).

Session of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i).

Slater Shoe Co. and Alien Labour, Res. of Shoemakers Union (read) 14666 (vi).

S. African Contingent, Saddles and Bridles, &c. (Ques.) 1675 (i).

S. A. War, Supplies purchased by Imp. Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for O. Cs., 2761 (ii).

See 'Hay,' &c.

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 457 (i).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Steel Rails, Contract, Price, &c. (Ques.) 285 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7036 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (archives) 4429; (criminal statistics) 4429 (ii); (Drolet, census schedules) 7055 (iii); (experimental farms) 4548; (general statistics) 4432; (imperial institute) 4435 (ii).

Canals: Chambly (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12909; Generally (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (toll collectors) 12929 (vi).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. ('Gazette' correspondents, Montreal) 7155 (iii).

Customs (inspectors, preventive, &c.) 3949; (preferential tariff) 3943; (stationery, printing, &c.) 3963 (ii).

Geological Survey (Dr. Bell's appnmt.) 6816; (explorations, &c.) 6816; (instruments purchased) 6820 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6660; (expenditure) 6615; (Fabre, Dr., medical inspector) 6662, 6850; (Hungarians, &c.) 6694; (medical inspection) 6852; (trachoma, inspection) 6668; (U. S. agents) 6850 (iii).

Indians: Yukon Ter. (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7271; (travelling expenses) 7272 (iii).

Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (Genelle *vs.* The King) 6795; (Keewatin govt., expenses) 6798; (litigation expenses) 6795; (maps, engraving, &c.) 6800 (iii).

Justice: Miscellaneous (Statutes, Revision) 14644 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Anticosti lightship) 5737; (*Bayfield*, str., reps. *re*) 5748; (light houses construction) 5737; (St. Lawrence route) 5758 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal ports) 7591 (iv).

Militia (annual drill) 3607 (ii); (Cole *vs.* Cooke, costs) 6950 (iii); (Cottee, Herbert, salary, &c.) 3610; (pay and allowance) 3586; (properties) 3612; (stores branch) 3609; (Valleyfield strike) 3586 (ii).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6986; (naturalization act, expenses) 6953; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6962 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, repairs) 5033; (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4041; (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4047; (St. Lawrence, obstruction, &c.) 4041 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 422 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

N.B., St. John (quarantine, water service) 415, 486 (i); (St. John water service) 486.

N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i).

Que. (Lévis) 431; (Montreal examining warehouse) 433; (Montreal, renewals) 436; (renewals, &c.) 422; (St. Hyacinthe) 441; (Valleyfield P. O.) 443 (i).

Docks (commissioner's reps.) 2984 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3354 (ii).

Ont. (Port Arthur) 3348 (ii).

Que. (Montreal harbour, 3365; (Quebec harbour improvements) 3336; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3304; (Sorel deep water wharf) 3376 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration and awards) 13339 (vi); (general expenditure) 2925 (ii); (Ottawa river surveys) 13341 (vi); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2925 (ii); (transportation commission) 13365 (vi).

Slides and Booms (repairs, &c.) 2979 (ii).

Telegraph Lines: N.W.T. (Wood Mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi).

Railways: I.C.R. (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii); Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12913 (vi); P.E.I. Ry. (Murray Harbour branch) 7534 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7275; (govtl. expenses) 6802 (iii).

Tarte, Mr., Resignation: *See* 'Ministerial.'

Telegraphic System, N.W.T. and C.P.R. Connection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vi).

Tobacco (Canadian) in Foreign Countries, Sale, &c., Amounts paid to Mr. Blaise Dugas, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

Tobacco Combine, Rep. (Ques). 1297 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Application for Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 1026 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry., Sale to G.T. Pacific Co., Par. in Toronto *News*, 7566 (iv).

Transcontinental Ry., Govt. Policy (remarks 5765 (iii).

———Proposals to Govt. (Ques.) 874 (i).

See 'G.T.P.R.'

Translation of Deptl. Reports: *See* 'Reports.'

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 853 (i).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13365 (vi).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. on Sup., 4505 (ii).

———(remarks) 3876 (ii).

———Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11064 (v).

Trent Canal Surveys, &c. on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2330 (i).

Turnpike Trust, Montreal, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 672 (i).

Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7569 (iv).

Valleyfield P.O., Erection, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Veterinary Chief Inspectors, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1591 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Victoria Bridge, Montreal, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 3245 ; on M. to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Wiallard, Paul, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 11188 (v).

Yukon District Newspapers, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for stmnt.*) 706 (i).

Morin, J. B., *Dorchester.*

Budget, The, 2034 (i).

Chabot, Mr. F.X., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2015 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12553 (v).

Employees in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7903 (iv.)

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12053 (v) ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12774 (vi).

———Parishes crossed, Lévis to Temiscouata (Ques.) 8117 (iv).

——— on Pets. presented (remarks) 12942 (vi).

———Surveys, in Com. of Sup., 14647 (vi).

House of Commons, Employees: *See* 'Employees.'

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5726 (iii).

Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville, &c. (Ques.) 8616 (iv).

Moreau, Dr., Appnmt. at Chambly Canal (Ques.) 8331, 8488 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Subsidy paid, &c.(Ques.) 10496 (v).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1337 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1815 (i).

Ross Rifle, Examination, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 2758 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6517 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (U.S. agents) 6857 (iii).

Legislation : H. of C.(tradesmen, &c.) 14115 (vi)

Post Office (country postmasters) 6060 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—**N.W.T.** (Yorkton court-house) 961 ; **Que.** (L'Assomption) 429; (Levis) 432 (i) ; (Levis, P.O.) 13055 ; (Montmagny, P.O.) 13066 ; (St. John's, P.O.) 13060 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—**Que.** (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 13445 ; (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446 (vi) ; (Cacouna, wharf) 5897 (iii) ; (Caplan, breakwater) 13451 (vi) ; (Chateauguay River) 3209 (ii) ; (Chateau Richer) 13455 (vi) ; (Crane Island, wharf) 1513 (i) ; (Desjardins, Allumette, wharf) 13457 ; (Grand Rivière, wharf) 13457 (vi) ; (Grande Vallee, pier) 1514 (i) ; (Grosbois Isle) 5902 ; (Hull, wharf) 5902 (iii) ; (Kamouraska, pier) 13458 ; (Mistook, wharf) 13461 ; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi) ; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3305 (ii) ; (St. Laurent, wharf) 5907 ; (St. Jerome, wharf) 5909 ; (St. Maurice River) 5905 ; (St. Nicholas, pier) 5905 (iii) ; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 3374 (ii) ; (Valleyfield, dredging) 5905 (iii)

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2678, 2689.

Telegraph Lines (Petite Rivière, St. Agnes) 13334 (vi).

Quarantine (small-pox) 5025 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Chaudière, engine-house) 14106 (vi) ; Ouelle River Branch) 7527 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7280 (iii).

Trottier, Louis M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8488 (iv).

Valleyfield Strike, 1900 (Ques.) 2759 (ii).

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster.*

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 654 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 591.

Century Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 175) 1°*, 3126.

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 611 (i), 5555, 5583, 6199 (iii).

Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering (B. 32) 1°*, 367 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6901 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8859 (iv).

Japanese Immigration (remarks) 3713 (ii).

Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 33) 1°*, 367 (i).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 591 (i).

Man. and North-western Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 44) 1°*, 591 (i).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261 (iv).

Private Bills (M.) to extend Time, 10489 (v).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints, &c. (remarks) 9970 (iv).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 249) 1°*, 10744 ; (M.) to receive Pet., 10744 (v).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Management, &c., Par. in *Post Intelligencer*, 7003 (iii).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm., K.C.M.G. (Postmaster General) *North York, O.*

Alliance Bank of Canada's incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7471 (iii).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Alien Labour Act, Prosecutions, &c. (Ans.) 3971.
See 'Naturalization.'

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 3285 (ii).

Ashcroft-Barkerville Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6958, 6966 (iii).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies,' &c.

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11171 (v).

Auditor General and Civil Service Bill (remarks) in Com., 13809 (vi).

Balaclava and Owen Sound Mail Contract (Ans.) 13263 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6383 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7367 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 6758 (iii).

Bloomfield Postmaster, Charges against, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).

Brecken, Mr., P.O. Inspector, P.E.I. (remarks) 14002 (vi).

B. C. Labour Troubles, Commissioners' Appnmt. (Ans.) 1596 (i), 8116 (iv).
See 'Labour.'

Brockvillle and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7445 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c, (remarks) 1346 (i).

——— (remarks) 3794 (ii), 7487 (iii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5064 (ii).

Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (Ans.) 14286 (vi).

——— and Mail Bags, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14222 (vi).

——— Govt. Ownership (Ans.) 14286 (vi).
See 'Mail Bags.'

C.A.R. Section-Men's Strike (remarks) 2303 (i).

Canada Foundry Co'.s Strike (remarks) 7205 (iii).
See 'Scotch,'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5105 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands in Man. Exempt from Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).
See 'Lands.'

Cane Bros., Timber License, &c. (Ans.) 2757 (ii).

Cartierville Workmen, Treatment by Govt. Contractors (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11288 (v).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5480 (iii).

Charlottetown, P.E.I., Free Delivery, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).

Chevrier Family, Number in Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 245) 1°m., 9079 (iv), wthdn., 11301 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 257) Res. prop., 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330, 12493, 12500, 12574 (v), 13809, 13833 (vi); 3°m, 13942 (vi).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3176, 3185 (ii).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Companies (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks Bill.'

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for 2°, 3259 (ii).

Conciliation Boards, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).

Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

——— (Ans.) 2308 (i).

Cutler, Spanish Mills, &c., Tender (Ans.) 2308.

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3098 (ii).

Dom. Lands, Man. and N.W.T. Sale, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 671, 816 (i).

Doukhobors, Homestead Entries, &c. (Ans.) 542.

——— Pilgrimage, Expenses, Losses, &c. Ans.) 542 (i).

——— Govt. Action, &c. (Ans.) 1031 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3021; in Com. on B., 4682 (ii).

Enterprise Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14008 (vi).

Ernestown Station, Postmaster, Change, &c. (Ans.) 1034 (i).

Fair Wage Schedule on Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
See 'Labour,' &c,

False Creek Lease to Burnett & Kelly (Ans.) 2758 (ii).

Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.

Govt. Business: *See* 'Business.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii); in Com., 7836, 7877 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9751 (iv); in Com. on B., 10564, 10624, 11190, 11288, 11348 (v).
See 'Transportation,' &c.

Half-Breeds Claims Commission, on Inquiry for Ret., 3397 (ii).

Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13767 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 685.

House of Commons, Ventilation: *See* 'Ventilation'

Immigration, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1127 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Immigration into Can. Nationality, &c. (Ans.) 2310 (i).

——— Number refused admittance, &c. (Ans.). 2310 (i), 2502 (ii).

Immigration into Man., Houses and Fuel (Ans.) 542 (i).

——— Medical Inspection, Appnmts. by Govt. (Ans.) 2757 (ii).

Immigration Office for Ireland, Closing, &c. (Ans.) 1032 (i).

Immigration for Ont., Govtl. Action (Ans.) 1593 (i).

Immigration, Provision for Settlers on C.P.R. Trains, &c. (remarks) 868 (i).

——— Total Number, Origin, Expenditure, &c. (Ans. 1035 (i).

Imperial Agency incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).

Indian Agents, Guardians, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).

Indian Medical Attendant, Kings, N.B. (Ans.) 2502 (ii).

Insurance Rates on Ocean Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 705 (i).

Interier, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ans.) 3972 (ii).

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14391 (vi).

Jonasson, Mr. S., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Labour Commission, B.C., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1596 (i), 8116 (iv).

Labour Commission of 1886, Names, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8083 (iv).

Labour Council, Toronto: *See* 'Toronto.'

Labour Disputes, Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 4003 (ii). *See* 'Ry. Labour Disputes,' 'Fair Wage.'

Labour Gazette Correspondents, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iii).

Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 951 (i).

——— (Ans.) 1596 (i).

Lambton Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 6166 (ii), 14278, 14651, 14661 (vi).

Lands (Govt.) available for Settlers, in B.C., &c. (Ans.) 4836 (ii).

——— Grants to Rys., Areas, &c. (Ans.) 2102 (i).

——— Sales, Winnipeg, Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 1858 (i).

——— Subsidies to Rys. unearned (Ans.) 3797½(ii). *See* 'C.P.R.,' &c., 'Rys,' &c.

Latour, Mr., Absence from Dept. to canvass for *Le Canada* (remarks) 14902 (vi).

——— *See* 'Postmasters in Que.'

Letter Carriers, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5672 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Lime Rock, N.S., Postmaster's Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2515 (ii).

Macleod, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 8083 (iv).

McNulty: *See* 'Lambton.'

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14222 (vi).

——— Statement *re* Special Trains, 14681 (vi).

——— Statement *re* Threats to Express Cos., 14851 (vi).

——— (remarks) 14540 (vi).

——— *See* 'Campaign.'

Mails carried by Rys., &c. (Ans.) 6268 (iii).

Mails carried *via* New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).

Mail Cars, N.W.T., Insufficient Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).

Mail Clerks: *See* 'P.O. B. 208.'

Maps, Printing and Publishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14273 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5099 (ii).

Miller Bros. and P.O. Bank Deposits, Defalcation of Postmaster, 14274, 14655 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4483 (ii).

Montreal Post Office, Enlargement of Building, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).

——— Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3973 (ii).

Naturalization Act, Regulations, &c. Ans.) 2015 (i).

——— *See* 'Aliens,' &c.

Nelson Post Office, B.C., Claims of Labourers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii). *See* 'Cartierville.'

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14396 (vi).

Nesbitt P.O., Man., Postmaster Watson, as Lib. Candidate (Ans.) 1196 (i).

Newmarket Office Specialty Co. (personal explanation) 13256 (vi).

N.W.T., Postal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14040 (vi). *See* 'Mail Cars, &c.'

Orleans Island Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 670 (i).

Ottawa Supply Co. *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

Parkhill Mail Contract, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Personal Explanation *re* Newmarket Specialty Co., 13256 (vi).

Petersen-Tate Deposit: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Picton Mail Service, Irregular Delivery, &c. (remarks) 13135 (vi).

Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13993 (vi).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.--*Con.*

Portage, P.E.I., Opening of Post Office (remarks) 14008 (vi).

Postal Facilities *re* Parishes near Montreal (Ans.) 12498 (v).

Postal Newspaper Boxes, Manufacture, &c. (Ans.) 14283 (vi).

Postal Service N.W.T. : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Postmasters' Association, Memorial *re* Salaries (Ans.) 129 (i), 13263 ; (remarks) 14016 (vi).

Postmasters' Bonds and Insurance Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

Postmasters, Country, Increases in Salaries (remarks) 6038 (iii) ; 14012 (vi).

Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

——— (remarks) 879 (i).

Postmasters in Man. and N.W.T., Pet. *re* Salaries (Ans.) 129 (i) ; 13263 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14672 (vi).

——— *See* 'Latour.'

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 208) 2° m., 5657 ; in Com., 5659 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep., Distribution, &c. (presented) 89 ; (remarks) 879 (i).

Post Office Employees, Holidays granted, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).

Post Offices in Cities, Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).

Post Office Insurance Fund, Rep. *re* (remarks) 14661 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

——— Statement *re* Progress, in Com. of Sup., 14012 (vi).

Préfontaine, Mr., Speech *re* G.T.P. Ry. : *See* 'Transportation.'

P.E.I. Coal Fields, &c. (Ans.) 2504 (ii).

——— *See* 'Winter Communication.'

Protective Tariff, Govt. Policy, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6689 (iii).

Public Works, Contracts awarded, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (iv).

Racine Bros. : *See* 'Nelson,' &c.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 7609, 8125 (iv).

Ry. Labour Disputes (B. 17) 2° m., 2535 ; in Com., 2580, 2923 ; 3° m., 3004, 3298 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Ry. Land Subsidies in Man. N.W.T., reserved, &c. (Ans,) 2307 (i).

——— Unpatented (Ans.) 2583 (ii).

——— Subsidies voted, &c., Govtl. Action *re* Selection (Ans.) 4832 (ii).

See 'Saskatchewan,' 'Lands,' &c.

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office Amt. B. 208, 5659 (iii).

——— *See* 'P.O. Bill 208.' 'Supply,' &c.

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.--*Con.*

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14349 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14349 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies granted to Provs. (remarks) 14485 (vi).

Ry. Transportation Policy : *See* 'Transportation.'

Rainy River Mail Service (remarks) 6890 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10881 ; in Com., 10924 ; (Norfolk) 11117 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12470 (v).

Robson, Michael, Dismissal from Ayr Post Office (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Ronan, Mr., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery (Ans.) 13259 (vi).

——— P.E.I. (remarks) 13806 (vi).

——— *See* Supply—'Post Office,' &c.

St. Boniface, Postal Facilities, &c. (Ans.) 1859 (i).

St. Chrysostôme Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 7772 (iv).

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sales, &c. (Ans.) 2502 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.'s Property (Ans.) 2306 (i).

Scotch Iron Moulders and Toronto Strike (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7192 (iii).

See 'Can. Foundry.'

Scotia, Str., Salvage Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7151 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Agricutture (exhibitions) 4624 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 272 (i).

Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 234 (i).

Interior (salaries) 267 (i).

Labour Dept. (*Gazette* cors., Montreal) 7154, 7155 ; (salaries) 7151 ; (Thompson, Mr. P., remuneration) 7152 (iii).

See 'Labour Dept.'

Post Office (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13995 ; (mail clerks) 13997 ; (Smith, F. H., salary) 14000 (vi).

Dom. Lands (maps, printing, &c.) 14273 (vi).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5125 (ii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6689 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7772 ; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7784 (iv).

Justice, Administration of, Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14259 (vi).

Labour Dept. (B. C. Commissioners) 7198 ; (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).

See 'Civil Govt.,' 'Labour.'

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7597 ; (G. B. and Can.) 7728 (iv).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984 ; (Martineau defalcations) 6991 (iii) ; (Post office, Miller's claims *re* Savings Bank) 14274, 14655 (vi) ; (Petersen, Tate and Co.'s deposit) 6958, 6966 (iii).

Post Office (automobiles, &c.) 6050 ; (Barrie branch) 6063 ; (box rents) 6139 (iii) ; (cities, promotions) 14009 (vi) ; (country postmasters) 6038 ; (Dawson and Eagle City) 5923 ; (Halifax, salaries) 6004 (iii) ; (inspectors' salaries) 14001 (vi) ; (jubilee stamps) 6061 ; (letter carriers, increases) 6004 ; (letter carriers,

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office—Con.

P.E.I.) 6058; (letter carriers, Toronto) 6005; (letter carriers, Winnipeg) 6006; (mail bag repairs) 6139; (mail marking machines) 6159; (mail service) 6065 (iii); (outside service, additional salaries) 14010 (vi); (outside service, Ottawa Supply Co.) 5936; (outside service, salaries, &c.) 5925 (iii); (pneumatic tube service) 13998 (vi); (postal service, Inverness) 6051; (postmasters, arrears of salaries) 5921; (P.E.I. winter service) 5943; (ry. mail clerks) 5928, 6026 (iii); (ry. mail clerks, Man. and N.W.T.) 14041 (vi); (ry. mail transfer agents) 6136; (rural mail delivery) 6137 (iii); (statutory increases) 14006 (vi); (superannuation, letter carriers) 6013 (iii); (temporary employees, promotion) 14001; (Vancouver, inspector) 14000; (Winnipeg, dead letter branch) 13995; (Winnipeg, inspector's office) 14001 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (furniture, &c.) 1007; (Orillia caretaker) 1017; (Ottawa, furniture, &c.) 978; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 993 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, **Ont.** (Port Arthur, dredging) 13021 (vi); **P.E.I.** (Gaspereaux harbour) 1156; **Que.** (Murray Bay wharf) 2270 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Ouelle River branch) 7527 (iii).

Tariff: *See* 'Customs,' 'Protective,' &c.

Tarte, Mr., Reference to in Toronto *Star* (explanation) 6758 (iii).

Tatamagouche Post office, Insurance Fund, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

Telephone Co.'s B. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 700 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 5555 (iii); in Com., 9424 (iv).

——— (remarks) 5883 (iii).

Toronto and James Bay Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14358 (vi).

Toronto Labour Council, Tel. *re* Mechanics from Eng. (Ans.) 1855 (i).

See 'Labour,' 'Can. Foundry,' &c.

Transportation Commission, &c., Par in Montreal *Herald re* Mr. Prefontaine (remarks) 858 (i).

Transportation Policy, *re* Speech from Throne (remarks) 6405 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4499.

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2826 (ii).

——— Appnmt. *re* (remarks) 3303 (ii).

——— Sec. 14, &c. (remarks) 4593 (ii).

Valleyfield Strike, 1900 (Ans.) 2760 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 6406 (iii).

Watson, Postmaster, and Man. Elections: *See* 'Nesbitt.'

Whitney Pier, N.S., Dismissal of Postmaster Carlin (Ans.) 130 (i).

——— Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 668 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 1045 (i).

Wood Alcohol, Contract with Standard Chemical Co., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

Wright, A. W., Amounts paid to (Ans.) 8116 (iv).

Murray, Mr. T., *Pontiac.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1011 (i); in Com. on B., 10552 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 767 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10792 (v).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c. (M. for copies) 1299 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13362; (transportation commission) 13367 (vi).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *E. Hastings.*

Banff Coal Reserve, Lease for Mining, &c. (Ques.) 13026 (vi).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3269 (ii).

Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11182.

G. T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9039 (iv); in Com. on B., 10419, 10658, 11191, 11353, 11856, 12198, 12261 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12711 (vi).

Hetu, Rudolph, Pardon, &c. (Ques.) 7915 (iv).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3680 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11407 (v).

Lt.-Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup., 123 (i).

Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 183 (i).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters. Western Rys., 10522, 10534 (v).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1219 (i); in Com., 10987, 11542; (Brant) 11107 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (post offices) 517 (i).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4951 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4525 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3879 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.*

Advocate, Prince Albert: *See* 'Supply.'

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°*, 11176 (v).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*

Autonomy for N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13883 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7374 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 7309 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7437 (iii).

Budget, The, 1799, 1816 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4391, 4996 (ii); in Com. on B., 5803 (iii).

Canadian North-West Irrigation Co.'s (B. 143) 1°*, 2300 (i); in Com., 3226 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands and School Taxation (Ques.) 4006.

Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp, (B. 140) 1°*, 2236 (i); in Com., 4591 (ii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5488 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13586, 13593, 14427 (vi).

Edmonton and Peace River Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 446 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 111) 1°*, 1462 (i).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Frank, Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2106. 2238 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5162 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8805 (iv); in Com. on B., 11352, 11946, 12145 (v).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, &c., on M. for Sup., 6562 (iii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7961 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4336 (ii).

Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10742 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8219 (iv).

Lumber Combine in N.W.T. and Man., Cor. read, &c., 1580 (i).

Lumber Combine Investigation, &c. (remarks) *re* B.C. Lumber Trade, 14767 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand) 5727 (iii).

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14592 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12316 (v).

Prince Albert *Advocate*, Printing: *See* 'Supply,' &c.

Provincial Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (fire-guards) 8187 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5522 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s (B. 139) 1°*, 2236 (i); in Com., 4588 (ii).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11825 (v).

S.A. War, Cattle for S.A.: *See* 'Cattle.'

———Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8266 (iv).

———Pensions to disabled Soldiers (remarks) 14592 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Dom. Lands (fire regulations) 6776; (tree culture) 6776 (iii).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268 (vi).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3479 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *W. Toronto.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6972 (iii).

Campbell, D. J., Postmaster at Macleod, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 8082 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation Co.'s (B. 54) in Com., 2303 (i).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4417 (ii).

Civil Service Act (superannuation) Amt. B. 49, in Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 595 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6649, 7492 (iii).

Defalcations in Deptl. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 623 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iii).

Fishing Industry, N.S., Accommodation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13163 (vi).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12300 (v).

Goods imported direct into Can., Value of Duty, &c. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9281 (iv); in Com. on B., 10600, 10650, 11279, 11320, 11972, 12038, 12062, 12161, 12286 (v); on M. for 3°, 12691; (amt.) 12693; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12703 (vi).

———Customs Duties *re* Clause 17, Legal Opinions (read) in Com. on B., 11320 (v).

See 'Ry. Policy.'

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4293 (ii).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8094 (iv).

Letters signed by Minister, stamped, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2527 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8054 (iv).

Macleod, N. W. T., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 8082 (iv).

Martineau, Defalcation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 195 (i).

Moosonee Diocese Trust Funds (B. 148) 1°*, 2396 (i).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12310 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of, Mr. Scott's Attack *re* Western Rys., 10497 (v).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Memo of Mr. Kingsmill *re* Bonds, &c. (read), 14588 (vi).

——Ques. of Privilege, *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6321 (iii).

——Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2559 (ii).

Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7125 (iii).

See 'Transportation.'

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Toronto) 11701; (York) 11671; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12462; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12437 (v).

Scotia, Str., Salvage Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7156 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7220 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7024 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (wharfs, &c.) 7564 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 240; Justice (salaries) 212 (i); Labour Dept. (Thompson, P., remuneration) 7154 (iii).

Dom. Lands (Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. surveys) 6940; (surveys) 6939 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6326; (medical attendance) 6409; Ont. and Que. (medical attendance) 6326; (schools) 6409; Que. (medical attendance) 6408 (iii).

Legislation (voters' list) 5275 (iii).

Militia (Cooke *vs* Cole, costs) 6950; (Winnipeg barracks, paving streets) 6949 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co's deposit) 6956 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 5043 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Cobourg, armoury) 640; (London, drill hall) 641; (Toronto Junction, post office) 651 (i).

Harbours and Rivers: N.S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13144; (Breton's Cove) 13163 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13342.

Telegraph Lines: (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2993; (Marconi stations) 2991; (Yukon) 2993 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations) 6933 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4929 (ii).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3490 (ii).

See 'Ry. Policy.'

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10157 (v).

Printing Com., 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 5314 (iii).

——4th Rep. (M.) to conc., 5581 (iii).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 460 (i).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5268 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 988 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William (Minister of Customs) *N. Wentworth and Brant.*

Agricultural Implements, Rebates for 1901-2 (Ans.) 3803 (ii).

Aluminum, Oxide of, imported into Can., Ports of Entry, &c. (Ans.) 1035 (i).

Audit Act and C. S. Employees, 13990 (vi).

Bananas imported into Dom., Value, &c. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Bauxite, Tons imported into Canada, 1902 (Ans.) 1678 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7385 (iii).

Binder Twine, Quantity imported from U. S. (Ans.) 7566 (iv).

Bonded Warehouses, Rental, Closing, &c. (Ans.) 12074 (v).

Bonding Privileges with U. S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

Bourgeois, M. E., Sub-collector of Customs at Tracadie, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 543 (i).

Budget, The, 2176 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5061 (ii).

Chevrier, F. L., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Cos. (Ans.) 3233.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12507 (v); in Com. on B., 13826 (vi).

Coal imported in Ontario from June, 1901, to March, 1902, and June, 1902, to March, 1903 (Ans.) 669 (i).

Coasting Laws, U. S., and Bonding Privileges, &c. (remarks) 13135 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. (B. 174) Prop. Res., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; in Com. on B., 4010; 3°m., 4187 (ii).

Customs Employees, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 5318.

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*

Customs and Excise, *per capita* Revenue from 1896 to 1903 (Ans.) 13935 (vi).

Euxine, Scuttling of Sch., on M. (Mr. *McLennan*) for Cor., 699 (i).

German Surtax, Purchases previous to (Ans.) 3395 (ii).

See 'Preferential,' &c.

Goods imported direct into Can., Value, &c. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Grain Receipts through Western Lake Ports (Ans.) 97 (i).

Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 543 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10275; in Com. on B., 10549, 11360, 12025, 12170 (v); on M. for 3°, 12698, 12755 (vi).

Grant, J. G., Sureties *re* defaulting Customs Collections (Ans.) 5991 (iii).

Imports for 1903, Duty collected and Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ans.) 13935 (vi).

See 'Preferential,' &c.

Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7959, 7979 (iv).

'Jesse James' Stories, Importation Free of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 11426 (v).

King's Warehouse at Winnipeg (Ans.) 6268 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8217 (iv).

Le Canada Newspaper: *See* 'Pelletier,' &c.

Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5994 (iii).

Montreal Customs Dept., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 8115 (iv).

Nova Scotia Bank, Customs Duty *re* Safe, &c. (remarks) 13988 (vi).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980 (vi).

Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Origin (remarks) 3584 (ii).

Preference Tariff *re* German Goods (Ans.) 5322 (iii).

——— *See* 'Goods.'

Questions put by Members, Answer *re* (remarks) 544 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14375 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14375 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10918, 11489; (Brant) 11098, 11149; on Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) to M. for 3°, 12488 (v).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Sugar for Home Consumption, Quantity entered (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 (iii); Welland (Dunnville dam) 7810 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 319 (i).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3782, 3897; (Dauphin port) 3898; (Gananoque port) 3897; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3949 (ii); (Kilroy, Mr., payment for services) 13993 (vi); (linseed oil fraud) 3935; (locks, printing, &c.) 3962; (Montreal contingencies) 3785; (preferential tariff) 3921; (printing, &c.) 3962; (salaries, &c.) 3897 (ii); (salaries, overtime) 13980 (vi); (Yukon expenditure) 3968 (ii)

Electric Light (inspectors) 5409 (iii).

Inamigration (repatriation, &c.) 6710 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (medical attendance) 6345 (iii).

Justice, Administration of: Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3427 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7592 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4098 (ii).

Post Office: Outside service (ry. mail service) 5956; (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5832.

Surtax Bill: *See* 'Customs.'

Tariff Charges, Free List, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).

Tobacco Duties collected for 1903 (Ans.) 12217.

Trade and Navigation Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Trade Commissioner in London, Appnmt., &c., (remarks) 3497 (ii).

U.S. Coasting Laws, &c., Regulations *re* (read) 13135 (vi).

Windsor Junction Accident, I.C.Ry., on Inquiry for Papers, 3496 (ii).

Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 284 (i).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Mr. Aylesworth, reported Interview (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4229 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5419, 5431 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5464; (Neg. Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).

Chickens, 'Wringing Chickens' Necks': *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Immigrants, Provision for Settlers (remarks) 868.

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. to Sup., 4341 (ii).

Latour, Mr., Leave of Absence and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980, 14002 (vi).

Le Canada and Mr. Pelletier's Canvassing, &c. (remarks) 13980 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

Mail Clerks, Promotions, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 13997 (vi).

Pope, Mr. R. H.—*Con.*

Ministerial Changes, on Explanations, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 191 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. E., and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980, 14002 (vi).

Postal Service in N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).

Poultry Fattening: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Pulp Wood, Duty by U.S. (remarks) 4362 (ii).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) for Com. of Sup., 2484 (i).

Sorel Wharf, Cor., Reps., &c., Inquiry for Papers, 2302 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (*Poultry Farming*) 7644.

Civil Govt.: Post Office (mail clerks, salaries) 13997 (vi).

Customs (salaries for overtime) 13980 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Bennett, Mr., salary increase) 13967 (vi).

Excise (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (close season, investigation, &c.) 13650; (dog-fish pest) 13651 (vi).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 6734 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 13640 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13963 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4064 (ii).

Post Office (dead letter branch, Winnipeg) 13995; (pneumatic tube service) 13998; (statutory increases) 14007; (Vancouver inspector) 14000; (Winnipeg, inspector's office) 14001 (vi).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Batiscan channel) 2280; (Chateauguay river) 2280; (Grande Vallee, pier) 1538; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie, ice piers) 2248; (Magdalen islands) 2265; (Maria, pier) 2265; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Orleans, wharf) 2290; (Rivière aux Renards) 2280; (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Francis, ice pier) 2282; (St. Jerome, wharf) 2291; (St. Lawrence, lower) 2257; (Sorel, wharf) 2291; (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2298; (Touladie river) 2286 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2961 (ii).

Slides and Booms (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974; (salaries) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Yukon working expenditure) 14042 (vi).

Quarantine: (diseased immigrants) 5492 (iii).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *W. Hastings.*

Ashley, Harford Relief (B. 236) 1°*, 8115 (iv).

Belleville Harbour Boundaries, &c. (Ques.) 5588.

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9597.

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 775 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8092 (iv), 10786 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8078 (iv).

Napanee and Deseronto Ry. Co.'s Charter, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*

Quinté Bay Buoys, Payments for Services, &c. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5342 (iii).

Rathbun Co.'s Ry. Charter, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11548 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Generally (Belleville armoury) 969 (i).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Rep. of W. McLeod, &c. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).

——— Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2334 (i).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Maisonneuve.*

Alaska, Str., Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 6629 (iii).

Annandale Range Lights, Amount expended (Ans.) 2922 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Bathurst Harbour Buoys (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

Bayfield, Str., Sale, &c. (Ans.) 5586 (iii).

——— Reps. of Mr. Evans and others (read) in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).

Belleville Harbour Boundaries (Ans.) 5588 (iii).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks) 12820 (vi).

Bishop, Capt., Harbour Master, Albert, N.B. (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

B. C. Fisheries, Rep. of Commissioners (remarks) 1199 (i).

C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Coal Oil as Fuel on Steamers: *See* 'Steamboat Inspection Bill.'

Daly, M. T., Harbour Master at Bathurst, N.B. (Ans.) 2919, 3630 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8259, 8360 (iv).

False Creek, Kelly & Burnett's Lease (Ans.) 7565 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3129 (ii), 5515, 6354 (iii).

Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 224) 1°m., 6538; in Com., 6896 (iii).

Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Fisheries Protection Service, Officers Mess, Regulations *re* (Ans.) 9820 (iv).

Fishery Rights between Dom. and Provs. (M.) for Memorandum, 7923 (iv).
See 'Supply—Fisheries.'

Fishing Rights, James and Hudson's Bay (Ans.) 1194 (i).
See 'James.'

Fishing within Three Mile Limit, N.B. (remarks) 4179 (ii).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10813 (v).

Frozen Fish, Goods, &c., Claims for Damages (Ans.) 13373 (vi).

——— Losses, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3394 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 5890 (iii).

Govt. Fishery Steamers, Names of Commanders, &c. (Ans.) 446 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8325 (iv).

G. T. R. Transcontinental Line, Speech in Montreal *Herald* :*See* 'Transportation.'

Harrison, Capt., Reimbursement to *re* Costs, &c. (remarks) 10240 (v).

Hatchey, Nazaire, Appnmt. as Harbour Master (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

James Bay Fishing Rights, on Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).
See 'Fishing.'

Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Kelly & Burnett: *See* 'False Creek.'

Latour, L. J., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Lighthouse Keepers, Pet. *re* Salaries (Ans.) 14666 (vi).

Macnee Fishing Licenses, on Inquiry for Ret., 4728 (ii).
See 'Fishing.'

Marine Deptl. Rep. (presented) 244 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificate B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) prop. Res., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6544; in Com. on B., 6917 (iii).

Mayrand, Denis, Petition *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 9082 (iv).

Mehan, Dr., Meteorological Service, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

Ménard, Denis, Lightkeeper, Charges against (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

Meteorological Service, Removal to Ottawa, &c. (Ans.) 6435 (iii).

Midland Water Front (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
See 'Pratt.'

Minto, Govt. Steamer, Passengers carried (Ans.) 3632 (ii).

Miscou Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3631 (ii).

Monterey, Str., Wreck, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 6803 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4474 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8084 (iv).

Montreal Northern Ry. and Ste. Agathe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Moreau, Dr., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8331 (iv).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Naval Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5296 (iii); 13545 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. (B. 260) in Com. on Res., 12779; in Com. on B., 12984 (vi).

Navy Training Ships, Establishment, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5296 (iii), 13545 (vi).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Nobles, Israel, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to, &c. (remarks) 12820 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, N.B., Dismissal of Miles McMonagle (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6533 (iii).

Oyster Fishing, P.E.I., Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2920 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 138) 1°*, 2100 (i).

——— Montreal and Quebec Districts Amt. (B. 261) in Com. on Res., 12781; in Com., 13627; 3° m., 13937 (vi).

——— Prop. Res. wthdn., 12493 (v).

Pratt & Co., Water Frontage, Lease, Midland: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5294 (iii).
See 'Midland.'

P. E. I. Winter Communication, *re* Str. *Stanley* (Ans.) 4007 (ii).
See 'Winter,' 'Supply,' &c.

Quesnel Dam, B.C., Obstructions, &c. (Ans.) 11557 (v).

Quinté Bay Buoys, Payments for Service, &c. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Policy of Govt.: *See* 'Transportation.'

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14317, 14508 (vi).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. Lawrence Gulf Fishermen, Pet., &c. (Ans.) 2917 (ii).

St. Lawrence Navigation, Rep. of Lloyds, &c. (read) 4138 (ii).
See 'Supply,' 'Lighthouses,' &c.

St. Lawrence River Pilots, &c. (Ans.) 2916 (ii).
See 'Pilotage Bill.'

Safety of Ships Act Amt. (B. 179) 1°m., 3298 (ii); in Com., 6918 (iii).

Salmon Canning Industry, B. C (remarks) 10241 (v).

——— Rep. (M.) 7109 (iii).

——— Complaints, &c. (remarks) 9974 (iv).

——— Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 12073 (v).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. (B. 263) in Com. on Res., 12801, 12894; 3°m, 13560 (vi).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Stanley and *Lansdowne*, Str., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

Stanley, *Minto*, Strs. in the Ice, Telegram read, 6 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).

——— (B. 225) prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; in Com. on B., 6915 (iii).

——— Amt. (B. 237) 1°m., 12494 (v); in Com., 12777 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5033 (ii); (salaries) 13663 (vi).

Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658 (vi); (Bance, Mr. promotion) 5277; (*Bayfield*, str.) 5278 (iii); (Behring sea arbitratin) 13658 (vi); (Canadian fishery exhibit) 4175 (ii); (close season, investigation, &c.) 13650 (vi); (fish-breeding establishments) 4175; (fish-ways) 4174; (hatcheries) 4174 (ii); 13660 (vi); (Hurley, J. M., inspector, &c.) 5123 (ii); 5283, 5306; (intelligence bureau reps.) 5277 (iii); (lobster factories inspection) 5123 (iii); (Ottawa exhibit) 5308 (iii); (protection service, B.C.) 4174 (ii); (provincial claims) 5311; (steamers, construction) 5278; (U.S. licenses, expenses) 5309 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agency, Montreal) 13632 (vi); (aids to navigation) 5736; (*Bayfield*, reps. *re*) 5740; (Bronté lighthouse) 5756 (iii); (Canadian coast lighting 4164 (ii); (gas lights) 13633; (Halifax harbour buoy service) 13638 (vi); (lightkeepers' salaries) 4132; (lighthouse supplies) 4168; (Lurcher's shoal lightship) 4173 (ii); (Marconi stations) 13640 (vi); (Montreal pilot commissioners) 4173 (ii); (St. Lawrence lights) 13632 (vi); (St. Lawrence, navigation, &c.) 4135 (ii); (sweeping boats) 13636; (telephone service, Port Atkinson and Vancouver) 13638; (wireless stations) 13639.

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 4116 (ii). 13543; (Couillard, Alfred, gratuity, 13546 (vi); (Dom. steamers, repairs) 5034; (Govt. steamers, repairs) 4041 (ii); 13518 (vi); (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4048 (ii); (life saving awards) 13543; (marine biological station) 13543; (master and mates examination) 13524; (vi); (meteorological service) 4118 (ii); (naval militia and school of navigation) 13545 (vi); (St. Lawrence, lighting, &c.) 4042; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4114 (ii); (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 13545 (vi); (wrecks, investigation) 4116 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Que. (Longueuil, P.O.) 13072; (St. Louis de Mile End, P.O.) 13080 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12848 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept., 2939 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection (boiler inspectors) 13648.

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6993; (time ball, Halifax) 6993 (iii).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. (B. 262) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v); 12800; in Com. on B., 12993 (vi).

—— Prop. Res. withdn., 12492 (v).

Swinehammer, Geo., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 2312.

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 855 (i).

Venoit, P. I., Absence from Duty, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).

Yamaska to Lotbiniere, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14319 (vi).

Winter Communication, P.E.I., Construction of Str. (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Hughes*, *P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1055.

Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Cornwall and Stormont.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4230 (ii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7145, 7400 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5808 (iii).

Cattle Guard Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 14686 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) 14136 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for Com. (M.) to refer back to Com. on Rys., &c., 4871; Neg. (Y. 55, N. 102) 4874 (ii); in Com., 5208 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10118 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13281 (vi).

See 'Transportation,' &c.

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4309 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14699, 14725 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Cornwall (electric lighting) 14136 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 487. Que. (L'Assomption) 428 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3493 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2842 (ii).

Puttee, Mr. A. W., *Winnipeg.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s (B. 192) in Com., 5588, 5960 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7324 (iii).

B. C. Labour Troubles, Appnmt. of Commission (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Budget, The, 2149 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5447 (iii).

Canada Foundry Co., Toronto, Strike, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7194 (iii).

See 'Immigration, Inadequate Inspection.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5108 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands in Man., Exemption from Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 610 (i).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3181 (ii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. (B. 95) 1°m., 1193 (i); 2°m., 2790, 3259; in Com., 3260 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6643 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 13572 (vi).

Fair Wage Schedule on Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7159 (iii).

Grain Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9120 (iv); in Com. on B., 11281 (v).

Immigration, Accommodation for Settlers, 1126 (i).

——— Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6567 (iii).

——— Provision for Settlers on Trains, &c. (remarks) 866 (i).

Labour: *See* 'B. C.', 'Can. Foundry,' 'Conciliation,' 'Fair Wage,' 'Ry. Labour B., 'Supply, —Civil Govt.', 'Workmen,' &c.

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 950 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2509.

North Pole Expedition, Aid to Capt. Bernier, &c. (remarks) 12819 (vi).

Post Offices in Cities, Stmnt. of Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

Preston, Mr., and Interference in Can. Labour Affairs: *See* 'Immigration, Inadequate Inspection.'

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4207 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6263 (iii), 8136 (iv).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2549 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., Car Shortage, &c., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2468 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 65 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10900; (Dauphin) 11748; (Winnipeg) 11784 (v).

St. Andrews' Locks Contract, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 287 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids, Expiration of Contract (Ques.) 10490 (v).
See 'Supply.'

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 242 (i); Labour Department (*Gazette*) 7154 (iii).
Post Office (letter carriers, Winnipeg) 6006 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, military stores) 13126; (Winnipeg, P. O.) 438 (i), 13127 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews Rapids) 3354; (snag boat) 2672 (ii).
Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5496 (iii).

Winnipeg and Assiniboine Water Power Co.'s (B. 192) 1°*, 3970 (ii).

Winnipeg P. O., Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

Workmen on G. T. P.Ry., Construction, Protection to, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11281 (v).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *S. Grenville.*

Alert, Str., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

Alexandria Wood Export Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).

Bank Failures since Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 6435 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S., 12761 (vi).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5060 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5112 (ii).

Cardinal Canal, Toll Collector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12929 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12336, 12546 (v).

Clergue Co., Reorganization and Govt. Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14098 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

——— Supt's Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4019 (ii).

Damages to Vessels at Govt. Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Electric Lighting, St. Lawrence Canals at Iroquois (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).

Fiddler's Elbow, Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10821 (v).

Galops Rapids, Deepening, &c., Contract, &c., Cor. (read) on conc., 8375 (iv).

Galops Rapids, Dam. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12608 (v).

Gananoque and Brockville Channel, Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13320 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12262 (v); on M. for 3°, 12699, 12743, 12761 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13277 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 787 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Locomotive Contract: *See* 'Locomotives.'

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759 (v).

Kingston and Brockville Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

Kingston Locomotive Works and Tenders for I. C. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).

Lachine Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14140 (vi).

Litigation Expenditure, Fees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12916 (vi).

Locomotive Contracts *re* I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5419 (iii).

Montreal Locomotive Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

Morrison, Mrs., Claim *re* Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Public Works Dept. and Transfer to Mr. Prefontaine, 2645 (ii).

Public Works let by Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6208, 6296 (iii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 2924 (ii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11487, 12295 (v).

Schell, Mr.: *See* 'Alexandria,' &c.

Stewart, Mr., Supt. of Murray Canal, 12927, 14146 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census enumerators) 4820 (ii).

Canals—**Chambly** (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12908; (tow paths) 12906; **Cornwall** (electrical equipment) 14134; (enlargement) 12896; **Farran's Point** (enlargement) 12898; **Galops** (dam) 12608 (vi); (deepening) conc., 8374 (iv); (enlargement) 12899, 14141; (north channel) 12899, 14142; **Generally** (operating expenses) 12924: (repairs. &c.) 12924; (salaries) 12934; (surveys, dredging, &c.) 12900: (toll collectors) 12929; **Grenville** (guide pier) 12909; **Lachine** (electrical equipment) 14142; (enlargement, &c.) 12903; (masonry walls) 12906; **Lake St. Francis** (dam) 14152; **Lake St. Louis** (hydrographic survey) 12904; **Miscellaneous** (engineers, &c., salaries) 12910; (litigation expenses) 12911; **Rapide Plat** (enlargement) 12898; **Sault Ste Marie** (construction) 12904; **Welland** (Port Colborne, entrance) 12902; **Williamsburg** (gate-lifter) 14149; (overseer's house) 14150; (scow) 14154 (vi).

Customs (salaries for overtime) 13984 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13956 (vi).

Excise (salaries *re* C. S. Act) 13967; (salaries, Prescott) 13968 (vi).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5129 (ii), 5281; (intelligence bureau reps.) 5277; (steamers, B.C.) 5278 (iii).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6332; (medical attendance) 6332 (iii).

Inland Revenue (excise inspections) 5364; (Keilty, Mr., Appnmt.) 5365, 5378 (iii).

Legislation (voter's lists) 5276 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4047, 4091, 5042 (ii).

Post Office (Doyle, Mr.) 5928; (Ottawa Supply Co.) 5936, 6153; (postmasters' arrears of salaries) 5923; (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (post office), 530 (i).

Docks (Montreal dry dock) 2988 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Generally (dredges, repairs) 2626 (ii); **B.C.** (Columbia river) 1455; **Man.** (Dauphin lake) 1448 (i); **N.B.** (Arsenault, Capt., damages to schooner) 13231; **Ont.** (Depot harbour, breakwater) 13239 (vi); (dredging plant) 2671 (ii); (Petawawa narrows) 1442 (i); (Prescott, dredging) 5916 (iii); (transfer to Marine dept.) 2645 (ii); (Wolfe Island, dredging) 1442 (i), 13252; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13319 (vi); **Que.** (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Sabrevois wharf) 13485; (Sacré-Cœur wharf) 13479 (vi); (St. Louis river) 13475 (vi); (Valleyfield dredging) 5905 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13344, 13347; (transportation commission) 13364 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

Slides and Booms (Gatineau river) 2977; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2975 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—**Mar. Provs.** (Deer Island and Eastport) 13325 (vi); **Que.** (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13326 (vi); (Marconi stations) 2991 (ii).

Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5492; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5497 (iii); (small-pox) 5012 (ii); (trachoma epidemic) 5493 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3702 (ii); (Canso ferry service) 14094; (Connolly's claim, &c.) 14103; (general vote) 12874; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14095 (vi); (Levis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (New Glasgow, freight shed) 14096; (rolling stock) 14100; (*Scotia*, salvage) 14107; (steel rails) 14099; (Windsor station) 14097; P. E. I. (Hillsborough, bridge) 12839, 14108; (Murray Harbour branch) 12833, 14123 (vi).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4884 (ii).

Telephone Service in the H. of C. (remarks) 5088 (ii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13364 (vi).

Williamsburg Canal, Electric Light, &c. (remarks) 14136 (vi).

——— Collector's Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).

——— Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).

Richardson, Mr. M. K., *S. Grey.*

Art Gallery, Can. Collection of Paintings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13513, 13517 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7378 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7465 (iii).

Richardson, Mr. M. K.—*Con.*

Budget, The, 1946 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7504 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 14415 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 632 (i).

Flesherton Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10040 (iv); in Com. on B., 10625 (v); on M. for 3°, 12701 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs, and Elections, 13274 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6573 (iii).

Lands available for Settlers in B. C., &c. (Ques.) 4836 (ii).

Mint Building, Progress, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1339 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

——— General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14345 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11000, 11525 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6472 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. Exhibit, Imp. Institute) 13509 (vi); (exhibitions) 4602; (Japan exhibition) 4635; (St. Louis exhibition) 4602 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Justice (salaries) 212 (i).

Dom. Lands (buffalo herd, &c.) 6790 (iii).

Fisheries (close season, investigation, &c.) 13649 (vi).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7776, 7778 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 13640 (vi).

Militia (pay and allowance) 13428 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4087 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, **Ont.** (Clinton P. O.) 521; (Durham) 506; (Ottawa, Rideau Hall), drainage) 647 (i); (Wingham, P. O.) 13122 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, **N. B.** (Caraquet, wharf) 1173; **N. S.** (Drumhead, breakwater) 1086; (Lunenburg, harbour) 1107 (i); **Que.** (Chateauguay river) 3210 (ii); (Grande Vallée, pier) 1534 (i); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13479 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys), 13350 (vi).

Robinson, Mr. Jabel, *W. Elgin.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Bananas imported into Can., Value, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Budget, The, 1825 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5064 (ii); in Com. on B., 5426 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 384 (i).

Cattle Guard Commission Rep., Publishing, &c. (remarks) 14758 (vi).

——— *See* 'Ry. Act.'

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6645 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3085 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 573 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 902 (i); in Com. (compulsory voting) 13582, 14415 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6439 (iii).

Elgin County Centenary Celebration (remarks) 3129 (ii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., 13164 (vi).

Gates over Ry. Crossings, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5775 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9228 (iv); in Com. on B., 12233 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 740 (i).

Immigrants for Ont., &c. (remarks), 1131 (i).

Immigrants for Ont., Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1593 (i).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3694 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7985 (iv).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10781 (v).

——— Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8069, 8372 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

McCraney, Mr. W., Letter *re* Legislation (read) 5362 (iii).

Mail Delivery, Free, Establishment, &c. (remarks) 14011 (vi).

——— *See* 'Rural.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452 (iii).

Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14855 (vi).

See 'Sessions.'

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4176 (ii); in Com., 6459 (iii).

Robinson, Mr. Jabel.—*Con.*

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5867 (iii).

Printing Bureau and Indebtedness of Members (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Attendance in House (remarks) 2015 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guard) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).

——— (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 258 (i); in Com., 4567 (ii), 5767, 6184, 6241, 6307 (iii), 8188 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5519 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Passenger Rates, to M. for 3°, 8346 (iv).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14431 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11523 (v).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of (Ques.) 285 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

——— *See* 'Mail.'

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7224 (iii).

Session of the House, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 473 (i).

——— *See* 'Parliament.'

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7035 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibit at Imp. Institute) 13511 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239 (i).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas lights) 13636 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7584; (Can. and S. Africa) 7752 (iv).

Post Office (free mail delivery) 14011 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1165 (i); N.S. (Breton's Cove) 13164 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14431 (vi).

Robinson, Mr. James, *Northumberland, N.B.*

Aluminum, Oxide of, Imports into Can. Ports, &c. (Ques.) 1035 (i).

Bauxite, Tons, Imports into Can. for 1902 (Ques.) 1678 (i).

Roche, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract with Allans, &c. (Ques.) 7091 (iii).

——— Delay by Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14185 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7312 (iii).

Budget, The, 1891 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12358 (v); on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).

Roche, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche*, Marquette) to Com. of Sup., 3197 (ii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., Accommodation, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13157 (vi).

——— *See* 'Privilege.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5194 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9553 (iv).

Immigration, Inspection, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6557 (iii).

Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7952 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* N.S. Fishermen on 'Outskirt of Civilization,' &c., 13373 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 13666 (vi).

Fisheries (dog-fish pest) 13650 (vi).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6667; (agents, &c.) 6835; (trachoma, inspection, &c.) 6667 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Sable Island, Marconi service) 13648 (vi).

Militia (pay and allowance) 13394 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6958 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—**Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 13319; **N.S.** (Breton's Cove) 13157; (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217 (vi).

Quarantine (small-pox), 5020 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Agricultural Implements, Rebate for 1901-2 (Ques.) 3803 (ii).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., Rep. of Inspector, &c. on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 850 (i).

Autonomy to N.W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 13905 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 253.'

Budget, The, 1876 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4996, 5109 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 402 (i),

Civil Servants, Interference in Man. Elections (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3141; Neg. (N. 71; Y. 22) 3206 (ii); (notice of motion) 3126 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Coal Lands, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Dom. Lands, Man. and N.W.T., Sale, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).

Ewart, Mr., and Adress to Judge Perdue, 11071, (v).

Govt. Appnmts. of Members, &c. (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Grain Weighing Machines : *See* 'Automatic.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7844, 7875 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9727 (iv); in Com. on B., 10444, 12267 (v); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12706; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709; on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 12734 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections 13278 (vi).

Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers, Par. in Winnipeg *Telegram*, 1121 (i).

Jerome, Martin, M.P.P., and Man. Elections, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Jonasson, Mr. S., Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Land Sales, Winnipeg, Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).

——— *See* 'Dom.', 'N.W.T. Grazing,' &c., 'Saskatchewan.'

McDonnell, Geo., Lease of, Grazing Lands, &c. (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

Man. and N.W.T. School Land, Sale, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

Man. Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).

Members appointed to Govt. Positions (M. for ret.*) 3805 (ii).

Members appointed to Offices, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 9582 (iv).

——— (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

Myers, Appnmt. as Judge in Man. (Ques.) 285 (i).

Nesbitt, Man., Postmaster Watson as Lib. Candidate (Ques.) 1196 (i).

N.W.T. Grazing Lands, Lease to Geo. McDonnell (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

N.W.T., Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12323 (v).

——— Senate Representation : *See* 'Senate.'

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Land Grants, &c. (M. for O.Cs., &c.*) 2338 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4363 (ii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11032, 11743; (Dauphin) 11748; (Macdonald) 11781; (amt.) to M. for 3°, 12476 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Property, &c. (Ques.) 2306 (i).

See 'Qu'Appelle.'

Senate Representation of N.W.T., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (St. Louis exhibition) 4611; (Treadgold exhibits) 4621 (ii).

Civil Govt. : Justice (salaries) 214 (i).

Customs (Dauphin port) 3898 (ii).

Fisheries (inspectors, Man.) 5127 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, immigration shed) 13127; Harbours and Rivers—Man. (dredging plant) 13311; (Mossy river, dredging) 13312 (vi).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).

Watson, John, Lib. Candidate in Man. (Ans.), 1196 (i).

Roddick, Mr. T. G., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 832 (i).

Rosamond, Mr. B., *N. Lanark.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4998 (ii).

City and County Bank of Can. incorp. (B. 172) 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10752 (v).

Electric Lighting, Public Buildings, Ottawa, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com , 5234 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11927, 12089 (v).

Herald Printing Co., Montreal, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 8329 (iv).

Lobster Packing Factory in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11490, 11650; (Brant) 11106; (Toronto) 11723; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12492 (v).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146; (Breton Cove) 13152 (vi); **Que.** (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3320; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Ross. Mr. J. H., *Yukon Territory.*

Hydraulic Leases, Yukon, O. C's., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1323 (i).

Ross, Hon. Wm., *Victoria (N.S.)*

Allan SS. Service, Reduction in Sailings from St. John (remarks) 14080 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6983 (iii).

See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7327 (iii).

British Members of Parlt., Visit to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 2105 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5080 (ii); in Com. on B., 5435 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., in Com. on Res., 4991 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 396 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 841 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock* in Com. on Res., 12504 (v); in Com. on B., 13825 (vi).

Ross, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Civil Service Act (superannuation) Amt. B. 49, (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 594 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3065 ; in Com. on B., 4015 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 575 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 309 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com,, 6897 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5198 (iii), 7884 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9583 (iv).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 772 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6576 (iii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7942 (iv).

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8371 (iv).

Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 955 (i).

Letter Carriers, &c., in Com. on Post Office B., 5660 (iii).

Markland, Schr., Seizure, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5994 (iii).

Masters and Mates Certificate B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6545 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5660 (iii).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5982 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3736 (ii), 5351, 5573, 5778, 6311 ; (telephones) 5553 (iii) ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Passenger Rates, to M. for 3°, 8358 (iv).

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv),

Schooley, Wm. Francis, Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com., 3225 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7221 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).

Steel Bounties : *See* 'Iron,' &c.

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (*Poultry Farming*) 7656 (iv).

Civil Govt. : Customs (salaries) 325 (i).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3787 (iii).

Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 6817 (iii).

Inland Revenue (Inspectors, N.S.) 5409 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7783 (iv).

Justice : Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3521 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5881 (iii), 13679 (vi) ; (Can. and G. B.) 7595 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6983 (iii).

Ross, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 4081, 5043; (*Stanley*, repairs, &c.) 4055 (ii).

Post Office : Outside Service (P.E.I., winter service) 5945 (iii).

Public Works : Buildings—**Ont.** (rural mail delivery) 514 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (hydraulic dredge) 2621, 2625 (ii) ; **N.S.** (Bridgewater dredging) 1075 ; (Campbellton wharf) 1143; (Green Cove harbour) 1100; (Neil's harbour) 1139 ; (Washabuck wharf) 1150 (i) ; **Que.** (Le Tableau wharf) 2255 (i) ; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3314 (ii).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2751 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8273; (Stellarton, accommodation) 8301 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4926 (ii).

Ross, Mr. W., *S. Ontario.*

Budget, The, 2036 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5433 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4369 (ii).

Clergue Steel Works, Sault Ste. Marie, Contract with Govt., &c. (Ques,) 13668 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646, 7503 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10754 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting) 14420 (vi).

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 707 (i).

Immigration Statistics, Total Number, Origin, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1035 (i).

Inspection, General Act (weighmasters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14312 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9927 (iv).

North-west Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2754 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2609 (ii), 5349, 5771 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6468, 7228 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 477 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7613 (iv) ; (experimental farms) 4551 ; (Shutt's, Prof., report) 4559 (ii).

Excise (analysts, food, &c.) 5395 (iii).

Justice, Administration of—Yukon (living allowances) 3417 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Oshawa P.O.) 13111 (vi).

Russell, Mr. B., *Hants.*

Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 212) M. to receive Pet., &c,, 4958 (ii) ; 1°*, 5512 ; 2° m., 5585 ; in Com., 7470 (iii).

Russell, Mr. B.—*Con.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4385 (ii).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Ry. Bill 21.'

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 608 (i).

Church Missionary Society of Canada incorp. (B. 202) 1°*, 4727 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8255 (iv).

Fire Guards on Ry. Lands: *See* 'Ry. Bill 21.'

Good Shepherd Reformatory B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4841 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7869 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8907, 8919 (iv).

Harrison, Capt. of Str. *Grecian*, Reimbursement *re* Costs, &c. (remarks) 10239 (v).

Home Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 191) 1°*, 3970

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2383 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com. *re* Beauharnois P. O. Site, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7920 (iv).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 72 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (tolls) 5576; (cattle guards) 6249; (2-cent rate) 6278; (fire guards) 6315 (iii).

Ry. Debts: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9423 (iv).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Alexandria Wood Export Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12926 (vi).

See 'Privilege.'

Bell Telephone: *See* 'Dundonald, Earl.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7321 (iii).

Budget, The, 2025 (i).

C. A. R. Section-Men's Strike (remarks) 2303 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4401 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14419 (vi).

Dundonald, Earl, Telephone Mess. *re* Scottish Demonstration (remarks) 10536, 10744 (v).

Glengarry Scottish Demonstration re Tel. Message to Lord Dundonald (remarks) 10536 (v).

Privilege (ques. of) *re* Govt. Purchases, 5416 (iii).

——— *See* 'Alexandria.'

——— *re* Mr. Stewart's Appointment, 14599 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (drainage) 4754 (ii).

Stewart, Mr., Appnmt. as Supt. of Williamsburg Canal, Ques. of Priv., 14599 (vi).

Schell, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Canals—Generally (operating, &c., expenses) 12926 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 488; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1518 (i).

Scott, Mr. W., *W. Assiniboia.*

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1° *, 591 (i).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 880 (i).

Autonomy for N.W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Hâlifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13914 (vi).

——— Correction in Press (remarks) 14855 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 259.'

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7329, 7357 (iii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Mortgage Deed, Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 13024 (vi).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.

Campaign Literature and Mail Bags, Complaint, &c. (remarks) 14220 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4387, 5102 (ii); in Com. on B., 5786 (iii).

C. P. R. and Car Shortage in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation,' &c.

C. P. R. (Kirkella and Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (amt.) 14501 (vi).

C. P. R. (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. Res., 14504 (vi).

Century Life Ins. Co., B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5583, 6201; (amt.) 5360 (iii).

Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3056 (ii).

Dime Novels: *See* 'Weekly Publications.'

Engineers, Marine, Certificates to: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'

Fire Guards along Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Bills.'

Frank Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2100 (i).

Freight Rates, Govt. Control: *See* 'Ry. Rates.'

Fyfe, Mr.: *See* 'Grain Weighing, &c., 'Supply—Excise.'

German Goods, 'Teapot,' Importation, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) 3056 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 5322 (iii).

Grain Blockade in the N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation,' &c.

Grain Weighing Scales in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4202 (ii).

——— *See* 'Automatic.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10173; Grafters,' 10189; in Com. on B., 10710, 12276 (v).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Graves, Florence D., Relief (B. 214) 1° *, 5581 (iii).

Herchmer, Lt.-Col., Pension, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. (B. 137) 1° m., 2101 (i); 2° m., 3294 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys., Areas, &c. (Ques.) 2101 (i); 3797 (ii).

——— *See* 'Rys.', &c.

Land Titles Amts. to N.W.T. Bill: *See* 'N.W.T. B. 259.'

Lumber Combines, N.W.T., Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 6168 (iii).

——— (remarks) 1579, 1589 (i).

MacLeod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1° *, 814 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14220 (vi).

Mail Cars, overcrowding, &c. (remarks) in Com. on P.O. Bill, 5870 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).

See 'Supply—Post Office.'

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7994 (iv).

Man. and N.W. Volunteers, Land Scrip., &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificates B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6545 (iii).

Mounted Police Act (pensions) Amt. Bill, M. to introduce, 14280 (vi).

Northern Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 51) 1° *, 654 (i).

Northwest Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1° *, 813 (i).

N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. (amts.) 13853, 14287 (vi).

N. W. T. Snow Storms, False Reps., &c. (remarks) 11822 (v).

Novels, Dime: *See* 'Weekly Publications.'

Osler, Mr. E. B., Attack *re* Qu'Appelle Ry. Bonds, &c., Ques. of Priv., 14583 (vi).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle,' &c., 'Privilege,' &c.

Parliament, Date of Convening (remarks) 14855 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. 5863, 5870 (iii).

Preference Tariff *re* German Goods (Ques.) 5322 (iii).

——— *See* 'German,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 10530, 10533 (v).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle.'

——— *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates,' &c., 14583.

Provincial Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s Contract, 'Grafters,' &c. (remarks) on G.T. Pacific Bill, 10189 (vi).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Mortgage, Regulations *re* Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 13024 (vi).

——— on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) 10500 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (fire-guards) 5782; (cattle-guards) 6242, 6321 (iii), 7610 (iv).

Ry. Act (fire guards) Amt. (B. 16) 2° m., 871 (i).

Rys. Land Grants in Man. and N.W.T. and rest of Can., Mileage, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1677 (i).

——— Man. and N.W.T., Area reserved and patented, &c. (Ques.) 2307 (i).

——— Area unpatented, &c. (Ques.) 2583 (ii).

——— Govtl. Action *re* Selection, &c. (Ques.) 4831 (ii).

See 'Lands,' &c. 'Railway Subsidies in Land,' &c.

Ry. Rates, Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies in Land and Money in N.W.T. and Man. (Ques.) 1677 (i).

——— paid by Govt. since Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Ry. Transportation, N.W.T., Congestion (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2424 (i).

Regina & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 43) 1°*, 591 (i).

Scrip to Volunteers: *See* 'Man. and N.W.T.' &c.

Snow Storms in N. W. T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11822 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, &c.) 4643 (ii).
Dom. Lands (surveys, printing, &c.) 13777 (vi); (tree culture) 6781 (iii).
Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5381; (grain weighing machine) 5381; (inspectors' salaries) 5381 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6673: (agents, &c.) 6836; (Barr Colony) 6870; (diseased immigrants) 6858; (exodus to U.S.) 6876; (expenditure, &c.) 6867; (ques. of order) 6854; (Galicians) 6863, 6878; (U. S. agents, &c.) 6858 (iii).
Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6343 (iii).
Post Office (Moosejaw postmaster) 6048; (postmasters, salaries) 6048; (ry. mail service, N.W.T.) 5835, 6048 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (St. Joseph wharf) 3384 (ii).
Tel. Lines (N.W.T.) 2715 (ii).

Tariff and Immigration into N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iii).

Textile Fabrics: *See* 'Inspection Act.'

Trant, Mr. (remarks) 3060, 3167 (ii).

Volunteers of Man. and N.W.T., Land Scrip, &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Weekly Publications, 'Jesse James Series', Customs Duty (Ques.) 11426 (v).

Weights and Measure Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4202 (iv).

Scott, Mr, W.—*Con.*

Wright, A. W., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 8116 (iv).

Sherritt, Mr. J., *N. Middlesex.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4246 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5463 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 393 (i).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13737 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 787 (i).

Parkhill Mail Contract, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Goderich, breakwater) 13242; (Grand Bend, pier) 13239 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3373; (St. Joseph's wharf) 3387 (ii).

Quarantine (hog cholera) 5506 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (Toronto stockyards) 8317 (iv).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford (Minister of the Interior) *Brandon.*

Alnwick Band, Mississaga Indians, Claims, &. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5965 (iii).

Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'Provincial.'

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6355, 6375 (iii).

See 'Supply—Immigration,' &c.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5606, 5793 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserves, Complaints *re* trespassing (Ans.) 7915 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act. B. (M.) dropped, 13444 (vi).

Doukhobors, Loan to by Govt. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) *re* one-fifth Vote, 6408 (iii).

Fire Guards: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8617 (iv).

Immigration Expenditure for 1902-3 (Ans.) 6269 (iii).

——— Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6603 (iii).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

Indian Boy, Sand: *See* 'Sand.'

Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

International Congress of Geology, Visit to Can. (Ans.) 8117 (iv).

McDonnell, Geo., Lease of Grazing Lands, &c. (Ans.) 8330 (iv).

Man. Grain Act (1900) Amt. (B. 232) 1° m., 7294; 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991 (iii); 9350 (iv).

Man. School Lands, on Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*

Moose Deer Point Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iii).

Pigeon Lake Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Provincial Autonomy, N.W.T., Further Cor., &c. (remarks) 7295 (iii).

——— Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6947 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).

See 'Supply—Dom. Lands.'

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5784 (iii).

Saskatchewan Land Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 7108 (iii).

Sand, Indian Boy, adopted by Mr. Johnstone (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii).

Scotch Labourers, Return to Old Country (remarks) 7206 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (boundary delimitations) 6790; (buffalo herd) 6790; (commissioner's salary) 6765; (half-breed schools, salaries) 6773; (homestead inspectors) 6766; (homestead lands) 6787; (inspector's expenses) 6766; (irrigation, &c.) 6764; (military asylum pensions) 6788; (roads, &c.) 6772; (Long Lake and Saskatchewan ry. surveys) 6940; (surveys, &c.) 6758, 6939; (swamp land expenditure) 6927; (Teulon road) 6927; (tree culture) 6774; (Winnipeg office) 6767; (Yoho Park roads, &c.) 6790 (iii).

Geological Survey (Bell, Dr., appnmt.) 6816; (coal, Sudbury) 6824; (geologist, international boundary survey) 6825; (instruments purchased) 6820; (plans, plottings, &c.) 6826; (surveys, exploration, &c.) 6815 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6658; (Barr colonists) 6696; (Cory, W. W., &c.) 6854; (Devlin, Mr., successor) 6732; (Ellis, Dr., inspector) 6702; (expenditure) 6615; (general expenses) 6827; (homestead entries) 6704; (Lake St. John Col. Co.) 6888; (mechanics, &c.) 6833; (medical inspection) 6695, 6851; (Murray, agent, Scotland, cor., &c.) 6827; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6849; (tents, &c.) 6849; (trachoma) 6695; (U. S. agents) 6848; (White, Mr. W. J., expenses) 6735, 6853 (iii).

Indians: B. C. (Clayoquot school) 7269; (fishing, &c., investigation *re*) 7265; (reserves, sale of, &c.) 7267; (salaries) 7257; schools, &c.) 7254, 7260; (Songhees, removal, &c.) 7258; (travelling expenses) 7262 (iii).

Generally (agency inspectors) 6425; (chiefs' salaries) 6410; (general vote) 6425; (land fund) 6415; (legal expenses) 6416; (medical attendance) 6421; (Robinson treaty payments) 6410; (Stewart, E., extra expenses) 6416; (survey reserves) 6411 (iii.)

Man., &c. (agricultural implements, &c.) 6422; (medical attendance) 6329, 6350 (iii).

See 'N.W.T.' &c.

Mar. Provs. (schools) 6409 (iii).

N. B. (St. John river, pet., &c.) 6352 (iii).

N. S. (seed grain relief) 6417 (iii).

N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 6348; (supplies, &c.) 6422 (iii).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—Con.

Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6326, 6344; (medical attendance) 6409 (iii).

Ont. and Que. (blankets, clothing, &c.) 6409; (medical attendance) 6326; (schools) 6409 (iii).

Que. (medical attendance) 6408; (St. Regis lockup) 6415 (iii).

Yukon Ter. (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7270 (iii).

Interior (Alaskan boundary commission) 6931; (Amos Barnes, claim) 6922; (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6791; (astronomical work) 6790; (Banff museum) 6927; (Bow River, bridge) 6925; (Casca Transportation Co.) 6926; (Howie, F. W., legal expenses) 6795: (Keewatin, govt.) 6797; (Keewatin, lunatics) 6798; (Liard river, miners) 6926; (litigation expenses) 6794; (maps, engraving, &c., N.W.T.) 6800 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6946; (general expenses) 6888 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher, expenditure) 6949, 7275; (govtl. expenses) 6802; (hospital grant) 7291; (Lithgow, Mr., controller) 7287; (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6931; (roads and bridges) 7283 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Corrected Answer, 6803 (iii).

——— Free Representations, &c. (Ans.) 5990 (iii).

——— Personnel of Commission *re* (remarks) 7297 (iii).

——— Telegram *re* Free Representations, 6427 (iii).

Smith, Mr. E. D., *S. Wentworth.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4227 (ii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7364 (iii).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7488 (iii).

Butter, Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5430 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5477 (iii).

Cold Storage: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4035 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. (B. 86) 1°*, 1023; 2° m., 2387 (i), 2788; on M. for 2°, 3807 (ii).

——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) 2° m., 3823 (ii).

Fruit Shipments in Cold Storage to Europe, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 3805 (ii).

——— Value, &c. (Ques.) 3232 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 3708 (ii).

Permanent Corps, Qualification of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).

See 'Royal.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Smith, Mr. E. D.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3550, 3714, 3850 (ii), 6208; (telephones) 5553 (iii).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2469 (i).

Royal Canadian Regiment, Strength, &c. (Ques. 3801 (ii).

See 'Permanent.'

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7236 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (cold storage, &c.) 7086 (iii), 7610, 7655; (creameries, &c.) 7633 (iv); (fumigating stations) 4434 (ii).

See 'Mail Subsidies.'

Customs (receipts, &c.) 3923; (salaries, &c.) 3923 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff springs) 6789; (boundary delimitations) 6791; (irrigation, surveys, &c.) 6764; (tree culture) 6774 (iii).

Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6774 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii); (Can. and G. B.) 7573 7590 (iv).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John river) 5896; Ont. (Midland, dredging) 5911 (iii); (Port Colborne) 3373 (ii); Que. (Cacouna, wharf) 5900; (Hull, wharf) 5902 (iii).

Quarantine (small-pox) 5032 (ii).

Smith, Mr. R., *Vancouver.*

Alien Restriction Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2390 (i).

Canada Foundry Co.'s Strike, Representations to Dept. of Labour (remarks) 7205 (iii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup (remarks) 945 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2512 (ii).

Ry. Employees Safety (B. 77) 1°m., 872; 2°m. 2386, 2387 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock* on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. L. P. Brodeur) *Rouville.*

Address, The, Reply from His Ex. (read) 1204 (i).

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) Members remarks checked, 3282 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 665 (i).

Bills, Royal Assent Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 5315, 5427, 6353 (iii), 8642 (iv), 14844 (vi).

Bills withdrawn, on M. (Mr. *Hyman*) 7203 (iii).

Binder Twine Inspector's Rep., on M. to suspend Rule (remarks) 13789 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan, &c., B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*) ruling, 5989 (iii).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7488 (iii).

Brunet: *See* 'Order,' 'St. James,' &c.

Budget, The, Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 1735, 1742 (i).

Butter Adulteration Act (remarks) 4960 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

Brockville and North-west Ry. Co. s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 ; (ruling) 7339 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Appeal to Speaker (ruling) 7342 (iii).

——— Translation of Bill (remarks) 7468 ; (ruling) 7469 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, Members remarks checked, 10746 (v).

Campaign Literature and Sessional Messengers (Ans.) 14286 (vi).

——— *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Apples, Packing, &c., Members called to Order, 11185 (v).

Cattle Guard Commission, Members remarks checked, 3396 (ii).

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 3286 (ii).

Clerk of the House (notification of appnmt.) 1 (i).

Columbia River Improvement B. 150 (Mr. *Galliher*) on Sen. Amts. (ruling) 6847 (iii).

Door-keeper of H. of C., Salary, &c. (remarks) 14115 (vi).

Dundonald, Lord, Telephone Message from Alexandria (ruling) 10536 (v).

Election Petitions, Judge's Reports (notification) 2 (i).

Elevator Accident in House (remarks) 5417 (iii).

Garden Products, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) Members remarks checked, 4768, 4779 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 941 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 8058 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) and M. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise (ruling) 7832 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wilmot*) Ruling, 8067 (iv).

G. T. Pacific B. 235, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) that Committee not properly constituted (ruling) 10634 (v).

——— on M. for 3°, Order, Ques. of, Ref. to previous Debate, 12742 (vi).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Irregularity of Proceeding, 7727 (iv) ; (ruling) 12774 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Irregularity of Proceeding, 13266 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, Member called to Order, 13271 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) *re* Affidavits being read (ruling) 14847 (vi).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Marcil*) 12941 (vi).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

G. T Pacific B. 235, onQues. of Order, Member reading Speech (ruling) 10250 (v).

——— Ruling, on M. to receive Pets., &c., 12715 (vi).

——— *re* Vote of Mr. Cargill (remarks) 10538 (v).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (ruling) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).

——— Members remarks checked, 3248 (ii).

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. B. 137, on M. for 2° (ruling) 3297 (ii).

Laval 'Electoral District, Judge's Certificates (notification) 1 (i).

Library of Parlt., Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, &c. (ruling) 110 (i).

Loy, Geo. M. and Election Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence (ruling) 7918 (iv).

McCraney, Mr. W., Letter *re* Legislation (ruling) 5363 (iii).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Member (Mr. *Taylor*) called to Order for ref. to past Debate, 14553 (vi).

——— Use of Rooms in H. of C. (stmnt.) 14565 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, on Mr. Taylor asking Question, 14684 (vi).

See 'Campaign.'

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13624 (vi).

Members, New, Certificates of Election (notification) 3 (i).

Members rights to speak, &c. (ruling) 10536 (v).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 4, 90, 707, 1204 (i), 4957 (ii), 14042, 14662 (vi).

Messengers of House and Mail Bags : *See* 'Campaign.'

Mounted Police Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 1°, 14281 (vi).

Mount Royal Savings Bank B. 153 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to withdraw Bill, 10831 (v).

Mowat, Sir Oliver : *See* 'Lt. Gov.'

Ontario Electoral District, Certificate : Notification, 367 (i).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3° (ruling) 4871 (ii).

Order of the House, &c., Remarks of Mr. Borden *re*, 12724 (vi).

Order, Ques. of *re* Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Election (ruling) 108 (i).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Bennett*) Irrelevancy of Deb. *re* Mr. Oliver (ruling) 11564 (v).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Monk*) on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) ruling, 10505 (v).

Order, Questions of (Mr. *Ingram*) on ruling (remarks) 10537 (v).

See 'Privilege,' &c.

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation, &c., Members remarks checked, 2398 (i).

Petitions presented, Rules, &c. (remarks) 6 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

Petitions received *re* G. T. P. Ry. (ruling) 12715 (vi).

Petitions *re* Subsidies, Rejected, 654 (i).
See 'Subsidies.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1° (ruling) 5241 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep., Distribution, &c. (remarks) 880 (i).

Press Gallery Representatives, Sessional Allowance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14243 (iv).

Preston, Mr., and Can. Butter : *See* 'Butter.'

Private Bills, Notice, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to revise Rules, 12216 (v), 13549 (vi).

——— Rules *re* presenting (remarks) 482 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) Statement of member must be accepted, 10503 (v).

——— (Mr. *Clancy*) *re* member reading a letter from Hugh Sutherland, Ruling, 10530 (v).

——— (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 'Outskirts of Civilization,' on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13374 (vi).
See 'Order,' &c.

Procedure, Ques. of, 5892 (iii).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 14844 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, (ruling) 8351 (iv).

——— Mess. from Senate *re* Conference on Amts., 14734 (vi).

——— on Conference with Senate *re* its Amts., Names of Managers (read) 14740 ; M. to suspend Sittings of Hse., 14740 (vi).

——— Procedure, Bourinot quoted, &c. 14760 (vi).

Railway Policy of Govt., Member (Mr. *Sproule*) must not refer to previous Debate, 7121 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (ruling) 548 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66, on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) Ruling, 12432, 12435 (v).

Royal Assent to Bills, Com. from His Ex. (read) 5315 (iii).
See 'Bills,' &c.

Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v), 13549 (vi).

Russell Electoral Division, Notification of Vacancy, 1023 (i).

St. James Division, Montreal, Judge's Certificates (notification) 1 (i).

——— Judgment of Supreme Court, (notification) 91 (i).

——— Vacancy (remarks) 410, 1023 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, Members remarks checked, 7044 (iii).

Subsidies for Public Highways, Pets., &c. (ruling) 591 (i).
See 'Petitions.'

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Legislation : House of Commons (debates, &c.) 5265 (iii) ; (debates, amanuenses) 14243 (vi) ; (messengers) 5265 ; (printing, &c.) 5267 (iii) ; (salaries, increases) 14112 ; (sessional clerks) 14113, 14242 ; (sessional messengers) 14243 (vi) ; (voters' lists) 5274 ; Library of Parlt., 5267 ; Senate (contingencies) 5264 (iii).

Telephone Service in H. of C. (remarks) 5088 (ii).

Terrebonne Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 7 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 5555 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) Ruling reserved, 7727 (iv).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, Ques. of Order (ruling) 7571 (iv).

Vacancies, Notification, 2 (i).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (remarks) 630-1 (i).

——— on M. to ref. to Private Bills Com. (ruling) 664 (i).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Members remarks checked, 7005 (iii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy (Mr. P. Macdonald) *E. Huron.*

Anglo-American Cable Co., Irrelevancy of Debate, 13338 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) on Amt. (Mr. *LaRivière*) ruling, 5559 (iii).

——— (ruling) *re* Notice of Amt., 5970 (iii).

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co. (ruling) 852 (i).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1808 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties, Ques. of Order, Remarks checked, 7305 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) read, 7400 ; (ruling) 7401 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) Irregularity of Deb. in Com., 5616 (iii).

——— Members' remarks checked, 4991 (ii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2303 (i).

Century Life Ins. Co.'s B. 175, on Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) ruling, 5360 (iii).

——— on Amt. of Mr. Morrison (ruling) 6199 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 843 (i).

Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Ques. of Order, 3167 (ii).

Civil Service B. 257, on Com. on Res., Members' remarks checked, 12338, 12561 (v).

Conciliation Act Amt. B. 95, Irrelevancy of Debate, 3262 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

Customs Act Amt., Irrelevancy of Deb. (ruling) 3058 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3, in Com. (ruling) 910 (i).
——— (remarks) 13569 (vi).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) ruled out of order, 14424 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) (remarks) 1062 (i).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5170 (iii).
——— in Com., Members' remarks checked, 7825; (ruling) 7814, 7826 (iv).
——— on Remarks *re* Par. in *Globe* (Mr. *Haggart*), Irrelevancy of Deb. (ruling) 5894 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Members' remarks checked, 10622, 10640, 11292, 11980, 11987, 12231, 12250 (v).
——— (amt.) read, 11834 (v).
——— Two-cent rate (ruling) 12235 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., Ques. of Order, ref. to past Debate, 8212; (ruling) 8214 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex. (estimates, suppl.) 12869 (vi).
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr *Lemieux*) 2° m., 1328 (i).
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256, Members' remarks checked, 12326 (v).
Order, Ques. of, (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Criminal Code Amt., 318 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208, Irrelevancy of Debate, 5868 (iii).
Ry. Act B. 21 (ruling) on Amts., 6220, 6272, 6311 (iii) 8143 (iv).
——— Com. from Senate insisting on its Amts., 14519 (vi).
——— Discussion *re* Private Bill (ruling) 6106 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Telephones (ruling) 5548 (iii).
——— Members' remarks checked, 5167 (iii).
Ry. Act (govt. supplies) B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., Members' remarks checked 12982 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies B. 2 (ruling) 551 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12293 (v).
——— Irrelevancy of Debate, 10966 (v).
——— Members' remarks checked, 11617 (v).
——— Ques. of Order, 11470, 11474 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Lennox*) 11710 (v).
St. Chrysostôme Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com. (remarks) 7771 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection B. 200, Members' remarks checked, 6478 (iii).
——— (remarks) 7215, 7218 (iii).
Skinner's Pond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi)

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Justice (ruling) 209 (i); Public Works (remarks) 5824 (iii).
Fisheries: Members' remarks checked, 5294, 5296 (iii).
Immigration (observance of rules) 6862; (quoting from speeches) Ruling, 6870–6874; Remarks *re* Discussion, 6708, 6724, 6854 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) Members' Remarks checked, 7778 (iv).
Interior (Liard River miners) remarks, 6926 (iii).
Militia (stores branch) Amt., 3609 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (members' remarks checked) 4043 (ii).
Post Office (irrelevancy of debate) 5954 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (ruling) 516 (i). N.B. (Campbellton) Members' Remarks checked, 13043, 13052; Ont. (ventilation of Chamber) 13010; (Wingham, P.O.) 13120 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers: Generally (irrelevancy of debate) 2638, 2669 (ii). N.S. Members' Remarks checked, 13171 (vi). Ont. (Bayfield, pier) 1189 (i). Que. (irrelevancy of debate) 2270 (i). Members' Remarks checked, 3367 (ii).
Railways: P.E.I. Ry. (M.) to reduce Vote, 7539 (iii).
Sydney Harbour Commission B., in Com. on Res. (ruling) 12306 (v).
Telegraphic Systems, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., Members' Remarks checked, 13330 (vi).
Toronto and James Bay Ry., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) (ruling) 14360 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Irregularity of Debate (ruling) 3470 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *E. Grey.*

Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6630 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, Refusal of Can. Commissioners to sign the award (remarks) 14402 (vi).
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).
Allan Line Steamers, Rate of Speed (remarks) 13672 (vi).
Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7473 (iii).
Anthrax in Cattle, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 10102 (v).
Assiniboine River and Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 6846 (iii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay of Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14178 (vi).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 664, 1509 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1806 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, &c. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T. (remarks) 885 (i).
Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6394, 6400 (iii).

Bass River (N.S.) Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fieldimg*) in Com. on Res., 7314, 7384 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties, &c., on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Binder Twine Inspector's Rep. (M.) for Distribution, 13789 (vi).

Binder Twine, 8th Rep. of Com. on Ag., on M. to conc., 14043 (vi).

——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* Mr. Haycock's Powers, 14047 (vi).

See 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.'

British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 236 (iv).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7400; on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 7343, 7469, (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14437 (vi).

Budget, The, 1740 (i).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 871, 2501 (i).

——— Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1350 (i); 6352 (iii).

——— on M. to take in Mondays, 3711 (ii).

——— Ry. Resolutions, &c. (remarks) 11422 (v).

See 'Govt.'

Butter Adulterations, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5054; in Com., 5422; (amt.) 5430 (iii).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Can. Associated Press Despatches: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.

Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5596, 5616 (iii).

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., 7484 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5555 (iii).

Canals, Tonnage Dues, Abolition of (Ques.) 874 (i).

Casey, Mr., and Archives, 13505 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 376 (i).

——— Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 14054 (vi).

Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5473 (iii).

Census of 1901, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 290 (i).

See 'Pub. Accts.'

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13710, 13721 (vi).

See 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5360, 5584 (iii).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 843 (i).

——— *See* 'Criminal Code B. 215.'

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12368 (v); in Com. on B., 13813, 13834; on M. for 3°, 13946 (vi).

Clergue Contract with Govt. for Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks.'

Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5678 (iii).

Cricket Playing on Parlt. Grounds: *See* 'Parliament,' &c.

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3240 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7491, 7501 (iii); (cigarettes) 10748 (v).

Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4010 (ii).

Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 9350 (iv).

Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13688 (vi).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 894 (i); in Com., 13584 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3010, 3026 (ii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Embargo on Cattle: *See* 'Cattle.'

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3226, 3580, 3751 (ii).

Ewart, Mr., Address to Judge *re* Treadgold Commission, &c. (remarks) 11072 (v).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 296 (i).

Fast Atlantic: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Fitzgerald, W. W., Homestead Pre-emption (M. for cor.) 289 (i).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10811; in Com. on B., 12299 (v).

Franking of Provincial Documents, 14036 (vi).

Freight Rates: *See* 'Rys.,' 'Discriminating,' &c.

Geological Survey, Maps: *See* 'Maps.'

Germans in Canada, Recruiting for Naval Service (remarks) 8717 (iv).

German Tariff Cor., Papers laid on Table (remarks) 1460 (i).

Govt. Business, &c. (remarks) 13547 (vi).

——— Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Govt. Business, &c. *See* 'Business of the House,' &c.

Grain Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Grain Weighers: *See* 'Inspection.'

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8057 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8746 (iv); in Com. on B., 10424, 10635, 11307, 11390, 11393, 11967, 11975, 12064, 12111, 12206, 12235 (v); on M. for 3°, 12657 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, *re* Irregularity of Introduction of B., Speaker's ruling asked for, 7726 (iv), 12774 (vi).

——— 'Hansard' Reporters not reporting Com., Mr. Speaker's ruling asked for, 10633 (v).

——— (M.) that Com. rise, 10633 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13268, 13273 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets., Ques. of Order, 13266 (vi).

——— *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

G. T. P. Bill 235, Distribution to Members (remarks) 8919 (iv).

Halifax Elevator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).

'Hansard' Reporters not reporting Com., Mr. Speaker's ruling asked for, 10633 (v).

Haycock, Mr., Inspector of Binder Twine, Authority to Inflict Penalties, Opinion of Min. of Jus., 14044 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 679 (i).

Hides Inspection, Tel. from W. F. Maclean, M.P. (read) 3969 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 742 (i).

Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 117) 1°*, 1642 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6590 (iii).

——— *See* 'Barr.'

Imperial Defences, and prop. Res. of Lord Rosebery (remarks) 410 (i).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3249 (ii).

Inspection, General, Act (weighmasters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14311 (vi).

Intercolonial Conference, Cor. *re* (remarks) 8230 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10799 (v).

Joint High Commission, Letter *re* Reciprocity (read) 14053 (vi).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10788; in Com. on B., 11418 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (Quebec) 12301 (v).

——— Retiring Allowances B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8103, 8371 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14290 (vi).

Kingston Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Groceries, &c. (Ques.) 10100 (v).

——— *See* 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.'

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res, 14490 (vi).

Lake St. John Ry. to La Tuque, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8201 (iv).

Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13832; in Com. on B., 14299 (vi).

Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup,, 121 (i).

——— (remarks) 663, 1206 (i).

Loan Companies, Extension of Powers B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2351 (i).

Lumber Combine in N. W. T. (remarks) 1587 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14225 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Maps, Printing for Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Geological.'

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5097 (ii), 5359 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Lighthouse,' &c,

Martineau, Inquiry for Papers, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'

Matane and Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14484 (vi).

Meaford, Ry. to Wharf, &c. (remarks) 14507 (vi).

Midway to Vernon Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5715 (iii)

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *F. W. Borden*) on M. for 1°, 872; in Com., 2240 (i).

Milk Cans B.: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).

Montreal and Atlantic and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Montreal *Herald* and Mr. Fisher: *See* 'Privilege.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5418 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14593 (vi).

Nationality of Mr. Gallery, 13506 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779.

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Newspaper Postage: *See* 'Post Office B. 208.'

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 5511 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12310 (v).

Ottawa Buildings, Govt. Offices rented, leased, &c. (M. for ret.) 588 (i).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1314 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on B., 6806 (iii).

Ottawa Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) 2° m., 1511 (i).

Parliamentary Documents, Postage *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation, &c. (remarks) 2398, 2421 (i).

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10797 (v).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12782; in Com., 13630 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5241; in Com., 5667 (iii).

Post Office Revenue, Increase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 14033 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks B. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6814 (iii).

Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G.B. (remarks) 3219 (ii).

Press Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Prime Minister, Congratulations *re* twenty-five years as Member (remarks) 11690 (v).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (remarks) 2396 (i); 4958 (ii); 10490 (v).

——— Notices, &c., on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend Rules; Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13548 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11563 (v).

——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10503, 10513 (v).

Procedure *re* Adjournment of Hse. (remarks) 6630 (iii).

Provincial Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Public Accounts Com., producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Resolutions (remarks) 14042, 14280, 14402 (vi).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 563 (i).

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8122 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 264 (i); in Com., 3542, 3716, 3834, 3856, 3883, 3991 (ii), 5250, 5568, 5688, 6121, 6174, 6203, 6279 (iii), 8194 (iv); (telephones) 5519 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8352 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13835 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. *re* Senate Amts., 14520 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order *re* (Mr. *Campbell*) 6105 (iii).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2557 (ii).

Railway Appropriations voted by Parlt., Transferred to other Appropriations, 14060 (vi).

Railways constructed without Govt. Aid, Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 8487 (iv).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5667 (iii).

Ry. Policy, Announcement by Govt. (remarks) 6426 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7118 (iii).

Ry. Rates, Control by Govt., Sec. 6 of Res. (remarks) 14502 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies by Provs., Amounts to each Prov., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14484 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies, General Policy (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14363 (vi).

——— (inquiry) 11422 (v).

——— Payments of, &c. (remarks) 14513 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14320, 14431; (cost of ry. bridges) 14512; auditing books by Aud. Gen., 14516 (vi).

Ry. Transportation in N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2496 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S. and Joint High Commission, Letter from an M.P. (read) 14053 (vi). *See* 'Joint.'

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).

Representation in the House of Commons, B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 713; on M. for 2°, 1282; (amt.) 1284; neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 1292 (i); in Com., 10944; 10958, 11057, 11470, 11511, 11584, 11628, 12294; (Brant) 11105; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12433 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Representation in the House of Commons, Evidence, Papers, &c. (remarks) 11424 (v).

Representation in H. of C. from Ont., Cor., &c. (M. for copies *) 2337 (i).

Rosebery and Imperial Defence : *See* 'Imperial.'

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9979 (iv).

San José Scale *re* Nursery Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13502 (vi).

Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3225 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); in Com. 6481, 7212 (iii).

Senate Amts. to Money Bills, Unconstitutionalty of (remarks) 14290 (vi).

Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Sup., 13950 (vi).

Shipping Federation of Canada incorp. B. 93 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 2° m., 1328 (i).

South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8267, 8320 (iv).
See 'Hay,' &c.

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 457 (i).

Statutes, Revision Commission, Names, Progress, &c. (Ques.) 1029 (i).

Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 634 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6542 (iii).

Steel Rails, Clergue's Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7046 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Bill 218 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6171 (iii).
—— (remarks) *re* one-fifth vote, 6408 (iii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13506; (archives) 13503; (Can. exhibit at Imp. Institute) 13511 (vi); (census schedules) 7054; (census, total cost) 7053; (cold storage) 7637; (creameries) 7636 (iv); (fumigating stations) 13502; (Toronto industrial exhibition) 13051; (tuberculosis, aid to Can. association) 13517 (vi).
Canals (Galops rapids, deepening, &c.) 8396 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling facilities) 7561; (construction) 7560 (iii).
Charges of Management (Dom. notes, printing) 14252; (public debt) 14254 (vi).
Civil Govt.: Aud. General (promotions) 14256 (vi); Customs (salaries) 319 (i); Geological Survey (Low, Mr., salary) 13771; (salaries) 13770, 13771 (vi); High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 13772 (vi); Indian Affairs (salaries) 282 (i); 13760 (vi); Interior (salaries) 13762; (Mines branch, salaries) 13764 (vi); Labour Dept. (salaries) 7151 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342 (i); (salaries) 13663 (vi); N.W. Mounted Police (salaries) 13761 (vi); Public Works (architect's salary) 13499

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Con.
(salaries) 13500 (vi); Railways and Canals (2nd class clerk) 14055 (vi); (salaries) 333 (i); Sec. of State (clerks' salaries) 14254 (vi).
Customs (contingent expenses) 3782, 3787, 3901; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3952; (preferential tariff) 3932; (stationery, &c.) 3964 (ii).
Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (boundary delimitations) 6791; (commissioner's salary) 6765; (inspectors' expenses) 6766 (iii); (maps, printing, &c.) 14272; (salaries, outside service) 13772 (vi); (surveys, &c.) 6759 (iii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 13777 (vi); (tree culture) 6779 (iii).
Excise (analysts, &c.) 5393; (inspectors' salaries) 5381; (liquor analysis) 5396 (iii).
Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5279, 5293 (iii); (fish hatcheries) 13660 (vi); (salaries) conc., 6069; (steamers, construction, &c.) 5296 (iii); (steamers, new) 13659 (vi); (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).
Geological Survey (coal discovery, Sudbury) 6824; (exploration, &c.) 6822 (iii); (maps, lithographing, &c.) 13778 (vi); (plans, plottings, &c.) 6827 (iii).
Govt. of N. W. T. (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6658; (Ellis, Dr., inspector) 6702; (expenditure) 6616 (iii); (general expenses) 2300 (i); (trachoma, &c.) 6843 (iii).
Indians: B.C. (medical attendance) 13785 (vi); (schools, medical attendance) 7255 (iii); (steam launch) 13787 (vi).
Generally (agency inspectors) 6425; (general vote) 6425; (legal expenses) 6418 (iii).
Man., &c. (agricultural implements, &c.) 6422; (medical attendance) 6351 (iii); (agricultural implements) 13782; (industrial schools) 13784; (medical attendance, Dr. West) 13784; (surveys) 13784; (triennial clothing) 13783 (vi).
N. W. T. (supplies) 6422 (iii).
N. S. (medical attendance and medicines) 6421; (seed grain, relief, &c.) 6417, 6420 (iii).
Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6327 (iii).
Ont. and Que. (Doncaster reserve road) 13780 (vi); (medical attendance) 6327 (iii); (Rama indians, roads, &c.) 13781; (roads, repairs) 13779 (vi).
Que. (St. Regis lockup) 6416 (iii).
Yukon (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7270 (iii).
Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., guarantee policy) 5407; (Ferguson, Mr., legal services) 5412 (iii).
Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6791; (Keewatin govt.) 6797; (Keewatin lunatics) 6798; (litigation expenses) 6794; (telescope for observatory) 6792 (iii).
Justice, Administration of: B. C. (Judges' travelling allowance) 3400 (ii).
Exchequer Court (salaries) 3406 (ii).
Generally (executions, expenditure) 3401 (ii).
N.W.T. (Supreme Court judge) 14258 (vi).
Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi).
Supreme Court (library) 3404 (ii).
Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3414 (ii); (law library) 14267 (vi); (living allowance, judges) 3411; (living allowances, officials) 3411 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3513; (Kingston) 3511; (Manitoba) 3534; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3534 (ii).
Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14269 (vi); (messengers, &c.) 5265 (iii), 14243 (vi); (printing, advertising, &c.) 5268 (iii); (salaries, increases) 14112 (vi); (voters' lists) 5274 (iii).
Library of Parlt., 5267 (iii).
Senate (contingencies) 5264 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agency, Montreal) 13632; (gas lights) 13635; (Halifax harbour, buoys) 13639; (Marconi stations) 13640; (St. Lawrence lights) 13632; (sweeping boats) 13636 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13678 (vi); (freight rates, &c.) 7586 (iii); (G.B. and Can.) 13672; (Magdalen islands) 13676 (vi); (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13674; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677; (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694; (wrecking plant) 13698 (vi).
Militia (annual drill) 3606, 5005; (cadet training) 3773 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (Esquimalt defences) 3778; (G.O.C.) 3780; (grants to associations) 3773; (Martineau investigation) 3752; (pay and allowance) 3601; (Valleyfield strike) 3753 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election petition) 14251 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268 (iv); Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce) 14274 (vi).
N.W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 5264 (iii); (Yukon) 5003 (ii); (Yukon, salaries) 5263 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (life-saving awards) 13544 (vi); (masters and mates examination) 13525 (vi); (St. Lawrence transportation) 4046 (ii); (surveys, northern coast) 13760; (wrecks, investigation) 13545 (vi).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 972 (i).
N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; (St. John quarantine water service) 415 (i).
N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i).
Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 494; (Bowmanville) 510; (Clinton P.O.) 523; (Cobourg armoury) 640; (Dom. renewals, &c.) 636; (Ft. William) 636; (Guelph P.O.) 638; (Kingston military stables) 639; (London, drill hall) 645; (Toronto, custom house) 649; (Toronto, post office) 956; (Toronto Junction, post office) 650 (i).
Ottawa (additional land) 353; (astronomical observatory) 342; (electric lighting) 988; (furniture, &c.) 980; (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, drainage) 647 (i); (Rideau Hall grounds) 5006 (ii); (Royal Mint) 348; (Victoria museum) 365 (i), 14243 (vi).
Que. (hospital for trachoma) 14246 (vi); (Thetford Mines) 441; (Valleyfield P.O.) 444 (i).
Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978, 2979 (ii).
Dredging (dredge vessels) 2612; (new dredges) 2673 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Arrow Lakes) 13305; (Columbia River) 13304; (dredging plant, &c.) 13311; (Fraser river, improvements) 13305; (Quatsino, wharf) 13305; (Williams Head, wharf) 13306;

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
(general vote) 13308 (vi).
Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2650 (ii).
Man. (Dauphin Lake) 1448; (Gull Harbour) 1448; (Hnausa, wharf) 1448; (Manitoba Lake) 1449 (i); (St. Andrews Rapids) 3356; (snag boat) 2672 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i).
Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2669 (ii); (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi).
Ont. (Bowmanville, pier) 1353; (Depot Harbour) 1359 (i); (dredging plant) 2672 (ii); (general repairs) 1372; (Goderich harbour) 1368; (Lake Temiscamingue, wharf) 1376; (Petewawa narrows) 1425, 1442, 1447 (i); (Port Arthur) 3348 (ii); (Point au Baril route) 1365; (Port Elgin, dredging) 1424; (Port Hope, pier) 1425; (Rivière aux Puces) 1425; (Rondeau harbour) 1427 (i); (St. Joseph's wharf) 3385 (ii); (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431; (Southampton, harbour) 1428; (Thornbury, harbour) 1432 (i); 13450 (vi); (Wendover, wharf) 1438 (i).
P. E. I. (dredging plant) 13314 (vi).
Que. (Barachois de Malbaie) 13445 (vi); (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446; (Caplan, breakwater) 13449; (Chambord, wharf) 13454; (Chateau Richer) 13456; (Douglastown, isolated block) 13457 (vi); (Esquimaux Point) 2278 (i); (Gatineau River, C.P.R. Bridge) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallée, pier) 1514, 1523; (Grosse Isle) 425; (Kamouraska, pier) 13458 (vi); (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2247; (Le Tableau, wharf) 2256 (i); (Lotbinière wharf) 13460; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2269; (Newport, breakwater) 2277; (Nicolet River) 2278; (Pointe St. Pierre) 2279; (repairs, improvements) 2241; (Rivière aux Renards) 2280; (St. Francis, ice pier) 2284 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3310 (ii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258; (St. Maurice, dredging) 2286 (i); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13483; (Sorel, wharf) 12856, 12869 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2297 (i).
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307 (vi).
Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13363 (vi).
Roads and Bridges, N.W.T. (Peace River, pack trail) 13324; (Pelly River bridge) 13368; Ottawa (Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).
Slides and Booms (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2975 (ii).
Telegraph Lines—B.C. (working expenses) 13368 (vi).
Mar. Provs. (Chatham to Tracadie) 13325 (vi).
Que. (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13325 (vi).
Yukon (generally) 2994 (ii); (Yukon, working expenses) 14041 (vi).
Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 5503; hog cholera) 5505 (iii); (public health) 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii); (small-pox) 5007 (ii), 5491 (iii).
Railways—G.T.R. (rental) 12887 (vi).
I.C.R. (Connolly's claims) 14105 (vi); (draw bars, exchange) 8289; (Halifax, accommodation) 8316 (iv); 12825; (general vote) 12877 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8313; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8292; (rolling stock) 8294

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—Con.

(iv); 14100; (St. John accommodation) 12823; (sidings, additional) 14055 (vi); (steel rails, &c.) 5006 (ii); 14097 (vi); (Toronto stock yards) 8317 (iv).

P. E. I. (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 12838, 14117 (vi).

Yukon Govt. (administration, &c.) 13367 (vi); (Eldorado Gusher) 7277; (hospital grants) 7291; (roads and bridges) 7283 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14308, 14403 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4908 (ii).

Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14385 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).

Tobin Co. and Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14462 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9425 (iv).

Transcontinental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°; Ques. of Order, 7726 (iv).

——— *See* 'G.T.P. B. 235.'

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13363 (vi).

——— Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (ii).

——— Par. in Montreal *Herald re* Mr. Préfontaine's Speech (remarks) 865 (i).

——— *See* Rys.,' &c.

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson newspapers (remarks) 11070 (v).

——— (remarks) 13792 (vi).

Trent Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2331 (i).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2343 (i).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 249 (Mr. *Morrison*) on M. to receive Pet., 10744 (v).

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14339 (vi).

York and Carleton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act (approval of regulations) in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

Yukon, Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

Stephens, Mr. G., *Kent (O).*

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 171) 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 841 (i).

Stephens, Mr. G.—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9963 (iv).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8103 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11005; (Kent) 11576 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6183 (iii); (drainage) 4751 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7213, 7235 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4097 (ii).

Stewart, Mr. D. A., *Lisgar.*

Automatic Grain Weighers in N. W. T., Rep. of Inspector, &c. (M. for ret.) 847 (i).

Brandon, Saskatchewan & Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 157) in Com., 5985 (iii).

Grain Weighing in Man. and N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4194 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10235 (v).

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co. (B. 124) 1°*, 1764 (i).

Morden Board of Trade, Res. *re* Wheat Freight Rates (Ques.) 12074 (v).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).

SUPPLY:

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary) 5384 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4194 (ii).

Wheat Freight Rates, Res. of Morden Board of Trade (Ques.) 12074 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James (Minister of Public Works) *N. Oxford.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Reported Interview of Mr. Aylesworth (remarks) 13961 (vi).

Amherst, Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 1591 (i).

Anglo-American Tel. Co. and P. E. I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vi).

Annandale ier, P. E. I., Amount expended (Ans.) 2921 (ii).

Armouries Construction: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Generally.'

Arsenault, Capt., Compensation for Damages to Schooner (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Art Gallery, Expenditure on Paintings, &c. (Ans.) 12717 (vi).

Assiniboine and Red Rivers Navigation, Improvement, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).

——— Rep. of Board of Trade, Winnipeg (Ans.) 1860 (i).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5888, 5961, 6846 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11171 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Beauharnois Electoral District, Representation and Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7103 (iii).

Blind River Wharf, Contracts, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 6656 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).

C. P. R. car 001, Improvements to, &c. (Ans.) 14282 (vi).

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14498 (vi).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5885 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12502 (v).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

Digby Port, Wharf Extension, &c. (Ans.) 2101 (i).

Dredges at Midland, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (iii).

Dredges, New, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 1856 (i).

Dunnville Dredging: *See* 'Grand River.'

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Electric Lighting of Buildings, Ottawa (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Electric Lighting of Chamber, Change of Lamps, &c. (Ans.) 816 (i).

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Bldgs., Ottawa.'

Emerson Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

Eureka, Str., Loaned by Govt. (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Tarte*) 14687 (vi).

Fielding, Dredge, Plans for Construction, &c. (Ans.) 14283 (vi).

Fishing Industry in N. S., Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vi).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).

Fuel Contracts, Interest on unpaid Accounts (Ans.) 5318 (iii).

Gananoque and Brockville Channel, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13320 (vi).

Geological Museum, Construction (Ans.) 11188 (i).

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Bldgs., Ottawa.'

Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vi).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 941 (i).

Grain Blockade in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Grand River, Dredging at Dunnville, &c. (Ans.) 12498 (v), 13027 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5154, 5233 (iii), 7856 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Maclean*) 7815 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10593, 11202 (v).

Harrison, Mr., Resignation as Inspector of Fisheries (Ans.) 288 (i).

Immigrants at Quebec, Medical Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 5318 (iii).

Imperial Building, Ottawa, Govt. Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 3803 (ii).

I. C. R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

International Dredge Leased by Govt. (Ans.) 12218 (v).

Isle of Orleans, Cable: *See* 'Submarine.'

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Jerome, Martin, and Man. Elections, &c. (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

King Edward VII., Portrait: *See* 'Portrait.'

Lake Superior Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).

Larkin, Capt. W. S., Charges against (Ans.) 2922 (ii).

L'Assomption Post Office, Site, &c. (Ans.) 3230 (ii).

Le Canada and L. J. Latour *re* Circular issued, &c. (Ans.) 1033 (i).

Listowel Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

Lobster Packing Factory in N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Lotbinière and Megantic Ry. Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).

Loy: *See* 'Beauharnois.'

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands, on M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2764 (ii).

Marine Engineers B.: *See* 'Steamboat,' &c.

Martineau Commission Report, and Fire Protection: *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.

Medical Examiner at Quebec of Immigrants (Ans.) 3536 (ii).

Midland Water Front, Lease to Pratt & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).

Mint Building, Establishment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 344 (i), 14244 (vi).

Mint, Canadian, Erection of (Ans.) 10955 (v).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4457 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Sheds, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 14282 (vi).

Napanee Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Nepean Point, Ottawa, Improvement, &c. (Ans.) 11829 (v).

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Ottawa Buildings, Leases and Rentals for Govt. Offices, on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) for Ret. *re*, 589 (i).

——— Fire Protection, Rep. *re* Martineau Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 4674 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial,' 'Woods,' &c.

Owen Sound Harbour, Water Lot, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (iii).

Parliament Buildings, Lighting: *See* 'Electric.'

Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i), 13119 (vi).

Portrait of King Edward, Painting, &c., by Canadian Artists (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. (B. 208) 1°m., 5240 (iii).

P. E. I. Telegraph System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Tel. Lines,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters' and Western Rys., 10511 (v).

Public Works Act Amt. (B. 193) 1°m., 3970; in Com., 4221 (ii).

Public Works, Deptl. Report (presented) 6 (i).

Public Works Employees, Dismissals, Promotions, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Léonard*) 1058 (i).

Public Works, Amount expended by Govt. in Provs. (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Quebec Harbour Pier, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3972 (ii).

——— Construction of, &c. (remarks) 2238 (i).

Racette, Vital, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 3231 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3559 (ii),

——— supplies for I. C. R. Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12959 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14382, 14428, 14505 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2489 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10964, 11436, 11462, 11572, 11622; (Brant) 11109; (Dauphin) 11748; (Portage la Prairie) 11781; (Toronto) 11693; (Waterloo) 11647; (York) 11665; on M. for 3°, 12395; on Amt. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) to M. for 3°, 12458; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12468 (v).

——— Printing of Evidence *re* (remarks) 11423 (v).

Richelieu River Inundations, &c. (Ans.) 10496 (v).

Roseau River Reserve, Sale of Lots (Ans.) 5320 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment (Ans.) 285 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids, Bridge Construction (Ans.) 14284 (vi).

——— Contract, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 288 (i).

——— Expiration of Contract (Ans.) 10490 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

St. Boniface, Money Order Branch, Closing (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

St. Lawrence Channel: *See* 'Gananoque,' 'Supply—Harbours and Rivers, Quebec.'

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4590 (ii).

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Sir Wilfrid Laurier Dredge, Sinking in Lake Ont. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Skinner's Pond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

Sorel Wharf, Cor., &c., on Inquiry for Papers, 2302 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Harbonrs and Rivers, Quebec.'

Springhill, N.S., Explosion in Dom. Building, Report *re* (read) 13257 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3293 (ii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7027 (iii).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14428 (vi).

Submarine Cable to Isle of Orleans (Ans.) 11187 (v).

Summerside, P.E.I., Breakwater, Completion of Work, &c. (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Welland (Dunnville, dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 332 (i).
Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239 (i).
Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342; (salaries) 341 (i).
Public Works (architect's salary) 13498 (vi); (contingencies) 5824 (iii); (Hunter, J. B., salary) 13499; (salaries) 333 (i), 13500 (vi).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5129 (ii).

Justice, Administration of: Supreme Court (library) 3403 (ii).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert printing) 14271 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Pratt & Co.'s lease of water front) 5751 (iii); (St. Lawrence navigation) 4148 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 13676 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4071; (meteorological service) 4118 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, B.C: (Nelson P. O.) 13131; (Rossland, armoury) 13133; (Rossland P. O.) 13131; (Vancouver P. O.) 13132 (vi).
Dom. (architect's office) 961; (caretakers) 1021; (electric power) 1067; (furniture) 1006; (heating, &c.) 1065; (lighting, &c.) 1067; (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 (i); (rents, &c.) 13133 (vi); (water supply) 1067 (i).
Generally (armouries) 965; (clerks of works) 963; (experimental farms) 972 (i); (immigrant buildings) 14247 (vi).
Man. (immigration, hospitals, &c.) 5845 (iii); (Winnipeg, immigration station) 13126; (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13127; (Winnipeg, military stores) 13126; (Winnipeg P.O.) 13127 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 422 (i).

N.B. (Campbellton P.O.) 13037 (vi); Dom. buildings) 421 (i); (Fredericton, military buildings) 13041 (vi); (Marysville) 5841 (iii); (Moncton P.O.) 13038; (Newcastle, improvements) 13038 (vi); (Richibucto) 412 (i); (St. John, drill hall) 13042 (vi); (St. John, immigrant shed, &c.) 412 (i), 13040 (vi); (St. John, quarantine water service) 414, 486 (i), 13041; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13038; (Woodstock, armoury) 13039; (Woodstock P. O.) 13041 (vi).

N. S. (Antigonish, post office) 13034 (vi); (Arichat) 5827 (iii); (Digby) 13034 (vi); (Guysborough) 5830 (iii); (Halifax, building) 411 (i); (Halifax, custom house) 13031; (Halifax, immigration shed) 13033 (vi); (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 412 (i); (Middleton, armoury) 5841 (iii); (North Sydney, post office) 13035; (Springhill, repairs) 14247; (Sydney Mines) 13028; (Sydney, post office) 13035 (vi).

N.W.T. (court-houses, &c.) 958 (i); (Edmonton jail) 13129 (vi); (Macleod, court-house) 959 (i); (Moosejaw P.O.) 13130; (Prince Albert court-house) 13129 (vi); (Red Deer, court-house) 960; (renewals, &c.) 959 (i); (Strathcona Horse barracks) 13130 (vi); (Yorkton, court-house) 961 (i).

Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 487; (architects) 524 (i); (Belleville, armoury) 13082 (vi); (Bowmanville) 508 (i); (Brantford, drill hall) 13108; (Bridgeburg, P.O.) 13113 (vi); (Clinton P. O.) 518; (Cobourg armoury) 640 (i); (Cobourg, P.O.) 13118 (vi); (Deseronto) 5842 (iii); (Deseronto, P.O.) 13112 (vi); (Dom. buildings, renewals) 636 (i); (Fort William) 536 (i); (Guelph, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Guelph P.O.) 637 (i); (Hamilton, building) 13113 (Hawkesbury, P.O.) 13119; (Kingston, barracks) 13118 (vi); (Kingston military stables) 638 (i); (Kingston, military school) 5842 (iii), 13094; (Kingston, military college stables) 13117 (vi); (London drill hall) 641 (i); (London, magazine) 13115 (vi); (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 (i); (Oshawa, P.O.) 13110; (Picton, P.O.) 13113; (St. Catherines, drill hall) 13106; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P. O.) 13107; (Sarnia, P. O.) 13118; (Stratford, armoury) 13125; (vi); (Toronto, branch post office) 5920 (iii); (Toronto custom-house) 648, 958 (i); (Toronto, drill hall) 13115; (Toronto examining warehouse) 13118: (Toronto, military buildings) 13086, 13115 (vi); (Toronto, post office) 956 (i), 5842 (iii); (Toronto P.O., addition) 13096; (Toronto postal station) 13112 (vi); (Toronto, rec. gen.'s office, vault) 5842 (iii); (Toronto, renewals, &c.) 956; (Toronto Junction, post office) 650 (i); (Windsor, P.O.) 13113; (Wingham, P.O.) 13120; (Woodstock, armoury) 13125; (Woodstock, P. O.) 13108 (vi).

Ottawa (additional land) 353 (i); (additional rooms, H. of C.) 13006 (vi); (astronomical observatory) 342 (i); (bacteriological laboratory) 5842 (iii); (census building) 991 (i); (coal sheds) 13115 (vi);

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con*

Public Works—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

Ottawa—*Con.*

(electric lighting) 988 (i); (electric light; ing, transformers) 5843 (iii); (elevators-1012 (i), 13115 (vi); (furniture, &c.) 973; (geological museum) 352; (grounds) 1015; (heating, &c.) 1008; (light, maintenance) 974, 1012; (Major's Hill park) 1015 (i); (paving, tar macadam) 13119 (vi); (post-office, elevator) 5844 (iii); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, drainage) 647; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 995 (i); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 13087 (vi); (Royal Mint) 344 (i); (steel shelving) 13087 (vi); (telephones) 1013 (i); (ventilation of chamber) 13011 (vi); (Victoria museum) 365 (i), 14243; (Western Block, heating) 13087 (vi).

P. E. I. (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; (Charlottetown, Dom. building) 13036 (vi).

Que. (Acton Vale P.O.) 13059 (vi); (Grosse Isle) 425; (L'Assomption) 427; (Lévis) 431 (i); (Lévis, P.O.) 13053, 13055; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13070; (Magog, P.O.) 13081 (vi); (Montmagny) 5841 (iii); (Montmagny, P.O.) 13066; (Montreal barracks) 13076 (vi); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 433 (i), 13058; (Montreal, P.O.) 13067; (Montreal, postal station) 13081 (vi); (Montreal, renewals, &c.) 437 (i); (Quebec, citadel) 13053; (Quebec, citadel drill shed) 13056; (Quebec, drill hall addition) 13077; (Quebec, hospital for trachoma) 14245; (Quebec, marine stores) 13053; (Quebec, military buildings) 13054; (Quebec, military iron foundry) 14247 (vi); (Quebec, renewals, &c.) 422; (St. Hyacinthe) 439 (i); (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (St. John's examining warehouse) 13069; (St. John's P.O.) 13059; (St. Louis de Mile-End, P.O.) 13080; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi); (Thetford Mines) 441 (i); (Three Rivers, custom house), 13080; (Three Rivers, heating, &c.) 13069 (vi); (Valleyfield, P.O.) 443 (i).

Yukon (White Horse, P.O.) 13133 (vi).

Docks (commission's rep.) 2983 (ii); (Kingston graving dock) 13023 (vi); (Lévis graving dock) 2979 (ii).

Dredging (vessels repairs) 2612; (dredges, new, Que.) 2674; (Ont. and Que. dredging plant) 2671 (ii).

Generally (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii), 13024 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Anderson Lake) 1451 (i); (Arrow Lakes) 13304 (vi); (Columbia river) 1451 (i), 13304; (dredging plant, &c.) 13311 (vi); (Esquimalt, graving dock) 5919 (iii); (Fraser river, improvements) 13305; (Hardy Bay, wharf) 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi); (Mr. Sinclair's dismissal) 1451; (Quatsino, wharf) 13305; (Victoria Harbour, dredging) 13306; (Williams Head quarantine wharf) 13306 (vi).

Generally, 13308 (vi); (new dredges) 2673; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633; (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii), 13024 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Man. (Dauphin lake) 1448 (i); (dredging) 2665 (ii); (dredging plant) 13311 (vi); (Gimli, wharf) 1450; (Gull Harbour, wharf) 1448; (Hnausa, wharf) 1448; (Lake Francis outlet) 1449 (i); (*Manitoba*, dredge) 13311 (vi); (Manitoba Lake) 1449; (repairs, &c.) 1448 (i); (St. Andrews Rapids) 3354 (ii); (Selkirk, wharf) 1450 (i); (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i).

Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); (dredging, &c., salaries) 13309 (vi); (hydraulic dredge) 2612 (ii), 13312 (vi); (repairs, &c.) 1185 (i).

N. B. (Alma Pier) 1184; (Anderson's Hollow) 1163 (i); (Arsenault, Capt., damages, &c.) 13231 (vi); (Bay du Vin) 1164 (i); (Black Brook) 13228 (vi); (Campbellton, wharf) 1164 (i); 13005, 13229; (Campobello, breakwater) 13228; (Cape Tormentine) 13228 (vi); (Caraquet wharf) 1173 (i); (Chatham, lightship) 13231; (Cocagne wharf, damages, &c.) 13231; (Dalhousie wharf) 13233; (Dipper Harbour, breakwater) 13233; (Grand Manan, breakwater) 13234 (vi); (Great Salmon River) 1177 (i); (Hopewell Cape, wharf) 13233 (vi); (Lord's Cove, wharf) 1177 (i); (Miscou, wharf) 13234 (vi); (Negro Point breakwater) 1181; (Oromocto, wharf) 1181 (i); (Petit Rocher) 13234; (Pointe du Chêne) 13235 (vi); (Richibucto wharf) 1177 (i); 13235 (vi); (St. Andrews wharf) 5894 (iii); (St. John harbour) 1183; (St. John river wharfs) 1178; (St. John tributaries) 1177 (i); (Shippegan harbour) 1183 (i).

N. S. (Abbot's Harbour) 13141; (Abram's wharf) 13141 (vi); (Amagandus wharf) 1068 (i); (Arichat) 13217 (vi); (Bailey's Brook, wharf) 1072 (i); (Baxter's, breakwater) 13142; (Bayfield, wharf) 13141; (Benoit's Cove) 13143; (Berlin, breakwater) 13180; (Big Harbour, wharf) 13143 (vi); (Big Pond, wharf) 1072, 1073 (i); (Breton Cove) 13151 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (Cariboo island, causeway) 13179; (Chegoggin, pier) 13179; (Chéticamp, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Cheverie breakwater) 1078 (i); (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217 (vi); (Church Point, breakwater) 1078 (i); (Cow Bay, breakwater) 1078 (i); 13178 (vi); (Digby pier) 1083 (i); (Donald's Head, breakwater) 13179 (vi); (Drumhead, breakwater) 1083 (i); 13179; (Duncan's Cove, wharf) 13179; (East Bay, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Economy, wharf) 1087 (i); (Finlay Point) 13181; (Five Islands, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Fort Lawrence, pier) 1087 (i); 13181; (Freeport, pier) 13182 (vi); (Friar's Head, harbour) 1087 (i); (Frudes Point, wharf) 13180; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182; (Georgeville, wharf) 13198 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1087 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang, entrance) 1095; (Grand Narrows, wharf) 1094 (i), 13198 (vi); (Grand River, entrance) 1094 (i); (Granite Village, pier) 13182 (vi); (Green Cove, harbour) 1100 (i); (Hall's harbour) 13198 (vi); (Hawk Point Inlet, channel) 1102; (Herring Cove, breakwater) 1102 (i); (Indian harbour, wharf) 13199; (Iona, harbour) 13200 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102 (i); (Jeddore, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Judique, breakwater) 1103 (i); (Ketch, harbour) 13202 (vi); (Kingsport, pier) 1103 (i), 13202; (L'Ardoise, breakwater) 13201 (vi); (Larry's River, breakwater) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105 (i); (Livingstone Cove) 13200; (McKay's Point, wharf) 13201; (McNutt's Island, beach) 13201; (Main-à-Dieu) 13201; (Malagawatch, channel) 13203; (Malignant Cove) 13201 (vi); (Margaree, wharf) 1133 (i); (Margaretsville, breakwater) 13202; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203 (vi); (Meteghan Cove) 1133 (i); (Middle river, dam) 13202; (Morrison's point, wharf) 13203; (Musquodoboit, harbour) 13202; (Necum Teuch, wharf) 1137 (i), 13203 (vi); (Neil's Harbour) 1139; (New Campbellton, wharf) 1142; (New Harbour) 1144 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Ogden's Pond) 13204; (Oyster Pond) 13204; (Parrsborough, landing) 13205; (Pembroke, breakwater) 13205 (vi); (Petit du Grat, dredging) 1146 (i); (Pickett's, pier) 13205 (vi); (Pictou, light beach) 13205 (vi); (Poirierville, wharf) 1146 (i), 13205; (Porter's channel) 13206 (vi); (Port George, breakwater) 1146 (i), 13210; (Port Greville, breakwater) 13210 (vi); (Port Hastings, wharf) 1146; (Port Hawkesbury) 1146 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206; (Port Howe, wharf) 13210; (Port Latour, breakwater) 13210; (Port Maitland) 13211; (Port au Pique, wharf) 13211; (Prospect, wharf) 13205; (Pugwash, landing) 13205; (St. Ann, wharf) 13203; (Sable Island, East End) 13180 (vi); (Sandy Cove, breakwater) 1149 (i); (Scott's Bay) 13211 (vi); (Short Beach) 1149 (i); (Skinner's Cove) 13213 (vi); (South Ingonish, wharf) 1149 (i); (Spry Bay) 13213; (Summerville, wharf) 13213; (Swim's Point, wharf) 13211; (Sydney, quarantine wharf) 13213; (Tenecape, breakwater) 13213 (vi); (Tiverton, breakwater) 1150 (i); (Victoria, beach wharf) 13213; (Wallace, harbour) 13216 (vi); (Washabuck Centre, wharf) 1150 (i); (Wedge Point) 13217; (Wentworth, wharf) 13216 (vi); (West Baccaro, channel) 1150 (i); (West Bay, wharf) 13217; (White's Cove, breakwater) 13217; (Windsor Harbour, sheer dam) 14248; (Wolfville, wharf) 13217; (Yarmouth, bar) 13218 (vi).

N. W. T. (repairs, &c.) 1450 (i).

Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185 (i) 13235 (vi); (Barrie wharf) 1187 (i); (Barry's Bay) 13236 (vi); (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1192 (i); (Blind River, wharf) 13235 (vi); (Bowmanville pier) 1352 (i); (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bronte, harbour) 1354 (i); (Bronte improvements) 13236 (vi); (Bruce Mines) 5911 (iii); (Burk's Falls) 1358; (Burlington channel) 1359 (i), 13237 (vi); (Cobourg, repairs) 5909 (iii); (Collingwood improve-

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Ont.—*Con.*

ments) 13239; (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland wharf) 13238; (vi); (Depot harbour) 1359 (i), 13239 (vi); (general repairs) 1369; (Goderich harbour) 1365 (i), 13240; (Gore's wharf) 13244; (Grand Bend, pier), 13239 (vi); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Kingsville) 13244 (vi); (Lake Temiscamingue wharf)1376(i);(Leamington,wharf) 13246; (Little Bear Creek) 13245; (Little Current) 13245 (vi); (Midland, dredging) 5909 (iii); (Midland, harbour) 1376 (i), 13246 (Oakville pier) 1376; (Orillia wharf) 1377 (i); (Ottawa River) 13251 (vi); (Owen Sound, harbour) 1377 (i); (Parry Sound wharf) 13248; (Petewawa narrows) 1425, 1442 (i), 13251 (vi); (Pickering harbour) 1377; (Point au Baril route) 1365 (i); (Point Edward) 13249 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3341 (ii), 13012; (Port Burwell) 13249 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3368 (ii); (Point Edward, dredging) 1377; (Port Elgin, dredging) 1424; (Port Hope pier) 1425 (i); (Port Perry) 13249; (Port Stanley) 13249 (vi); (Prescott, dredging) 5915 (iii); (Rivière aux Puces) 1425; (Rondeau harbour) 1427 (i); (Rosedale, wharf) 13250 (vi); (St. Joseph, wharf) 3382 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 13253 (vi); (Southampton harbour), 1428; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431 (i); (Sydenham river) 13250; (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254 (vi); (Thornbury harbour) 1432; (Toronto harbour) 1433 (i); (Toronto, Magann & Phinn claim) 13255, (Toronto, pier) 13255 (vi); (Trenton, dredging) 1434 (i); (Victoria harbour) 13255 (vi); (Wendover wharf) 1434 (i); (Wiarton wharf) 13256 (vi); (Wolfe Island dredging) 1443 (i), 13252 (vi).

P.E.I. (Aitken's wharf) 1159 (i); (Beach point) 13218 (vi); (Belfast, pier) 1153 (i); (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Cape Traverse, survey) 13219 (vi); (Cascumpec, harbour) 1153 (i); (Cove Head, channel) 13222 (vi); (Cove Head, harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber) 1155 (i); (dredging) 13310; (dredging plant) 13313 (vi); (Gaspereaux, harbour) 1155; (Higgin's shore pier) 1159 (i), 13222; (Lewis point, pier) 13223; (North Cardigan) 13223 (vi); (New London) 1160 (i); (New London, channel) 13223 (vi); (piers, repairs, &c.) 1161 (i); (Point Prim, wharf) 13223; (Richmond Bay) 13223; (Skinner's Pond) 13309 (vi); (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i); (Summerside, breakwater) 13224 (vi); (Summerside, harbour) 3367 (ii); (Tignish breakwater) 1162 (i).

Que. (Anse aux Gascons wharf) 13445; (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 13445; (Anse St. Jean wharf) 13445; (Barachois de Malbaie breakwater) 13445 (vi); (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Bois Brulé pier) 13448; (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446 (vi); (Cacouna wharf) 5896 (iii), 13442; (Caplan, breakwater) 13448; (Chambord, wharf) 13454 (vi); (Chateauguay river) 2280 (i), 3208 (ii); (Chateau Richer) 13455 (vi); (Crane Island, wharf) 1513; (Cross

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Que.—*Con.*

Point pier) 1512 (i); (Desjardins, Allumette wharf) 13457 (vi); (Doucet's Landing) 5907 (iii); (Douglastown, isolated block) 13457 (vi); (Esquimaux Point) 2278; (Father Point, pier) 1513 (i); (Gatineau River, C. P. R. bridge) 13457; (Grande Rivière, wharf) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallee, pier) 1514-72 (i); (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Isle aux Coudres wharf) 2242 (i); (Isle Grosbois) 5902 (iii); (Kamouraska, pier) 13457; (Lake St. John, dredging) 13459 (vi); (Lake St. John, wharf) 2243; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie ice piers) 2248 (i), 13460 (vi); (Le Tableau, wharf) 2249; (L'Ile d'Alma) 2257 (i); (Lotbinière, wharf) 13460 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 2264 (i); (Maguasha, pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Mistook, wharf) 13461; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (Montreal harbour) 3365 (ii); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Newport breakwater) 2277 (i), 13462; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463 (vi); (Nicolet river) 2278 (i); (Nominingue Lake, wharfs) 13460; (Notre Dame du Portage) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (Perce pier) 13467; (Pierreville, wharf) 13468; (Pointe Fortune, wharf) 13468 (vi); (Pointe St. Pierre) 2278 (i); (Pointe aux Trembles, wharf) 13468; (Port Daniel, wharf) 13468 (vi); (Quebec, harbour) 3336 (ii); (repairs, improvements) 2241 (i); (Repentigny, wharf) 13468; (Rimouski, pier, &c.) 13468 (vi); (river and bridge works) 5907 (iii); (Rivière Jesus, dredging) 13470; (Rivière du Loup, harbour) 13476 (vi); (Rivière du Loup, wharf) 2281 (i); (Rivière du Nord) 5907 (iii); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 (i); (Rivière Verte) 13470 (vi); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289 (i); (St. Alphonse, Ha-Ha Bay) 13489 (vi); (St. André de Kamouraska, pier) 2290 (i); (Ste. Anne de la Pérade, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Anne de la Pocatière) 13489; (Ste. Anne de Saguenay, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Anne de Sorel) 13489; (Ste. Famille, pier) 13488; (St. Fidèle, wharf) 13493 (vi); (St. Francis, ice pier) 2282; St. François, Orleans) 2290 (i); (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491; (St. Gédéon Islands, wharf) 13491; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13489 (vi); (St. Irénée, wharf) 2291 (i); (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 (vi); (St. Jerome, wharf) 2291 (i), 5909 (iii); (St. Laurent, wharf) 5906 (iii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2257 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3304 (ii); (St. Louis river) 13473 (vi); (St. Maurice, Grandes Piles) 2286 (i); (St. Maurice River) 5904 (iii); (St. Maurice River, dam) 13491; (St. Michel de Bellechasse) 13494 (vi); (St. Nicholas, pier) 5905 (iii); (St. Simeon, wharf) 13493; (Sabrevois, wharf) 13485; (Sacré-Cœur, wharf) 13478; (Saguenay, dredging) 13472; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13479; (Shegawake, harbour) 13479 (vi); (Sorel, wharf) 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12848, 12869 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs)

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Que.—*Con.*

2296; (Touladie River) 2286 (i); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2298 (i), 5905 (iii); (Ville Marie, wharf) 14248; (Yamaska lock, dredging) 13498 (vi).

Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13306 (vi).

Miscellaneous: (architect's office) 2747 (ii); (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi); (art gallery) 2725; (clerical assistance) 2753 (ii); (Ottawa river, surveys) 13340 (vi); (salaries, engineers, &c.) 2726 (ii), 13340 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2715, 2720 (ii); (transportation commission) 13362 (vi).

Roads and Bridges: Generally (Bryson, approaches) 13321 (vi); (Dom. traffic, bridges) 2701 (ii); (Edmonton, flooring) 13323; (Moisie Post road) 13322; (Peace River, pack trail) 13323 (vi).

N.W.T. (Pelly river bridge) 13367 (vi).

Ottawa, 2700 (ii); (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321; (Union bridges, Ottawa) 13321; Quebec (Bryson) 13321 (vi); (Portage du Fort) 2690 (ii).

Yukon (Trading and Exploring Co.) 5826 (iii).

Slides and Booms (Gagner, Mr., salary) 2976; (Gatineau) 2977; (generally) 2690 (repairs, &c.) 2978; (St. Maurice slides) 2676; (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—B.C., 2992 (ii); (Alberni-Clayoquot) 5918 (iii); (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2992 (ii); (Kamloops, Nicola line) 13337 (vi); (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5826 (iii); (Vancouver Island to Salt Springs) 13337; (working expenses) 13368 (vi).

Mar. Provs. (Chatham to Tracadie) 13325; (Deer Island to Eastport) 13325 (vi); (land and cable, Mar. Provs.) 2701 (ii).

N.W.T., 2991 (ii); (Alexander, Indian agency) 5918 (iii); (Edmonton and Athabasca) 13335; (Edmonton, Indian agency) 13334; (Victoria to Andrews) 13335; (Wood Mountain Post) 13335 (vi).

P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13326 (vi); (P.E.I. and mainland) 2988 (ii), 5918 (iii).

Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii) 13325 (vi); (Belle Isle) 2712, 2989 (ii); (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332; (Chicoutimi, St. Charles) 13333 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 2714 (ii); (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13326; (Murray Bay, &c.) 13326; (Orleans Island) 13330; (Petite Rivière, St. Agnes) 13334 (vi); (Quebec, repairs, &c.) 2711 (ii); (Ste. Anne du Saguenay) 13331 (vi).

Yukon (working expenses) 14041 (vi).

Yukon Govt. (administration, &c.) 13367 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14381, 14511 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14737 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) M. to ref. back to Com., 7813 iv).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Toronto Island, Damage by Storms, &c. (Ans.) 5589 (iii).

Toronto to Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Toronto Post Office, Contract of Mr. Coleman (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13099 (vi).

Toronto Public Works Employees, Delay of Payment, &c. (Ans.) 5588 (iii).

Translators, Debates, Rent of Office, &c. (Ans.) 2311 (i), 3799 (ii).

Transportation Com., in Com. of Sup., 12854, 13362 (vi).

——— Instructions, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

——— Meetings, Business transacted, &c. (Ans.) 13027 (vi).

——— N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours, Que., Sorel,'

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11074 (v).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 13134, 13258 (vi).

Valleyfield P.O., Site, Erection, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 11187 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 4362 (ii) 13011 (vi).

Wharfs, Govt. Policy *re* Construction, 13156 (vi).

Winnipeg City Water B.: *See* 'Assiniboine.'

Woods, J. W., Rental of Buildings, &c. (Ans.) 5764 (iii).

Woodstock, N. B., P. O., Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 672 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4563 (ii).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Management, &c., Complaints *re*, 7004 (iii).

See: 'Supply—Public Works — Telegraph Lines, Yukon.'

Sutherland, Mr. R. F., *N. Essex.*

Box Freight Cars, Ladders, &c.: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Budget, The, 1860 (i).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) M. to refer back to Com., 5959 (iii).

Drainage on Rys.: *See* Ry. B. 21.'

G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9447 (iv).

Osler, Mr. and 'Grafters.': *See* 'Privileges.'

Privileges and Elections, Sel. Com., 1st Rep. *re* Mr. Schell (presented) 5511 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry., Subsidy, 10520 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (box-cars, safety appliances, amt.) 6325; (cattle guards, amt.) 6220 (iii); in Com. (drainage) 4754 (ii).

Schell, J. T., M.P., 1st Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com. *re* (presented) 5511 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (exhibitions) 4623 (ii).

Customs (salaries, &c.) 3909 (ii).

Windsor, Ont., Customs Officers, Overtime, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7370 (iii).

Campaign Literature and Mail Bags, Govt. Ownership (Ques.) 14286 (vi).

Campaign Literature, Employment of Sessional Messengers (Ques.) 14286 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12340, 12521 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5150 (iii), 7909 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9472 (iv); in Com. on B., 11951 (v); on M. for 3°, 12736 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, Authenticity of, (M.) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).

——— Pets., Irregularities, &c., Par. in Montreal *Star*, (M.) to adjn., Affidavits, &c., 14845 (vi).

——— Pets. *re* (remarks) 12944 (vi).

——— *See* 'Petitions,' &c.

G. T. Ry. Co., Loans by Govt. (Ques.) 2920 (ii).

——— Terminal Facilities: *See* 'Transportation.'

Hagar, Miss, Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 5316 (iii).

Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 144) 1°*, 2396 (i).

Isle of Orleans, Submarine Cable, &c. (M. for ret.*) 11301 (v).

——— *See* 'Submarine.'

McCraney, W., Letter *re* Legislation (ques. of order) 5362 (iii).

Mail Bags: *See* 'Campaign.'

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 814 (i).

Petitions *re* G. T. P. Ry. Co., Responsibility of Members, &c. (remarks) 12715 (vi).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12786; on M. for 3°, 13939 (vi).

——— Statement of Mr. L. E. Morin (read) 12786 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in *Citizen*, 3127 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Co.'s (B. 145) 1°*, 2396 (i).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14454 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14454, 14495 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies for Man., &c. (remarks) 14495 (vi).

Saunders, Mr. C. E,, Appnmt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 1676 (i).

Submarine Cable to Island of Orleans, &c. (Ques.) 11186 (v).

——— *See* 'Isle of Orleans.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (exhibitions) 4623 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Levis) 431 (i); (Montmagny, P. O.) 13067 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers: Generally (dredges, repairs, &c.) 2627 (ii); Que. (Grande Vallee pier) 1547 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways: I. C. R. (Amqui, accommodation) 12601 (v).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*), (M.) to adjn. deb., 4868 (ii).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11082 (v).

Woolf Valve Gear Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 161) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel, *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14818 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iii).

Beauharnois Electoral District, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7104 (iii), 8025 (iv).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7303, 7322, 7353 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, Par. in Toronto *News* (remarks) 6751 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ministerial.'

Budget, The, 1619 (i).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'

Cable News with G. B. and Can. B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8235 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5602 (iii).

Can. Northern Ry., Cor. between Govt. and Mackenzie & Mann (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).

C. P. R. and Car Shortage in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 392 (i).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4419 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 842 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7519 (iii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3098 (ii).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3006 (ii).

Eureka, Str., Personal Explanation, 14687 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal: *See* 'Ottawa.'

Grain Blockade in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9644 (iv); in Com. on B., 10420, 10467 (v).

G. T. R. Transcontinental Ry. (M. for cor.) 447 (i).

Iron and Steel Bounties B, 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7937 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. on Sup., 4322 (ii).

Le Canada and Mr. Latour: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2504, 2521 (ii).

——— Settlement, &c., Tel. (read) 2677 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., and Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, on M. to conc., 8025 (iv).

——— *See* 'Beauharnois.'

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7998 (iv).

Ministerial Changes (explanation) 136 (i).

——— Par. in Toronto *News* (remarks) 6751 (iii).

Montreal Dry Dock, Site, &c. (M. for O. Cs. cor., &c.*) 706 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Docks.'

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4452 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co., O. Cs. Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 705 (i).

Newspaper Agents and Quebec Postmasters (M.) to adjn. Hse., 14669 (vi.)

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1309 (i).

Petersen-Tate Deposit: *See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14669 (vi).

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4211 (ii).

Public Works Dept. and Mr. Préfontaine: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Harbours and Rivers, Quebec.'

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14721 (vi).

Quebec Harbour Improvements, Reps. to Council, &c. (M. for copies*) 706 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2299 (i), 3337 (ii).

Racine Bros., Claims against Contractors of Nelson, P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 254 (i); in Com., 6103 (iii).

Ry. Commissioners' Salaries B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8121 (iv).

Ry. Labour Dispute B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2579 (ii).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., and Freight Blockade, Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2445 (i).

Reciprocity Negatiations, Emissaries from Can. (remarks) on Alaskan Boundary Award, 14819 (vi).

Resignation as Minister: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

St. Lawrence Channel: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Que.'

Sorel Wharf: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours and Rivers, Que.'

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c. (M. for cor.) 451 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

South Shore Ry., Working, &c. (M. for cor.) 448 (i).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7051 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 7560; (transportation facilities) 7562; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7552; (Corry & Laverdure, contract, &c.) 7559 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Interior (salaries) 269 (i); Labour Dept. (Racine Bros. claims) 7168 (iii).

Customs (Montreal port) 3901 (ii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6679 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7576, 7584 (iv).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes royal commission) 6985; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6981 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 4046; (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4067; (hydrographic surveys) 4118; (meteorological service) 4118; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4116; (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 4116 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; (quarantine station, St. John) 487; (St. John quarantine water service) 414 (i).

Ont. (architects) 524 (i).

Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 342; (geological museum) 352; (Royal Mint) 344; (ventilation, &c.) 488; (Victoria Museum) 365 (i).

Que. (Thetford Mines) 441; (Valleyfield P.O.) 444 (i).

Docks (Montreal) 2981; (rep. of commission) 2981 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers: B.C. (Columbia River) 1457 (i).

Generally (dredge vessels, repairs,) 2612; (hydraulic dredge) 2612 (ii).

Man. (dredging) 2665; (St. Andrews Rapids) 3355 (ii).

N. B. (Campbellton wharf) 1168; (Caraquet wharf) 1176; (St. John River wharfs) 1178 (i).

N. S. (Bridgewater, dredging) 1075; (Cow Bay) 1081; (Glace Bay) 1090; (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1097; (Lunenburg Harbour) 1109 (i).

Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185 (i); (dredging plant) 2671 (ii); (Petawawa narrows) 1444 (i); (Port Arthur) 3341; (Port Colborne) 3369; (St. Joseph, wharf) 3382 (ii); (St. Lawrence, dredging) 1444 (i).

Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1537; (Lake St. John, wharf) 2243; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie ice piers) 2248; (Le Tableau wharf) 2249; (Magdalen islands) 2264; (Maria, pier) 2266 (i); (Montreal, harbour) 3365; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Que. harbour) 3336 (ii); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. André de Kamouraska) 2290; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 3305 (ii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 2292 (i), 3377 (ii); (Three Rivers wharfs) 2297; (Touladie river) 2286 (i); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633, 2945; (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2299 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633, 2 45 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2992; (Belleisle station) 2989; (Marconi stations) 2989; (Yukon) 2992 (ii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875 (ii); (Neg. Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4263 (ii).

Tariff Revision, Inquiry for Cor., &c., 3003 (ii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co. (M. for cor.) 672 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., G. T. Pac. Ry. (M. for cor.) 447 (i).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Transportation Commission, O.C., Cor., &c. *re* Appnmts. (M. for copies) 1324 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2633, 2926, 3305, 3369, 3451 (ii), 7562 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works,' &c.

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4522 (ii).

Valleyfield, P. O. Site: *See* 'Beauharnois.'

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Buildings.'

Yukon Supplies, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4071 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 3283 (ii).

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Allegations *re* Inspection of Fruit (remarks) 13508 (vi).

Auditor General and Finance Dept. (remarks) 11423 (v).

Aud. Gen. and Payment of Members (remarks) 11552 (v).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circular (read) 11552 (v).

Bayfield, Str., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7302, 7323; in Com. on B., 7384 (iii).

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14049 (vi).

Bonding Privileges with U.S.: *See* 'Coasting,' &c.

Boyd, Sir John, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 5990 (iii).

Brockville and North-western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 6655, 7137, 7430 (iii).

——— on Order for resuming adjnd. Deb., 6847 (iii).

——— (M.) that com. rise, 7339 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 7339 (iii).

——— on M. for 3° (amt.) 7469 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co., (M.) to reprint Bill, 7467 (iii).

Brockville and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67) 1° *, 813 (i).

Budget, The, 1974 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5055, 5066 (ii); in Com. on B., 5422, 5461 (iii).

Campaign Literature, *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian (3rd) Mounted Rifles, Medals, &c. (Ques.) 1675 (i).

Census of 1901, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 203 (i).

——— (M. for ret.) 289 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 479, 544 (i).

——— (remarks) 204 (i).

Chickens, Killing of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 836 (i).

Cigarettes Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 1°, 2014 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12493, 12571 (v).

Clergue Contract for Steel Rails, Quality, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Coasting Privileges *re* U.S. (remarks) 12714, 12756 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6638; in Com., 7491 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3048; in Com. on B., 4011 (ii).

See 'Masters,' &c.

Customs Employees, Transfers, &c. (M.) for Ret., 5318 (iii).

Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Ferry Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'

France and Can. SS. Service B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 11422 (v).

Grain in Bond: *See* 'Coasting.'

Grain Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. of Res., 13807 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10485, 10555, 10562, 11290, 11982, 12252 (v); on M. for 3°, 12697, 12770; (amt.) 12750 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13270, 13301 (vi).

Haycock, Jos., Inspector of Binder Twine, &c. (Ques.) 4960 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection,' &c.

Howe Island Ferry: *See* 'Navigable,' &c., 'Wolfe,' &c.

Hurley: *See* 'Supply—Fisheries,' 'Lighthouse Service,' &c.

I. C. R. Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12301 (v).

Le Canada: *See* 'Pelletier.'

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Cor. *re* Mr. Mullen, &c.) 5757 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Mails carried *via* New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7729 (iv).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14549 (vi).

——— Campaign Literature, Statement *re* Sp[illegible] Trains, 14681 (vi).

——— Refund of Express Charges (remarks) 14684 (vi).

Masters of Vessels, Instructions *re* Postage, &c., in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5664 (iii).

Militia Estimates (remarks) 13369 (vi)

Militia Tents, Rush Ordér, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

See 'N. W. M. P.'

Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4484 (ii); in Com. on B., 5418 (iii).

Napanee Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12780; in Com. on B., 12984 (vi).

N. W. Mounted Police Tents, Wood & Co.'s Tender, &c. (Ques.) 3804 (ii).

——— Remarks, 6850 (iii).

Officers Mess, Fisheries Protection Service, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 9819 (iv).

Parliament Buildings, Ottawa: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Buildings,' 'Ventilation.'

Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and *Le Canada*, Canvass (remarks) 13982 (vi).

——— Salary, &c. (remarks) 13992 (vi).

——— *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10829 (v).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12791 (vi).

Postal Newspaper Boxes for Streets, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 14283 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14671 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5664 (iii).

Poultry, Fattening, &c.: *See* Supply—'Agriculture.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) M. to adjn. Hse., 10535 (v).

Public Works Dept. and Mr. Préfontaine: *See* 'Pilotage Bill.'

Quadra, Str., Officers Mess, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 9819 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3750, 3896 (ii); 6299 (iii).

——— Suggestions *re* Sel. Com. (remarks) 5313.

Ry. Act (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12950 (vi).

Ry. Commission: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7129 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14464 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11014, 11483; on M. for 3°, 12478 (v).

Rideau Canal Employees, Payment of, Delay, &c. (remarks) 13302 (vi).

St. Lawrence Islands, Improvements, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7215, 7242 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 13503 (vi); (census enumerators, Gananoque) 4823; (patent branch, salaries) 4351 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7640; ('wringing chickens' necks') 7640 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (electric lighting) 14139 (vi); (Galops, deepening, &c.) 8400; (enlargement) 7804 (iv).

Gene ally (toll collectors) 12932 (vi).

Grenville (Tucker, Henry, investigation *re* Supt.) 14157 (vi).

Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv).

Murray (Supt.'s duties and expenses) 14146; (wire fencing) 14150 (vi).

Rideau (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); (swing bridge, Concession St., Ottawa) 14150 (vi).

Soulanges (bank repairs) 14153 (vi); (construction) 7550 (iii); (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (J. & M. O'Leary's claims) 14651 (vi).

Welland (Dunnville dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 237; Justice (salaries) 212 (i); (marine contingencies) 5033 (ii); Militia (salaries) 2 2 (i); Post Office (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13996 (vi).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3897; (contingent expenses, Montreal) 3784; (Gananoque port) 3897 (ii); (Kilroy, Mr., payment to) 13994 (vi); (locks, instruments, &c.) 3962; (preferential ta iff) 3932; (preventive service) 3949; (printing, &c.) 3962 (ii); (salaries, extra) 13980 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Teulon, North, road) 6927; (tree culture) 6773 (iii); (tree planting) 13775 (vi).

Excise (inspectors salaries) 13978 (vi); (tobacco stamps) 5373; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (Bance, Mr., promotion) 5277; (*Bayfield*, str.) 5280, 5292 (iii); (Canadian fishery exhibit) 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii); (fish-breeding stations) 4174; (fishery officers) 5050; (fishways) 4174; (Hurley, J. M., inspector, &c.) 5123, (ii); 5280, 5305; (intelligence bureau) 5277; (Ottawa exhibit) 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii); (protection service, B.C.) 4174 (ii); (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

Immigration (Ques. of order) 6855; (tents, &c.) 6850 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7773; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7763 (iv).

Justice, Administration of — Penitentiaries (binder twine circular) 3512 (ii).

Supreme Court (contingencies) 3404; (reporter) 3402 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.

Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3414; (Eil[illegible] allowances, &c.) 3509; (police magistrate) 3415; (Taylor, Geo. L.) 3415 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (messengers, &c.) 5265; (printing, &c.) 5267; (senate contingencies) 5264 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 4173 (ii); (Hurley, J. M.) 5740 (iii); (lighthouse supplies) 4168; (lightkeepers' salaries) 4132; (wharfs, repairs) 4174 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7729; (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5033 (ii).

Militia (military college) 3778 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 13543 (vi); (Dominion steamers, repairs) 5034; (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4084 (ii); masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi); (meteorological service) 4118; (steamer supplies, Drolet, F.X.) 5036 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings, Generally (armouries) 970; (Gananoque armoury) 970 (i).
Man. (military buildings) 13128 (vi).
N. B. (St. John quarantine station) 486.
N. W. T. (Moose Jaw, P.O.) 13130 (vi).; (Prince Albert, court house) 13129 (ii).
Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 503 (i); (Kingston military college, stables) 13117, 13128; (Wingham, P.O.) 13123 (vi).
Ottawa (coal sheds) 13116; (elevator, west Block) 13115 (vi).
Docks (commissioner's rep.) 2983 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Anderson's Hollow) 1163; (Campbellton, wharf) 1166; (Caraquet, wharf) 1175 (i).
N. S. (Amagandus wharf) 1068; (Bailey's Brook, wharf) 1072; (Big Pond, wharf) 1071; (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (cement, piers, &c.) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1098; (Kingsport Pier) 1103 (i).
Ont. (Bronte, harbour) 1354; (Gananoque, harbour) 1371 (i).
P.E.I. (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i).
Que. (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13494 (vi); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i).
Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13344 (vi).
Slides and Booms (Ottawa river staff) 2980 (ii).
Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Kamloops, Nicola line) 13337; N.W.T. (Wood Mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle) 5504; (Dr. Couture) 5504; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5496 (iii); (public health, small-pox) 5008 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Clergue's rails) 14097; Miscellaneous (Ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration Act) 7759; (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7797 (iv).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7282; (roads and bridges) 7284; (supplies purchased, &c.) 6930 (iii).

Swing Bridges Bill: *See* 'Navigable,' &c.

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Ques. of Order (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) *re* Mr. Tarte, 4843 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Thousand Islands, Improvement: *See* 'St. Lawrence.'

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14464 (vi).

Tyerman, P. D., Payments to, by Govt. (Ques.) 286 (i).

U. S. Coasting Privileges: *See* 'Coasting.'

Valleyfield Post office, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 11187 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber, Fans, &c. (remarks) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2344 (i); on M. to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal, Collector, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12935 (vi).

Wolfe Island and Howe Island wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13498 (iii).

Woods, J. W., Amount paid for Tents, &c. (Ques.) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

——— Rental of Buildings to Govt. (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

Thompson, Mr. A. T., *Haldimand and Monck.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (moved) 7 (i).

Budget, The, 1994 (i).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 872 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13583 (vi).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, Deb. adjourned, 1065 (i).

G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2415 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12206 (v).

Hides Bill: *See* 'General Inspection B.'

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1°*, 1204.

Loan Companies Extension (B. 24) 1°m., 284; 2°m., 2349; in Com., 2350 (i).

Mexican Light and Power Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 1853 (i).

Militia Force, Condition, Pay, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 5702 (iii).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 1811 (i).

Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1059 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11635, 11659 (v).

SUPPLY:

Militia (annual drill) 3606 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13430 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 499; (Cayuga) 499 (i).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s (B. 163) 1°*, 2582; in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

Thomson, Mr. T. I., *N. Grey.*

Balaclava and Owen Sound Mail Contract (Ques.) 13263 (vi).

Bayfield, Str., Sale, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 5586 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

See 'Supply—Fisheries,' 'Lighthouse Service.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7359, 7372; in Com. on B., 7383, 7391 (iii).

See 'Supply—Inspection.'

Cement in Buildings: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ottawa.'

Census: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Commercial Agencies, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4360 (ii).

Dredges at Midland, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3011 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9573 (iv).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections) 13277 (vi).

Grey County, Public Buildings wanted, &c., List read, in Com. of Sup., 5835 (iii).

Indians: *See* 'Supply—Indians.'

I. C. R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Ry. Act.'

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8226 (iv).

Meaford Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

Owen Sound, Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks B.'

——— Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13063 (vi).

——— Water Lot, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (iii).

See 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ont.'

Public Works, Contracts awarded, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (iv).

——— Govt. Policy *re* Public Buildings, 5831 (iii).

Ry Act (stores of I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12967 (vi).

Representation in H of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10999, 11528 (v).

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Dredge, Sinking in Lake Ont. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

Small-pox: *See* 'Supply—Quarantine.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, Grey counties) 4826 (ii).
Excise (Standard Chemical Co.) 5380 (iii); (wood alcohol) 5380 (iii).
Fisheries (str. *Bayfield*) 5278 (iii).
Indians—B.C. (salaries) 7257; (schools, &c.) 7257; (travelling expenses) 7262; Yukon (expenses, generally) 7272 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7775; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7775 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str. reps. *re*) 5743; (*Bayfield*, str., sale, &c.) 5763 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4096 (ii).

Thomson, Mr. T. I.—*Con.*

SUPPLY.—*Con.*

Post Office (Chatsworth, vacancy) 6057; (postmasters' salaries, arrears) 5924; (postmasters, &c.) 6057 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5831; (Guysborough) 5840 (iii).
Ont. (Bridgeburg, P. O.) 13113; (Guelph, armoury) 13083; (Oshawa, P. O.) 13111 (vi); (Owen Sound) 439, 533 (i), 13063; (Picton, P.O.) 13114; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P. O.) 13107 (vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 652 (i); (Wingham, P. O.) 13120; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13108 (vi).
Ottawa (coal sheds) 13115 (vi).
Que. (Longueuil, P. O.) 13070 (vi)
Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (dredging, plant, &c.) 13311; (Fraser river, improvement) 13305 (vi).
Mar. Provs. (dredging) 13309; (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi); (dredging, repairs) 2639 (ii).
Ont. (general repairs) 1370 (i); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Owen Sound, harbour) 1377 (i); (Port Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi).
P.E.I. (dredging plant) 13313 (vi).
Que. (Grande Vallee, pier) 1515 (i).
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307 (vi).
Quarantine (small-pox) 5011 (ii).
Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276 (iii).

Wood Alcohol: *See* 'Supply—Excise.'

Tisdale, Hon. David, *S. Norfolk.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5968 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5989 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378, 4962 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3229 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Ry. Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4422 (ii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1327 (i), 3243 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 576 (i).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 613 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5168 (iii).

Indian Agents, Brant Reserve, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 1322 (i).

Indian Agents, Guardians, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) in Com., 1117 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4870 (ii).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5982 (iii).

Tisdale, Hon. David—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com., 2586; in Com., 2593, 3721, 3835, 3882 (ii), 6075 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10960, 10911 ; (Brant) 11087 ; (Norfolk) 11117, 11427 ; on M. for 3°, 12372 (v).

SUPPLY :

Militia (annual drill) 3603 ; (association grants) 3767 : (defence scheme) 3763 ; (G.O.C.) 3779; (Martineau investigation) 3584, 3752 ; (military college) 3778; (pay and allowance, 3584 (ii) ; (pay and allowance, general statement) 13405 (vi); (stores branch) 3608 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3591, 3756 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings—N. B. (St. John, drill hall) 13043 (vi).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Manitoba Newspapers *re* Judges (remarks) 11082 (v).

Wilson, Stephen Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9150 (iv).

Tobin, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 1575 (i).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4090 (ii).

Tolmie, Mr. J., *W. Bruce.*

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10944 (v).

Tucker, Mr. J. J., *St. John City, (N.B).*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5186 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies, &c.) 5043 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert, K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Award, &c. (remarks) 14280 (vi).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 316 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 303, 628 (i).

Hay and Oats bought by Can., for S. A. War, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 682 (i).

Inverness and Richmond Ry. Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 872 (i).

Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. (B. 10) in Com., 314 (i).

Judges of High Court, B.C., Salaries, &c. (remarks) 14305 (vi).

Minister of Mines, Appnmt. of, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).

Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).

Pensions to S. A. Veterans by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14599 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations of Postmasters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14275 (vi).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c., 14368 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. Interior (salaries) 269 (i).

Miscellaneous—Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce) 14274 (vi).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14305 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 314 (i).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).

SUPPLY ;

Public Works : Buildings—N. B. (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (dredges, repairs) 2631 (ii) ; N. B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176 ; (Shippegan harbour) 1184 (i).

Vrooman, Mr. A. E., *S. Victoria (O.)*

Budget, The, 1832 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10102 (v).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11500, 11658 (v).

Pigeon Lake Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 6412 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Indians (survey, reserves) 6412 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Seven Islands, wharf) 13484 (vi).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5501 (iii) ; (small-pox) 5025 (ii) ; (trachoma epidemic) 5496 (iii).

Wade, Mr. F. B., *Annapolis.*

Beauharnois Electoral District : *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7336, 7371 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7492 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8245, 8361 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6909 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3819, 3829 (ii).

G. T Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5174, 5199 (iii), 7859 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9820 (iv).

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8100, 8371 (iv).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt., &c., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com. (presented) 7916 (iv).

——— (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8008 (iv).

McDermid, Ellen, Relief (B. 229) 1°*, 7922 (iv).

Wade, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii), 5359 (iii).
Mills, Mr., Claims against (Ques.) 6167 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4469 (ii).
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4868 (ii).
Postage Rates for Books, &c. (remarks) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5869 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5869 (iii).
Privileges and Elections Com., Rep. of Com. *re* Geo. M. Loy, M.P. (M.) to conc., 8008; on Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8034 (iv).
——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 7916 (iv).
Ry. Act (consolidation Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4581, 4702 (ii), 6115, 6192, 6209, 6291 (iii).
Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

SUPPLY:

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Furness-Withy Co.) 7734; (St. John and London) 7734 (iv).
Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5835 (iii).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief (B. 228) 1°*, 7922 (iv).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *E. Durham.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10010 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Cricket Playing (remarks) 2423 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia (annual drill) 3603; (military property) 3621 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13425 (vi); (properties) 3612; (Valleyfield strike) 3599 (ii).
Trent Canal, Hastings and Trenton, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 129 (i).
——— Surveys at Rice Lake, (M for reps.) 2313, 2333 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.* (*N.B.*)

Bathurst Harbour Buoys, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Bourgeois, M. E., Sub-Collector of Customs at Tracadie, N.B., Dismissal (Ques.) 543 (i).
Census, Sunbury, N.B., Religious Classification, &c, (Ques.) 4005 (ii).
Daly, Michael, Harbour Master, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4687 (ii).
Gagetown, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1676 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7902; on M. for 3° (amt.) 8067 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9980 (iv).
Harrison, Mr., Inspector of Fisheries, N.B., Resignation (Ques.) 288 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D.—*Con.*

Hatchey, Nazaire, Appnmt. as Harbour Master, (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
McMonagle, Miles, Dismissal from Beacon Light, N.B. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
Mehan, Dr., Meterological Service, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Oromocto Shoals, N.B., Dismissal of Miles McMonagle, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).
Rivers, Robert, Dismissal from Miscou Light-house (Ques.) 3631 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, N.B., religions) 4821 (ii).
Indians: N.B. (St. John river, pet., &c.) 6352 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Bay du Vin) 1164; (Lord's Cove, wharf) 1177; (Great Salmon River) 1177; (Negro Point, breakwater) 1182; (Oromocto, wharf) 1181; (St. John, harbour) 1183; (St. John river, tributaries) 1177 (i).
Tracadie Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 543 (i).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Contract with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2759 (ii).
Venoit, P. I., Customs Collector at Bathurst, Absence, &c. (Ques.) 3629 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6969 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11169 (v).
Binder Twine Inspector, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 4959 (ii).
——— Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5588 (iii).
——— Penalties *re* Inspection (remarks) 14048 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection.'
Bridges over Canals, Maintenance by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5617 (iii).
Doukhobors Homestead Entries, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).
——— Loans to by Govt. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).
——— Pilgrimage, Expenses, Losses, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).
Ernestown Station Postmaster, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).
False Creek, B.C., Lease to Burnett & Kelly (Ques.) 2758, 2919 (ii).
Grain carried by C. P. R. to St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9367 (iv); in Com. on B., 10697 (v).
G. T. Pacific Bill, Distribution to Members (remarks) 8918 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Haycock, Jos., Appnmt. as Inspector of Binder Twine (Ques.) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection of Staples.'

Immigrants at Quebec, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

Immigration Expenditure, 1902 to 1903 (Ques.) 6269 (iii).

Immigration, Inspection, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6546 (iii).

——— Notice of M., 6522 (iii).

——— Nationality, &c., (Ques.) 2310 (i).

Immigration into Man., Houses and Fuel, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).

Immigration refused Admission, &c. (Ques.) 2310 (i), 2502 (ii).

Iron and Steel, Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7925, 7929, 7986 (iv).

Iron and Steel, Bounty Payments (Ques.) 6435 (iii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8088 (iv), 10763 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8206, 8228 (iv).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10828 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on Sen. Amts., 13846 (vi).

Ry. Carriage of Mails, &c. (Ques.) 6268 (iii).

Railway Subsidies, Amounts paid from 1900 to 1903 (Ques.) 13370 (vi).

——— Interest payable, &c. (Ques.) 3970 (ii).

——— voted for 1900, 1901, 1902 (Ques.) 12842, 13027, 13259, 13934 (vi).

——— voted and paid by Govt. 1901-3 (Ques.) 2306 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Service *re* (Ques.) 13259 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (experimental farms) 4549 (ii).
Canals: Beauharnois (dykes) 14152; Generally (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157 (vi).
Civil Govt.: Finance (contingencies) 227 (i); Finance (insurance) 12587 (v); Sec. of State (printing, &c.) 223; (salaries) 223 (i).
Customs (Napanee collector, salary) 3919 (ii).
Dom. Lands (Banff Hot springs, baths) 6789; (Stewart, inspector of forests) 6774; (tree culture) 6774 (iii).
Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5283 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6660; (Devlin, Mr., successor) 6731; (expenditures) 6615; (White, Mr., expenses) 6732 (iii).
Indians: B.C. (industrial schools) 7254 (iii).
Inland Revenue (excise inspections) 5364 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7766; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7766 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii); (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Paris agency) 12589 (v); (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6969 (iii); (Printing Bureau, plant) 12587 (v).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4104 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Dom. renewals, &c.) 636; (Ft. William) 637 (i).
Ottawa (additional rooms) 13012 (vi); (Rideau Hall, grounds, &c.) 5006 (ii); (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 993 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Glace Bay) 1094 (i).
Ont. (Port Arthur, dredging) 13019 (vi).
Miscellaneous (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi).
Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 2701; (Portage du Fort) 2699 (ii).
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice slides) 2678 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (St. Lawrence) 5007 (ii).
Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5494; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5499 (iii); (small-pox) 5029 (ii); (trachoma disease) 5494 (iii).
Railways: I.C.R. (G. T. R. rental) 12888 (vi); (Rivière du Loup engine houses, &c.) 12593 (v); Miscellaneous (Ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

Wright, Mr. A. A., *S. Renfrew.*

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14052 (vi).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10735 (v).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5076 (ii); in Com. on B., 5424 (iii).

Can. Central and O. & B. Ry., Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5622 (iii).

C. P. R. Transcontinental Trains, Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 9455 (iv).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10754 (v).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3054 (ii).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6416 (iii).

Electric Lighting in Renfrew, 14137 (vi).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 300 (i).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10817 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10483 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com, of Sup., 772 (i).

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8095 (iv).

K. and P. Ry. (remarks) 5622 (iii).

Milk Can B.: *See* 'Weights,' &c

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1307 (i).

Wright, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telegraph poles) 5350 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6480, 7225, 7228 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7629 ; (creameries) 7633 (iv).

Canals : Cornwall (electric lighting) 14137 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7593 (iv).

Wright, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works : Buildings, Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie, P.O.) 13108 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12858 (vi).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii)

Weights and Measure Act (milk cans) Amt. B. (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2346 (i).

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

ABRAM'S RIVER, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

ACADEMY OF ARTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

——— *See* 'Agriculture, Arts.'

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

'ACADIAN,' SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

——— *See* 'Marine.'

ACETYLENE, GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

——— IN LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

ACTON VALE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 18 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 23; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 40; (Mr. *Monk*) 55; (Mr. *Charlton*) 67; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 75 (i).

ADDRESS, THE, REPLY FROM HIS EX.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1204 (i).

AD HOC JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS:

ASCENSION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3127 (ii).

DOMINION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5589 (iii).

EASTER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

LABOUR DAY, DELAYING SESSION, &C. (remarks) 10742 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10489 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 10712 (v).

PROCEDURE *re* ADJOURNMENT: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Sproule*) 6630 (iii).

THANKSGIVING DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13790 (vi).

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1*, 4; *pro forma.*

ADMIRALTY COURT, ACCOMMODATION FOR SITTINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

ADVERTISING (GOVT.) IN NEWSPAPERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5267–5274 (iii).

'ADVOCATE,' PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING *re* ELECTION PROCLAMATION: in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

——— *See* 'Prince Albert.'

AFFIDAVITS *re* P. O. SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iii).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR N. W. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REBATE FOR 1901–2: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3803 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION SEL. COM.: M. to add Name (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5679 (iii).

——— REP. *re* BINDER TWINE: *See* 'Binder Twine,' &c.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:

ACADEMY OF ARTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

AGRICULTURAL LECTURERS IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).

AGRICULTURE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4429, 4548, 4800 (ii), 7053 (iii),

——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).

——— SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4349 (ii).

AIDS TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).

ANDERSON, MR. J. G., APPNMT. AS FRUIT INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13372 (vi).

——— Remarks *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).

ANTHRAX IN CATTLE, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10102 (v).

APPLES, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S STATEMENT *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).

ARCHIVES, CANADIAN, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5417 (iii).

——— RE-ORGANIZATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13503 (vi).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

ART GALLERY, ENCOURAGEMENT TO CANADIAN ARTISTS: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

——— EXPENDITURE ON PAINTINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12717 (vi).

——— NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 2725 (ii), 12589 (v).

BURRARD, B.C., CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

BUTTER ADULTERATION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Blain*) *re* Irish Butter in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING, REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 5414 (iii).
BUTTER, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712, 10745 (v).
BUTTER MADE AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593, 1857 (i).
CANADIAN APPLES: *See* 'Apples.'
CANADIAN ARTISTS AND ART GALLERY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION, GOVT. AID *re* TUBERCULOSIS: in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
CANADIAN BUTTER, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712, 10745 (v).
CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU, SUIT AGAINST W. T. R. PRESTON: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
CANADIAN EXHIBITS AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
——— *See* 'Imperial.'
CANADIAN TRADE WITH JAPAN: *See* 'Japan Exhibition.'
CARLETON, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).
CATTLE EMBARGO IN G.B.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 267 (i).
——— LORD ONSLOW'S DECLARATION: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 14054 (vi).
——— Papers laid on Table, 591 (i).
CATTLE INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
——— ON STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
CATTLE PURCHASED BY BRITISH GOVT.: Par. in Montreal *Gazette* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5415.
CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; (Neg. Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).
CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
CENSUS: in Com. of Sup., 4594 (ii).
——— CARLETON, &C., N.B., RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).
——— CIRCULAR OF MR. COTE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
——— COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).
——— EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 69) 13759 (vi).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Monk*) 13368 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13672 (vi).
——— GRAND MANAN, N.B., RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).
——— LAND VALUES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 286 (i).
——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).
——— SCHEDULES, HALTON, PEEL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii), 11425 (v).
——— SCHEDULES, 1891, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7054 (iii).
——— SCHEDULES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4635.
——— STAFF EMPLOYED *re* ALTERATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13935 (vi).
——— TOTAL COST: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iii).
——— TOTAL COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593 (i).
——— TOTAL COST, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 289, 479, 544 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 203 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 204 (i).
CIRCULARS TO CURÉS, P.Q., *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
CLASSIFYING RECORD: in Com. of Sup., 12592.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii), 7086 (iii), 7610 (iv).
COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7632.
CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
DAIRYING BRANCH, AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
——— COLD STORAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii).
DEPUTY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Amount paid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 7055 (iii).
EXHIBITION FURNITURE, &C., AT PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).
EXHIBITIONS, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 4548 (ii).
——— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1937 (i).
FOOD ANALYSIS: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
FRUIT INSPECTORS BUYING APPLES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
——— *See* 'Anderson.'
FRUIT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE TO EUROPE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3805 (ii).
——— VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3232 (ii).
FUMIGATION STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).
GAUDET, COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
GENERAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
GOLD NUGGETS, EXHIBITION AT GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
GREY COUNTIES, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE, SUPPLIES *re* QUARANTINE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
HAGAR, MISS, APPNMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5316 (iii).
HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL, CENSUS CHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
See 'Census.'
HEALTH ACT, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4440 (ii). *See* 'Public Health.'
HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE: in Com. of Sup., 550 (iii).
——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &C.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).
IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, CANADIAN EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, INFLUX OF: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 3713 (ii).
JAPAN EXHIBITION, GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii),
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv.)
LEPROSY IN CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes. Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (ii).
See 'St. Louis.'
MINING EXHIBIT.: *See* 'Can. Exhibit,' &C.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
See 'Arts,' &c.
O'HALLORAN, GEO. F., DEP. MIN. OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
ONSLOW, LORD, *re* CATTLE EMBARGO; *See* 'Cattle Embargo.'
ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
OSAKA EXHIBITION: *See* 'Japan.'
PATENT BRANCH, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
PATENTS, CLASSIFICATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4433 (ii).
PEEL, CARDWELL AND HALTON, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436 (iii).
See 'Halton,' &c.
PETHICK, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
'POULTRY FARMING,' PAMPHLET OF DEPT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 7640 (iv).
PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
See 'Health.'
PUBLIC HEALTH, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii).
QUARANTINE, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i) 13030 (vi).
QUARANTINE, ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (i).
ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
RUTHERFORD, DR., DUTIES IN ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3001 (ii).
——— LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 4837 (ii).
See 'Live Stock.'
SAN JOSE SCALE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii).
SAUNDERS, DR. C. E., APPNMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 1676 (i).
SHUTT, PROF., REPORT *re* SOFT PORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
SIMCOE COUNTY, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SMALL-POX, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5491 (iii).
SUNBURY, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).
TORONTO INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO: in COM. of Sup., 534 (i), 13501 (vi).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii).
TUBERCULOSIS, AID TO CAN. ASSOCIATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
VETERINARY CHIEF INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1591 (i).
VETERINARY DIVISION, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
'YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

AIDS TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).

AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

——— CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).

AITKEN'S WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).

ALASKAN BOUNDARY AWARD, &C., TEL. FROM LONDON *re* LORD ALVERSTONE'S REFERENCE TO CANADIAN CRITICISM: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).
——— ALLEGED INTERVIEW WITH MR. AYLESWORTH: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi).
——— ALLEGED INTERVIEW WITH MR. AYLESWORTH, VERIFICATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13667 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 14287 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 14280 (vi).
See 'Interview.'
——— Official Information, Inquiry for Cor., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*. *Halifax*) 14521 (vi).
——— BOND-HAY TREATY, &C.: Inquiry for Papers *re* (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 878 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. *Monk*) 853 (i).
——— COMMISSION, CABLEGRAM FROM LORD ALVERSTONE: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13806 (vi).
——— Cor. *re*, Laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14688 (vi).
——— CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, ABROGATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 109 (i).
——— Inquiry for ret. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7297 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on Alaska Award, 14521 (vi).
——— COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 2299 (ii).
——— EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii), 13957 (vi).
——— GOVT. RESPONSIBILITY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 14791 (vi).
——— HISTORY OF CASE, &C.: Recapitulation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14773 (vi).
——— JUDGMENT, &C.: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Bell*) 13671 (vi).
——— Notice *re* proposed Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 14765 (vi).
——— REFUSAL OF CAN. COMMISSIONERS TO SIGN AWARD: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14402 (vi).
——— SUMMARY PUBLISHED: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10536 (v).
——— TEL. FROM MR. SIFTON: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14529 (vi).
——— TREATY, CONVENTION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 480 (i).

'ALASKA,' STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629 (iii).

ALBANY STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
——— *See* 'B.C.'

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 75.)

Alberta Railway and Coal Co.'s B. No. 119 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 3582; in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 76.)

ALBERT COUNTY, HARBOUR-MASTER, DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

ALBERTON, P.E.I., RY. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

ALCOHOL: *See* 'Wood.'

ALERT,' STR., *re* CANAL SURVEYS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup.. 12900 (vi).

ALEXANDER INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE TO: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).

ALEXANDRIA WOOD EXPORT CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).

Algoma Ry.: *See* 'BRUCE.'

Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2172 (ii); in Com., 5361; 3°*, 5361 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 77.)

ALIEN LABOUR ACT, PROSECUTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3971 (ii).

Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. No. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i), 3282 (ii).

Aliens: *See* 'Naturalization.'

ALLANS' CONTRACT *re* ATLANTIC SERVICES, DISCRIMINATING RATES *re* CAN. FREIGHT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13674 (vi).

——— *See* 'Atlantic Fast SS.'

ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937 (vi).

——— *See* 'Atlantic,' 'C.P.R. Steamers,' &c.

Allan, William, Relief B. No. 196 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 4179; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 78.)

Alliance Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) M to receive Pet., 4958 (ii); 1°*, 5512; 2°m., 5585; in Com., 7470; 3°*, 7478 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 79.)

ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).

ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).

ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).

ALUMINUM, OXIDE OF, IMPORTS INTO CAN., PORTS OF ENTRY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *N.B.*) 1035 (i).

ALVERSTONE, LORD: *See* 'Alaskan Boundary.'

AMAGANDUS WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).

Amalgamated Engineers: *See* 'Dom. Institute,' &c.

AMHERSTBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i), 13236 (vi).

AMHERST, N.S., POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell* 1591 (i).

AMQUI STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).

ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

ANCHOR LINE SALVAGE COMPENSATION FOR 'SCOTIA': in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).

ANDERSON AND KENNEDY LAKE: in Com. of Sup. 1451 (i).

ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup , 1163 (i).

ANDERSON, MR. J. G., APPNMT. AS FRUIT INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13372 (vi).

——— Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).

ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. No. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1°*, 4003; 2°m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690; 3°*, 4691 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 11.)

ANN NDALE PIER, P.E.I., AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).

——— RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii)

ANNUAL DRILL, CAMPS: in Com of Sup., 5005 (ii).

ANNUAL DRILL OF MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 3603 (ii).

ANSE AUX GASCONS, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANTHRAX IN CATTLE, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10102 (v).

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com of Sup., 13325 (vi).

——— LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).

——— TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

ANTIGONISH POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).

APPLES, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S STATEMENT *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).

ARBITRATION AND AWARDS, *re* PUBLIC WORKS, PAYMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vi).

ARCHITECT'S (CHIEF) OFFICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).

ARCHITECTS *re* PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).

ARCHITECTS STAFF, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).

——— *See* 'Public Works.'

ARCHIVES, CANADIAN, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5417 (iii).

——— DEPT., RE-ORGANIZATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13503 (vi).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

ARICHAT, N S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).

ARICHAT, WEST, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

ARMOURIES, CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).

ARMOURIES, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).

ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

ARSENALS, DOM., CONSTRUCTION IN CAN.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

ARSENAULT, CAPT., COMPENSATION *re* DAMAGES TO SCHR.: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

ART GALLERY, ENCOURAGEMENT TO CANADIAN ARTISTS: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

—— EXPENDITURE ON PAINTINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12717 (vi).

—— NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 2725 (ii).

—— *See* 'Portrait.'

ASCENSION ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3127 (ii).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in in Com. of Sup., 29.2 (ii).

Ashley, Harford, Relief B. No. 236 (Mr. *Porter*) 1°*, 8115; 2°*, 9431 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 12146 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 80).

ASSAY OFFICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii); 13779, 13965 (vi).

ASSENT, ROYAL: *See* 'Bills.'

ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. No. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) 1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 5558, 5584, 5887, 5960, 6845; 3°*, 6845 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 203).

ASTRONOMICAL, DEMARCATION WORK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i); 6791 (iii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) 1°*, 446; on order for 2°, 631, 664, 852; 2° m., 1505 (i); M. *re* Ry. Com., 6617 (iii).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 3299 (ii).

ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4007 (ii).

—— Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 14158; Neg. (Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).
Debate: (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14171; (Mr. *Sproule*) 14178; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 14185; (Mr. *Bell*) 14193; (Mr. *Logan*) 14203; (Mr. *Gourley*) 14204; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 14215; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14216 (vi).

—— TENDERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3882, 4120 (ii).

—— INQUIRY (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Stmnt., 4445 (ii).

—— TENDERS RECEIVED: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4727 (ii).

—— ALLAN'S CONTRACT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv); 13672 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Halifax* 7091 (iii).

—— ALLAN STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN, REDUCTION IN NUMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, ALLAN STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN, REDUCTION IN NUMBER: Remarks *re* Amt. to Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13948 (vi).

—— PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806; M. for 3°, 1810, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 81).

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. No. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 11159 (v); Order dschgd., 13444 (vi).
Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13990 (vi).

—— GOVTL., INTENTION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11692 (v), 13258 (vi).

AUDITING DEPTL. FINANCES: Remarks *re* Martineau Investigation, 6933 (iii).

AUD. GENERAL AUDITING BOOKS OF RY. COS., *re* SUBSIDIES: in Com. on Res., 14516 (vi).

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

—— OFFICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD, PAYMENTS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 10956 (v).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 11427 (v).

—— CIRCULAR FROM AUD. GEN.: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 11552 (iv).

—— *See* 'Audit Act,' &c.

AURORA FOUNDRY, MANUFACTURE OF POST BOXES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).

AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).

AUSTRALIA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS IN N. W. T., REP. OF INSPECTORS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*) 847, 880 (i).

AUTOMOBILES FOR P.O. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).

AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T., Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).
Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 13856; (Mr. *Oliver*) 13883 (Mr. *Hackett*) 13894; (Mr. *Sproule*) 13894; (Mr. *Davis*) 13896; (Mr. *McCreary*) 13897; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 13905; (Mr. *Scott*) 13914 (vi).

—— *See* 'Provincial'.

AYLESWORTH, MR.: *See* 'Alaskan Boundary.'

AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

BACTERIOLOGICAL LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).

BAILEY'S BROOK, N.S., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com of Sup., 1072 (i).

BAIN, MR., ASS'T COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT., &c.: Remarks in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B., 4010 (ii).

BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 13263 (vi).

BALSAM LAKE AND LAKE SIMCOE : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).

BALSAM LAKE LOCKS : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).

——— *See* 'Trent.'

BANANAS IMPORTED, VALUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1198 (i).

BANCE, MR., PROMOTION, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

BANFF, BATH HOUSE, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii), 13955 (vi).

——— COAL RESERVE, LEASES BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).

——— MUSEUM BUILDING, ADDITION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).

——— ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. No. 234 (Mr. *Henderson*) 1°, 7565 (iv).

BANKERS' ASSOCIATION, INSPECTION DUTIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 819 (i).

BANKERS, PRIVATE, LEGISLATION *re* ; Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 285 (i).

BANK FAILURES SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 6435 (iii).

Bank of Montreal B. No. 72 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 814 ; 2°*, 1026 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 82).

Bank of Winnipeg Incorp. B. No. 79 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 940 ; 2°*, 1026 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 83).

BANKS, UNCLAIMED BALANCES : Rep. presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (ii).

——— *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

———.*See* 'Alliance,' 'Citizens, &c.', 'City and County,' 'Crown,' 'Home,' 'Mount Royal,' 'Northern, 'Sterling.'

BAPTISTS, N.B., CENSUS ENUMERATION, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. 4801 (ii).

BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

BARNES, AMOS, CLAIMS FOR LAND, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6922 (iii).

BARR COLONY, MR. HAULTAIN'S SPEECH, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 6354 (iii).

Debate : (Mr. *Sifton*) 6355, 6375 ; (Mr. *Lennox*) 6358 ; (Mr. *Bell*) 6360 ; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx*) 6365 ; (Mr. *Gourley*) 6369 ; (Mr. *Scott*) 6371 ; (Sir *William Mulock*) 6383 ; (Mr. *Fowler*) 6384 ; (Mr. *Davis*) 6391 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6394, 6400 ; (Mr. *Henderson*) 6404 (iii).

BARR COLONY AND IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

——— NUMBER, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).

BARRIE, WHARF, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup , 1186 (i), 13452 (vi).

——— P. O., BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).

BARRY'S BAY, ONT., MADAWASKA RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).

BARTON, SIR EDMUND, EXPENDITURE *re* CAN. VISIT in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

BASS RIVER, PERMANENT LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

BATHURST CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

——— FISHERY INSPECTOR : *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

——— HARBOUR BUOYS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

BATISCAN RIVER CHANNEL, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).

BAUXITE, TONS IMPORTED IN 1902 : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1678 (i).

BAXTER'S HARBOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).

BAYFIELD HARBOUR WORKS, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

BAYFIELD, ONT., EXTENSION PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).

'BAYFIELD,' STR., REPAIRS AND SALE, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5278, 5282, 5762 (iii).

——— SALE, REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5586 (iii).

——— in Com. of Sup., Mr. Evans Reps., &c. : Read (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 5742, 5763 (iii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY : in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BAY OF QUINTE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14435 (vi).

BEACH POINT, P.E.I., BOAT CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, FLOODING LANDS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT : (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).

——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BEERSVILLE COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi.).

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION, EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

BELFAST PIER, P.E.I., DREDGING : in Com. of Sup 1153 (i).

BELL, DR., APPNMT. AS DIRECTOR OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).

BELLE ISLE TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup. 2712, 2989 (ii).

BELLE RIVIERE, SHEET PILING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).

BELL TELEPHONE AND C. P. R. AGREEMENT, &c : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ry. B. 21,' 'Telephones,' &c.

BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup.. 969 (i), 13082 (vi).

——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5588 (iii).

BELMONT ACCIDENT, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14154

BENNETT, MR., INCREASE IN SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13967 (vi).

BENOIT'S COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Clare*) 1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 84).

BERNIER, CAPT., GOVT. AID TO, *re* POLAR EXPEDITION: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 12805 (vi).

BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).

BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

BIG POND WHARF, N.S., SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).

BILLS, PRIVATE, DELAY IN TRANSLATION AND PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 482 (i).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 5427, 6388 (iii), 8655 (iv), 14858 (vi).

——— COMS. FROM GOV. GEN'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5315, 6353 (iii), 8642 (iv), 14844 (vi).

BILLS WITHDRAWN: M. (Mr. *Hyman*) 7203 (iii).

——— *See* 'Business,' &c.

BILLS:

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1°*, 4; *pro formâ*.

BILL (No. 2) To amend Chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1900, authorizing the granting of Railway Subsidies.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1° m., 92; 2° m., 545; in Com., 550; ref. back to Sel. Com. on Rys., 700; in Com., 1059; 3° m., 1199 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 56).

BILL (No. 3) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1°*, 92; 2° m., 885; in Com., 902, 1200 (i). M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; in Com., 13560, 14405; wthdn., 14769 (vi).

BILL (No. 4) Respecting Telephone Companies.—(Mr. *Maclean*).
1°*, 92; 2° m., 700 (i).

BILL (No. 5) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Maclean*).
1° m., 92; 2° m., 701 (i).

BILL (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Lancaster*).
1° m., 93; 2° m., 552; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., agreed to (Y., 99; N., 53) 565 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 7) To amend Chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes with respect to retiring allowances of Judges.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 93; wthdn., 634 (i).

BILL (No. 8) To amend the Expropriation Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 93; 2°*, 291; in Com., 291, 612, 632; 3°*, 945 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 22).

BILL (No. 9) To amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2° m., 313; in Com., 313; 3°*, 314 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 73).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 10) To amend the Act relating to the Custody of Juvenile Offenders in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2°*, 314; in Com., 314; 3°*, 316 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 30).

BILL (No. 11) To amend the Act respecting the Publication of the Statutes.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2°*, 634; in Com., 634; 3°*, 635 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 65).

BILL (No. 12) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 95; 2°*, 316; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 13).

BILL (No. 13) To amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 95; 2° and in Com., 635; on Order for Com., 945, 1115, 2239; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 12).

BILL (No. 14) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Law*).
1°*, 113; 2° m., 1061; in Com., 1062 (i).

BILL (No. 15) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Clancy*).
1°*, 114; 2° m., 704 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 19).

BILL (No. 16) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 114; 2°, 871 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 17) To aid in the Settlement of Railway Labour Disputes.—(Sir *William Mulock*).
1°*, 114; 2° m., 2535 (ii); in Com., 2923; 3°*, 3298 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5653 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 55).

BILL (No. 18) To amend the Interpretation Act.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1° m., 125; on Order for 2°, 566, 705; 2° m., 916; negatived, 939 (i).

BILL (No. 19) Respecting Drainage on and across the property of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Cowan*).
1° m., 202; 2°*, 916 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 20) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1° m., 203; 2° m., 2338 (i), 3245 (ii).

BILL (No. 21) To amend and consolidate the Law respecting Railways.—(Mr. *Blair*).
1° m., 244 (i); 2°*, 2585; M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591 (i), 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5513, 5560, 5679, 5765, 6071, 6170, 6172, 6202, 6271, 7299 (iii), 7609, 8125; 3° m., 8334 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13834, 14519, 14663, 14690, 14734, 14740, 14760, 14762, 14844 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 58).
——— Salaries of Ry. Commissioners, &c., Res. prop., 8085; in Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).

BILL (No. 22) To amend the Supreme Court and Exchequer Court Acts.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).

BILL (No. 23) To indemnify those who suffered damages in consequence of Fires caused by Railways.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1° m., 283 (i); 2° m., 2780 (ii); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 24) To extend the power of Loan Companies.—(Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*).
1° m., 284; 2°*, 1025; in Com., 2349 (i); 3°*, 2756 (ii); Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).

BILL (No. 25) Respecting the Eastern Townships Bank.—(Mr. *McIntosh*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1853 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 115).

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. *Costigan*).
1°*, 367; 2° m., 630, 664 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 27) Respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1025 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 92).

BILL (No. 28) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lemieux*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; M. for Com., 1804 ; in Com., 1806 ; M. for 3°, 1810, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 81).

BILL (No. 29) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Geoffrion*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 121).

BILL (No. 30) To incorporate the Federal Oil Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 120).

BILL (No. 31) Repecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—(Mr. *Calvert*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., 1854 ; 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 206).

BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 (i).

BILL (No. 33) To incorporate the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 141).

BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 446 ; 2°*, 632 (i).

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson*).
1°*, 446 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 108).

BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ball*).
1°*, 446 ; on Order for 2°, 631, 664, 852 ; 2° m., 1505 (i) ; M. *re* Ry. Com., 6617 (iii).

BILL (No. 37) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Champagne*).
1°*, 540 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 173).

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 124).

BILL (No. 39) To make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to Animals, and to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Brock*).
1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 1324 ; in Com., 1324 (i) ; 2779, 3237 (ii)

BILL (No. 40) To confer on the Commisssioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the International Railway Appliance Company.—(Mr. *Brock*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 133).

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 142).

BILL (No. 42) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 75).

BILL (No. 43) To incorporate the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 852 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 182).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i).

BILL (No. 45) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 89).

BILL (No. 46) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Harty*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 976 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 139).

BILL (No. 47) To incorporate the Nipissing and Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 166).

BILL (No. 48) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1° m., 592 ; 2° m., 1065 (i) ; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

BILL (No. 49) To amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 204 ; in Com. on Res., 593 ; 1°* of B., 597 ; 2°, 1116; in Com., and 3°*, 1116 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 10).

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway (Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 853 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 87).

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Northern Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 853 (i) ; in Com., 2753 ; 3°*, 2755 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 168).

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bazinet*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 135).

BILL (No. 53) Respecting Insolvency.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1° m., 654 ; 2° m., 2373 (i) ; on Order for 2°, 2787 ; 2° m., 3248 ; neg. (Y., 41 ; N., 74), 3256 (ii).

BILL (No. 54) Respecting the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation, and to change its name to the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., 2303 ; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 94).

BILL (No. 55) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 (i).

BILL (No. 56) To incorporate the Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. *Girard*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 179).

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr *German*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., 1811 ; 3°*, 1812 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 161).

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Edmonton Street Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 (i).

BILL (No. 59) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1°*, 707 ; on Order for 2°, 977 ; 2° m., 1327, 1511 (i) ; M. *re* Ry. Com., 6523 ; Neg. (Y., 51 ; N., 87), 6537 (iii).

BILL (No. 60) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ross, Ontario*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 1327 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 130).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the Winnipeg Western Land Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 204).

BILL (No. 62) Respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., 2716; 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 169).

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *McGugan*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 145).

BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); M. for Com., 4132; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 4441, 4586; M. for Com., 4871 (ii); in Com., 5139 (iii) 7814; 3° m., 8055, 8321 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 122).

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada (Mr. *Bruce*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2304; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 159).

BILL (No. 66) To Readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1° m., 708; 2° m., 1207; ref. to Sel. Com., 1294 (i); Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 7293 (iii); M. for Com., 10832, 10903; in Com., 10911, 10958, 11087, 11427, 11567, 11692, 12293; 3° m., 12372, 12492 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 60).

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Brockville and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor*).
1°*, 813 (i).

BILL (No. 68) To incorporate the Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1°*, 813; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 146).

BILL (No. 69) To incorporate the North-west Coal and Coke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 813; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 167).

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 147).

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Imperial Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 2956, 3170 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 132).

BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 82).

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Power Co.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 4868; 3° m., 4869; 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 170).

BILL (No. 74) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Guthrie*).
1° m., 814 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3247 (ii).

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*).
1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 98).

BILL (No. 76) To enable the City of Vancouver to acquire certain lands and interests adjoining Vancouver Harbour.—(Mr. *Macpherson*).
1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 77) To promote the Safety of Railway Employees.—(Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*).
1°* m., 872; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2387 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 78) To amend the Militia Pension Act, 1901.—(Sir *Frederick W. Borden*).
1°* m., 872; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2240; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 35).

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026; in Com. and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 83).

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Canada North-west Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 93).

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5585 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 85.)

BILL (No. 82) Respecting and restricting Chinese Immigration.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
Res. prop., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°-4 of B., 945; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2398; 3°*, 2399 (i); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 8).

BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the New Canadian Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Lemieux*.)
1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 1328; 2° m., 1512, 2241; in Com., 2241 (i), 2720; ref. back to Com., 2753; in Com., 3221; 3°*, 3222 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 160.)

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1338; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 176.)

BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Clare*.)
1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 84.)

BILL (No. 86) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*.)
1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°*, 2387 (i); 2° m., 2788, 3257, 3807 (ii).

BILL (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson*.)
1°*, 1111; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., 4587; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 199.)

BILL (No. 88) Respecting the Mutual Fire Insurance Company, of the City of Montreal, and to change its name to the 'Montreal Fire Insurance Company.'—(Mr. *LaRivière*.)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 158.)

BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Brockville and North-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)
1° m., 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i).

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company, Limited; and to change its name to the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—(Mr. *Guthrie*.)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 163.)

BILL (No. 91) To incorporate the Dominion Gas Improvement Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 114.)

BILL (No. 92) Respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company, Limited; and to change its name to the 'Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—(Mr. *Bickerdike*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 92)—*Con.*

1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 113.)

BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Shipping Federation of Canada.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)

1°*, 1193; 2° m., 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 190.)

BILL (No. 94) Respecting Incorporated Companies.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)

1°*, 1193 (i); 2° m., 3257 (ii).

BILL (No. 95) To amend the Conciliation Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Puttee.*)

1° m., 1193 (i); 2° m., 2790; 2° m., and in Com., 3259, 3260 (ii).

BILL (No. 96) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *German.*)

1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 138.)

BILL (No. 97) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)

1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 148.)

BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)

1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i).

BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)

1°*, 1294; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Sterling Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 194.)

BILL (No. 101) To Incorporate the London Loan Company of Canada.—(Mr. *McGugan.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1815 (i).

BILL (No. 102) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°m., 1812; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 5892; 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 181.)

BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Royal Trust Company.—(Mr. *Casgrain.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 185.)

BILL (No. 104) To incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., 6655; on Order for Com., 6846, 7137, 7339; in Com., 7339, 7400; 3°m., 7468 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 88).

BILL (No. 105) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Standard Car Truck Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)

1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 192.)

BILL (No. 106) To amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)

1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i), 3282 (ii).

BILL (No. 107) To incorporate the Empire Accident and Surety Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)

1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 2755; 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c* 118).

BILL (No. 108) Respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)

1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 171.)

BILL (No. 109) To correct a clerical error in the Act to incorporate the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1°*, 1378 (i); 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 2581 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 18.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 110) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)

1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 111) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)

1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 116.)

BILL (No. 112) To incorporate the Canada Industrials Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)

1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 113) To incorporate the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)

1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 3225; 3°*, 3225 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 188.)

BILL (No. 114) Respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool.*)

1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 165.)

BILL (No. 115) To incorporate the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Tobin.*)

1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1816; in Com., 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 83).

BILL (No. 116) Respecting the Restigouche Boom Company, and to change its name to 'The Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Company.—(Mr. *Logan.*)

1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1816 (i).

BILL (No. 117) To incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)

1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 128).

BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)

1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 90).

BILL (No. 119) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)

1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 3582; in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 120) Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)

1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 143.)

BILL (No. 121) To incorporate the Consolidated Trust Corporation.—(Mr. *McColl.*)

1°*, 1675; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 110).

BILL (No. 122) Respecting the Rathbun Company.—(Mr. *Harty.*)

1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 180).

BILL (No. 123) To incorporate the Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)

1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4588 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 131).

BILL (No. 124) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Stewart.*)

1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii (3 *Edward VII, c.* 129).

BILL (No. 125 To incorporate the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. *Guthrie.*)

1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 125).

BILL (No. 126) Respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. *Thompson.*)

1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 153).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 127) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George M. Depew.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 112).

BILL (No. 128, from the Senate) For the relief of William Francis Schooley.—(Mr. *Boyd*).
1°*, 2100; 2° m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 189).

BILL (No. 129) Respecting the Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Guthrie*).
1°*, 1936; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2756 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 111).

BILL (No. 130) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Henderson*).
1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285, 3823 (ii).

BILL (No. 131) To incorporate the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *McIsaac*).
1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 5093, 5359; 3°*, 5360 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 149).

BILL (No. 132) To incorporate the Père Marquette International Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Cowan*).
1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 175).

BILL (No. 133) To prohibit the importation, manufacture, or sale of Cigarettes.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1° m., 2014 (i); 2° m., 3286 (ii).

BILL (No. 134) To incorporate the Erie, Ontario Power Company.—(Mr. *German*).
1°*, 2100; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751, 3982; 3°*, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 119).

BILL (No. 135) To incorporate the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Railway Company.—(Mr. *Logan*).
1°*, 2100 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978, 6399; 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 178).

BILL (No. 136) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 2100 (i); 2° m., 3288 (ii).

BILL (No. 137) To regulate the sale and provide for the inspection of Textile Fabrics.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°, 2101 (i); 2° m., 3294 (ii).

BILL (No. 138) To amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1°*, 2100 (i); wthdn., 11302 (v).

BILL (No. 139) Respecting the St. Mary's River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4591 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 187).

BILL (No. 140) To incorporate the Cardiff Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4591; 3°*, 4592 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 103).

BILL (No. 141) Respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c,* 152).

BILL (No. 142) Respecting the Elgin and Havelock Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fowler*).
1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 117).

BILL (No. 143) Respecting the Canadian Northwest Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2300 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 3226, 3582, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 96).

BILL (No. 144) Respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 2395 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 134).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 145) Respecting the Quebec Bridge Company; and to change its name to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(*Mr. Power*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4586; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 177).

BILL (No. 146) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *Vrooman*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 144).

BILL (No. 147) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4672; order for Com., 4868 (ii); 5555 (remarks), 5882, 6198 (iii); ref. back to Sel. Com., 7812; in Com., 9419; 3°*, 9431 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 196).

BILL (No. 148) respecting certain Trust Funds of the Diocese of Moosonee.—(Mr. *Osler*.)
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in. Com. and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 157).

BILL (No. 149) To incorporate the Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Company. (Mr. *Cowan*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4587; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 126).

BILL (No. 150) To incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Galliher*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., 5559; in Com., and 3°*, 5585; Sen. Amts., 6847, 6894 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 109).

BILL (No. 151) To incorporate the St. Joseph Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Calvert*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii).

BILL (No. 152) To incorporate the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Riley*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 191).

BILL (No. 153) To incorporate the Mount Royal Savings Bank.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2720 (ii); wthdn., 10831 (v).

BILL (No. 154) To incorporate the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Railway Company.—(Mr. *German*).
1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4592; 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 162).

BILL (No. 155) Respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts.—(Mr. *Demers. St. John and Iberville*).
1°*, 2501 (ii); 2° m., 8243; in Com., 8244, 8360; 3°*, 8369 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14769 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 21).

BILL (No. 156) To incorporate the Longueuil Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5558; 3°*, 5558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 156).

BILL (No. 157) To incorporate the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); M to ref. back to Sel. Com., 5238; in Com., 5985; 3°*, 5989 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 86).

BILL (No. 158) To incorporate the St. Chrysostôme Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); ref. back to Sel. Com., 7399 (iii); in Com., 7771; 3°*, 7772 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 186).

BILL (No. 159) To incorporate the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 102).

BILL (No. 160) To incorporate the Stewart River Development Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 160)—*Con.*

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 195).

BILL (No. 161) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Woolf Valve Gear Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 205).

BILL (No. 162) Respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, and to change its name to the "Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company."—(Mr. *German*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 136).

BILL (No. 163) Respecting the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Thompson*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3796, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 198).

BILL (No. 164) To incorporate the Pacific Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Galliher*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 3796 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 174).

BILL (No. 165) To incorporate the Algonquin Lumber and Power Company.—(Mr. *Gould*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., 5361; 3°*, 5361 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 77).

BILL (No. 166) To incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gauvreau*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5890; 3°*, 5891.

BILL (No. 167) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, and to change its name to "The Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company."—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

BILL (No. 168) To incorporate the Chicoutimi and North Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Girard*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii).

BILL (No. 169) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of James Sinclair McDougall.—(Mr. *Gallery*.)

M. to rec. Pet., 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 151).

BILL (No. 170) To incorporate the Nepigon Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)

M. to rec. Pet., 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

BILL (No. 171) To incorporate the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company—(Mr. *Stephens*).

1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 105).

BILL (No. 172) To incorporate the City and County Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Rosamond*.)

1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3797 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 107).

BILL (No. 173) To change the name of Hudson's Bay.—(Mr. *Maclean*.)

1°m., 2794 (ii).

BILL (No. 174) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Paterson*.)

Res. prop., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; 1°* of B., 3126; 2°*, 4010; in Com., 4010; 3°m., 4187; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 14).

BILL (No. 175) Respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)

1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5583, 5960, 6199; 3°*, 6202 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 104).

BILL (No. 176) To incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.—(Mr. *German*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 176)—*Con.*

1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883; 3°*, 5887 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 101).

BILL (No. 177) Respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. *McIsaac*.)

M. to receive Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219; 2°*, 3583; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 140).

BILL (No. 178) Respecting the encouragement of the construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)

Res. prop., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; 2°, and in Com., 4678 (ii); 5871; 3°*, 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 17).

BILL (No. 179) To amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)

1°m., 3298 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6918; 3°*, 6921 (iii). (3 *Edward VII* c. 63).

BILL (No. 180) To incorporate the Prince Edward Island Ferry Company.—(Mr. *Emmerson*.)

1°*, 3391; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914; 3°, 7914 (iv).

BILL (No. 181) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *German*.)

1°m., 3391 (ii).

BILL (No. 182) To amend Chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

1°m., 3392; 2°*, 4203; in Com., 4203; 3°*, 4213 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 50).

BILL (No. 183) Respecting the Desjardins Canal.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

1°m., 3393; 2°*, 4213; in Com., and 3°*, 4213 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 16).

BILL (No. 184) To amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)

1°m., 3622; 2°*, 4213; in Com., 4213, 4674 (ii); 3°*, 5243 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 46).

BILL (No. 185) Respecting the Canadian Steel Company.—(Mr. *German*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 3797; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 99).

BILL (No. 186) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4007; in Com., 4007; 3°*, 4009 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 26).

BILL (No. 187) To amend the Electric Light Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°m., 4007; in Com., and 3°*, 4007 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 20).

BILL (No. 188) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4009; in Com., 4009, 4187; 3°*, 4203 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 72).

BILL (No. 189) To incorporate the Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Birkett*.)

1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3°m., 7485; agreed to (Y., 57; N., 9); 7486 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 100).

BILL (No. 190) Respecting Queen's College, Kingston.—(Mr. *Harty*.)

1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4404 (ii).

BILL (No. 191, from the Senate) To incorporate the Home Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Russell*.)

1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 127).

BILL (No. 192) To enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr *Puttee*.)

1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 5558, 5584, 5887, 5960, 6845; 3°*, 6845 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 203).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 193) To amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford.*)
1° m., 3970; 2°*, 4221; in Com., 4221; 3°*, 4224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 194) Respecting infectious or contagious Diseases affecting Animals.—(Mr. *Fisher*).
1°*, 4003; 2° m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690; 3°*, 4691 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 195, from the Senate) For the Relief of James Reid Steele.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 4178; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 193.)

BILL (No. 196, from the Senate) For the Relief of William Allen.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 4179; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 78.)

BILL (No. 197, from the Senate) Respecting the Rocky Mountains Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 4262; 2°*, 4404 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 184.)

BILL (No. 198) Respecting Penny Banks.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1° m., 4175 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793; 3°*, 10798 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 199) Respecting the Good Shepherd Reformatory in the City of St. John, N.B.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 4178; 2°, and in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4842 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 200) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1° m., 4442; in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); 2°*, and in Com., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn., 12493 (v.)

BILL (No. 201) To provide for further Advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop. 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445; 1°* of B., 4486 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5417; 3°, m., 5657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 202, from the Senate) To incorporate the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. *Russell.*)
1 *, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6846 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 155.)

BILL (No. 203) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 4261; 1°*, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 197.)

BILL (No. 204, from the Senate) To amend the Act relating to Naturalization and Aliens.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 5137; 2°, and in Com., 5872; 3° m., 5991 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 205, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 5238, 2°*, 5362; in Com., and 3°*, 6657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 200.)

BILL (No. 206) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1903.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5243 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 207) To prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of adulterated, process or renovated Butter, Oleomargarine, Butterine or other substitute for Butter; and to prevent the improper marking of Butter.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 207)—*Con.*
Res. prop., 4960; in Com. on Res., 5052 (ii); 1° of B., 5240; 2°, and in Com., 5419, 5430, 5845; 3°*, 5853 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 208) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Sir *William Mulock.*)
1° m., 5240; 2° m., 5657; in Com., 5659, 5853; 3°*, 5871 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 209) Respecting certain Aid for the Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Res. prop., 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5100 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; 2°, and in Com., 5589, 5786; 3°*, 5824 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 210) Respecting the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool.*)
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 211) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 2°*, 5585; in Com., 6428 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 164.)

BILL (No. 212) To incorporate the Alliance Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Russell.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 4958 (ii); 1°*, 5512; 2° m., 5585; in Com., 7470; 3°*, 7478 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 213) To incorporate the Citizens' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5990; in Com., 7478; 3°*, 7479 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 214) For the Relief of Florence D. Graves.—(Mr. *Scott.*)
1°*, 5581; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 123.)

BILL (No. 215) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 5581; 2°*, 6638; M. for Com., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746 (v); wthdn., 14768 (vi).

BILL (No. 216) Respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher*).
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 154.)

BILL (No. 217) Respecting Penitentiaries.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 5763 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v); Order dschgd, 13444 (vi).

BILL (No. 218) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1903, and the 30th June, 1904.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Remarks, 6170; 1°*, 2°*, 6170; in Com., 6171; 3°*, 6172 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 219, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting the punishment of Fradulent Debtors.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 220) Respecting Government and Post Office Savings Banks.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
1°, 6353; 2°*, and in Com., 6814; 3°*, 6815 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 221) Further to amend the Act respecting Public and Reformatory Prisons.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 6427 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8087; 3°*, 8087 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 51).

BILL (No. 222) Respecting Dominion Notes.—(Mr. *Fielding*)
Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; 2°, and in Com., 6913; 3°*, 6915 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 43).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 223) To amend the Act of 1899, respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6448; 1°*, of B., 6456; 2°*, and in Com., 6806; 3°*, 6814 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 45).

BILL (No. 224) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1° m., 6538; 2°, and in Com., 6896; 3°*, 6913 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 225) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; 1°* of B., 6543; 2°, and in Com., 6915; 3°*, 6917 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 66.)

BILL (No. 226) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
Res. prop., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6543; 1°* of B., 6545; 2°, and in Com., 6917; 3°*. 6918 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 227, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act, 1902.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 228, from the Senate) For the relief of Stephen Wilson.—(Mr. *Wade*).
1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9149; in Com. and 3°*, 9152 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 202.)

BILL (No. 229, from the Senate) For the relief of Ellen McDermid.—(Mr. *Birkett*).
1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9148; in Com., and 3°*, 9149 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 150.)

BILL (No. 230, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting Offences connected with Trade and Breaches of Contract.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 231) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Keller Heater Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *McIsaac*).
M. to rec. Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294; 2°*, 7487 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 137.)

BILL (No. 232) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Sifton*).
1° m., 7294 (iii); 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991, 9350 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 233) Respecting the Manufacture of Binder Twine in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300, 7353; 1°*, 2°*. 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii), 7728 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 234) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. *Henderson*).
1°, 7565 (iv).

BILL (No. 235) To provide for the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1° m., 7658; Res. prop., 7915; M. for Com. on Res., 8406, 8484, 8559, 8617, 8656, 8718, 8808, 8918, 9082, 9152, 9218, 9351, 9431, 9459, 9582, 9683, 9820, 9980 (iv), 10102, 10243; agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10408; in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°, and in Com. on B., 10412, 10538, 11190, 11302, 11833, 11959, 12074, 12146, 12221 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12720 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 71.)

BILL (No. 236, from the Senate) For the relief of Harford Ashley.—(Mr. *Porter*).
1°*, 8115; 2°*, 9431 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 12146 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 80.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 237, from the Senate) Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1° m., 12494 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12777; 3°*, 12779 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 67.)

BILL (No. 238) To amend chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1899, respecting the Bounties on Steel and Iron, and to provide for the payment of Bounties on certain articles manufactured from Steel.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6629 (iii); in Com. on prop. Res., 7923; 1°* of B., 7988 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10799; 3°*, 10802 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 239) To provide for the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores mined in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
Res. prop., 6169 (iii), in Com. on Res., 8195; 1°* of B., 8230 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10798; 3°*, 10799 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 240) To assist in establishing and maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain, for publication in the Canadian Press.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
Res. prop., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of B., 8243 (iv); 2°m., 10715; in Com., 10718; 3°*, 10741 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 70.)

BILL (No. 241) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1903.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1°*; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 8404 (iv).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 242) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)
1° m., 8321 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10741; 3°*, 10742 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 243) To amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)
Res. prop. 203 (i); withdn., 2582; Res. prop., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii), 8087; in Com. on Res., 8369; 1°*; 2°* of B.; in Com. and 3°*, 8372 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 29).

BILL (No. 244) Respecting the Western Assurance Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1°*, 8406; 2°*, 8559 (iv); in Com. and 3°*, 10903 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 201).

BILL (No. 245) To further amend the Civil Service Act.—(Sir *Wm. Mulock*.)
1° m., 9079 (iv); Res. prop., 10410; wthdn., 11301 (v).

BILL (No. 246, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting Freedom of Labour.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 247, from the Senate) To amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 248, from the Senate) Respecting the incorporation of Mining Companies.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 249) To incorporate the Westminster Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
M. to rec. Pet., 10489; 1°, 10744; 2°*, 10903 (v).

BILL (No. 250) Respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 250)—*Con.*

Prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 10759; 1°*; 2°*; and in Com., 10792, 11406; 3°*, 11422 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 27.)

BILL (No. 251) To amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

1° m., 11159 (v); Order dischd., 13444 (vi).

BILL (No. 252) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)

Res. prop., 10410; in Com. on Res., 10802; 1°* of B., 11422; 2°*, and in Com., 12295; 3°*, 12500 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 44.)

BILL (No. 253) To increase the Representation of the North-west Territories in the Senate.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 11691; 2°*, and in Com., 12302; 3°*, 12304 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 42.)

BILL (No. 254) Further to amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 11692; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 12301 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 74.)

BILL (No. 255) To provide for the Appointment of an Additional Judge of the Superior Court of Quebec.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Res. prop., 11426; in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° of Res., 11833; 1°* of B. 11833; 2°*, and in Com., 12301; 3°*, 12302 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 28.)

BILL (No. 256) To provide for Advances to the Government of the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Res. prop., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°* of B., 12330 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12843; 3°*, 12845 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 41.)

BILL (No. 257) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Sir *William Mulock.*)

Res. prop., 10410, 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330; M. for Com., 12493; in Com. on Res., 12500; 1°* of B., 12574 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 13808, 13833; 3° m., 13942; Sen, Amts., 14845 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 9.)

BILL (No. 258) To amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Res. prop., 8332 (iv); Res. wthdn., 10715; Res. prop., 11189; in Com. on Res., 12574; 1°* of B., 12584 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12944; 3°*, 12983 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 59.)

BILL (No. 259) To amend the North-west Territories Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 12610; 2°, and in Com., 13853; 14287; 3°*, 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 40.)

BILL (No. 260) To amend the Act respecting certain Works constructed in or over Navigable Waters.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

In Com. on Res., 12779; 1°* of B., 12781; 2°, and in Com., 12984; wthdn., 14768 (vi).

BILL (No. 261) Respecting the Pilotage District of Montreal, and the Port and Pilotage District of Quebec.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

Res. wthdn., 12493 (v); in Com. on Res., 12781; 1°* of B. 12800; 2° m., 12984; 2°, and in Com. 13627; 3° m., 13937 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 48.)

BILL (No. 262) To amend the Act respecting the Harbour of North Sydney, in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

In Com. on Res., 12304; wthdn., 12492 (v); in Com. on Res., 12800; 1°* of B., 12801; 2°, and in Com., 12993; 3°*, 12994 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 39.)

BILL (No. 263) To amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 263)—*Con.*

In Com. on Res., 12801; 1°* of B., 12805; 2°, and in Com., 12994; 3°, 13560 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 264) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ethier.*)

1°*; 2°*; and ref. to Ry. Com., 12993; in Com., and 3°*, 13330 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 172.)

BILL (No. 265) Respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1°, 13667; 2°*, and in Com., 14297; 3°*, 14299 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 61.)

BILL (No. 266) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)

Prop. Res., 13264; in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808; 2°, and in Com., 14311; 3°*, 14313 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 24.)

BILL (No. 267) Respecting the Librarians of Parliament.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14299; 3°*, 14300 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 32.)

BILL (No. 268) Respecting the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14300, 14403; 3°*, 14405 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 269) Respecting the Management and Control of Public and other Works.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 14281; 2°, and in Com., 14741; 3°*, 14755 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 53.)

BILL (No. 270) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the Construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Prop. Res., 13549; in Com. on Res., 14313, 14428; 1°*, 14519; 2°, and in Com., 14735, 14740; 3°*, 14741 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 57.)

BILL (No. 271) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1904.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 14765; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14768 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 4.)

BILL (No. 272) To authorize aid to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company towards the completion of its undertaking, and to confirm an Agreement between His Majesty and the said Company, with respect to such aid.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Prop. Res., 14523; on Order for Com. on Res., 14690; 1°* of B., 14734; 2° m., 14734; in Com., and 3°*, 14735 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 54.)

BILL (No. 273) To amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1897.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

In Com. on Ways and Means, 14755; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14758 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 15.)

BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE OF MANILLA, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7566 (v).

BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE OF SISAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8085 (iv).

Binder Twine Bounties B. No. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300, 7353; 1°*; 2°*, 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii), 7728 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 5.)

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7305, 7353 (iii).

BINDER TWINE, CIRCULAR ISSUED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).

——— CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4180 (ii).

——— COST IN 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 447 (i).

——— INSPECTION, ADMINISTRATION OF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).

——— INSPECTOR, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii).

——— INSPECTION, METHOD OF COLLECTING PENALTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 14684 (vi).

——— INSPECTOR HAYCOCK, DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).

——— INSPECTOR'S REP.: M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc. in Rep. on Agriculture, &c., 13788, 14043 (vi).

——— NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 3798 (ii).

——— PRICES FOR CURRENT YEAR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 203 (i).

——— PRICES FIXED FOR PENITENTIARY SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1590 (i).

——— QUANTITY, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 2311 (i).

——— QUANTITY IMPORTED FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7565 (iv).

——— REP. OF AG. COM., DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES: M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc., 13788, 14043 (vi).

——— RESIDENCES OF PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4182 (ii).

BIRKETT, MR. T., M.P., LEASE OF LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 12217 (v).

BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOUR MASTER FROM ALBERT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

BLACK, A. W., ENGLISH M.P., STATEMENTS *re* COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND GERMAN CONSUL, 12218 (v).

BLACK BROOK, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).

BLAIR, HON. A. G., RESIGNATION: Announcement (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6540 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6522 (iii).

——— Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

BLANKETS, CLOTHING, INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).

BLANKETS, WEBCLOTH, PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 10102, 10410, 10714, 10954 (v).

BLIND RIVER, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).

——— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 1298 (i).

BLOOMFIELD POSTMASTER, N.B., CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BLUESHANK, P.E.I., STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).

Boards of Trade Incorp. B. (No. 247, from the Senate). [This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BOIS BRULÉ, TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

BONAVENTURE EAST, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

BOND-HAY TREATY: *See* 'Finance-German.'

BONDING PRIVILEGES WITH U. S.: *See* 'Coasting, &c.'

BONDED WAREHOUSES, P.E.I., RENTAL, CLOSING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

BOOK-KEEPING *re* I.C.R. EXPENDITURE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8269 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 12877

BOOTS FOR MAIL CARRIERS: *See* 'Post Office, &c.'

BOPP, GERMAN CONSUL, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

——— *See* 'German Tariff.'

BORDEN, MR., RY. POLICY: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'

BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6790.

Bounties, &c.: *See* 'Lead, &c.', 'Steel and Iron'

BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, N.B., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).

——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).

BOW RIVER BRIDGE, CANMORE, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).

BOYD, SIR JOHN, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5990 (iii).

——— RELATIVES IN GOVT. EMPLOY: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 4185 (ii).

BRACEBRIDGE, CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960

——— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).

BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 157 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. to ref. back to sel. com., 5238; in Com., 5985; 3°*, 5989 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 86).

Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 940; 2°* 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5585 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 85).

BRANTFORD DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).

BRANTFORD ELECTORAL DISTRICT: in Com. on Representation B. 66, 10919 (v).

———*See* 'Representation B. 66.

BRANT INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., P.E.I., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

BRETON COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).

BRIDGES OVER CANALS, GOVERNMENT MAINTENANCE OF, &C.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BRIDGES OF I.C.R., STRENGTHENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).

BRIDGEWATER, N.S., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).

BRIGADE CAMP, SUSSEX, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).

British Cable News Service, G. B. and Can. B. No. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*). Res. prop., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of B., 8243 (iv); 2°m., 10715; in Com., 10718; 3°*, 10741 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 70).

——Remarks *re* (Mr. *Gourley*) 1396 (vi).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 853; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 87).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup. 13304 (vi).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

ASSAY OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii), 13965 13779 (vi).

ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

BURRARD, CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

CANNING INDUSTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

——*See* 'Fraser,' 'Salmon,' &c.

CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO., *re* LIARD RIVER MINERS: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).

——*See* 'Indians.'

COLUMBIA RIVER, ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).

CROW'S NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).

DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

——GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

FALSE CREEK, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C.: M. (Mr. *Earle*) for Copies*, 2337 (i).

——LEASE TO KELLY & BURNETT: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2758, 2919 (ii).

——Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Earle*) 3129 (ii), 5513, 6354 (iii).

FISHERIES PROTECTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

FISHERIES STEAMERS, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 5278 (iii).

FLAGSHIP, BRITISH, REMOVAL FROM ESQUIMALT: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

FRASER RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRASER RIVER SALMON INDUSTRY, COMPLAINTS FROM CANNER'S ASSOCIATION TEL.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

——Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

——*See* 'Salmon,' &c.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).

HARDY BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).

HAZLETON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

'HOT AIR LINE' RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

INDIANS: in Com of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——AGENTS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iii).

——FISHING RIGHTS *re* INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7264 (iii).

——MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii), 13786 (vi).

——STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, ROYAL COMMISSION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).

JUDGES, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

KELLY & BURNETT, LEASE OF FALSE CREEK: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——*See* 'False Creek.'

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

——CORRECTION, &C: in Com., 14519 (vi).

LABOUR COMMISSION, REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 8116 (iv).

—— REP. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 7198 (iii).

—— COMMISSIONERS, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 1595 (i).

LABOUR TROUBLES, ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, B.C.*) 945 (i).

——*See* 'Industrial.'

LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).

LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

LUMBER TRADE, TEL. FROM MANUFACTURERS: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14766 (vi).

MCCRANEY, MR. W., EX-M.P., LETTER *re* LEGISLATION: Read (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5362 (iii).

MARINE SIGNAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

MILITARY RESERVE AT PORT MOODY: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).

NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

—— RACINE BROS., CLAIMS AGAINST CONTRACTORS: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

—— *See* 'Racine.'

NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

NICOLA-KAMLOOPS, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).

OFFICERS' MESS., STR. 'QUADRA,' REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

PORT MOODY, MILITARY RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B.C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS'

BRITISH COLUMBIA--*Con.*

'QUADRA' STR.—*Con.*

MESS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).
QUATSINO CITY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
QUESNEL DAM, OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 11557 (v).
RACINE BROS., CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
——— AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS : Read (Mr. *Monk*) 7162 (iii).
——— Letters read from Dep. Minister of Labour, &c., 7164 (iii).
ROSSLAND, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
ROYAL COMMISSION *re* INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES : in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
SALMON COMMISSIONERS : M. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii).
SALMON INDUSTRY, FRASER RIVER, TELS. FROM CANNERS' ASSOCIATION, &C.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).
——— INCREASED CAPACITY OF HATCHERIES : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).
SALMON SHIPPED TO FRANCE FROM B.C., TARIFF *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE OF, &C.: M. for O.C's., &c.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 706 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2016 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print, 2675 (ii).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7258 (iii).
TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).
UPPER SALMON RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND, TELEPHONE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
VANCOUVER POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— INSPECTOR, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
VICTORIA AND VANCOUVER ISLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
WILLIAMS HEAD, QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

BRITISH JOURNALISTS' AND MEMBERS' VISIT TO CAN., RECEPTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 7488 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 2105 (i).

B.N.A. BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE KING, EXPENSES *re* : in Com. of Sup., 14279 (vi).

BRITTON, JUDGE, CHARGES *re* INVESTIGATION OF TREADGOLD COMMISSION, PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11065 (v).

——— *See* 'Treadgold.'

BROAD COVE, N.S., HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).

Brockville and North-Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1° m., 1193 ; 2°*, 1328 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1295 ; 2°*, 1512 (i) ; in Com., 6655 ; on Order for Com., 6846, 7137, 7339 ; in Com., 7339, 7400 ; 3° m., 7468 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 88.)
——— M. (Mr. *Galliher*) for Com., 7339 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).
——— Appeal to Speaker from Dep. Speaker's Ruling (Mr. *Taylor*) 7342 (iii).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7401 (iii) ; M. (Mr. *Speaker*) for 3°, Agreed to (Y. 64 ; N. 35) 7468 (iii) ; 3° m. (Mr. *Galliher*) 7468 ; Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7469 (iii).
——— on M. to resume adjnd. Deb., 6847 (iii).

Brockville and Western Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 67 (Mr. *Taylor*) 1°*, 813 (i).

BRONTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).

BRONTE LIGHTHOUSE : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5755, 5757 (iii).

BROOKFIELD STATION, ENLARGEMENT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

BROWN, MRS., GRATUITY TO : in COM. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

BRUCE COUNTY, REPRESENTATION IN PARLT. : in Com. on Representation B. 66, 10940 (v).
——— *See* 'Representation B. 66.'

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s B. No. 98 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1204 ; 2°*, 1512 (i).

BRUCE MINES AND ALGOMA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

BRUCE MINES, DREDGING : in Com of Sup., 5911 (iii).

BRUNET, ARTHUR, AND DOM. ELECTION ACT : M. for Pets., O.Cs., &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 101 (i).
——— *See* 'St. James,' &c.

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

BUDGET, THE: Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1378, 1743 (i).
——— Reply (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1462, 2192 (i).
Debate : (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1596 ; (Mr. *Tarte*) 1619 ; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1643 ; (Mr. *Gourley*) 1657 ; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1681 ; (Mr. *Davis*) 1715 ; (Mr. *Speaker*, irrelevancy of debate, Ruling) 1735, 1742 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1740 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) on Ques. of Order, 1743 ; (Mr. *Heyd*) 1764 ; (Mr. *Blain*) 1785 ; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1799, 1816 ; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1825 ; (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1832 ; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 1860 ; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1876 ; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 1891 ; (Mr. *Bell*) 1907 ; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 1937 ; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1946 ; (Mr. *Holmes*) 1953 ; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1974 ; (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1994 ; (Mr. *Hackett*) 2017 ; (Mr. *Schell*) 2025 ; (Mr. *Morin*) 2034 ; (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 2036 ; (Mr. *Kemp*) 2050 ; (Mr. *Galliher*) 2063 ; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2076 ; (Mr. *Grant*) 2109 ; (Mr. *Broder*) 2119 ; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2131 ; (Mr. *Puttee*) 2149 ; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2167 ; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2176 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Remarks, *re* Winnipeg Speech, 2192 ; (Mr. *Clarke*) 2206 ; (Mr. *Ball*) 2234 (i).

BUDGET, AMT. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Negatived (Y. 54 ; N. 107) 2235 (i).

BUDGET, THE: (Remarks) 1114 (i).

—— REP. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 410 (i).

BUFFALO HERD IN BANFF PARK: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

BUILDINGS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).

—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 412, 421, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).

—— N.W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i), 13129 (vi).

—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).

—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).

—— OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i).

—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i), 5841 (iii), 13053, 14245 (vi).

—— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

—— *See* 'Dom. Buildings.'

Burglary Guarantee: *See* 'Dom. Guarantee.

BURK'S FALLS, MAGANETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).

BURLINGTON CHANNEL, PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup , 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).

BURRARD, B.C., CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

BUSINESS OF THE HSE., COMPLAINTS, &C.: (Mr. *Monk*) 1343 (i).

—— DELAY IN PRINTING BILLS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 482 (i).

—— INACCURACY OF STATEMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4347 (ii).

—— LATE SITTINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3207 (ii).

—— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) *re* Victoria Day Adjournment, 3127 (ii).

—— ON M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) TO TAKE IN MONDAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3708 (ii).

—— PRIVATE BILLS PROCEDURE: Remarks (Mr. *LaRiviére*) 5138 (iii).

—— PUBLIC BILLS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 2300 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2386 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1110 (i), 3794, 5051 (ii), 5581, 5959, 7090 (iii), 7728, 7812 (iv).

—— *re* SUPPL. ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 4957 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 2394 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 871 (i).

—— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. No. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) Res. prop., 4960 ; in Com. on Res., 5052 (ii) ; 1° of B., 5240 ; 2°, and in Com , 5419, 5430, 5845 ; 3°*, 5853 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 6.)

BUTTER ADULTERATION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Blain*) *re* Irish Butter in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).

BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING, REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 5414 (iii).

BUTTER, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10745 (v).

—— *See* 'Canadian.'

BUTTER MADE AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593, 1857 (i).

CABINET CHANGES: *See* 'Ministerial Changes.'

CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

Cable News Service between G. B. and Can: *See* 'British Cable.'

CACOUNA WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).

CADET TRAINING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 89).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY., REGULATIONS *re* MORTGAGE DEEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).

'CAMPANA,' INVESTIGATION *re* WRECK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE AND MAIL BAGS, AUTHORITY TO USE: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14286 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*) 14219 (vi).

—— *See* 'Mail Bags.'

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, EMPLYMT. OF SESSIONAL MESSENGERS: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14286 (vi).

—— *See* 'Franking.'

CAMPBELL, D. J., POSTMASTER AT MACLEOD, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).

CAMPBELLFORD, PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

—— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).

CAMPBELLTON, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).

—— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).

CAMPOBELLO, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

Canada Atlantic Railway Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1642 ; 2°*, 1816 (i) ; in Com., and 3*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 90).

C. A. RY., STRIKE OF SECTION MEN: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 2303 (i).

CAN. AND AUSTRALIA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

Canada Bank: *See* 'Sterling Bank of Canada.'

Canada Central Railway Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 1294; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 91).

CAN. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (iii), 7728 (iv).

Canada Industrial Corporation, Limited, Incorp. Co.'s B. No. 112 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 95).

CANADA IRON FOUNDRY, TORONTO, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).

—— REPRESENTATIONS TO MIN. OF LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 7205 (iii).

Canada National Railway and Transport Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1025 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 92).

Canada North-west Land Company, Limited, Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°* 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 93).

Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation Co.'s B. No. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2303; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 94).

CAN. AND SOUTH AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).

CANADA STEEL CO., RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14479 (vi).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 14 (Mr. *Law*) 1°*, 113; 2° m., 1061; in Com., 1062.

CANADIAN APPLES: *See* 'Apples.'

CANADIAN ARTISTS AND ART GALLERY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

—— *See* 'Art,' &c.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION, GOVT. AID *re* TUBERCULOSIS: in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

CANADIAN BEEF SUPPLIED TO BRITISH TROOPS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 483 (i)

—— *See* 'Cattle.'

CANADIAN BUTTER, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).

—— *See* 'Butter.'

CANADIAN CATTLE EMBARGO IN G. B.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

—— *See* 'Cattle.'

CAN. CENTRAL AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

CANADIAN COAST LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 4164 (ii).

CANADIAN COMPANY (NEW) INCORP. B. No. 83 (MR. LEMIEUX): M. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2753 (ii).

—— *See* 'New.'

CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU, SUIT AGAINST W. T. R. PRESTON: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).

CANADIAN EXHIBITS AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).

CANADIAN FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

—— *See* 'Fisheries.'

CANADIAN FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION, APPROVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3537 (ii).

—— O. C. *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).

CANADIAN-GERMAN FISCAL POLICY, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (vi).

—— *See* 'German Tariff.'

CANADIAN MAIL VIA NEW YORK, NUMBER OF TONS, &C.: (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).

CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).

CANADIAN MINT, ERECTION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 10955 (v).

—— *See* 'Ottawa.'

CANADIAN MOUNTED RIFLES, MEDALS, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

—— *See* 'Militia.'

Canadian, New Co.: *See* 'New Canadian.'

Canadian Northern Railway Co.'s B. No. 110 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 97).

—— **Aid B. No. 209** (Mr. *Blair*) Res. prop., 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5100 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; 2°, and in Com., 5589, 5786; 3°*., 5824 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 7).

CAN. NORTHERN RY., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MACKENZIE & MANN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 916 (i).

—— Ret. *re* Estimate of Cost laid on Table, 5052.

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. No. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2300 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 3226, 3582, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 96).

Canadian Order of Woodmen: *See* 'Woodmen.'

Canadian Pacific Railway Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 98).

C. P. R., ARRANGEMENTS WITH JAMES BAY RY. CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

—— CAR SHORTAGE AND FREIGHT CONGESTION IN N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation from N.W.T.'

—— ELKHORN BRANCH SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

—— EXPENDITURE FOR ROLLING STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 2311 (i).

—— EXTENSION TO WINNIPEG BEACH SUBSIDY: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

—— AND GREAT NORTHWEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

—— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXES IN MAN. AND N. W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 916 (i).

—— LANDS AND SCHOOL TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).

—— LANDS IN MAN., TAX EXEMPTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 667 (i).

C.P.R., Private Car No. 001, Improvements, &c., Payment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, St. John*) 14282 (vi).
——— Steamers leaving St. John : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup. 14076 (vi).
——— *See* 'Allan Line.'
——— Transcontinental Trains, Water Supply : Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).
Can. Press Despatches: *See* 'British Cable, &c.'
Canadian Steel Co.'s B. No. 185 (Mr. *German*) 1°, 3708; 2°, 3797; in Com., and 3°, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 99).
Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) 1°*, 3864; 2°, 4132 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3° m., 7485; agreed to (Y. 57; N. 9) 7486 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 100).
——— in Com.: Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7479 (iii). Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).
Canadian Trade with Japan : *See* 'Japan Exhibition.'
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 176 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883; 3°*, 5887 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 101).
Canadian Yukon Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 159 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 102).

CANALS :

'Alert,' Str., Canal Surveys : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi.)
Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).
——— Locks : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
Beauharnois Canal, Flooding Lands, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
Canals : in Com. of Sup., 7803, 8268 (iv); 12895, 14134 (vi).
——— Conc., 8374 (iv).
Canal Collectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12933 (vi).
——— Employees, Increases of Wages : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 2303 (i).
——— in Ont. and Quebec, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
——— Miscellaneous Vote : in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).
——— Operating Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 12920 (vi).
——— Tolls, Collectors Duties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12929 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— Tonnage Dues, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 874 (i).
Casselman, Lockmaster, Williamsburg Canal, Superannuation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
Chambly, Collector of Tolls, Salary : Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
——— Dismissal of Jules Quesnel : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
——— *See* 'Moreau.'
——— Electric Station By-Wash : in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

CANALS—*Con.*

Chambly, Land Damages : in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
——— Landing Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
——— Macadamizing Tow Path : in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).
Cornwall, Electrical Equipment for Lock Gates : in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
——— Lighting, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii), 12895 (vi).
——— Supt.'s Duties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).
Corry Award, 7557 (iii).
Engineers Salaries *re* Canals : in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Equipment : in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii), 14150 (vi).
Galops, Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).
——— surveys, lifting boulders : in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— Dam : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12608 (vi).
——— Rapids Channel, Deepening, &c.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) Agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
——— deepening, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).
——— *See* 'Farrans,' 'North Channel,' 'Williamsburg,' &c.
Grenville, Guide Piers at Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
——— Payment to Henry Tucker *re* Investigation : in Com. of Sup., 14166 (vi).
Gibault, Mr. Edward, Gratuity to Widow : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Howie, F. W., Legal Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).
Iroquois Canals, Electric Lighting : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901.
Lachine, Electrical Appliances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).
——— Enlargement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— Gratuities : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
——— Lighting : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).
——— Lock Gate Protection : in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— Masonry Wall, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
Lockmen, &c., on Canals : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Mill Street, Paving, Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Moreau, Mr. H., Collector on Chambly Canal : Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
——— *See* 'Chambly—Dismissal,' &c.
Morrison, Mrs., Claims *re* Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).
Murray, Purchase of Mr. Johnson's House : in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
——— Goodrich, Mr., Removal : Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).
——— Wire Fencing : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
North Channel and Dam, Galops Rapids : in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vi).
——— Completion : in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— *See* 'Farrans,' 'Galops,' &c.

CANALS—*Con.*

NORTH CHANNEL CONSTRUCTION OF DAM: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv).
O'LEARY, J. & M., CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS; in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPORTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
PETERBOROUGH CANAL, LIFT LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE PIER, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
PRIVILEGE, Ques. of (Mr. *Schell*) *re* appmnt. of Mr. Stewart on Canals, 14599 (vi).
QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
RAMY'S POINT, WELLAND CANAL, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— *See* 'Welland'.
RAPIDE PLAT ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— BIRKETT, Mr. T., M.P., LEASE OF LAND, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 12217 (v).
——— CONCESSION ST. BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 13302 (vi).
——— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE, EQUIPMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 12845–7 (vi).
ST. OURS, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
——— STOP LOGS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE, COALING ACCOMMODATION *re* SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iii).
——— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii)., 12904 (vi).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &c.: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2762 (ii).
SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEORGE GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— PAYMENT OF O'LEARYS' CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— REPAIRS TO BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
STEWART, Mr., APPNMT AS SUPT. OF CANALS: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*) 14599 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).
'TOWNSEND' VALVE *re* LOCK GATES, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
TRENT, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii)., 14645 (vi).
——— DODDS, THOS., PAYMENT TO: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).
——— EMPLOYMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr *Hughes, Victoria*) 8117 (iv).
——— HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 129 (i).
——— MESSRS. CORRY & LAVERDURE, INTEREST *re* ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— *See* 'Corry'.
——— PETERBOROUCH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— *See* 'Peterborough'.

CANALS—*Con.*

TRENT, REP. OF ENGINEER MCLEOD, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 12716 (vi).
——— ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, REPORTS, &c.: M. (Mr. *Ward*) for copies, 2313 (i).
See 'Simcoe.'
TUCKER, HENRY, PAYMENT *re* INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
WELLAND, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
——— DRAINAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— DUNNVILLE DAM & BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12900, 14148 (vi).
——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv)., 14149 (vi).
——— RAMY'S POINT: *See* 'Ramy's Point.'
——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— TOWNSEND VALVE, 12905 (vi).
——— WATER POWER, O.Cs., *re*., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE, ST. CATHARINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
WILLIAMSBURG, APPNMT. OF SUPT., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— LOCKMASTER CASSLEMAN, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— OVERSEER'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
WIRE FENCING, MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— *See* 'Murray.'
YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

CANE BROS., GRANTS FOR TIMBER LICENSE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).

CANNING INDUSTRY IN B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE, N.B., PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr *Campbell*) in Com. on Res., 14470 (vi).

CAPE TRAVERSE, P.E.I., SURVEY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).

CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

Cardiff Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4591; 3°*, 4592 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 103).

CARETAKERS, DOM. BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).

CARETAKERS, GOVT. POLICY *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13061 (vi).

CARGILL, HENRY, LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12937 (vi).

CARIBOO ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR OF REFUGE: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CARLETON, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— *See* 'Census.'

CARLETON HEAD, P.E.I., SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).

CARLIN, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).

CAR SHOPS, NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).

See 'I.C.R.'

CARTOONS IN 'MILITARY GAZETTE,' &c.: (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2103 (i).

CARVER *vs.* KING, COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).

CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO. AND LIARD RIVER MINERS: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I., BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).

CASEY, GEO. E., EX-M.P., AND ARCHIVES: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 13504 (vi).

CASSELMAN, LOCKMASTER, WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

——— *See* 'Canals.'

CATTLE EMBARGO IN G.B.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bell*) 368 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Fielding*) 375; (Mr. *Sproule*) 376; (Mr. *Maclean*) 381; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 384; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 385; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 388; (Mr. *Tarte*) 392; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 393; (Mr. *Cargill*) 395; (Mr. *Ross*) 396; (Mr. *McGowan*) 396; (Mr. *Boyd*) 397; (Mr. *Clancy*) 398; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 400; (Mr. *Ingram*) 401; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 402; (Mr. *Hackett*) 405; (Mr. *Haggart*) 408 (i).

CATTLE EMBARGO in G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 267 (i).

——— LORD ONSLOW'S DECLARATION: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 14054 (vi).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

——— papers laid on Table, 591 (i).

CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF MR. GEO. ROBERTSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 668 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF MR. HOLT AND RETIREMENT OF MR. ROBERTSON, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1059 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Lennox*) 3396 (ii).

——— NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

——— REP., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 669 (i).

——— REP.: Inquiry (Mr. *Pringle*) 14686 (vi).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1199 (i).

——— REP. LAID ON TABLE, PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 14758 (vi).

——— WITHDRAWAL OF MR. ROBERTSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1034 (i).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Railway Act.'

CATTLE INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

——— ON STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

CATTLE PURCHASED BY BRITISH GOVT.: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5415 (iii).

CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; Neg. (Y., 48; N., 78) 5489 (iii).

Debate: (Mr. *Fisher*) 5467; (Mr. *Henderson*) 5468; (Mr. *Gourley*) 5469; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5473; (Mr. *Logan*) 5475; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 5477; (Mr. *Broder*) 5478; (Sir *William Mulock*) 5480; (Mr *Lennox*) 5484; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 5487; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5488 (iii).

CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).

CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).

CEMENT USED FOR BUILDINGS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

CENSUS, BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

——— CARLETON, &c., N.B., RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— CIRCULAR OF MR. COTE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).

——— COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).

——— COST, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4800 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 204 (i).

——— ENUMERATORS, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4800 (ii).

——— EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y., 35; N., 69) 13759 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Fisher*) 13707; (Mr. *Clarke*) 13708; (Mr. *Sproule*) 13721; (Mr. *Heyd*) 13724; (Mr. *Henderson*) 13730; (Mr. *Holmes*) 13733; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 13737; (Mr. *Bell*) 13740; (Mr. *McEwen*) 13753; (Mr. *Clancy*) 13755 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13672 (vi).

——— EXPENDITURE: Notice of Motion (Mr. *Monk*) 12368 (vi).

——— GRAND MANAN, N.B., RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).

——— LAND VALUES: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).

——— N.B., RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— PAYMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 286 (i).

——— SCHEDULES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4635 (ii), 7054 (iii).

——— SCHEDULES, HALTON, PEEL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6894 (iii).

——— SCHEDULES, 1891, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7054 (iii).

——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).

CENSUS SCHEDULES, *re* HALTON AND CARDWELL: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 11425 (v).

——— STAFF EMPLOYED *re* ALTERATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13935 (vi).

——— TOTAL COST, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 289; Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) 289 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 479, 544 (i).

CENSUS BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 203 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593 (i).
—— TOTAL COST: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iii).
—— VOTE: in Com. of Sup , 4594 (ii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5583, 5960, 6199; 3°*, 6202 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 104).

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 55 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i).

CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2015 (i).

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET AND GOV. GEN'S SPEECH: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN PARIS, COR., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).

CHAMBERLAIN, HON. MR., SUGGESTIONS *re* MILITIA ACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).
—— SPEECH *re* PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, 13375 (vi).

CHAMBLY CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
—— DISMISSAL OF JULES QUESNEL, Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
—— ELECTRIC STATION BY-WASH: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
—— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— MACADAMIZING TOW PATH: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).

CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).

CHAPMAN DOUBLE BALLBEARING CO., LETTER *re*: Read (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
—— REP. *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iii).

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
—— *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

CHARLOTTETOWN ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
—— DOM. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
—— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14131 (vi).
—— REBUILDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).

CHARTERED BANKS, LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1575 (i).

CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).

CHATHAM DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).

CHATHAM, N.B., LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CHATHAM TO TRACADIE, N.B., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 171 (Mr. *Stephens*) 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 105).

CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).

CHAUDIERE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).

CHEGOGGIN, N.S., PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CHÉTICAMP, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CHEVERIE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CHEVRIER FAMILY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12498 (v), 12716 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13971 (vi).

CHEZZETCOOK, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

Chicoutimi and North Eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 168 (Mr. *Girard*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii).

CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).

Chinese Restriction Immigration B. No. 82 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Res. prop., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°* of B., 945; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2398; 3°*, 2399 (i); Sen Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 8).

Church Missionary Society of Canada Incorp. B. No. 202 (Mr. *Russell*) 1°*, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6846. (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 155).

CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CIGARETTES, LEGISLATION *re*, in Com. on Criminal Code, 10748 (v).

CIGARETTES, PROHIBITION OF: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).
Debate: (Mr. *Holmes*) 824; (Mr. *Barker*) 830; (Mr. *Lennox*) 831; (Mr. *Roddick*) 832; (Mr. *Logan*) 833; (Mr. *Taylor*) 836; (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) 837; (Mr. *Bureau*) 838; (Mr. *Heyd*) 838; (Mr. *Broder*) 839; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 839; (Mr. *Stephens*) 841; (Mr. *Ross*, *Victoria*) 841; (Mr. *Tarte*) 842; (Mr. *Sproule*) 843; (Mr. *Macdonald*) 843; (Mr. *Brock*) 844; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 845 (i).

Cigarettes Prohibition Sale B. No. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°m., 2014 (i); 2°m, 3286; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3286 (ii).

CIRCULARS TO CURÉS, P.Q. *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).

Citizens' Bank of Canada B. No. 213 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5990; in Com., 7478; 3°* 7479 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 106).

City and County Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 172 (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3797 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 107).

CITY POST OFFICES, APPNMT. OF CLERKS ON PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 14001, 14009 (vi).

CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 207, 267, 319 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND GUARANTEE COMPANIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3233 (ii).

CIVIL SERVANTS IN MAN., AND INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3141; Neg. (N. 71; Y. 22) 3206 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *McCreary*) 3152; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3158; (Mr. *Scott*) 3164; (Mr. *Ingram*) 3167, 3183; Ques. of Order, 3167; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ruling, 3167; (Mr. *Blain*) 3169; (Mr. *Boyd*) 3172; (Sir *William Mulock*) 3176, 3185; (Mr. *Davis*) 3179; (Mr. *Puttee*) 3181; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3189 (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3191; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 3197; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3198 (ii)

——— Notice of Amt., 3126 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 245 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1°m., 9079 (iv); Res. prop. 10410; wthdn., 11301 (v).

——— **B. No. 257** (Sir *William Mulock*) Res. prop. 10410, 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330; M. for Com., 12493; in Com. on Res., 12500; 1°* of B., 12574 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 13808, 13833; 3°m., 13942; Sen. Amts., 14845 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 9).

See 'Post Office Bill'.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12330; Amts. (Mr. *Birkett*) 12349, 12370, 12510 (v).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND TECHNICAL OFFICERS, &C.; Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13771 (vi).

CIVIL SERVICE, DECORATIONS: *See* 'Imperial Service'

——— EMPLOYEES CLASSIFICATION, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 9681 (iv).

——— EXAMINATIONS *re* CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. on Customs Bill, 4016 (ii).

——— EXAMINERS LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 479 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).

Civil Service Superannuation Act Amt. B. No. 49 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 204; in Com. on Res., 593; 1°* of B., 597; 2°m., 1116; in Com., and 3°*, 1116 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 10).

CLARKE, DUNCAN, EX. COURT: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

CLASSIFYING RECORDS: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOLS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, ABROGATION, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 109 (i).

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Alaskan Boundary Award, 14521 (vi).

CLAYTON, &C., Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7297 (iii). *See* 'Alaskan.'

CLEMENT, JULES, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13664 (vi).

CLERGUE'S CONTRACT WITH I. C. R. FOR STEEL RAILS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

See 'Steel Rails.'

CLERGUE SYNDICATE, LABOUR DISTURBANCES: Remarks, 12610, 12717, (vi).

——— *See* 'Sault Ste. Marie.

CLERGUE RY. SYNDICATE, SUBSIDIES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14397 (vi).

CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT FOR GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 13668 (vi).

CLERKS OF PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i). *See* 'Public Works.'

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notification of Appnmt. (Mr. *Speaker* 1 (i).

'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER, PATENT *re* I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).

CLINTON, ONT., CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).

CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).

CLOTHING FOR INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).

COAL CONTRACTS FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. on Sup., 1065 (i).

COAL FIELDS, SURVEY, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).

COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE, 1901, TO MARCH, 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 669 (i).

COALING ACCOMMODATION *re* SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

COAL LANDS IN CROW'S NEST PASS APPLICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).

COAL MINING IN BANFF RESERVE, LEASE BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).

COAL RATES, I. C. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 6167 (iii).

COAL SHEDS, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

COASTING LAWS AND BONDING PRIVILEGES OF U. S., REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).

——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

Coast Yukon Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Macpherson*) 1°*, 446; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 108).

COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i), 13084 (vi).

——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).

——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS; in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).

COCAGNE, WHARF, N.B., COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

COCHRANE, HON. SEN., TEL. *re* HEALTH (Mr. *Fielding*) 3000 (ii).

COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii), 7086 (iii), 7610 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'

COLDSTREAM GUARDS BAND, ARRANGEMENTS *re* VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) 9683 (iv).

COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

COLLINGWOOD DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).

COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

COLLINS, MR., PAYMENT *re* FISHERY INSPECTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5129 (ii).

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, BOND-HAY TREATY AND ALASKA: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 853 (i).
—— MEMORANDUM OF CAN. MINISTERS: in Budget Speech, 1404 (i).
—— REP. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 3632 (ii).

COLONIAL OFFICE AND CAN. PRIME MINISTER, COR. *re* GERMAN FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 12218 (v).
—— *See* 'German.'

COLUMBIA RIVER, B. C., ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
—— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
—— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).

Columbia River Improvement Company Limited, Incorp. B. No. 150 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., 5559; in Com., and 3°*, 5585; Sen. Amts., 6847, 6894 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 109).

COMMANDERS OF GOVT. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 446 (i).

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson*, Grey) 4360 (ii).

COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, PRIVILEGES, FARES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Clarke*) 5680 (iii).

COMMISSIONER, ASS'T., CUSTOMS: *See* 'Customs Act Surtax.'

COMMITTEES:

COMMITTEES, SEL. STANDING: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).
—— STANDING: Lists presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 197 (i).
—— M. to meet during Sittings of Hse. (Mr. *Hyman*) 8405 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 8333 (iv).

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: M. to add Name (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5679 (iii).
—— REP. *re* BINDER TWINE: M. to conc., 13788, 14043 (vi).

DEBATES: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).

ELECTION LAWS: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to add Name, 6734 (iii).

INTERNAL ECONOMY: M. for Com., 91 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).

COMMITTEES:—*Con.*

PRINTING, JOINT: List presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).
—— M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. (Mr. *Parmelee*) 5314 (iii).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, 1ST REP. OF SEL. COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*, *Essex*) 5511 (iii).
—— M. to employ stenographer (Mr. *Fraser*) 7202 (iii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, MEETING CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 8334 (iv).
—— Motion to add Name (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 3431 (ii).
—— M. *re* Pub. Accts. (Mr. *Fraser*): 67 (i).
—— PRODUCING CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

COMMUTATION OF CARVER: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 13303 (vi).

Companies Act (1902) Amt. B. No. 227, (from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Elections B. 3.'

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) 1°m., 1193 (i); 2°m., 2790, 3259; in Com., 3260 (ii).

CONCILIATION BOARD, REGISTRATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3628 (ii).

CONCILIATORS, SETTLEMENT OF LABOUR DISPUTES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4003 (ii).

CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENT FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).

CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

CONSERVATIVE LITERATURE: *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.

Consolidated Revenue, &c.; *See* 'Audit Act.'

Consolidated Trust Corporation Incorp. B. No. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 110).

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

Contagious Diseases: *See* 'Animals.'

Contracts, Public Works: *See* 'Public Works Act.'

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

Controverted Elections Bill: *See* 'Dominion Election Bills.'

COOKE VS. COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORN DUTIES, ABOLITION OF BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1681 (i).

CORNWALL CANAL, ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
—— ENLARGEMENT, ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vi).
—— LIGHTING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
—— SUPT'S. DUTIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).

CORNWALL ROAD P. O., MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14038 (vi).

CORONATION CONTINGENT, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORRY & LAVERDURE, AWARD *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).

——— COMPENSATION *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

CORY, W. W., SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).

COTTEE, HERBERT, SALARY AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3610 (ii).

COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATIONS OF WATER: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).

COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES, APPOINTMENTS FROM LOCAL BARS: Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 5582 (iii).

——— APPOINTMENTS., RETIREMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 4960 (ii).

COUNTRY POSTMASTERS: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).

——— SALARIES: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5662, 5676, 5863 (iii).

——— SALARY INCREASES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).

Court of Appeal, Yukon: *See* 'Yukon B. 254.'

COURTS, YUKON, PURCHASE OF LAW BOOKS: in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).
See 'Yukon.'

COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).

COVE HEAD HARBOUR, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com of Sup., 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).

COW BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vi).

COW BAY (POINT MORIEN) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CRANDALL, BRAKESMAN, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).

——— *See* 'Belmont.'

CRANE ISLAND WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).

CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

CRICKET PLAYING ON PARLIAMENT GROUNDS: Objection (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 95; 2°*, 316; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 13.)

Criminal Code, 1892 (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) 1°*, 541; 2°*, 1324; in Com., 1324 (i), 2779, 3237 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. No. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 5581; 2°*, 6638; M. for Com., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746 (v); wthdn., 14768 (vi).

Criminal Code (fraudulent debtors) B. (No. 219, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Criminal Code (1902) Act (trades and contracts) Amt. B. (No. 230, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (freedom of labour) B. (No. 246, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

CRISIS IN ONT: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'

CROSS POINT PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).

Crown Bank of Canada B. No. 129 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1936; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2756 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 111.)

CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P.O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).

CROWS NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 12217 (v).

Cruelty to Animals: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

CULLING TIMBER, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).

CUMBERLAND RY. AND COAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14506 (vi).

CUMBERLAND WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

CUMMINGS, JAMES, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 9458 (iv).

Currency Amt.: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).

Customs Act Amt. B. No. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) Res. prop., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; 1°* of B., 3126; 2°*, 4010; in Com., 4010; 3° m., 4187; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 14.)

——— **(German Surtax) Amt. B. No. 273** (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 14758 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 15.)

CUSTOMS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REBATE FOR 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 3803 (ii).

ALUMINUM, OXIDE OF, IMPORTATION INTO CANADA, PORTS OF ENTRY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *N.B.*) 1035 (i).

BAIN, MR., ASST. COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B., 4010 (ii).

BANANAS IMPORTED, VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *Elgin*) 1198 (i).

BATHURST CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

BAUXITE, TONS IMPORTED IN 1902: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *N.B.*) 1678 (i).

BONDED WAREHOUSES, P.E.I., RENTAL, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

BONDING PRIVILEGES WITH U.S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

BRACEBRIDGE CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

CAMPBELLFORD PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS *re* CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. on Customs Bill, 4016 (ii).

COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE 1901 TO MARCH 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 669 (i).

COASTING LAWS AND BONDING PRIVILEGES OF U. S.: Regulations (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

COMMISSIONER, ASST.: *See* 'Customs Act, B. 174.

CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR, TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

CORN DUTIES, ABOLITION OF BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1681 (i).

CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, PER CAPITA REVENUE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13935 (vi).
——— *See* 'Per Capita.'

CUSTOMS CLAUSE G. T. P. BILL, LEGAL OPINIONS: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).

CUSTOMS DEPT., CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 331 (i), 3782, 3897 (ii).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 319 (i).
——— PORTS OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3697 (ii).
——— OVERTIME OF OFFICERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13980 (vi).
——— TRANSFERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5318 (iii).
——— PRINTING, STATIONERY, &C., in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).
——— TEMPORARY CLERKS. APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Customs Bill, 4012 (ii).

DAUPHIN, PORT OF ENTRY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

DIME NOVELS: *See* 'Jesse James.'

DRESDEN CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

FREE LIST, CHANGES IN TARIFF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

GANANOQUE PORT OF ENTRY, COLLECTIONS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3791, 3897 (ii).

GERMAN GOODS ('TEAPOTS, &C.') IMPORTED UNDER PREFERENTIAL TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on Customs Act, 3056 (ii).

GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

GERMAN SURTAX, PURCHASES PREVIOUS TO IMPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3394 (ii).

GERMAN TEAPOT AND MR. BLAIN: *See* 'German Goods.'

GOODS IMPORTED DIRECT INTO CAN., VALUE OF DUTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 12716 (vi).

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).

GRANT, J. G., BARRIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFAULT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).

IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, &C., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 13935 (vi).

INSPECTION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL TARIFF, CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

JAPANESE TARIFF *re* U. S. PRODUCTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

JAPAN TRADE WITH CAN., CUSTOMS DUTIES *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8617 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

'JESSE JAMES' SERIES OF PUBLICATIONS, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT, PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).

LINSEED OIL, DEPUTATION *re* IMPORTATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii).

LOCKS FOR CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup. 3962 (ii).

'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup. 5992 (iii).

MIDLAND PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

MONTREAL PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
——— CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i).
——— SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv)

NAPANEE, COLLECTOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).

OXIDE OF ALUMINUM IMPORTS INTO CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N. B.*) 1035 (i).

PER CAPITA TAX, EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).

PER CAPITA TAX, REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13935 (vi).
——— *See* 'Customs.'

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3583 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B. C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
——— *re* GERMAN GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5322 (iii).
——— *See* 'German Goods.'
——— PREVENTION OF FRAUD, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE, OFFER OF CAN. GOVT. TO G. B.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3219 (ii).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).

PULP WOOD, DUTY BY U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 4362 (ii).

REVENUE COLLECTED FOR 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12715 (vi).

S. A. COLONIES, AND PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL AMOUNT 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 14285 (vi).

SUGAR IMPORTED INTO CANADA 1902: M. (Mr. *Madore*) for Stmnt.,* 3236 (ii).

TARIFF CHANGES, FREE LIST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

TARIFF PROTECTION, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6707 (iii).
See 'Tariff.'

TOBACCO (CANADIAN) SALE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, AMOUNTS PAID TO MR. BLAISE DUGAS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).

TOBACCO DUTIES COLLECTED IN 1902, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2103 (i), 12217 (v).
——— DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 446 (i).

TORONTO, CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Supply., 3906 (ii).

TRACADIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
U. S. Coasting Laws, Bonding Privileges, &c.: Regulations *re* (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
See 'Coasting.'
Vegetables imported from U.S., Duty collected at Toronto and Montreal: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1058 (i).
Veniot, P.I., Customs Collector at Bathurst: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
Walpole Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
Warehouse at Winnipeg, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavière*) 6268 (iii).
Weekly Publications, 'Jesse James' Series, Customs Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).
Wheat, Export Freight Rate per Hundred Pounds: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
Windsor, Customs Port of Entry, Salaries, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
See 'Kilroy.'

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Contract, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

Cutler, Gore Bay Mail Service; Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

Cutler, Spanish Mills Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

Dairying Branch, Agriculture: in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
——— Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii).

Dalhousie Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

Daly, M.T., Harbour Master at Bathurst, N.B., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

Dauphin, Lake, Lowering: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
——— Port of Entry, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3898 (ii).

Dawson Board of Trade, Memorial *re* Treadgold Concessions: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1024 (i).
See 'Treadgold.'

Dawson City to Stewart River, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Dawson Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

Debates, Amanuenses, Increase of Salary: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

Debates, Official: in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Com., 5 (i).
——— 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 654 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 814 (i).
——— 2nd Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 939 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1111 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1461 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1764 (i).
——— 4th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1674 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1936 (i).
——— 5th Rep.: M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii).

Debates, 6th Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 7658 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 7922, 9349 (iv).
——— 7th and 8th Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 14053 (vi).
——— 8th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 12216 (v).

Debates Translators, Rental of Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 3799 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2311 (i).

Debert Coal Mines Ry. Subsidy: in Com. of Res., 14328 (vi).

Debt of Can.: *See* 'Public Debt.'

Deer Island to Eastport, Me., Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

Defalcations, &c.: *See* 'Post Office.'

Defaulting Postmasters *re* Saving Banks Deposits: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

Defence Scheme *re* Militia: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).
See 'Militia.'

Delegates from Chambers of Commerce, Treatment by U. S. Immigration Officers: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).

Demurrage Regulations, I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).

Departments, Reorganisation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief B. No. 127 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 112).

Depot Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).

Deputy Minister of Agriculture: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).

Deseronto Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

Deschambault, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

Desjardins, Allumette Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).

Desjardins Canal B. No. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3393; 2°, 4213; in Com., and 3°, 4213 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 16.)

DesRoches, Fishery Guardian, Alleged Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Detroit River, &c., International Waters, U. S. Govt. Work: M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Cor.,* 2778 (ii).

Devlin, Mr., Successor of, as Immigration Agent, Ireland: in Com. of Sup., 6731 (iii).

Digby, Pier, Renewal, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— Wharf Extension, Improvement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).

Diocese of Moosonee: *See* 'Trust Funds.'

DIPPER HARBOUR, N. B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

DISCRIMINATING RATES, G. T. RY. CO. BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).

DISCRIMINATING FREIGHTS ON OCEAN VESSELS: *See* 'Freight Rates.'

DISTILLERIES, &C., INSPECTORS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13974 (vi).

DIVISIONS:

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 14158; Neg. (Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

BROCKVILLE AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) neg. (Y. 26; N. 44) 7467; M. for 3°, agreed to (Y. 64; N. 35) 7468 (iii).

BUDGET, THE: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Neg. (Y. 54; N. 107) 2235 (i).

CANADIAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7479; Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).

CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).

CENSUS EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &C:. Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 69) 13759 (vi).

CIGARETTES, PROHIBITION OF: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND POLITICAL INTERFERENCE, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3151; Neg. (Y. 22; N. 71) 3206 (ii).

FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y. 30; N. 68) 14642 (vi).

G.T. PACIFIC RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) M. for Com., 4871: Amt. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4871; Neg. (Y. 55; N. 102) 4874 (ii).

G.T.P. B. No. 235: Amt. (Mr. *Borden*) Alternative Route, to M. for 3°, 12642 (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Osler*) Customs Duties, &c., 12693; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12702 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Alcorn*) Capital Stock, 12704; Neg. (Y. 25; N. 75) 12705 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) Rates, &c., Neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Puttee*) to M. for Com. on Res., 9148; Neg. (Y, 50; N. 135) 10404 (v).

——Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) 10076 (iv); Neg. (Y. 68; N. 119) 10404 (v).

——Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 10405; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 117) 10407 (v).

——3° of Bill; Agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10407 (v).

——Reporting Debates, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) Speaker's Ruling sustained (Y. 52; N. 30) 0634 (v).

HAY AND OATS BOUGHT BY IMP. GOVT., AMOUNT PAID BY CAN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 6) 690 (i).

INSOLVENCY ACT AMT. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) 2°m., 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION: Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 4799 (ii).

OTTAWA VALLEY RY. CO.'S B. No. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87) 6537 (iii).

DIVISIONS—*Con.*

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM. *re* MR. LOY, M.P.: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7917; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7918; M. to conc. in Rep., 7922, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008, 8069; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 105) 8080, (iv).

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

RY. ACT (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2°m., 552; M. (Mr. *Blair*) to ref. to Com. on Rys..; Agreed to (Y. 99; N. 53) 565 (i).

RY. ACT (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) 3°m., 8334; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* two cent rate, 8334; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 45) 8359 (iv).

REPRESENTATION IN H. OF C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2°m., 1207, 1265; Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) to M. for 2°, Neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 1284, 1292 (i).

——Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to recommit to Com. of Whole Hse., Neg. (Y. 28; N. 65) 12430 (v).

TARIFF POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95) 2914 (ii).

——INSTRUCTION TO COMMISSIONS, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4486; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, N.B., SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

Divorce: *See* 'Allan, William.'

——*See* 'Ashley.'

——*See* 'Graves, Florence.'

——*See* 'McDermid, Ellen.'

——*See* 'Schooley.'

——*See* 'Steele, James Reid.'

——*See* 'Wilson, Stephen'

DIXON, F. A. PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726–2753 (ii).

——COR., &C. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1058 (i).

——Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).

DIXON, MR. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, WINNIPEG, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DIXON, CAPT., DUTIES IN S. AFRICA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7914 (iv).

DOCKS, HARBOURS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii). *See* 'Public Works.'

DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

DODDS, MR. THOS., PAYMENT TO *re* TRENT CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).

DOG FISH NUISANCE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi)

DOKIS INDIAN RESERVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST TRESPASSERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 7914 (iv.)

DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12590 (v).

DOMINION ARSENAL: in Com. of Sup., 7089 (iii).

DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO. (WOLFVILLE) SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

DOM. BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

——N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 421 (i).

DOMINION BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).

——RENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

—— *See* 'Buildings.'

DOM. COAL, IRON AND STEEL CO.'S ACCOMMODATION AT GLACE BAY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).

—— *See* 'Glace Bay.'

Dominion Controverted Elections Act (trials) Amt. B. No. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 95; 2°, and in Com., 635; on Order for Com., 945, 1115, 2239; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 12).

DOM. CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. NO. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., Objection (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 945 (i).

DOM. DAY ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5589 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 92; 2° m., 885, in Com., 902, 1200 (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; in Com., (compulsory voting) 13560; wthdn.. 14769 (vi).

DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT.: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Sel. Com., 3001 (ii); 6734 (iii).

DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. NO. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*): Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12720 (vi).

Dominion Elections Act (intimidation) Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) 1°*, 114; 2° m., 704 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 19).

DOM. EXHIBITION, TORONTO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 534 (i).

—— *See* 'Agriculture.'

Dominion Gas Improvement Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 91 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1193; 2°* 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 114).

Dominion (burglary) Guarantee Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 113).

Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineers Incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632 (i).

DOM. LANDS ACT AMT. B. (Mr. *Sifton*). Motion dropped, 13444 (vi).

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

—— COMMISSIONER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iii).

—— INSPECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).

—— MAN. AND N.W.T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816 (i).

—— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

—— SALE, LOCATION, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 670 (i).

—— SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 6939 (iii).

DOM. LANDS, SURVEYORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).

DOM. LANDS *re* YUKON REGULATIONS: in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

Dominion Notes B. No. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; 2°, and in Com., 6913; 3°*, 6915 (iii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 43).

DOMINION NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii) 14252 (vi).

DOM. NOTES SECURITY: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6270 (iii).

DOMINION POLICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).

DOM. STATUTES CONSOLIDATION: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

DOM. STEAMERS, REPAIRS, SUPPLIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5033 (ii).

DOM. SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, INCREASE, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).

DOM. TRAFFIC BRIDGES THROUGH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).

DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, TERREBONNE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 10102 (v).

DOUBLE TRACKING PARTS OF I.C.R. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).

—— *See* 'I.C.R.'

DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).

DOUGLASTOWN, ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

DOUKHOBORS, HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).

—— LOANS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).

—— PILGRIMAGE, AND GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).

—— PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).

DOYLE, MR., RY. MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

Drainage across Railway Property B. No. 19 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1° m., 202; 2°*, 916 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

See 'Ry. B. 21.'

DRAINAGE CLAUSE IN B. 21, RAILWAY ACT AMT.: 5774 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 4729, 4735 (ii).

DRAKE, MR., N.W.M.P., INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13761 (vi).

DRAW-BARS, EXCHANGE ON FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520, (iii), 8288 (iv).

DREDGES AT MIDLAND, CAPACITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

DREDGES, NEW, COST, CAPACITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1856 (i).

DREDGING, MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).

DREDGING PLANT, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2674 (ii).

DREDGING PLANT FOR B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).

—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).

—— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).

—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).

DREDGING VESSELS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'

DRESDEN CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

DRILL HALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13643 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).

—— ST. JOHN'S, QUE., CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).

—— WOODSTOCK, N.B., PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Hale*) 3236 (ii).

DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR, AMOUNT PAID TO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7055 (iii).

DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).

DRUMMONDVILLE RY. SIDING, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. No. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; 2°, and in Com., 4678 (ii), 5871; 3°*, 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 17.)

DUCHESNEAU, RESIGNATION AS WARDEN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).

DUFFERIN AND SAPPERS BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

DUGAS, JUDGE, YUKON TER., REFUND TO DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNT PAID TO, FOR TRIP IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES *re* SALE OF CANADIAN TOBACCO: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).

DUNCAN, ARCHIBALD, FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

DUNCAN'S COVE, N.S., APPROACH TO WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

DUNDONALD, LORD, AND FRAUDULENT TELEPHONE MESSAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 10536, 10744 (v).
See 'G. O. C.'

DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
See 'Grand River.'

DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).

EARNINGS, &c, I.C.R., DATE OF INTERIM REPS.: Ques., (Mr. *Barker*) 4444 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'

EASTER ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

EAST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EAST BERLIN, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EASTERN EXTENSION CO., CONCESSIONS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2675 (ii).

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., N.B., BALANCE OF INTEREST *re* AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iii).

—— FEES OF STENOGRAPHER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).

Eastern Townships Bank B. No. 25 (Mr. *McIntosh*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1853 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 115).

ECONOMY, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).

Edmonton and Peace River Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 446; 2°*, 632 (i).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co. (correction) B. No. 109 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 1378 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2581 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 18.)

EDMONTON BRIDGE, SASKATCHEWAN RIVER, FLOORING: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).

EDMONTON INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).

EDMONTON N.W.T., JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 707, 2°*, 977 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 111 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 116.)

EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

EDMUNDSTON, N.B., INDIAN RESERVE, FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).

EDVILLE POSTMASTER, OPENING OF OFFICE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

EEL RIVER, I. C. R. STATION AGENT'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 12600 (v).

EILBECK, SHERIFF, YUKON, FEES, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3414, 3507 (ii).

ELDORADO GUSHER, EXPENDITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6949, 7275 (iii).

Election Bills: *See* 'Dom. Elections, &c.'

ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED, CERTIFICATES, &c.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ELECTION LAWS COMMITTEE: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to add Name, 6734 (iii).

ELECTION LAW, LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

ELECTION PAMPHLETS : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

ELECTION PETITIONS, JUDGMENTS OF SUPREME COURT : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 91 (i).

ELECTION PROCLAMATIONS, PRINTING : *See* 'Saskatchewan Elections.'

ELECTIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN, PAYMENT TO PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE' : in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 288 (i).

——— N.S., PRINTING, &c., CHANGES MADE : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 8331 (iv).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 187 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708 ; 2° m., 4007 ; in Com., and 3°*, 4007 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 20).

ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5407 (iii).

ELECTRIC LIGHTING, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, CONTRACT PRICES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 3235 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 816 (i).

——— TRANSFORMERS : in Com. of Sup., 5843 (iii).

——— CORNWALL CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

——— WELLAND CANAL : in Com of Sup., 14148 (vi). *See* 'Canals.'

ELECTRIC POWER FOR DOM. BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).

ELEVATOR ACCIDENT : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5417 (iii).

ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi). *See* 'Ottawa Buildings.'

ELEVATOR RATES, ADVANCE, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 11062 (v). *See* 'Grain.'

ELGIN COUNTY CENTENARY CELEBRATION : Remarks (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 3129 (ii).

ELGIN COUNTY REDISTRIBUTION, PAR. IN 'TORONTO GLOBE' : Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 6540 (iii).

Elgin and Havelock Railway Co.'s B. No. 142 (Mr. *Fowler*) 1°*, 2237 (i) ; 2°*, 2544 ; in Com. and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 117.)

ELKHORN AND M. OSOMIN RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 14497 (vi).

ELKHORN INDIAN SCHOOL, N. W. TER., AVERAGE ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii). *See* 'Indians.'

ELLIS, DR., INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRATION : in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).

ELMIRA BRANCH LINE, P. E. I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).

EMERSON MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).

Empire Accident and Surety Co.'s B. No. 107 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1378 ; 2°*, 1815 (i) ; in Com., 2755 ; 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 118.)

EMPLOYEES, PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726-2753 (ii).

Employees on Rys. : *See* 'Ry. Employees.'

Engineers, Marine : *See* 'Steamboat Inspection.'

ENGINEERS' OFFICE, PUB. WORKS, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'

ENGINEERS SALARIES *re* CANALS : in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).

Engineers : *See* 'Dom. Institute.'

ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007 ; Memorandum read, 14008 (vi).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 134 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2100 ; 2°*, 2305 (i) ; in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751, 3982 ; 3°*, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 119).

ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

——— GRAVING DOCK : in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

——— NAVAL STATION, REMOVAL OF FLAGSHIP : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

ESQUIMAUX POINTE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

ESTIMATES 1902-3 : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 (i).

——— SUPPL., 1903 : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 707 (i) ; 4956 (ii).

——— (1904) : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).

ESTIMATES *re* ONE-FIFTH VOTE : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii). *See* 'Supply.'

"EUREKA," STR., LOAN BY GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14285 (vi).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Tarte*) 14687 (vi).

"EUXINE," SCHR., SCUTTLING OF : M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*) 699 (i).

EWART, MR., ARCHITECT OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY ARREARS : in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

EWART, JOHN A., ADDRESS PRESENTED TO JUDGE PERDUE : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).

Exchequer Court (railway debts) B. No. 155 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1° m., 2501 (ii) ; 2° m., 8243 ; in Com., 8244, 8360 ; 3°*, 8369 (iv) ; Sen. Amts., 14769 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 21).

——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to place on Govt. Orders, 8115 (iv).

EXCHEQUER COURT, JUDGES TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE : in Com of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

EXCISE INSPECTORS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

——— OFFICERS, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).

——— TAXATION, PER CAPITA FOR 1896 AND 1903 : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi). *See* 'Customs,' &c.

EXECUTIONS, EXPENDITURE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

EXHIBITION, FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).

EXHIBITIONS, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
See 'Agriculture.'

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 4548 (ii).

——— REPAIRS TO BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

——— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1937 (i).

EXPORT FREIGHT RATES ON WHEAT TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 93; 2°*, 291; in Com., 291, 612, 632; 3°*, 945 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 22).

FABER, DR., ILLEGAL PRACTICE, CHARGES *re*: Par. in *Star*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iii).

——— MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 6850 (iii).

FAIR WAGES SCHEDULE ON GOVT. CONTRACTS AND LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
See 'Labour.'

FALSE CREEK, B.C., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C.: M. (Mr. *Earle*) for Copies*, 2337 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Earle*) 3129 (ii), 5513, 6354 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2758, 2919 (ii).

FARQUHARSON, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).

FARRAN'S POINT CANAL, ACETYLENE GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).

——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii); 14150 (vi).

FAST ATLANTIC SS. LINE: *See* 'Atlantic.'

FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

Federal Oil Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 30 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 120).

FERGUSON, J. M., LEGAL EXPENSES *re* ADULTERATION ACT: in Com. of Sup., 5412 (iii).

FERRIES, CONTROL OF: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13696 (vi).

Ferries Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'

FIELDING, HON. MR., PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME: Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13936 (vi).

"FIELDING, W. S.", DREDGE, PREPARATION OF PLANS, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14283 (vi).

FINANCE:

ASSAY OFFICE, B.C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779, 13965 (vi).

AUDIT ACT AMT. BILL, GOVTL. INTENTION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11692 (v), 13258.

AUDITING DEPTL. FINANCES: Remarks *re* Martineau Investigation, 6933 (iii).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD, PAYMENTS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 10956 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11427 (v).

——— CIRCULAR FROM AUD. GEN.: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 11552 (v).

AUD. GENERAL AUDITING BOOKS OF RY. COS., *Re* SUBSIDIES: in Com. on Res., 14516 (vi).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

——— OFFICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).
See 'Audit.' &c.

BANKERS ASSOCIATION, INSPECTION DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 819 (i)

BANKERS, PRIVATE, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 285 (i).

BANK FAILURES SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 6435 (iii).

BANKING BUSINESS: M. (Mr. *Russell*) to receive Pet., 4958 (ii).

BANKS, UNCLAIMED BALANCES: Rep. presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (ii).

BARTON, SIR EDMUND, EXPENDITURE *re* CAN. VISIT: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

BLACK, A. W., ENGLISH M.P., STATEMENTS *re* COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND GERMAN CONSUL: 12218 (v).

BOPP, GERMAN CONSUL, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
See 'German Tariff.'

B.N.A. BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE KING, EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14279 (vi).

BUDGET, THE: Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1378 (i).

——— REP. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 410 (i).
See 'Financial Review.'

CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

CANADIAN-GERMAN FISCAL POLICY, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
See 'German Tariff.'

CANADIAN MINT, ERECTION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 10955 (v).
See 'Mint.'

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
See 'Dom. Notes.'

CHARTERED BANKS, REP. *re*: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1575 (i).

COLONIAL OFFICE AND CAN. PRIME MINISTER, COR. *re* GERMAN FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

DEBT OF CAN.: *See* 'Public Debt.'

DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRTION, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 12590 (v).

DOM. NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii), 14252 (vi).
See 'Charges,' &c.

DOM. SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, INCREASE, &c.; M. for Cor., (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).

ESTIMATES, 1902-3: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90.

ESTIMATES *re* ONE-FIFTH VOTE: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

——— SUPPL., 1903; Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 707 (i), 4956 (ii).

——— SUPPL., 1904: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply,' &c.

FIELDING, HON. MR., PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME: Par in Montreol *Star*, 13936 (vi).

FINANCE DEPT., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i).

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N.S. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*

FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601 (vi).
See 'Budget, &c.'

GERMAN CONSUL BOPP, COR. WITH CAN. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

GERMAN TARIFF, COR. &C.: Papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).

——— DISCRIMINATION AND BOND-HAY TREATY: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 1324 (i).

——— LORD STRATHCONA'S LETTER: in Budget Speech, 1413 (i).

——— MR. FIELDING'S MEMORANDUM *re* MR. BOPP: in Budget Speech, 1414 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S SPEECH AT CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, COR., &C., CAN. GOVT'S REFUSAL TO PUBLISH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 9457 (iv).

——— PAPERS *re*: laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).

INSOLVENCY ACT, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 818 (i).

INSURANCE COS. OF CANADA, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1025 (i).

INSURANCE, REPORT OF SUPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 9350 (iv).

——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12586 (v).

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).

——— LEGAL EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7795 (iv).

——— PAID FOR 1890-1903: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 11556 (v)

——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6435 (iii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).

——— AMT.: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) *re* Notice of Motion, 3864, 4040 (ii).

LADY LAFONTAINE, PENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14252 (vi).

LOANS, GOVT., &C.: *See* 'Public Debt.'

MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re* TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 265 (i).

MINT, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi)
See 'Can. Mint.'

NORTH-WEST TER., ADVANCE ACCOUNT, &C.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 10102 (v).

——— INCREASED SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
See general heading.

N. S. AND DOM. OF CAN. FINANCIAL TERMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF AND S. A. COLONIES, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE, MEMORANDUM OF MR. BALFOUR, PRES. OF BRITISH BOARD OF TRADE: in Financial Statement, 1402 (i).

——— Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Mr. Fielding's pledges *re* Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, 13936 (vi).

PRIVATE BANKERS: *See* 'Bankers.'

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, INCREASES, &C.: M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux* 5764 (iii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

PUBLIC DEBT, DECREASE OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14665 (vi).

PUBLIC DEBT CONVERSION, PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14253 (vi).

RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*

RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE, TORONTO, ADDITIONAL VAULT: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1903, AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 13370 (vi).

STEEL SHIPBUILDING, BOUNTY TO AID: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES: Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).

SUPPLY: Remarks *re* one-fifth vote (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

SUPPLY BILL, VOTE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 5995 (iii).

——— Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6003 (iii).
See general heading.

TARIFF AND TAXATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. on Immigration, 6861 (iii),

——— NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4957 (ii).

——— POLICY OF GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 4263, 4843, 4875 (ii).

——— CORRESPONDENCE, *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*) 3003 (ii).

——— PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. on Binder Twine, B. 233, Remarks (Mr. *Maclean* &c.) 7304, 7392 (iii).

——— REVISION, CORRESPONDENCE *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*) 3003 (ii).

TREASURY BOARD: *See* 'Auditor General.'

WAYS AND MEANS—GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on B. 273, 14755 (vi).

——— Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 89, 1378 (i).

——— Financial Statement, 1378 (i).

——— FOR DEBATE: *See* 'Budget.'

FINLAY POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N.S. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).

FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y., 30; N., 68) 14642 (vi).

FIRE AT MORTIMER & CO., GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4836 (ii).

Fire Damages: *See* 'Railway Act.'

Fire Guards: *See* 'Railway Act.'

FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).

FIRE REGULATIONS, N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).

FIRE, SECURITY FROM, IN PARLT. BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

FISHER, CHAS. A. L., INSPECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1592 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt., B. No. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1° m., 6538; 2°, and in Com., 6896; 3°*., 6913 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 23).

FISHERIES:

BANCE, MR., PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

BATHURST FISHERY INSPECTOR: *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

CANADIAN FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).

CANNING INDUSTRY IN B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

COLLINS, MR., PAYMENT *re* FISHERY INSPECTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5129 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

DesRoches, Fishery Guard, Alleged Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Dog Fish Nuisance, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi).

Duncan, Archibald, Fishery Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

False Creek B.C., Lease to Burnett & Kelly: *See* 'B.C.'

Fish Breeding Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Fish Breeding and Lobster Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, Compiling Reps.: in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

Fisheries Protective Service, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* Officers Mess: Que. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

Fisheries, Salaries: Conc., 6069 (iii).

——— Steamers in B.C., Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5278 (iii).

Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization': Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13316 (vi).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 13373 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13374 (vi).

Fishery Exhibit, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).

Fishery Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii), 5278 (iii).

Fishery Officers, Inspections, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).

Fishery Officers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5050 (ii).

Fishery Overseer, Bathurst, N.B., Complaints, *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14686 (vi).

Fishery Rights of Dom. and Provs.: M. to bring down Papers (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 7923 (iv).

Fishermen's Indemnity from U. S. Govt.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3236 (ii).

Fishing Bounties, Guardian DesRoches, Alleged Fraud: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Fishing Industry, Mar. Provs., Wharf, Building, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Fishing Licenses to U.S. Vessels, Collectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5309 (iii).

Fishing Rights *re* Indians, B.C., Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7264 (iii).

Fishing within Three Mile Limit, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 4179 (ii).

Fish Inspection, Investigations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

Fish Shippers, Loss, &c., by Govt. Strs.: Memorandum read (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4051-54 (ii).
See 'Frozen.'

Fishways, Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

Fraser River Salmon Industry, Complaints from Canners Ass'n.: Tel. read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

Frozen Fish, &c., P.E.I.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

——— Shippers, Losses, &c., Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (iii), 13373 (vi).
See 'Fish Shippers.'

Harrison, Mr., Inspector of Fisheries, N.B., Resignation: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).

Hurley, J. M., Appnmt., Duties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (ii), 5280 (iii).

——— Rep., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
See 'Mullen.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*

James and Hudson Bay Fishing Rights: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6893 (iii).

James and Hudson Bays, Fishing Rights, Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).

Larkin, Capt. W. S., Complaint *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).

Lobster Factory Inspection, Halifax: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).

Lobster Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

——— Industry, Inspection *re:* in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151, 13660 (vi).

Lunenburg Fish Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Mullen, Cornelius: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5280 (iii).

——— Letter *re* Hurley, J. M., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Taylor*) 5757, 5761 (iii).

Oyster Fishing, P.E.I., Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).

Oyster, Herring, &c., Fish Inspection, Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Roche, Hfx.*), *re* Fishermen of N.S., 13373 (vi).
See 'Fishermen of N.S.'

Rivière du Nord Fish Ladders, &c.: M. for Copies of Reps.* (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

Salmon Canning Industry in B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

Salmon Commissioners, B.C.: M. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii).

Salmon Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, B.C., Tels. from Canners Association, &c.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

Salmon shipped to France from B.C., Tariff *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).

Shepherd, B., Fishery Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

Sills, E. H., Payment *re* Storage of Fish Nets: in Com. of Sup., 5128 (ii).

Trap Nets in Gulf St. Lawrence, Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

U. S. Indemnity to Fishermen, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor.* 3236 (ii).

Five Islands, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

Flagship, Removal from Esquimalt: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

Flesherton Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

Flint, T. B., Clerk of Hse., Appnmt.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

Food Analysis: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
See 'Inland Revenue,' 'Customs,' &c.

Forrest, E., Reimbursement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).

Fort Dufferin, Extension Wharf, River St. John: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

FORT LAWRENCE LANDING PIER, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).

FT. WILLIAM PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 636 (i). *See* 'Public Works,' &c.

FRANCE AND CANADA SS. SERVICE : Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4957 (ii).

FRANCE AND CAN. STEAMSHIP SERVICE SUBSIDY : Prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 10410 (v). *See* 'Ocean SS. Subsidies Bill.'

FRANK DISASTER, INVESTIGATION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi). *See* 'Turtle.'

—— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 2100 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 2106 ; Tels. read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2106 (i).

—— TEL. TO DEP. MIN. OF INT. : Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2238 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE *re* CAMPAIGN LITERATURE : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 14286 (vi). *See* 'Campaign.'

FRASER RIVER, B.C., IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRASER RIVER SALMON INDUSTRY, COMPLAINTS FROM CANNERS' ASSOCIATION, TEL. : Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

—— SALMON INDUSTRY : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v). *See* 'Fisheries.'

Fraudulent Debtors : *See* 'Criminal.'

FRAUDULENT MARKING ACT, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

FRAWLEY, MR., REMOVAL FROM ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).

FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

FREE LIST, CHANGES IN TARIFF, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

FREE PASSES, I.C.R. : M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337.

FREEPORT, N.S., LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

FREIGHT CARS OF I.C.R. ON CONNECTING LINES, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).

FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION (CANADIAN), O.Cs,' &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).

FREIGHT RATES BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B. : (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).

FREIGHT RATES, I.C.R., CLASSES 1-10 : M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.*, 2338 (i).

FREIGHT RATES ON COMMODITIES TO G.B. : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).

—— DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN CAN. AND U.S. FREIGHT : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 13674 (vi).

—— PROVISION IN CONTRACT *re* DISCRIMINATION : (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).

FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674 (iii).

FRENCH CANADIAN REPATRIATION : in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iii).

FRIARS HEAD, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

FROZEN FISH, &C., P.E.I. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

FROZEN FISH SHIPPERS, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).

—— LOSSES, &C., PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (ii).

FRUDES POINT, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

FRUIT INSPECTORS, BUYING APPLES, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi). *See* 'Anderson.'

FRUIT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE TO EUROPE, &C. : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3805 (ii).

—— VALUE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3232 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. No. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1°*, 1023 ; on Order for 2°, 2387 (i) ; 2° m., 2788, 3257, 3807 (ii).

—— **B. No. 130** (Mr. *Henderson*) 1°*, 1936 (i) ; 2° m., 3285, 3823 (ii).

FUEL CONTRACT, INTEREST *re* UNPAID ACCOUNTS : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5318 (iii).

FUMIGATING STATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).

FURNESS-WITHY CO., SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

FYFE, MR., INSPECTION REP. *re* GRAIN THRESHING SCALE : Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).

—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).

GABAROUSE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT, N.B. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).

GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS *re* N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).

GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).

—— SURVEYS, LIFTING BOULDERS : in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

—— DAM : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12608 (v).

—— RAPIDS CHANNEL, DEEPENING, &C. : M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y., 36 ; N., 14) 8403 (iv).

—— COMPLETION OF CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).

GANANOQUE ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 970(i).

—— CENSUS ENUMERATORS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4823 (ii).

—— CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3791, 3897 (ii).

—— HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).

GARDEN PRODUCTS, READJUSTMENT OF DUTY, &C. : Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766 ; Neg. (Y., 51 ; N., 100) 4799 (ii).

Debate : (Mr. *Speaker*) Members' remarks checked, 4768, 4779 ; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4768 ; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4770 ; (Mr. *Holmes*) 4771 ; (Mr. *Monk*) 4772 ; (Mr. *Ethier*) 4777 ; (Mr. *Speaker* members' remarks checked, 4779 ; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4782 ; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 4784 ; (Mr.

GARDEN PRODUCTS—*Con.*
Debate—*Con.*
Fielding) 4785; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4789; (Mr. *Campbell*) 4792; (Mr. *Broder*) 4796; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 4798 (ii).

GAS BUOYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
See 'Marine.'

Gas, Dom., Improvement Bill: *See* 'Dom. Gas.'

GASPE AND DALHOUSIE SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).

Gaspe and Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5890; 3°*, 5891 (iii).

GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

GATE LIFTER, WILLIAMSBURG CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).

GATES OVER RY. CROSSINGS: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5775 (iii).

GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C. P. R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup. 13457 (vi).

GAUDET, MR., COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

GAYNOR & GREENE EXTRADITION: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

GENELLE *vs.* THE KING, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. No. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1° m., 592; 2° m., 1065 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

—— **(Weigh Masters) Amt. B. No. 266** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Res. prop., 13264; in Com. on Res., 13307; 1°* of B., 13308; 2°, and in Com., 14311; 3°*, 14313 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 24).

GENERAL STATEMENT, I. C. R.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Blair*) 3633 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'

GENERAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

G. O. C., APPNMT., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3779 (ii).

—— LORD DUNDONALD'S SPEECH AT HAMILTON: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).

—— REP. *re* DEFENCE SCHEME: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

—— REP., &c., PUBLISHMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
See 'Militia Act Amt.'

GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS, VISIT TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).

GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11188 (v).

GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 352 (i), 6824 (iii).

—— VICTORIA MEMORIAL: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

—— EXPLORATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, PLOTS, PLANS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iii).

—— REP.: Presented (Sir. *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).

—— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v), 13769 (vi

GEO. M. DEPEW: *See* 'Depew.'

GEORGEVILLE, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com of Sup., 13198 (vi).

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 13340 (vi).
See 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'

GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 6410 (iii).

GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).

GERMAN CONSUL BOPP, COR. WITH CAN. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
See 'German Tariff.'

GERMAN GOODS (TEAPOT) IMPORTED UNDER PREFERENTIAL TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on Customs Act, 3056 (ii).

GERMANS RECRUITED IN CANADA FOR NAVAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).

German Surtax Bill: *See* 'Customs.'

GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

GERMAN SURTAX, PURCHASES PREVIOUS TO IMPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3394 (ii).

GERMAN TARIFF, COR., &c.: Papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).

—— DISCRIMINATION AND BOND-HAY TREATY: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 1324 (i).

—— Lord Strathcona's Letter in Budget Speech, 1413 (i).

—— Mr. Fielding's Memorandum *re* Mr. Bopp in Budget Speech, 1414 (i).

'Gerrymander' Bill: *See* 'Representation.'

GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

—— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).

GLASS FACTORY, PICTOU: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii).

GLENGARRY SCOTTISH DEMONSTRATION: *See* 'Dundonald, Lord.'

GLOCKLING, MR. ROBERT, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iii).

GODERICH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).

—— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup, 1365 (i).

GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).
See 'Yukon.'

GOLD NUGGETS, EXHIBITION AT GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).

GOODERICH, MR., REMOVAL FROM MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).

Good Shepherd Reformatory St. John, N.B., B. No. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 4178; 2°, and in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4842 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 25).

GOODS IMPORTED DIRECT INTO CAN., VALUE OF DUTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 12716 (vi).

GOODWIN, GEO., COMPENSATION *re* SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

GORDON HIGHLANDERS' TROPHY: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7253 (iii).

GORE'S LANDING WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

GOVT. APPOINTMENTS OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

GOVT. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, REP. *re* MARTINEAU INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

GOVT. BUSINESS FURTHER LEGISLATION: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13559 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 13547 (vi).

——— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3708 (ii).

——— PRECEDENCE ON WEDNESDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1114 (i).

——— PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

——— PRIVATE MEMBERS' DAY: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1343 (i).

——— REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 204 (i).

See 'Business of the Hse.'

GOVT. CONTRACTS TENDERS *re*: Par. in Ottawa *Free Press* (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

GOVT. LANDS: *See* 'Lands.'

GOVT. POLICY *re* DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works Transfer.'

GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED BY FIRE: *See* 'Mortimer & Co.'

GOVT. RY. POLICY, DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7298 (iii).

See 'G. T. P. R.'

Govt. Rys., Supplies to: *See* 'Railway Act.'

Govt. Savings Bank: *See* 'Post office.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMANDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 446 (i).

——— REPAIRS TO 'STANLEY' AND 'LANSDOWNE': in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

——— SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4047, 5033 (ii).

See 'Marine.'

GOVT. STEAMER TO REPLACE 'ACADIA,' &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13659 (vi).

GOV. GEN'S OFFICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S SPEECH AT CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

GRAHAM *vs.* KING, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* PUBLIC WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13471 (vi).

Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain Act,' 'General Inspection B. 266.'

GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).

GRAIN INSPECTION, COST PER CAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4837 (ii).

GRAIN INSPECTION *re* STANDARD SAMPLES, RES. OF TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).

——— OFFICIAL GRAIN WEIGHERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12535 (v).

Grain Scales: *See* 'Weights and Measures B. 188.'

GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).

GRAIN STANDARD WEIGHING MACHINES: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).

GRAIN TRAFFIC FROM N.W.T.: *See* Ry. Transportation from N.W.T.

GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).

See 'Automatic.'

GRAND BEND, ONT., BREAKWATER PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

GRAND ETANG BRIDGE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).

GRANDE RIVIÈRE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

GRANDE VALLEE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514-1574 (i); Conc., 6070 (iii).

GRAND MANAN, BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).

GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTIONS in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).

GRAND NARROWS, BRIDGE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).

——— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).

——— WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND PILES, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND RIVER WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); M. for Com., 4132; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 4441, 4586; M. for Com., 4871 (ii); in Com, 5139 (iii); 7814; 3° m., 8055, 8321 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 122).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3° m., 8055, 8321; amt. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8055, 8321; Amt. (Mr. *Kemp*) 8066; Amt. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8065; (Mr. *Wilmot*) 8067; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8324; Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) 8326 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. No. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 7658; Res. prop., 7915; M. for Com. on Res., 8406, 8488, 8559, 8617, 8656, 8718, 8808, 8918, 9082, 9152, 9218, 9351, 9431, 9459, 9582, 9683, 9820, 9980 (iv); 10102, 10243; agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10408; in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°, and in Com. on B. 10412, 10538, 11190, 11302, 11833, 11959, 12074, 12146, 12221 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12720 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 71).

——— AGREEMENT B. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*): Remarks, 8086 (iv).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.'S SUBSIDY B. NO. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 7658; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7697; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7726; Ruling reserved (Mr. *Speaker*) 7727 (iv).

Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 7915; (M.) for Com. on Res., 8406 (iv).

Débate: (Mr. *Blair*) 8406; (Mr. *Charlton*) 8467, 8489; (Mr. *Monk*) 8526; (Mr. *Fielding*) 8546; (Mr. *Barker*) 8593; (Mr. *Sifton*) 8617; (Mr. *Haggart*) 8680; (Mr. *Emmerson*) 8706, 8718; (Mr. *Sproule*) 8746; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8776; (Mr. *Oliver*) 8805; (Mr. *Lennox*) 8808; (Mr. *Morrison*) 8859; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8874; (Mr. *Russell*) 8907. 8919; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 8961; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 9006; (Mr. *Northrup*) 9039; (Mr. *Costigan*) 9064; (Mr. *Guthrie*) 9082; (Mr. *Puttee*) 9120; (Mr. *Kemp*) 9152; (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 9183; (Mr. *Bennett*) 9198; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 9218; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 9228; (Mr. *Logan*) 9238; (Mr. *Osler*) 9281; (Mr. *Heyd*) 9305; (Mr. *Ganong*) 9327; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 9351; (Mr. *Wilson*) 9367; (Mr. *Broder*) 9394; (Mr. *Mackie*) 9414; (Mr. *Lavell*) 9431; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 9447; (Mr. *Hackett*) 9459; (Mr. *Talbot*) 9472; (Mr. *Blain*) 9495; (Mr. *Fisher*) 9512; (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 9529; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 9553; (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 9573; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 9583; (Mr. *Porter*) 9597; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 9622; (Mr. *Tarte*) 9640; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 9666; (Mr. *Clancy*) 9683; (Mr. *German*) 9708; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9727; (Sir *William Mulock*) 9751; (Mr. *Bell*) 9784; (Mr. *Wade*) 9820; (Mr. *Brock*) 9871; (Mr. *Malouin*) 9882; (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) 9898; (Mr. *Bureau*) 9906; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 9909; (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 9927; (Mr. *Henderson*) 9942; (Mr. *Stephens*) 9963; (Mr. *Wilmot*) 9980; (Mr. *Girard*) 9992; (Mr. *Ward*) 10010; (Mr. *Davis*) 10019; (Mr. *Richardson*) 10040; (Mr. *Holmes*) 10049; (Mr. *Clare*) 10060; (Mr. *Archambault*) 10071; (Mr. *Boyd*) 10076; (Mr. *Johnston, Lambton*) 10096 (iv); (Mr. *Vrooman*) 10102; (Mr. *Murray*) 10111; (Mr. *Pringle*) 10118; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 10139; (Mr. *Henry Cargill*) 10146; (Mr. *Parmelee*) 10157; (Mr. *Ball*) 10165; (Mr. *Scott*) 10173; (Mr. *Birkett*) 10216; (Mr. *Beland*) 10224; (Mr. *Stewart*) 10235; (Mr. *Fowler*) 10243; (Mr. *Paterson*) 10275; (Mr. *Clarke*) 10308, 10317; (Mr. *Angers*) 10349; (Mr. *Gourley*) 10353 (v).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC, &C.—*Con.*

Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax.*) by (Mr. *Monk*) 10315; Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) neg. (Y. 68; N. 119) 10403; Amt. (Mr. *Puttee*) neg. (Y. 50; N. 135) 10404; Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) neg. (Y. 70; N. 117) 10406; M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10407 (v).

3° m., 12612, 12644 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12612; (amt.) 12642; neg. (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12644; (Mr. *Sproule*) 12657; (Mr. *Haggart*) 12676; (Mr. *Osler*) Amt., 12691; (Mr. *Fielding*) 12694; (Mr. *Broder*) 12695; (Mr. *Taylor*) 12697; (Mr. *Paterson*) 12698; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12699; (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 12700; (Mr. *Richardson*) 12701; neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12702; (Mr. *Alcorn*) Amt., 12703; neg. (Y. 35; N. 75) 12705; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) Amt., 12706; neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709; (Mr. *Fowler*) Amt., 12709; (Mr. *Northrup*) Amt., 12711; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12720, Amt., 12721; (Mr. *Blain*) Amt., 12724; (Mr. *Kemp*) 12729; (Mr. *Emmerson*) 12731; (Mr. *Hale*) 12733; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12734; (Mr. *Talbot*) 12736; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12736; (Mr. *Hackett*) 12740; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12743; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12743; (Mr. *Fowler*) 12744; (Mr. *Taylor*) Amt., 12750; (Mr. *Paterson*) 12755; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12755; (Mr. *Haggart*) 12757; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12758; (Mr. *Bennett*) 12761; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12761; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12762; (Mr. *Bennett*) Amt., 12767; (Mr. *Barker*) Amt., 12768; (Mr. *Charlton*) 12770; (Mr. *Henderson*) Amt., 12770; (Mr. *Bell*) Amt., 12772; (Mr. *Morin*) Amt., 12774 (vi).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Sproule*) Irregularity of Introduction of Bill, 7726 (iv), 12774; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12744 (vi).

G. T. P. RY., ALTERNATIVE POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).

——— COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT SYSTEMS: Remarks (Mr. *Cargill*) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

——— CONTRACTS *re* EASTERN PORTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 13027 (vi).

——— DISTRIBUTION OF BILL TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 8918 (iv).

——— FRENCH TRANSLATION OF BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Léonard*) 8118 (iv).

——— GOVT. POLICY, DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7487 (iii).

——— M. (Mr. *Lennox*) to adjn. Debate, 8806 (iv).

——— M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 447 (i).

——— MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).

——— PARISHES CROSSED, LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).

——— PETS. *re* IRREGULARITIES, AFFIDAVITS, &C.: Par. in Montreal *Star* (Mr. *Talbot*) 14845; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14846 (vi).

——— PETS. *re*: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 13266; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 13266 (vi).

——— PETS. *re*, MEETINGS OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13559, 13671 (vi).

——— Remarks *re* (Mr. *Marcil, Bagot*) 12941 (vi).

G. T. P. Ry. Ques. of Order (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) Member reading Speech, 10249; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 10250 (v).

——— Subsidies : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 671, 1031 (i).

——— Subsidy : Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (Mr. *Kemp*) 5733 (iii).

——— Par. in Toronto *Globe re* Details (Mr. *Haggart*) 5892 (iii).

——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).

——— Mr. Hays Statement *re*, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 14648 (vi).

——— Surveys, 'Business System,' &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14355 (vi).

——— Surveys, Plans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 8230 (iv).

——— Surveys, Reps. of Surveyors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14765 (vi).

——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. *Fielding*) 14765 (vi).

——— Two-Cent Rate, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 10462 (iv).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 12221 (v).
See 'G.T.R.'

——— Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 5892 (iii).

——— and Trans Canada, Sale, &c.: Par. in Toronto *News* : Read (Mr. *Monk*) 7566 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII* ; *c.* 121).

G. T. Ry. and C.P.R. Fiscal Policy : Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).

G.T.R. and I.C.R. Traffic Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 2759 (ii).

G. T. Ry. Co., Discriminating Rates between Canadians and Americans : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).

——— Loans by Fed. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 2920 (ii).

——— Rentals from I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).

——— Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

——— Terminals at St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).

——— Two-Cent Rate, Repeal of Clause in Charter : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 11556, 11828 (v).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on B. 235, 12221 (v).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.'

Granite Village, N.S., Mooring Pier : in Com. of Sup., (vi).

Grant, J. G., Barrie Customs Collector, Default, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).

Graves, Florence D. Relief B. No. 214 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 5581 ; 2°*, 5989 ; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 123).

Grazing Lands, N.W.T., Lease to Geo. McDonnell, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).

G.B. and Can. Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 13672 (vi).
See 'Can. and G. B.'

Great North-West Central Ry. and C. P. Ry. Co.'s Agreement : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

Great North West Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 124).

Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

'Grecian,' Str., Reimbursement to Capt. Harrison *re* Suspension of Certificate, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).

Green Cove Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).

Grenville Canal, Guide Pier at Entrance : in Com. ot Sup., 12909 (vi).

——— Payment to Henry Tucker *re* Investigations : in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).

Grey Counties, Census Enumerators : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).

Grey County, List of Public Buildings wanted : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).

——— Supplies *re* Quarantine Service : in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).

Guay, Mr. A., Compensation for Loss of Horse : in Com. of Sup., 5406 (iii).

Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1764 ; 2°*, 2050 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 125).

Guelph, Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).

——— Post Office Building : in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).

Guilbault, Mr. Edward, Gratuity to Widow : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).

Gull Habbour, St. George's Bay, Man., Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).

Guns ordered by British Army : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

Guysborough, N.S., Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).

Haanel, Dr., Supt. of Mines, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13764, 13774 (vi).

Hagar, Miss, Appnmt. at Experimental Farm : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5316 (iii).

Haldimand, Census Enumerator : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).

Half-Breed Claims, Commissions, Applications for Scrip, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).

——— Schools, Salaries paid, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).

HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
See 'Can. and G. B.,' 'Mail Subsidies,' &c.
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
—— AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
—— COTTON CO., LOAN OF RAILS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
—— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
—— DEEP-WATER TERMINUS, I.C.R., DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).
—— HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
—— HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).
—— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 12874, 14080 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
—— MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*) 14279 (vi).
—— MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com of Sup., 13032 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).
—— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
—— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
—— TIME BALL: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
—— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HALTON, PEEL AND CARDWELL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
Hamilton, &c., Power Co.: *See* 'Jordan Light, &c.'
Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4587; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 126.)
HAMILTON, DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
—— ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER CO., RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3803 (ii).
—— GRIMSBY ELECTRIC RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6084 (iii).
HAMILTON INLAND REVENUE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, MONTREAL, LOAN B. No. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5417 (iii).
See 'Montreal.'
HARBOUR AND RIVERS AND BRIDGES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
—— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii), 13308 (vi).
—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
—— MAR. PROVS., GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424 (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1512, 2241 (i), 3304 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
—— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
HARDY BAY, B.C., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
HARRISON, CAPT., STR. *Grecian*, COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
HARRISON, MR., INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, N.B., RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY., SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).
HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
HATFIELDS POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
HAULAGE OF GOVT., &C., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
HAWK POINT INLET, N.S., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HAWKESBURY, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup, 13119 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, ONT., TO SOUTH INDIAN, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT AID *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAY AND OATS BOUGHT BY CAN. GOVT. FOR IMPERIAL GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr *Monk*) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 66) 690 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Ret., 1057 (i).
HAYCOCK, MR. J., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE: in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4960 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).

HAZELTON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

HEALTH ACT, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4440 (ii).

HEATH, GEO., COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).

'HERALD' PRINTING CO., MONTREAL, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 8329 (vi); Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

HERCHMER, MR. L. W., PENSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5321 (iii).

HERRING COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

HÊTU, RUDOLPH, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 7915 (iv).

Hides Inspection Bill: *See* 'General Inspection.'

HIDES INSPECTION, TEL. FROM W. F. MACLEAN, M.P.: Read (Mr. *Sproule*) 3969 (ii).

HIDES INSPECTION AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).

HIDES, TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7748 (iv), 13678 (vi).

HIGGINS SHORE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup, 12585 (v).

—— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).

—— CONTRACTORS AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).

—— CONTRACTORS NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).

—— PREPARATION OF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD, PAINTING OF PORTRAIT BY CANADIAN ARTIST: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13026 (vi).

HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

HNAUSA WHARF EXTENSION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).

HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).

—— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).

HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

See 'Cattle Guard Comn.'

Home Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 191 (Mr. *Russell*) 1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 127.)

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 720 (i).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND—*Con.*

Debate: (Mr. *Hackett*) 731; (Mr. *Charleton*) 734; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 740; (Mr. *Sproule*) 742; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 751; (Mr. *Broder*) 754; (Mr. *Belcourt*) 758; (Mr. *Richardson*) 761; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 763; (Mr. *Kemp*) 766; (Mr. *Murray*) 767; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 769; (Mr. *Wright*) 772; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 772; (Mr. *Porter*) 775; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 778; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 782; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 787; (Mr. *Reid*) 787; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 788; (Mr. *Clarke* 794; (Mr. *Ingram*) 809 (i).

—— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 871 (i).

—— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to present Address to His Maj., 1193 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13894 (vi).

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FREE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

—— *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iii).

—— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).

—— LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).

See 'Immigration.'

HOPEWELL CAPE, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

HOSPITALS FOR TREATMENT OF TRACHOMA, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).

See 'Trachoma.'

HOSPITALS OF ISOLATION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).

'HOT AIR LINE' RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14490 (vi).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS: *See* 'Rooms,' &c.

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).

—— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, PRIVATE BILLS PROCEDURE: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).

—— *See* general heading.

CARGILL, HENRY, LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12937 (vi).

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notification of Appnmt. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

CONSERVATIVE LITERATURE: *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

DOOR-KEEPER'S SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

ELECTION LAW, LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

ELECTION PAMPHLETS, FRANKING, &C.: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

ELECTION PETITIONS, JUDGMENT OF SUPREME COURT: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 91 (i).

ELECTIONS OF 1878, CONGRATULATIONS TO PRIME MINISTER (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

ELEVATOR ACCIDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5417 (iii).

FARQUHARSON, MR., late M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).

FLINT, T. B., CLERK OF HSE., APPNMT.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE *re* CAMPAIGN LITERATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 14286 (vi).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

FRANKING PRIVILEGES : *See* 'Mail Bags.'
GOVT. APPOINTMENTS OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS, BETTER ACCOMMODATION *re* ROOMS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13007 (vi).
——— INCREASES TO CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii), 14112 (vi).
——— LOCKED P.O. BOXES : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Vic.*) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT : *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'
——— *See* 'Schell, J. T.'
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS : in Com. of Sup., 14112 (vi).
LIBRARY OF PARLT. : in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
See general heading.
LOY, GEO. M., INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT, &C. : on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
——— *See* 'Beauharnois Electoral District.'
——— REP. OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS : Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 7203 (iii).
MAIL BAGS AND CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, BLOCKING CORRIDORS : Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 14219 (vi).
See general heading.
MARTINEAU, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).
MEMBERS APPOINTED TO GOVT. POSITION : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3805 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9582 (iv).
MEMBERS INTRODUCED : 3, 7, 283, 1642 (i).
——— CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3, 367 (i).
MEMBERS' RIGHTS TO SPEAK *re* MR. SPEAKER'S RULING : Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 10535 (v).
MESSENGERS OF THE H. OF C. : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— *See* 'House.'
MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90, 707 (i). 4956 (ii), 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).
——— Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 90, 707 (i), 4956 (ii), 14042, 14662 (vi).
——— Read (*Dep. Speaker*) 12869 (vi).
ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 367 (i).
ORDER, QUES. OF, *re* BRUNET AND DOM. ELECTIONS : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 108 (i).
OTTAWA PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, ADDITIONAL ROOMS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).
PARLIAMENT, DATE OF CONVENING, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).
PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DUST NUISANCE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 2104 (i).
——— PLAYING CRICKET : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
PERKINS, WM., PAYMENT TO, *re* LISGAR ELECTION : in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
PETITIONS, PRESENTATION OF, RULES, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
PETITIONS REJECTED AS CONTRARY TO RULE 86 : (Mr. *Speaker*) 654 (i).
PRESS REPRESENTATIVES IN GALLERY OF H. OF C., SESSIONAL SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14242 (vi).
PRIME MINISTER, CONGRATULATIONS *re* TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AS A MEMBER : (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PRINTING : *See* general heading.
PRIVATE BILLS : M. (Mr. *Morrison*) to extend Time, 10489 (v).
——— M. to suspend Rule (Mr. *Russell*) 4958 (ii).
——— NOTICES, REVISING RULES *re* : M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) *re* Rep. of Joint. Com., 13547 (vi).
——— *See* 'Rules.'
——— ORDER FOR PROCEDURE : Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* VISITORS IN CORRIDORS, 11557 (v).
——— *See* 'Visitors.'
——— (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) *re* ATTENDANCE IN HOUSE, 2015 (i).
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION TO BOARDS OF TRADE : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1378 (i).
——— *See* 'Parliamentary Documents.'
QUEENS, WEST, P.E.I. REPRESENTATION *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).
ROOMS FOR MEMBERS, FURNITURE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).
——— *See* 'House,' &c.
RULES OF HSE., REVISION, &C. *re* PETS. FOR PRIVATE BILLS : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Demers*) 4441 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) to amend, 12216 (v).
——— *See* 'Private Bills.'
RUSSELL ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 1027 (i).
ST. JAMES (MONTREAL) ELECTORAL DIVISION, JUDGMENT OF SUP. COURT : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WARRANT : M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i), 6995 (iii), 13376 (vi).
——— NOTIFICATION OF VACANCY : (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).
——— *See* 'Brunet.'
SCHELL, J. T., M.P., 1ST REP. OF PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS COM. *re* : Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 5511 (iii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 14242 (vi).
——— INCREASES TO, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 14113 (vi).
——— MESSENGERS : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
See 'Messengers.'
SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE, DATE OF MEETING : M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).
SITTINGS OF HOUSE : *See* 'Govt. Business.'
TRADESMEN'S ACCOUNTS FOR H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).
VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 1023 (i).
VENTILATION IN H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 13007 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).
VISITORS IN H. OF C. CORRIDORS : Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 11427 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lennox*) 11557 (v).
VOTERS' LISTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 5274 (iii).
WALLACE, DAVID WARDROPE, MEMBER FOR ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RUSSELL : Introduced, 1642 (i).

HOWIE, F. W., LEGAL EXPENSES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

Hudson's Bay, Change of Name B. No. 173 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 2794 (ii).

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Co.'s B. No. 124 (Mr. *Stewart*) 1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 129.)

Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Haggart*) 1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 128.)
See 'James Bay.'

HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

HULL WHARF, COMPLETION: in Com. of Sup., 5900 (iii).

HUNGARIAN IMMIGRATION, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iii).

HUNTER, J. B., PROMOTION: in Com. of Sup., 13499 (vi).

HURLEY, J. M., APPNMT., DUTIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (iii), 5280 (iii).
——— REP., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 13744 (vi).

HURON COUNTY JUDGESHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 123 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4588 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 131.)

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60 (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 1327; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 130.)

HUTTON, MAJ.-GEN., INQUIRY FOR RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 206 (i).

HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii), 13312 (vi).

HYDRAULIC LEASES, YUKON TER.: M. for Cor.*, (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).
——— O.C.'s &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*) 1323 (i).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720, 4118 (ii).

IMMIGRATION, &c., INADEQUATE INSPECTION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6546; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 6557; (Mr. *Oliver*) 6562: (Mr. *Puttee*) 6567; (Mr. *Richardson*) 6573; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 6576; (Mr. *Bell*) 6577; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6590; (Mr. *Davis*) 6596; (Mr. *Sifton*) 6603 (iii).

IMMIGRATION:

ACCOMMODATION FOR SETTLERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Sup., 1119 (i).
AGENCIES IN OLD COUNTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iii).
AGENCIES, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6615, 6658 (iii).
BARR COLONY, IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
——— NUMBER, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

BARR COLONY, BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
See 'general heading.'
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE DELEGATES, TREATMENT BY U.S. IMMIGRATION OFFICERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).
DEVLIN, MR., SUCCESSOR OF, AS IMMIGRATION AGENT, IRELAND: in Com of Sup., 6731 (iii).
DISEASED IMMIGRANTS, INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5492 (iii).
DOUKHOBORS, HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
——— LOANS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
——— PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
——— AND GOVTL., ACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
ELLIS, DR., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6702.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
EXPENDITURE, 1902–3: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6269 (iii).
FABER, DR., ILLEGAL PRACTICE, CHARGES *re* PAR. IN 'STAR': Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iii).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6850 (iii).
FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674, 6700 (iii).
GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS, *re* N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).
GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 2299 (i), 6827 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6269 (iii).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
HAZLETON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FREE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704.
——— IMMIGRATION AGENTS, PRE-EMPTION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Sproule*) 289 (i).
——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
——— LANDS, AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).
HOSPITALS OF ISOLATION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).
HUNGARIAN IMMIGRATION, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iii).
IMMIGRANTS, LANDING AT QUEBEC, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5318 (iii).
——— Notice of M. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6522 (iii).
——— *See* general heading.
——— PROVISION FOR NEW SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) 866 (i).
——— REFUSED ADMISSION INTO CANADA, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2310 (i), 2501 (ii).
IMMIGRATION INTO MAN., HOUSES AND FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC, GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1593 (i).
——— QUES. OF ORDER *re* DISCUSSION: in Com. of Sup, 6854 (iii).
——— *re* observance of Rules, 6862 (iii).
——— *re* quoting of Speeches, 6870–74 (iii).
——— STATISTICS, TOTAL NUMBER, ORIGIN, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 1035 (i).
IRELAND, IMMIGRATION OFFICE, CLOSING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1031 (i).
See 'Devlin.'
LAKE ST. JOHN COL. CO., EXPENDITURE *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iii).
LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN B.C., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).
See 'Homestead' &c.

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

MAR. PROVS., IMMIGRANTS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1855 (i).
MEDICAL EXAMINER, QUEBEC, &C.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTION, GOVT. APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2756 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 6695, 6851 (iii).
MURRAY, IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).
NATIONALITIES, &C., IMMIGRATION, 1902-3: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2310 (i).
N.S. EXODUS TO U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
ONT. AND QUEBEC, IMMIGRATION FOR, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1593 (i).
PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
PRESTON, MR., INTERVIEW *re* CAN. BUTTER: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).
——— STATEMENT *re* CAN. APPLES: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
——— SUIT BY CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
P.E.I. AGENTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6884 (iii).
QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
REPATRIATION AGENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6674, 6700 (iii).
RITCHIE, MR., U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).
SETTLERS EFFECTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).
TRACHOMA EPIDEMIC *re* IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 5493 (iii).
——— HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6662, 6696, 6843 (iii).
U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).
U.S. IMMIGRATION EXODUS TO: in Com. of Sup., 6727, 6874 (iii).
WHITE, MR., EXPENSES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6732, 6853 (iii).
WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 11188 (v).
See 'Interior', 'Indians,' &c.

Immoral Intertainments: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

Imperial Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 2956, 3170 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 132).

'IMPERIAL' BUILDING, OTTAWA, GOVT. OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3803 (ii).

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, COR., &C., CAN. GOVT'S., REFUSAL TO PUBLISH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 9457 (iv).
——— Papers *re* laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
——— *See* 'Colonial.'

IMPERIAL DEFENCE AND PROP. RES. OF LORD ROSEBERY: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 410 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Reserve,' &c.

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, CANADIAN EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).

IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATION, NAMES OF OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 12715, 13936 (vi).

IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATION SYSTEM *re* SELECTION OF CIVIL SERVANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13669 (vi).

IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, &C., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 13935 (vi).
See 'Preferential,' 'Tariff,' &c., 'Customs,'&c.

Incorporated Companies B. No. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1193 (i); 2° m., 3257 (ii).

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT: *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.', 'Schell, J. T.'

INDIANS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR N.W. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
ALEXANDER INDIAN AGENCY TELEPHONE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*), 6895 (iii).
BLANKETS, CLOTHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
BRANT, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOL, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).
CLOTHING FOR INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).
DOKIS RESERVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST TRESPASSERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 7914 (iv).
DONCASTER RESERVE, SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*), 288 (i).
EDMONTON AGENCY, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
EDMUNDSTON RESERVE, N.B., FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
ELKHORN SCHOOL, N.W.T.. AVERAGE ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSION *re* APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*), 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
HALF-BREED SCHOOLS, SALARIES PAID, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).
INDIAN AFFAIRS, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 13760 (vi).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 272 (i).
——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
INDIAN AGENTS, B.C., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iii)
——— GUARDIANS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*), 819 (i).
——— TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7262 (iii).
INDIANS, BRANT RESERVE, LEASE, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tisdale*), 1322 (i).
INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
INDIANS, CHIEFS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
——— GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
——— LAND MANAGEMENT FUND: in Com, of Sup., 6415 (iii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANT, KINGS, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2501 (ii).
——— N.B., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— N.S., PURCHASE OF RESERVE LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
——— N.W.T., AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).

INDIANS--*Con.*

INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— N.W.T., LIVE STOCK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iii).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC, ROAD REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
——— QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
——— RESERVES, RE-ALLOTMENT, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7262 (iii).
——— SCHOOLS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 6409, 6414 (iii).
——— SCHOOLS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— SUPPLIES, N.W.T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).
——— SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS. B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iii),
MACRAE, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— B.C.: in Com of Sup., 13785 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
ROBINSON TREATY, PAYMENTS *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 5319 (iii).
ST. JOHN'S RIVER AND ST. MARY'S RIVER INDIANS, PET. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).
SAND, INDIAN BOY ADOPTED BY MR. JOHNSTON: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii).
SCHOOLS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii), 13786 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
SEED GRAIN, RELIEF: in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— N. W. T. Reserves, &c., 6350 (iii).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup.. 7258 (iii).
STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
TERREBONNE INDIAN RESERVE: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— *See* 'Doncaster.'
VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
WADSWORTH, MR., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
YUKON INDIANS, GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iii).
——— RELIEF, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7270 (iii)
See 'Immigration' 'Interior,' &c.

INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
INDIAN RIVER RY. AND LAKE MEGANTIC SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, B. C., ROYAL COMMISSION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
——— *See* 'Labour,' &c.
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS FOR INDIANS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
INGERSOLL TO STRATFORD, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14345 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 186 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4007; in Com., 4007; 3°*, 4009 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 26).

INLAND REVENUE:

ALCOHOL: *See* 'Wood.'
ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS in N.W.T., REP. OF INSPECTOR, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*) 847, 880 (i).
BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).
CHEVRIER FAMILY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12498 (v), 12716 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13971 (vi).
CLEMENT, JULES, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13664 (vi).
CULLING TIMBER, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
DISTILLERIES, &c., INSPECTORS' SALARIES: in Com., of Sup., 13974 (vi).
DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNTS PAID TO *re* TRIP TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5407 (iii).
EXCISE OFFICERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).
——— SALARIES *re* C. S. ACT AMT.: in Com. of Sup., 13967 (vi).
——— TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (vi).
EXCISE TAXATION PER CAPITA FOR 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).
FERGUSON, J. M., LEGAL EXPENSES *re* ADULTERATION ACT: in Com. of Sup., 5412 (iii).
FORREST, E., REIMBURSEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
FYFE, MR., REP. *re* GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).
GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
GRAIN INSPECTION, COST PER CAR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4837 (ii).
——— *re* STANDARD SAMPLES, RES. OF TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINE: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*, &c.) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 89 (i).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
——— INSPECTORS, &c.: Salaries in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).
INSPECTION OF STAPLES: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).

INLAND EEVENUE—*Con.*

KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).
KELLY, ASST. INSPECTOR, REFUND, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 5405 (iii).
LIQUOR INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
LONGFORD: *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191,-4203 (ii).
MAN. GRAIN ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
——— INSPECTION *re*, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
——— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLIED TO MANUFACTURERS: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
——— *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
MONTREAL INLAND REV. OFFICE, MONEY STOLEN: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
PRESCOTT, INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
STANDARD CHEMICAL COMPANY, PURCHASE OF WOOD ALCOHOL: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).
——— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).
TOBACCO COMBINE, CHAIRMAN'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).
TOBACCO EXCISE DUTIES: PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5701 (iii).
TOBACCO STAMPS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).
WOOD ALCOHOL, MANUFACTURED AT LONGFORD, OUTPUT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 98 (i).
——— *See* 'Standard.'
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

Insolvency B. No. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 654; 2° m., 2373 (i); on Order for 2°, 2787; 2° m., 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).

INSOLVENT ACT, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 818 (i).

Inspection Act: *See* 'General.'
——— *See* 'Textile Fabrics.'

INSPECTION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).

INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS. *See* 'Immigration.'

INSPECTION OF STAPLES: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).

INSURANCE COS. OF CANADA, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1025 (i).

INSURANCE FUND, P. O., REP., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'

INSURANCE RATES *re* MARINE SHIPPING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13697 (vi).

INSURANCE, ON OCEAN STEAMERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
——— REPORT OF SUPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 9350 (iv).
——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12586 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8230 (iv).
——— *See* 'Imperial Preference.'
——— CONFIDENTIAL REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 7923 (iv).

I. C. R., Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. Act, B. 258.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

ADDITIONAL SIDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 14055(vi).
——— *See* 'Sidings.'
AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).
BOOK-KEEPING *re* EXPENDITURE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8270 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 12877 (vi).
BRIDGES, STRENGTHENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).
BROWN, MRS., GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
CAR SHOPS, NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
——— *See* 'Machinery,' 'Moncton,' &c.
'CHAPMAN' BALL-BEARING APPARATUS, REP. *re*: Remarks in Com of Sup., 8283 (iv).
——— LETTER *re*: Read (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. of Sup., 7024 (iii).
——— *See* 'Muhlfeld.'
CHAUDIERE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).
CLERGUE'S CONTRACT FOR STEEL RAILS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER PATENT: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).
COAL RATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 6167 (iii).
DEMURRAGE ON CARS, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).
DOUBLE TRACKING: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).
DRAW BARS ON FREIGHT CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 8288 (iv).
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
DRUMMONDVILLE SIDING, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).
EARNINGS, &c., DATE OF INTERIM REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4444 (ii).
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FREIGHT CARS ON CONNECTING LINES, &c.: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
——— FREIGHT RATES, CLASSES 1–10: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.* 2338 (i).
——— *See* 'Traffic.'
——— RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1857 (i).
——— *See* 'Traffic Arrangements,' &c.
GENERAL STATEMENT: on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Blair*) 3633 (ii).
——— INQUIRY FOR PAPERS *re* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3537 (ii).
GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
HALIFAX DEEP WATER TERMINUS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
HAULAGE OF GOVT., &c., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12593 (v), 12823 (vi).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONSTRUCTION FOR I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

LEVIS, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
——— LAND PURCHASE, PAYMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &C., PURCHASED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
LORNE SIDING, TRAFFIC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR LOCOMOTIVE AND CAR SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 8290 (iv), 14106 (vi).
MONCTON, INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS, I. C. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
MONTREAL LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'Chapman.'
OFFICIAL GUIDE, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3535 (ii).
OPERATING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7811 (iv).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3698 (ii).
PASSES: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9582 (iv).
PENSION SYSTEM, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 9216 (iv).
PINTSH GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
PRIVATE CARS, PURCHASE BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2309 (i).
See 'Haulage.'
RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER: in Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).
RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1857 (i).
REP. OF MR. POTTINGER *re* TIES, &C.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Haggart*) 3806 (ii).
RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, FIRE PROTECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
RHODES, CURRY & CO., CONTRACT FOR ROLLING STOCK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100 (vi).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup. 8314 (iv).
——— SHOPS, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gouvreau*) 12497 (v).
RIVER OUELLE BRANCH, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).
——— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).
ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8292 (iv), 14100 (vi).
'SCOTIA' STR., SALVAGE SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
——— Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 7150 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7206 (iii).
SIDINGS AND INCREASED FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14081, 14107 (vi).
See 'Additional.'
STEEL RAILS, FASTENINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).
——— CONTRACT WITH CLERGUE SYNDICATE: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
——— CONTRACT, PRICES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 285 (i).
SUPPLIES ENTERED DUTY FREE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fowler*) 916 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

SUSSEX, N.B., ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672 (ii).
SYDNEY JUNCTION TO NORTH SYDNEY EXTENSION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 447 (i).
TARIFF RATES, INQUIRY FOR PAPERS: (Mr. *Bell*) 3712 (ii).
See 'Freight.'
TERMINAL FACILITIES AT BONAVENTURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
TIES IMPORTED FOR GOVT. RYS., COST, QUANTITY, &C., Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1679 (i).
——— PURCHASED, USED, &C.; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
TRACKMEN ON I. C. R., INCREASE OF WAGES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12874, 14083 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. on B. 257 (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 12558 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 1297 (i).
TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS WITH G. T. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 2759 (ii).
VESTIBULE EQUIPMENT FOR CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT, EVIDENCE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3301, 3398 (ii).
WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
See 'Railways.'

INTERIOR:

ASSAY OFFICE, VANCOUVER: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii).
ASTRONOMICAL DEMARCATION, WORKS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i) 6791 (iii).
BACTERIOLOGICAL LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
BANFF SPRINGS, BATHS: in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii) 13955 (vi).
——— MUSEUM BUILDING, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
——— ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
BELL, DR., APPNMT. AS DIRECTOR OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
BUFFALO HERD IN BANFF PARK: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
C. P. R. LANDS, AND SCHOOL TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).
CANE BROS., GRANTS FOR TIMBER LICENSE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
COAL MINING IN BANFF RESERVE, LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).
CORY, W. W., SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).
COTTEE, HERBERT, SALARY AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3610 (ii).
CROWS'S NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— COMMISSIONER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iii).
——— INSPECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
——— MAN. AND N. W. T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816 (i).
——— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— SALE, LOCATION, PURCHASERS &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 670 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

DOM. LANDS SURVEYORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).
——— SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 6939 (iii).
——— YUKON REGULATIONS *re*: in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).
GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS, VISIT TO CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).
GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM, VICTORIA MEMORIAL: in Com. of Sup., 352 (i), 14243 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11188 (v).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— EXPLORATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
——— PLOTS, PLANS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iii).
——— REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v), 13769 (vi).
GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).
GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T., LEASE TO GEO. MCDONNELL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
GUAY, MR. A., COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF HORSE: in Com. of Sup., 5406 (iii).
HAANEL, DR., SUPT. OF MINES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13764, 13774 (vi).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSIONS, APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
INTERIOR, DEPTL. EMPLOYEES, DATE OF APPNMT., SALARIES, &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Ret.,* 23.8 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
——— COMPLAINTS *re* ILLUSTRATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3972 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6922 (iii).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 267 (i), 13761 (vi).
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, GEOLOGISTS REP.: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iii).
——— CONGRESS OF GEOLOGY, VISIT TO CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).
IRRIGATION, N.W.T., SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).
JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).
LAND GUIDES, *re* SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6768 (iii).
LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1858 (i).
LAND SLIDES: *See* 'Turtle Mountain.'
——— *See* 'Frank Disaster.'
LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).
LOW, A. P., TECHNICAL OFFICER, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13770 (vi).
MCDONALD, GEO., LEASE OF GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOL LANDS, PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 6169 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

MAN. AND N.W.T., SCHOOL LANDS, SALES, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 706 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6893 (iii).
MAPS, LITHOGRAPHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6800 (iii), 13778 (vi).
——— PRINTING, &C., INFORMATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
MEHAN, DR., METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
METALLURGISTS AND PETROGRAPHERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13778 (vi).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MINES BRANCH, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13762 (vi).
MINING INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 12591 (v), 13965 (vi).
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING CO., CONTRACT WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13372 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13667, 13933 (vi).
N. W. TERS., MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
P. E. I. COAL FIELDS, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO., SECTIONS ACQUIRED, &C.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor.*, 2338.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (*W. J. Roche*) 4363 (ii).
——— SALES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (ii).
SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
STEWART, E., FOREST INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6416, 6774 (iii).
SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS, PURCHASE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6820 (iii)
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
TELESCOPE FOR OTTAWA OBSERVATORY; in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).
TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
TREE CULTURE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii).
——— PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13775 14272 (vi).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
TYERMAN, P. D., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 286 (i).
VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
See 'Geological.'
WASHINGTON, MR. HECTOR, REP. *re* LAND VALUES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
WINNIPEG LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
YOHO PARK, ROADS CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
See 'Immigration', 'Indians', &c.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Com., 91 (i).

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, GEOLOGIST'S REP.: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iii).

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF GEOLOGY, VISIT TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).

'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE, LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr *Fowler*) 12218 (v).

International Railway Appliance Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 40 (Mr. *Brock*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 133.)

INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. OF N.B., RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

INTERNATIONAL TARIFF CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 125; on Order for 2°, 566, 705; 2° m., 916; neg., 939 (i).

Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 144 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2395 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 134.)

INTERPROVINCIAL AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
See 'James Bay.'

INTERVIEW WITH N. Y. REPORTERS *re* ALASKAN BOUNDARY: Denial (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13962 (vi).

INVERNESS MINES, N. S., BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).

INVERNESS POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).

INVERNESS RY. AND COAL CO.'S RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).

IONA, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. B.: *See* 'Steel,' &c.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com, of Sup., 7762 (iv).

—— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7795 (iv).

—— PAYMENTS FOR 1890–1903: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 11556 (v).

—— PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6435 (iii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Fielding*) 4278; (Mr. *Bell*) 4279; (Mr. *Kendall*) 4288; (Mr. *Osler*) 4293; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4297; (Mr. *Clancy*) 4300; (Mr. *Pringle*) 4309; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4322; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4329 (Mr. *Oliver*) 4336; (Mr. *Heyd*) 4338; (Mr. *Pope*) 4341 (ii).

—— TARIFF PROTECTION: Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3864 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) *re* Notice of Motion, 4040 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).

IROQUOIS CANAL, ELECTRIC LIGHTING: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).

IRRIGATION, N. W. T., SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).

ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).

ISLE GROSBOIS. BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5902 (iii).

ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).

—— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).

JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

JAMES AND HUDSON'S BAYS, FISHING RIGHTS, APPLICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6893 (iii).

JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).

James Bay Ry.: *See* 'Interprovincial.'

JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

JAPAN EXHIBITION, GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, INFLUX OF: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 3713 (ii).

JAPANESE TARIFF *re* U.S. PRODUCTS: Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

JAPAN TRADE WITH CAN., CUSTOMS DUTIES *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8617 (iv).

JEDDORE EAST, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

JEROME, MARTIN, M.P.P., AND MAN. ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 5321 (iii).

'JESSE JAMES' SERIES OF PUBLICATIONS, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).

—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

JOGGINS RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).

JOHNSON, MR., PURCHASE OF HOUSE BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).

JOINT HIGH COMMISSION AND RECIPROCITY WITH U.S.: Par. in Toronto *World* (Mr. *Sproule*) 14053 (vi).
See 'Alaskan,' 'Colonial,' &c.

—— COR. WITH SENATOR FAIRBANKS: in Budget Speech, 1407 (i).

Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Co.'s Incorp, B. No. 52 (Mr. *Bazinet*) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 977; in Com. and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 135.)

JOLIETTE AND LAKE MANUAN RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).

JONQUIERES TO HA HA BAY RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

Jordan Light, Heat and Power Co.'s B. No. 162 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2582: 2°*, 2756; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 136.)

JUBILEE STAMPS, SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6060 (iii).

Judges of the N. W. Ters. Act Amt. B. No. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 12609 (v) ; 2°, in Com., 13853, 14287 ; 3°*, 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 40.)

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. No. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 10102 ; in Com on Res., 10759 ; 1°* ; 2°*, and in Com., 10792, 11406 ; 3°*, 11422 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 27.)

Judges Retiring Allowance B. No. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 1° m., 93 ; wthdn., 634 (i).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. No. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 203 (i) ; wthdn., 2582 ; Res. prop., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii), 8087 ; in Com. on Res., 8369 ; 1°*, 2°* of B. and in Com., and 3°*, 8372 (iv) ; Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 29.)

Judges of Superior Court (Quebec) Act Amt. B. No. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), Res. prop., 11426 ; in Com. on Res., 11821 ; 2° m., 11833 ; 1°* of B, 11833 ; 2°*, and in Com., 12301 ; 3°*, 12302 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 28.)

JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, RETIRING ALLOWANCES B.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 3431 (ii).

JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), 11072 (v).

JUDGES APPOINTED FROM LOCAL BAR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

JUDGES, B.C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

——— MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

——— N.S., INCREASE OF SALARY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

JUDGES SALARIES, COUNTY COURTS, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3628 (ii).

——— LEGISLATION *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 95 (i).

JUDGESHIP, OFFER TO CONSERVATIVE POLITICIAN : Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13805 (vi).

JUDGES IN QUEBEC AND OUTSIDE LEGAL BUSINESS : Ques. (Mr. *Grant*), 14665 (vi).

JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).

JUSTICE :

AD HOC JUDGES : in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

ADMIRALTY COURT, ACCOMMODATION FOR SITTINGS : in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

BINDER TWINE, COST IN 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 447 (i)

——— NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 3798 (ii).

——— PRICES FOR CURRENT YEAR, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 203 (i).

——— PRICES FIXED FOR PENITENTIARY SUPPLY : Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 1595 (i).

——— *See* 'Sisal.'

B.C. STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE OF, &C.: M. for O.Cs., &c* (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), 706 (i).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

B. C. STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 2016 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to print, 2675 (ii).

BRUNET, ARTHUR, AND DOM. ELECTION ACT : M. for Pets., O.Cs., &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 101 (i).

CLARKE, DUNCAN, EX. COURT : in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

COMMUTATION OF CARVER : Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), 13303 (vi.)

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES : *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

COOKE *vs.* COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

COUNTY COURTS, APPOINTMENTS FROM LOCAL BARS : Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*), 5582 (iii).

——— APPNMTS., RETIREMENT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*), 4960 (ii).

See 'Judges.'

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, N.B., SALARY OF JUDGE : in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

DOM. STATUTES CONSOLIDATION : *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*), 10102 (v).

EXCHEQUER COURT, JUDGE'S TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR, EDITING REPS. : in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

EXECUTIONS, EXPENDITURES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

GAYNOR & GREENE, EXTRADITION : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 109 (i).

GENELLE *vs.* THE KING, LEGAL EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

GRAHAM *vs.* KING, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* PUBLIC WORKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13471 (vi).

HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).

HETU, RUDOLPHE, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*), 7915 (iv).

HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

HOWIE, F. W., LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), 11072 (v).

JUDGES APPOINTED FROM LOCAL BAR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

See 'County.'

——— QUES. OF ORDER *re* : Ruling (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*), 209 (i).

JUDGES, B.C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

JUDGESHIP, HURON COUNTY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

——— MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

JUDGESHIP, MANITOBA, DELAY IN APPNMT. ; Remarks in Com of Sup., 212 (i).

JUDGE, N.W.TERS. SUPREME COURT, ADDITIONAL : in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).

JUDGES, N.S., INCREASE OF SALARY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

JUDGES, QUEBEC, COMPLAINTS *re* OUTSIDE BUSINESS : Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).

——— JUDGESHIP, OFFER TO CONSERVATIVE POLITICIAN : Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13805 (vi).

——— SALARIES, COUNTY COURTS, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3628 (ii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

JUDGES, QUE., SALARIES, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 95 (i).
——— YUKON, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com of Sup., 3409 (ii).
JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).
——— DEP. REPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 90 (i).
——— INCREASE OF SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*), 10100 (v).
See 'Binder Twine.'
LAW LIBRARY IN ENGLAND, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 98 (i).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* GOVT. CASES: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
LEGAL OPINIONS *re* G.T.P. CLAUSE, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).
LITIGATION EXPENSES *re* INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 6794 (iii).
MANITOBA PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
MATHURIN, JOS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGE'S REP., &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).
MYERS, JUDGE OF MAN., REP. IN HANSARD: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14258 (vi).
N.W. TER. MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
PARDONS, PREROGATIVE OF HIS EX., O. CS., &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 567 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
PENITENTIARY, CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
——— GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
PRENDERGAST AND MAN. JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT, CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii).
REVISION OF DOM. STATUTES, PAYMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14643 (vi).
——— REVISION COMMISSION, NAMES, PROGRESS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1029 (i).
ROBERT *vs.* KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. REGIS LOCKUP: in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
——— HOSPITAL: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
——— WARDEN'S RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 286 (i).
——— ACTING WARDEN, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 10831 (v).
SISAL USED IN BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8085 (iv).
——— *See* 'Binder.'
STEWART *vs.* KING, LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

SUPREME COURT, CONTINGENCIES, DISBURSEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).
——— LIBRARY, PURCHASE OF BOOKS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3402, 3405 (ii).
——— REPORTER, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).
——— REPORTS, BINDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3405 (ii).
——— SALARY OF MR. TASCHEREAU: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
——— TICKET OF LEAVE ACT, RELEASE, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 566 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
TOBACCO COMMISSION EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 8267 (iv).
WABY, INDIAN PRISONER, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iii).
YUKON TER. GOVT., ADMINISTRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

Juvenile Offenders (N.B.) Act Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 94; 2°*, 314; in Com., 314; 3°*, 316 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 30.)

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
KAMOURASKA, EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).

Keller Heater Co. of Can. Patent Relief B. No. 231 (Mr. *McIsaac*) M. to receive Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294; 2°*, 7487 (iii); in Com. and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 137.)

KELLY, ASST. INSPECTOR, REFUND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
KELLY & BURNETT, LEASE OF FALSE CREEK: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).
——— *See* 'False Creek.'
KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938, 6064 (iii).
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
KENSINGTON, STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KETCH, N.S., HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).

Kettle River Valley Railway Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 138.)

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).
KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
KINGS, N.B., INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2502 (ii).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 976 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 139.)

KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i), 13202 (vi).

King's Printer B.: *See* 'Public Printing.'

KING'S S.A. MEDALS PET., *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).

KINGSTON BARRACKS, R. C. FIELD ARTILLERY: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).

KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).

——— GROCERY CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).

KINGSTON ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).

——— STABLE: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 13117 (vi).

KINGSVILLE, ONT., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 6268 (iii).

——— *See* 'Customs.'

KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).

Klondike Mines Railway Co.'s B. No. 177 (Mr. *McIsaac*) M. to receive Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219; 2°*, 3583; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 140).

KLONDIKE MINES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 33 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 141).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 142).

KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

——— CORRECTION, &c.: in Com., 14519 (vi).

LABOUR COMMISSION 1886, NAMES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 8083 (iv).

LABOUR COMMISSION, B.C., APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 1595 (i).

——— REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 8116 (iv).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Ingram*) 7198 (iii).

LABOUR DAY ADJOURNMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10489 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 10712 (v).

——— DELAYING SESSION, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10742 (v).

LABOUR DEPARTMENT, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iii).

LABOUR DISPUTES, SETTLEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4003 (ii).

Labour Disputes Settlement: *See* 'Railway Labour.'

'LABOUR GAZETTE,' CORS., REMUNERATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7154 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7203 (iii).

LABOUR TROUBLES IN B.C.: on M. for Com. of Sup. Remarks (Mr. *Smith, B.C.*) 945 (i).

——— *See* 'Nelson P. O.', 'Racine Bros.' &c., 'Longshoremen, &c.

LAC BOUCHETTE AND QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).

——— ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).

——— GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).

——— LIGHTING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).

——— LOCK GATE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

——— MASONRY WALL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

LADY LAFONTAINE, PENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14252 (vi).

Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Co.'s B. No. 120 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 143).

LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).

LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6679, 6888 (iii).

LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13459 (vi).

LAKE ST. JOHN RY. AND LA TUQUE RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

——— PIERS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (i).

LAKE SUPERIOR, LONG LAKE AND ALBANY RY. CO. TO PENINSULAR HARBOUR SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE, IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).

——— *See* 'Temiscamingue.'

LAMBTON POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14272, 14661 (vi).

LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN B.C., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).

Land Company Bills: *See* 'Canada Northwest,' 'Ontario and Qu'Appelle.'

LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i), 3797 (ii).

——— VOTED BY PARLT., AREA &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).

——— *See* 'Manitoba,' 'N.W.T.', &c.

LAND GUIDES, *re* SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6768 (iii).

LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1858 (i).

LAND SCRIP, MAN. AND N. W. T. VOLUNTEERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
LAND SLIDE: *See* 'Turtle Mountain,' 'Frank Disaster.'
LAND SUBSIDIES TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N.W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
——— UNEARNED, &C., Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3797 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARKIN, CAPT. W. S., COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION, POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3230 (ii).
——— P O., RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &C.: M. for Copies*, 3236 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
LATOUR, L. J., CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* 'LE CANADA': Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 1032 (i).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980, 14002 (vi).
——— *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
LAW LIBRARY IN ENGLAND, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 98 (i).
Lead Bounties Payment B. No. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6169 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8195; 1°* of B., 8230 (iv); 2° and in Com., 10798; 3°*, 10799 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 31).
LEAMINGTON WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
'LE CANADA,' CIRCULAR ISSUED BY L. J. LATOUR, &C.. Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 1032 (i).
——— *See* 'Newspaper Agents,' &c., 'Latour,' &c.
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* GOVT. CASES: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
——— *re* INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iii).
——— *re* RYS. AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
——— *See* 'Justice.'
LEGAL OPINIONS *re* G.T.P. RY., CLAUSE 17, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).
LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 14112 (vi).
——— PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).
LEPROSY IN CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— *See* 'Tracadie.'
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249 (i).
LETTER BOX COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER BOXES IN POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— LOCKED BOXES IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 6026 (iii).
LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— BOOTS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER CARRIERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on Post Office B., 5660, 5672 (iii).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iii).
——— TORONTO, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— WINNIPEG, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
LEVIS, ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
——— GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
——— LAND PURCHASED FOR I. C. R.: M. for O. Cs. &c.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING; in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
——— *See* 'Yukon.'
LEWIS POINT, P. E. I., PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).
Librarians of Parliament B. No. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14299; 3°*, 14300 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 32.)
LIBRARY OF PARLT.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
LT. GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO AND APPNMT. OF ADMINISTRATOR: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— Remarks, on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i). *See* 'Mowat.'
LIFE-SAVING AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii), 5735, 5751 (iii), 12632 (vi).
——— AGENCIES, RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5312 (iii).
——— FLOATING LIGHTHOUSES, APPLICATIONS, &C. FROM CAPTAINS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE, KEEPERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii).
——— KEEPERS, INCREASE OF SALARY, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).
——— SUPPLIES, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).
LIGHTING DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa Buildings.'
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
LIME RIDGE AND MEGANTIC RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
LIME ROCK, N.S., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. No. 146 (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 144.)
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
LINSEED OIL, DEPUTATION *re* IMPORTATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii).
LIQUOR INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
See 'Inland Revenue.'
LISGAR ELECTION TRIAL: *See* 'Perkins.'
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITHGOW, MR., CONTROLLER, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).
LITIGATION EXPENSES *re* INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 6794 (iii).
See 'Justice,' &c., 'Legal,' &c.
LITTLE BEAR CREEK, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE METIS: *See* 'Metis.'
LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133–38 (ii).
See 'Marine,' 'St. Lawrence Route, &c.'
Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. No. 24 (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1° m., 284; 2°*, 1025; in Com., 2349 (i); 3°*, 2756 (ii); Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).
LOANS, GOVT., &C.: *See* 'Public Debt.'
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LOBSTER INDUSTRY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— INDUSTRY, N. S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
LOBSTER INSPECTION, HALIFAX: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'
LOCKMEN, &C., ON CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
LOCKS FOR CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &C., I. C. R., PURCHASE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
See 'I. C. R.'
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. *McGugan*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 145).
LONDON DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
London Loan Co. of Canada Incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. *McGugan*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1815 (i).
LONDON MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
LONGFORD: *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, MONTREAL, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: Remarks, (Mr. *Monk*) 2504 (ii).
——— PAY OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— SETTLEMENT, &C.: Tel. Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 2676–7 (ii).
LONGUEUIL BRIDGE: *See* 'Montreal and Longueuil B.'
LONGUEUIL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com, of Sup., 13069 (vi).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N.B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Q es. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
LORD'S COVE (DEER ISLAND) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
LORNE SIDING, I. C. R., TRAFFIC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
'LORD STRATHCONA' WRECKING PLANT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).
LOTBINIÈRE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOW, A. P., TECHNICAL OFFICER, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13770 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
LOY, GEO. M., M. P. FOR BEAUHARNOIS, VIOLATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT, REPORT OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS: Presented (Mr. *Wade*) 7916 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7917; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7918, 7922 (iv)
——— on M. to Conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
——— REP. *re* STENOGRAPHER: Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 7203 (iii).
——— *See* 'Beauharnois Electoral District.'
LUMBER COMBINE IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 1579–1590 (i).
——— N. W. T., COMMISSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr *Scott*) 6168 (iii).
Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Co's. Incorp. B. No. 68 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 813; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 146).

LUMBER TRADE IN B. C., TEL. FROM MANUFACTURERS: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14766 (vi).
LUNENBURG FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com of Sup., 13315 (vi).
LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
MACGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).
MACNEE FISHING LICENSES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii).
Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co's. Incorp. B. No. 70. (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 814; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 147).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
MACLEOD, N. W. T., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
MACPHERSON, D. F., CENSUS ENUMERATOR, CLINTON: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
MACRAE, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
MCCRANEY, MR. W., ex-M. P., LETTER *re* LEGISLATION: Read (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5362 (iii).
McDermid, Ellen, Relief B. No. 229 (Mr. *Birkett*) 1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9148; in Com., and 3°*, 9149 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 150).
MCDONNELL, GEO., LEASE OF GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
McDougall, James Sinclair, Patent Relief B. No. 169 (Mr. *Gallery*) M. to receive Pet., 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 151).
MCKAY'S POINT, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOALS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PETS. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
See 'Lambton.'
MCNUTT'S ISLAND, N. S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MABOU AND GULF RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: in Com. on RES., 14326 (vi).
MACHINERY FOR CAR SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS *re* TORONTO HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATERS, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— LAND TEL. LINES, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191-4203 (ii).
——— *See* 'Fyfe.'
MAGOG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
MAGUASHA, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MAHONE BAY POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
MAIL BAGS AND CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, BLOCKING CORRIDORS: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*) 14219 (vi).
——— *See* 'Campaign.'
——— REFUNDING EXPRESS CHARGES: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14684 (vi).
——— REFUSAL TO ACCEPT IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14550 (vi).
——— SPECIAL TRAINS, ACCOMMODATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 14680, 14688 (vi).
——— STATEMENT *re* CONFERENCE (Sir *William Mulock*) 14681 (vi).
——— STATEMENT (Sir *William Mulock*) read *re* Threats to Express Cos., 14851 (vi).
——— USE OF ROOMS IN H. OF C., &C.: Remarks (Mr, *Borden, Halifax*) M. to adjn. Hse., 14530 (vi).
——— STATEMENT *re*: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14565 (vi).
MAIL BAGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
MAILS CARRIED BY RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
MAILS CARRIED VIA NEW YORK, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).
MAIL CARS, N.W.T., INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
MAIL CLERKS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13997 (vi).
——— *See* 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
MAIL-MARKING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I.: IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 5878, 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672, 14249 (vi).
——— *See* 'Trade and Commerce.'
MAIN A DIEU, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
MALAGAWATCH, N.S., BOAT CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MALIGNANT COVE, N.S., HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MALLON, A.D., RETIREMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).
MANAGERS *re* RY. CONFERENCE: *See* 'Railw

MANCHESTER AND MONTREAL SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act (1900) Amt. B. No. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 7294 (iii); 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991, 9350 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 33).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co's. B. No. 44 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i).

MANITOBA:

ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Larivière*) 1859 (i).
AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS, &c., 847, 880 (i).
——— *See* 'Grain.'
BARNES, AMOS, CLAIM FOR LAND, &c.: in Com, of Sup., 6922 (iii).
BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 442 (i), 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
CORY, W. W. SALARY, DUTIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).
DAUPHIN, LAKE LOWERING: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
——— PORT OF ENTRY, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
DOM. LANDS, MAN. AND N.W.T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816.
——— *See* 'Lands,' &c.
DOUKHOBORS HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
——— LOANS TO, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
———PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).
ELEVATOR RATES, ADVANCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 11062 (vi).
EMERSON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
EWART, JOHN A., ADDRESS PRESENTED TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).
FYFE, MR., INSPECTION REP. *re* GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).
——— *See* 'Grain.'
GRAIN ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
——— INSPECTION *re*, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
——— WEIGHING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*, &c.) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).
GULL HARBOUR, ST. GEORGE'S BAY, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSIONS, APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
HNAUSA WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iii).
HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
HOMESTEAD LANDS, AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).
IMMIGRATION BUILDING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

IMMIGRANTS, ACCOMMODATION FOR SETTLERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Sup., 1119 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) 866 (i).
——— HOUSES AND FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
JEROME, MARTIN, M.P.P., AND MAN. ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 5321 (iii).
JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).
JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).
JUDGES' TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).
LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAKE MANITOBA, OUTLET *via* FAIRFORD RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAND SUBSIDIES TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N. W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
——— AREAS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2102 (i).
——— AREA UNPATENTED: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1858 (i).
——— *See* 'Dom. Lands.'
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191-4203 (ii).
——— *See* 'Grain,' &c.
MAN. POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Postmasters.'
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
MYERS, JUDGE, REP. IN HANSARD: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).
NATURALIZATION ACT, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2015 (i).
NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON, AND EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).
PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &c.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Copies*, 2338 (i).
PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
PERKINS, WM., PAYMENT TO *re* LISGAR ELECTION; in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
POSTMASTERS' ASSOCIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T., MEMORIAL *re* SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 125 (i), 13259 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
——— Stmnt. (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).
PRENDERGAST AND MAN. JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply,' 'Public Works.'
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RY. MAIL CLERKS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
RY. SUBSIDIES FOR MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).
RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6889 (iii).
REPRESENTATION OF MAN. AND N.W.T. IN THE SENATE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1297 (i).

MANITOBA—*Con.*
ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5319 (iii).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 14284 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 10490 (v).
ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
——— POSTAL FACILITIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
SCHOOL LANDS, MAN. AND N. W. T., SALE, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 706 (i).
——— *See* 'Lands,' &c., 'Dom.', &c.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6893 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 6169 (iii).
SELKIRK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
SENATE REPRESENTATION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1297 (i).
——— *See* 'N. W. T., B. 254.'
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
TEULON NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N. W. T., LAND SCRIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
WATSON, JOHN, PRES'DT. OF LIB. ASSOCIATION: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).
WHEAT FREIGHT RATES, RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
WHITE MUD RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
WINNIPEG, CUSTOMS WAREHOUSE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS AND POSTAL STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
——— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
——— MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i), 13127 (vi).
——— Dixon, Mr. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).
——— P.O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
——— REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 666 (i).
WINNIPEGOSIS CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
See 'N.W.T.,' 'Immigration,' 'Interior,' &c.

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. *Dyment*), 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 148.)

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).
MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re* TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*), 265 (i).
MAPS, LITHOGRAPHING AND PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 6800 (iii), 13778 (vi).
——— PRINTING, INFORMATION *re*, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
MARA, RAMA, &C., FLOODING OF LANDS: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Copies of Rep., &c., 2762 (ii).

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada, Limited, Incorp. B. No. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*), 1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 5093, 5359; 3°*, 5360 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 149.)

MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. APPARATUS AT CHATEAU BAY: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— SUCCESS OF SYSTEM: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— TELEGRAPH STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii), 13639 (vi).
MARGAREE, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MARGARETVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MARIA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).

Marine Engineers Bill: *See* 'Steamboat Bill.'

MARINE:
"ACADIA", SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 13658 (vi).
——— STEAMER TO REPLACE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13659 (vi).
ACETYLENE GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
ACETYLENE GAS, &C., IN LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).
AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
——— CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
See 'St. Lawrence.'
ALBERT CO., N.B., DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
ANCHOR LINE SALVAGE COMPENSATION FOR "SCOTIA": in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
ANNANDALE RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 2921 (ii).
ANTICOSTI LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
ARSENEAULT, CAPT., COMPENSATION *re* DAMAGES TO SCHR.: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
BASS RIVER PERMANENT LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
BATHURST HARBOUR BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).
——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2919 (ii).
"BAYFIELD", REPAIRS AND SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5278, 5282, 5762 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*), 5586; in Com. of Sup., Mr. Evans' Reps., &c.: read (Mr. *Préfontaine*), 5742, 5763 (iii).
BIOLOGICAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOUR MASTER FROM ALBERT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
BRONTE LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Henderson*), 5757 (iii).
"CAMPANA", INVESTIGATION *re* WRECK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
CANADIAN COAST LIGHTING: Quotation (Mr. *Préfontaine*), from English paper, in Com. of Sup., 4164 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*), 2015 (i).

COMMANDERS OF GOVT. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 446 (i).

DALY, M. T., HARBOUR MASTER AT BATHURST, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2919 (ii).

DALY, MICHAEL, HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).

"EUXINE", SCUTTLING OF SCHR.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*), 699 (i).

GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi). *See* 'Acetylene.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMANDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 446 (i).

——— REPAIRS, SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4047, 5033 (ii).

"GRECIAN", STR., REIMBURSEMENT TO CAPT. HARRISON *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*), 10239 (v).

HALIFAX HARBOUR, BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

——— LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).

——— MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*), 14279 (iii).

HARRISON, CAPT., STR. "GRECIAN", COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*), 10239 (v).

HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).

HATFIELD S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720, 4118 (ii).

INSURANCE RATES ON OCEAN STEAMERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv), 13697 (vi).

LIFE-SAVING AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi.).

LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii), 5735, 5751 (iii), 13632 (vi).

——— AGENCIES, RENTS, &C.; in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5312 (iii).

——— FLOATING LIGHTHOUSES, APPLICATIONS, &C., FROM CAPTAINS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1466 (vi).

——— KEEPERS SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii).

——— SUPPLIES, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).

LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133-38 (ii).

——— *See* 'St. Lawrence.'

LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

MCGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOALS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).

MARCONI STATIONS: *See* general heading.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, DEPT. CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5033 (ii).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 244 (i).

——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 341 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

MARINE, DEPTL. SALARIES, INCREASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13663 (vi).

——— AND TRANSFER OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works.'

MARINE SIGNAL SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13524 (vi).

MASTERS OF VESSELS, INSTRUCTIONS *re* POSTAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).

MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

——— REMOVAL FROM TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).

'MINTO' AND 'STANLEY' STRS., INFORMATION *re* TELEGRAM: Read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6 (i).

'MINTO' GOVT. STR., PASSENGERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3631 (ii).

MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

MONTREAL PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

MONTREAL SHIPPING INTERESTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).

'MONTEREY' STR. WRECK, PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR': Memo read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6803 (iii).

NAVAL RESERVE: *See* 'Schools.'

NEWFOUNDLAND COAST WRECKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, P. E. I., WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4041, 5033 (ii).

OFFICERS MESS, STR. 'QUADRA,' REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).

PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Copies*, 2338 (i).

PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).

'PETREL,' REPLACEMENT BY NEW STEAMER: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

PICTOU LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

P. E. I. WINTER COMMUNICATION: M. for Copies of Pets., &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

PUGWASH, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE GULF FISHING, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

——— AND LLOYDS, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).

——— *See* 'Can. Coasts.'

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, NAVIGATION OBSTRUCTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE, REP. *re* : in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4133 (ii).

——— PILOTAGE, *re*, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4132, 4168 (ii).

——— RETIREMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).

——— SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 5758 (iii).

ST. LOUIS LAKE, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 13545 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. of Sup., 13535 (vi).

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS AND HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

'SCOTIA,' STR., SALVAGE CLAIMS, &C. : Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 7150 (iii).

——— SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION : in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7206 (iii).

'STANLEY,' STR., MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).

——— REPAIRS TO 'STANLEY' AND 'LANSDOWNE': in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

——— AND P. E. I., WINTER COMMUNICATION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

See 'Govt. Steamers,' 'Winter,' &c.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION : in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

——— TORONTO DISTRICT : in Com. of Sup., 13648 (vi).

SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4114 (ii).

WINTER NAVIGATION, P.E.I., CONSTRUCTION OF STR. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).

——— COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I., COR. WITH GOVT. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1036 (i).

——— M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

WIRELESS STATIONS ON MARINE COASTS : in Com. of Sup., 13639 (vi).

See 'Marconi.'

WRECKING PLANT 'LORD STRATHCONA,' MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii), 6803 (iii), 13524, 13544 (vi).

MAR. PROVS., BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C. : in Com. of Sup,, 422 (i).

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION : Amt. (Mr. *Lèonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766 ; Neg. (Y. 51 ; N. 100) 4799 (ii).

See 'Vegetables,' &c.

'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5992 (iii).

MARTINEAU, ARTHUR, APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3802 (ii).

MARTINEAU DEFALCATIONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 6934 (iii).

——— EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iii).

——— AND REPORT *re* FIRE SECURITY : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

——— REP. *re* AUD. GENERAL : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii), 6933 (iii).

MARTINEAU DEFALCATIONS, INQUIRY FOR REP. OF INVESTIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

MARTINEAU, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).

MARYSVILLE N. B., POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. No. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) Res. prop., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6543 ; 1°* of B., 6545 ; 2°, and in Com., 6917 ; 3°*, 6918 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 34.)

MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 13524 (vi).

MASTERS OF VESSELS FROM FOREIGN PORTS AND CUSTOMS DEPT., INSTRUCTIONS *re* POSTAGE : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

MATANE AND GASPE RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).

MATHURIN, JCS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGE'S REP. &C. : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).

MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).

MEAFORD POST OFFICE : Remarks (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

MECHANICS FROM ENG., AND TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).

MEDALS FOR THIRD CAN. MOUNTED RIFLES : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

See 'Militia.'

MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, BRANT INDIAN RESERVE : in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

——— INDIANS, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——— INDIANS, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).

——— INDIANS, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).

——— INDIANS, ONT. : in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).

——— INDIANS, QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).

MEDICAL INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 6695, 6851 (iii).

See 'Immigration.'

Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 141 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2237 (i) ; 2°*, 2544 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 152.)

MEDICINE HAT RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).

MEHAN, DR., METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

MELBOURNE, N.S., WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

MEMBERS APPOINTED TO GOVT. POSITIONS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3805 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9582 (iv).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 3, 7, 283, 1642 (i).

——— NEW, CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

MEMBERS RIGHTS TO SPEAK, MR. SPEAKER'S RULINGS : Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 10535 (v).

See 'H. of C.'

MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3526 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 707 (i), 4956 (ii), 14662 (vi).

——— Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1204 (i).

——— Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 90, 707, 1204 (i), 4956 (ii), 14662 (vi).

——— Read (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 12869 (vi).

MESSENGERS OF THE H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
See 'H. of C.'

METALLURGIST AND PETROGRAPHERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13778 (vi).

METAPEDIA, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).

METEGHAN COVE BREAKWATER, RESTORATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).

——— REMOVAL FROM TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLIED TO MANUFACTURERS: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

METIS STATION, DIVERTING ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).

Mexican Light and Power Co., Limited, Co.'s B. No. 126 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 153.)

MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

MIDDLE RIVER, N.S., SHEAR DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).

MIDDLETON ARMOURY, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).

MIDDLETON AND VICTORIA BEACH RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).

MIDDLETON, N. W., GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

MIDLAND DREDGES, &C., CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

MIDLAND HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii).

——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).

MIDLAND MERCANTILE CO., RENT OF BUILDINGS ON DOCK, MIDLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii), 13247 (vi).

——— PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).

MIDLAND RY. CO., TRURO BRANCH, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

MIDLAND WATER FRONT, LEASE TO PRATT & CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii), 13247 (vi).

Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 216 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6658 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 154).

MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFAULTING POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

MILITARY ASYLUM, PENSIONS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

——— BUILDINGS, QUE., IRON FOUNDRY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
See 'Militia.'

——— COLLEGE, KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
See 'Royal Military,' 'Kingston,' &c.

MILITIA ACT AMT. AND MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SUGGESTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).

MILITIA FORCE, CONDITIONS, PAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5702 (iii).

DEB.: (Mr. *Sproule*) 5715; (Mr. *Gourley*) 5717; (Mr. *Fielding*) 5719; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5720; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5722; (Mr. *Ingram*) 5725; (Mr. *Morin*) 5726; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5727; (Mr. *Clarke*) 5729; (Mr. *Johnson, Cardwell*) 5732; (Mr. *Kemp*) 5733 (iii).

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. No. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 1°m., 872; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2240; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 35)

MILITIA:

ANNUAL DRILL, CAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 3603, 5005 (ii).

ARMOURIES, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).

ARSENAL, DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 7089 (iii).

——— CONSTRUCTION IN CAN.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

——— DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

BLANKETS, WEB, CLOTH, PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 10102, 10410, 10714, 10954 (v).

CADET TRAINING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).

CAMPS FOR MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 3603, 5005 (ii).

CANADIAN BEEF SUPPLIED TO BRITISH TROOPS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 483 (i).

——— MOUNTED RIFLES, MEDALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

CARTOONS IN 'MILITARY GAZETTE,' &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2103 (i).

CHAMBERLAIN, HON. MR., SUGGESTIONS *re* MILITIA ACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).

COLDSTREAM GUARDS BAND, ARRANGEMENT *re* VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9683 (iv).

COOKE *vs.* COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORONATION CONTINGENT, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

DEFENCE SCHEME *re* MILITIA: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

DIXON, CAPT., DUTIES IN S. AFRICA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7914 (iv).

DUNDONALD, LORD: *See* 'G. O. C.'

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

FLAGSHIP, REMOVAL FROM ESQUIMALT: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

G. O. C., APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3779 (ii).

——— LORD DUNDONALD'S SPEECH IN HAMILTON: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup. 2399 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

G. O. C., Rep. *re* Defence Scheme : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).
——— Rep., &c., Publishing of : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
German Recruiting in Canada for Naval Service : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (vi).
Gordon Highlanders Trophy : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7253 (iii).
Guns ordered by British Army : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt. : on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Ret., Remarks, 1057 (i).
See general heading.
Hutton, Maj. Gen.: Inquiry for Ret., Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 206 (i).
Imperial Defence and prop. Res. of Lord Rosebery : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 410 (i).
See 'Naval Reserve'
King's S. A. Medals, Pet. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
See 'S. A. War.'
Kingston Barracks, R. C. Field Artillery : in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 13128 (vi).
——— Military College : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii), 5842 (iii).
——— drill hall : in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Pay of Militia : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— Strike, Montreal, Govtl. Action, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 2504 (ii).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3802 (ii).
——— Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 6934 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep. of Investigation ; in Com. of Sup., 3752, 3898 (ii).
——— Investigation, Rep. *re* Aud. General : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).
Medals for Third Can. Mounted Rifles : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).
——— *See* 'S.A.', &c.
Middleton Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 969 (i).
Military Asylum, Pensions, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
Military College : *See* 'Kingston.'
Military Properties, Care and Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 3611 (ii).
Military Reserve at Port Moody : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8616 (iv).
Military Stores Branch, Reorganization : in Com. of Sup., 3608 (ii).
Militia : in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii), 7089 (iii).
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
Militia, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 283 (i).
——— Dept., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
——— Estimates : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13368 (vi).
——— Expenditures : in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
Montreal Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Payment of Militia : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— *See* 'Longshoremen.'
Mulloy, Trooper, Pension to by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Naval Defence : Par. in Toronto 'Globe.' (Mr. *Clarke*) 944 (i).
Naval Militia and School of Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 13545 (vi).
Naval Recruiting in Can. for German Navy : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).
Naval Reserve, &c., in Can., Cor. between G.B. and Can. : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7298 (iii).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
Niagara Militia Camp, Annual Drill : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
Ninety-Fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9080 (iv).
Pay and Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 13379 (vi).
——— General Statement (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 13379 (vi).
Permanent Force, Increase, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
——— Increase of Pay : Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 13371 (vi).
——— Qualifications of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).
See 'Royal,' &c.
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3234 (ii).
Port Moody, Military Reserve : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
Quebec Military Buildings, Iron Foundry : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army : Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Sup., 3130, 3134 (ii).
Rebellion of 1885, Claims of Settlers : Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
Rifle Associations, Grants to : in Com. of Sup., 3767 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Examination by Experts : Ques. (Mr *Morin*) 2758 (ii).
Ross Rifle Factory, Establishment at Quebec: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).
——— Imperfect Return : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture of : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Royal Canadian Regiment, Numerical Strength, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3801 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Trouble : Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Militia (Mr. *Borden, Kings*) 12939 (vi).
Settlers Claims *re* Rebellion, 1885 : Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
S. A. Constabulary, Information *re* Grievances, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1027 (i).
——— Purchase of Discharge, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 14287 (vi).
S. A. Contingents, Employees reinstated, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2337 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1026 (i).
——— Pensions to by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
——— Pensions from Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
S.A., Medals presented by King, Pet. *re* from Non-Com. Officers : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
——— Regulations *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv).
——— Remarks (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 8319 (iv).
——— Memorial Association Grant : in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

S. A., Saddles and Bridles Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).
——— Supplies purchased for Imp. Govt.: M. *Borden, Halifax*) for Copies of O. Cs., &c., 2760 (ii).
Stuart, Capt. D. C., Halifax, Dismissal, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4353 (ii).
Sussex, N. B., Armoury Construction, &c., Overseer's Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8331 (iv).
——— Brigade Camp: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).
Target Practice, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).
Tents, Rush Order, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
See 'Woods.'
Transport and Freight for Military Purposes: in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii).
Valleyfield Strike, Pay of Militia: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).
Veterans, Canadian, Pet. *re* Military Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 11188 (v).
Volunteers of Man. and N. W. T., Land Scrip, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
West Point, U.S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13095 (vi).
Winnipeg Barracks, Street Paving: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
——— Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
Woods, J. W., Amount paid for Tents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights and Measures, B. 20.'

Mills, Mr., Annapolis, Claims against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wade*) 6167 (iii).

Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2794 (ii).

Mill Street Paving, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).

Mines Branch, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 13762 (vi).

Mining Companies Incorp. B. (No. 248 from the Senate). This bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Mining Companies Incorporation Bill: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14850 (vi).

Mining Institute: in Com. of Sup., 12591 (v), 13508 (vi).

Ministerial Changes, Explanation: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 110 (i).
——— Explanation *re* Mr. Tarte, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 130, 159 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 90 (i).
——— Explanation *re* Mr. Blair, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

Ministers, Reduction in Numbers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

Mint, Establishment, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi).
——— *See* 'Royal.'

'Minto' and 'Stanley' Strs., Information *re* Telegram: Read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6 (i).
'Minto' Govt. Str., Passengers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3631 (ii).
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.

Miramichi Bridge, Superstructure: in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'

Miscou Harbour, N.B., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
——— Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

Missionary Society of Can.: *See* 'Church Missionary.'

Mississaga Indians, Alnwick Band, Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).

Mistook (Delisle) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

Moira River, Flooding: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

Moisie Point Road, Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).

Moncton, Car Shop Extension: in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— Increased Shed Accommodation for I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).

Money Subsidies to Rys., I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
See 'Subsidies,' &c., 'Rys., &c.

Montague Bridge Survey, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

'Monterey' Str., Wreck, Par. in Montreal *Star*: Memo. read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6803 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

Mont Louis, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

Montmagny Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).

Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Montreal Bank: *See* 'Bank.'

Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
——— *See* 'Militia.'

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 167 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

Montreal, Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of of Sup., 436 (i).
——— Customs Dept., Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
——— Customs Port of Entry, Changes, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
——— contingent expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— Dry Dock: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
——— rep. of commission *re* site: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).

MONTREAL DRY DOCK, SITE, &c.: M. FOR O. CS., COR., &c.: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).

——— *See* 'Harbour.'

——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i), 13058 (vi).

Montreal Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name Bill No. 88 (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 158).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan Bill No. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445; 1°* of B. 4486 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5417; 3°m., 5657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 36).

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (iv).

——— HARBOUR, DOCK IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).

——— PERMANENT SHEDS, PLANS PREPARED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).

MONTREAL 'HERALD' CO., &c.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

MONTREAL, INLAND REVENUE OFFICE, MONEY ABSTRACTED: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).

——— 'LABOUR GAZETTE,' COR.: in Com. of Sup., 7155 (iii).

——— LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

——— LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Longshoremen's.'

Montreal and Longueuil Bridge Co's. Incorp. B. No. 156. (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5558; 3°*, 5558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 156).

MONTREAL, NEW POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

——— PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
See 'Pilotage.' 'Shipping Casualties Bills.'

——— POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).

——— ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).

——— SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).

——— SUBWAY CO., O. CS., COR., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 705 (i).

MONTREAL TURNPIKE: *See* 'Turnpike Trust.'

MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).

MOOSEJAW POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).

Moosonee Diocese: *See* 'Trust Funds.'

MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).

MOREAU, DR. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331 (iv).

——— AT CHAMBLY CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).

MOREAU, MR. H., COLLECTOR ON CHAMBLY CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).

MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8333 (iv).

MORRISBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup. 492 (i).

MORRISON, MRS., CLAIMS *re* LANDS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

MORRISON'S POINT, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup. 13203 (vi).

Mortgage, &c.: *See* 'Canada Permanent..

MORTIMER & CO'S. FIRE, GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4836 (ii).

Mounted Police: *See* 'N. W. Mounted.'

Mount Royal Savings Bank Incorp. B. No. 153. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2720 (ii); wthdn., 10831 (v).

MOUNT ROYAL SAVINGS BANK INCORP. B. NO. 153 (Mr. *Campbell*): M. to withdraw Bill and refund fees, 10831 (v).

MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup. 7530 (iii).

MOWAT, SIR OLIVER, LT.-GOV. OF ONTARIO. DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1575 (i).
See 'Lt.-Governor.'

MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'I. C. R.'

MULGRAVE AND PETIT DE GRAT S.S. SERVICE: *See* 'Petit de Grat.'

MULLENS, CORNELIUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5280 (iii).

MULLENS' LETTER *re* HURLEY, J. M., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5757, 5761 (iii).

MULLOY, TROOPER, PENSION TO BY THE DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).

MUNICIPALITIES, COMPENSATION FOR AMALGAMATION OF CANADA CENTRAL AND BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RYS., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* TRAMWAY CO'S., &c.: Remarks in Com. on Railway Bill, 6081 (iii).

MURRAY BAY TO ST. CATHARINES TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

MURRAY BAY, WHARF EXTENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).

MURRAY CANAL, PURCHASE OF MR. JOHNSTON'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).

——— WIRE FENCING: in Com. of Sup. 14150 (vi).

MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530, (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 4108, 14115 (vi).

MURRAY, IMMIGRATION AGENT, SCOTLAND: in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).

MUSEUM AT HALIFAX, REMOVAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).

MUSQUODOBOIT, N. S., WHARF APPROACHES: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

Mutual Fire Ins.: *See* 'Montreal Fire.'

Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada B. No. 65. (Mr. *Bruce*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2304; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 159.)

MYERS, JUDGE, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).

NAPANEE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).

NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY., CHARTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).

NAPPAN EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
See 'Art, &c.

National Ry. and Transport Co.: *See* 'Canada.'

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'

NATURALIZATION ACT, EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

——— REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2015 (i).

Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. B. No. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5137; 2°; and in Com., 5872; 3°IC., 5991 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 38).
See 'Aliens.'

NAVAL DEFENCE, PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 944 (i).

——— GREAT LAKES, NUCLEUS OF: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5295 (iii).

NAVAL MILITIA RESERVE AND SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 13535, 13545 (vi).

NAVAL RECRUITING IN CANADA FOR GERMAN VESSELS: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).

NAVAL RESERVE, &C., IN CAN., COR. BETWEEN G.B. AND CAN.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

——— Inquiry for papers (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7298 (iii).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. No. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779; 1°* of B., 12781; 2°, and in Com., 12984; wthdn., 14768 (vi).

NECUM TEUCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).

NEIL'S HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).

NELSON POST OFFICE, B. C., RACINE BROS., CLAIMS AGAINST CONTRACTORS: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

NEPEAN POINT, IMPROVEMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).

NEPIGON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON, AND EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK:

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

ALBERT CO., N. B., DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS, WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).

ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).

BATHURST, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

——— FISHERY INSPECTOR: *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

——— HARBOUR BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOURMASTER FROM ALBERT CO., N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

BLACK BROOK, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).

BLOOMFIELD, POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

BRIGADE CAMP, SUSSEX: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 412, 421, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).

CAMPBELLTON, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).

——— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).

CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

C.P.R. STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
See 'Allan.'

CAPE TORMENTINE, PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com. on Res., 14470 (vi).

CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

CHATHAM, LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CHATHAM TO TRACADIE, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

CENSUS, BAPTISTS ENUMERATION, &C., RELIGIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— CARLETON, &C., CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— GRAND MANAN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).

——— RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).

COCAGNE WHARF, COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENT FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).

DALY, M. T., HARBOUR MASTER AT BATHURST, DISMISSAL, &C.; Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

DEER ISLAND TO EASTPORT, ME., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

DIPPER HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup. 13233 (vi).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 10102 (v).
EDMUNDSTON INDIAN RESERVE, FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
FISHERY OVERSEER, BATHURST, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14686 (vi).
FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).
GAUDET, MR., COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GRAND MANAN, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
See 'Census,' &c.
GREAT SALMON RIVER, GROYNE AND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).
HARRISON, MR., INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).
HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
HATFIELD'S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT, KING'S: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2502 (ii).
INDIANS, N.B., SALARY TO AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12218 (v).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N.B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOAL LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
MARYSVILLE, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
MISCOU HARBOUR, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).
MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).
NEWCASTLE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
PETIT ROCHER, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
POINTE DU CHÊNE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

RICHIBUCTO, HARBOUR, PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).
RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).
ST. ANDREWS WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
ST. JOHN, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
——— LONG WHARF: *See* 'Long Wharf.'
——— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE, WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).
——— WINTER SERVICE: *See* 'Allan.'
ST. JOHN RIVER AND ST. MARY'S RIVER INDIANS, PET. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).
SHEGAWAKE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SMALL-POX PATIENTS, EXPENSES INCURRED BY GLOUCESTER COUNTY: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14688 (vi).
SUNBURY, CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8331 (iv).
——— STATION GROUNDS, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
TRACADIE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii), 13038 (vi).
VENIOT, P. I., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT BATHURST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
WOODSTOCK ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
——— DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4563, 4593 (ii), 5735 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
See 'N. S.,' 'P. E. I.'

NEW CAMPBELLTON, BALLAST WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).

New Canadian Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 1328; 2° m., 1512, 2241; in Com., 2241 (i), 2720; ref. back to Com., 2753; in Com., 3221; 3°*, 3222 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 160.)

NEWCASTLE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
NEWFOUNDLAND, AIDS TO NAVIGATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13647 (vi).
NEWFOUNDLAND COAST WRECKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, PROTECTION SLOPES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).

NEW LONDON, P.E.I., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— REPAIRS TO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NEWPORT, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
NEW RICHMOND, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
NEWSPAPER AGENTS AND POSTMASTERS IN QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 14669 (vi).
——— *See* 'Latour.'
NEWSPAPER, CABLE NEWS: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.
NEWSPAPER POSTAGE: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5856 (iii).
NEWSPAPERS IN UNITED KINGDOM, U. S., &C.: AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.,* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 57 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 1811; 3°*, 1812 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 161.)
NIAGARA MILITIA CAMP, ANNUAL DRILL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 154 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4582; 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 162.)
Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 163.)
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Co.'s B. No. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) M. to receive Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 2°*, 5585; in Com., 6428 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 164.)
NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14337 (vi).
NICOLA, KAMLOOPS, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
NICOLET RIVER, BRIDGE SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
NINETY-FOURTH REGIMENT, SENIOR AND JUNIOR MAJORS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 9080 (iv).
Nipigon Iron Range Ry Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 170 (Mr. *Dyment*), M. to receive Pet., 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956 (ii).
Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 114 (Mr. *McCool*), 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 165.)
Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 210 (Mr. *McCool*): 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Nipissing and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 47 (Mr. *McCool*): 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 166.)
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY: in Com. o Sup., 14258 (vi).
NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
NOEL WHARF, N.S., REPAIRS: in Com of Sup., 13204 (vi).
NOMININGUE LAKE, WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING CO., CONTRACTS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 13372 (vi).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRANSPORTATION CO.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 13667, 13933 (vi).
Northern Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*), 1°*, 654; 2°*, 853 (i); in Com., 2753; 3°*, 2755 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 168.)
NORTH CARDIGAN, P.E.I., PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
NORTH CHANNEL AND DAM, GALOPS RAPIDS: in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION OF DAM: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 14142 (vi).
NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3536 (ii).
NORTH POLE EXPEDITION, GOVT. AID TO CAPT. BERNIER: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), 12805 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
See 'I.C.R.', &c., 'Sydney', &c.
North Sydney Harbour Commission: *See* 'Sydney', &c.
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, P.E.I., WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6895 (iii).
See 'Winter Navigation.'
North-West Central: *See* 'Great N.W. Central.'
North-west Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 69 (Mr. *Scott*), 1°*, 813; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 167.)
N.W. Mounted Police (1894) Act Amt. B. No. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1°, 8321 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10741; 3°*, 10742 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 37.)
N.W. MOUNTED POLICE, APPNMTS AND PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 2921 (ii).
——— COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 92 (i).
——— PAY OF FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 5262 (iii).
——— PENSIONS ACT AMT.: M. to introduce B. (Mr. *Scott*), 14280; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 14281 (vi).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i); 13760 (vi).
——— TENTS, WOOD & CO.'S TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 3804 (ii).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup.. 5003 (ii).

N.W. Provincial Autonomy, Imperfect Ret. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), 6891 (iii).
See 'Provincial Autonomy,' &c.

N.W. Ters. Govt., Additional Subsidies B. No. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°* of B., 12330 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12843; 3°*, 12845 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 41.)

N.W.T., Senate Representation B. No. 254 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 1°m., 11691; 2°*, and in Com., 12302; 3°*, 12304 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 42.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES :

"Advocate, Prince Albert," Payments for Printing *re* Election Proclamation : in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Aid to Agricultural Societies, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).
Alexander Indian Agency, Telephone : in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., Rep. of Inspector, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*), 847, 880 (i).
See 'Automatic.'
Autonomy for N.W.T., Amt. : (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), on M. for Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63), 13932 (vi).
Banff Springs, Baths : in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii), 13955 (vi).
——— Museum Building, Addition, &c.: in Com. of Sup , 6927 (iii).
——— Roads and Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
Barr Colony, Mr. Haultain's Speech, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on M. for Sup., 6354 (iii).
——— and Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
——— Number, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).
Bennett, Mr., Increase in Salary : Remarks (Mr. *Pope*), 13967 (vi).
Bow River Bridge, Canmore, Protection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
Buffalo Herd in Banff Park : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958, 959 (i), 13129 (vi).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry., Regulations *re* Mortgage Deeds : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 13024 (vi).
C.P. Ry., Elkhorn Branch Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
——— lands exempt from taxes in Man. and N.W.T. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), 916 (i).
——— Land and School Taxation : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Lands.'
Coal Mining in Banff Reserve, Lease by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).
Court Houses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
Creameries : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Doukhobors Pilgrimage and Govtl. Action : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i), 5587 (iii).
Drake, Mr., N.W.M.P., Increase of Salary : in Com. of Sup., 13761 (vi).
Edmonton and Athabasca Landing, Tel. Service : in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
——— Bridge, Saskatchewan River, Flooring : in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— Indian Agency, Telephone Service : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
——— Jail : in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con-*

Elections in Saskatchewan, Payments to Prince Albert 'Advocate' : in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Elkhorn Indian School, Average Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
Elkhorn and Moosomin Ry. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 14497 (vi).
Fire Regulations . Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 2100 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 2106; Tels. read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2106, 2238 (i).
——— Investigation *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
Gallician Immigrants *re* N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).
Grain Blockade : *See* 'Ry. Traffic.'
Grazing Lands leased to Geo. McDonnell, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
Great North-west Central Ry. and C. P. Ry. Co.'s Agreement : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).
Half-Breed Schools, Salaries paid, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).
Herchmer, Mr. L. W., Pension, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5321 (iii).
Homestead Entries, Free : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
Immigration Agents, Homestead Pre-emption : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Sproule*) 289 (i).
Immigration and Settlers' Effects, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
Indians : in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— Agricultural Implements : in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii), 13782 (vi).
——— Blankets, Clothing : in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— Clothing : in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).
——— Land Management Fund : in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
——— Live Stock, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iii).
——— Medical Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— Schools : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— Seed Grain, Relief : in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).
——— Supplies &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).
Irrigation, Surveys, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).
Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N. W. T. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i).
See general heading.
Land Slides : *See* 'Turtle Mountain.'
——— *See* 'Frank Disaster.'
Lumber Combines, Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 1579-1590 (i).
Macleod Court House : in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
——— Dismissal of Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
Macrae, Mr., Indian Inspector : in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
Mail Cars, Overcrowding, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
See 'Postal,' 'Ry. Mail,' &c.
Maintenance of Prisoners : in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
Medicine Hat Ry. Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).
Military Asylum, Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
MOUNTED POLICE, APPNMTS. AND PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2921 (ii).
——— COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).
——— M. to introduce Pension Bill (Mr. *Scott*) 14280; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 14281 (vi).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
——— TENTS, WOODS & CO.'S TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
N. W. T., GOVTL. EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iii).
——— ADDITIONAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii), 13787 (vi).
——— MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
——— NATURALIZATION RETURNS: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3804 (ii).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
POSTAL SERVICE IN N. W. TERS.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).
See 'Mail.'
PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
——— CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
— — COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29 N. 63) 13932 (vi).
——— LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1296 (i).
——— O. Cs., &c.: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for copies,* 2778 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5088 (ii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print Papers, 5582 (iii).
——— IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6891 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. 6946 (iii).
——— FURTHER COR., &c.; Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 7295 (iii).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RYS.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY.: Bonds, Attack on Mr. E. B. Osler, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*) 14583 (vi). Memorandum from Mr. Kingsmill: Read, 14588 (vi).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. CO.'S LAND GRANT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2338 (i).
——— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. MORTGAGE, DEEDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
RY. LANDS VOTED, &c., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
See 'Mail, &c.'

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

RY. TRAFFIC IN N.W.T., BLOCKADE, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 2424 (i).
REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii).
REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY, SURVEYS OF RESERVED LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
REPRESENTATION *re* SENATE: *See* 'N.W.T. Senate Representation B. 254.'
See 'Senate.'
ROADS AND BRIDGES CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).
SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION, PROCLAMATION IN PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO.'S SALES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO., SECTIONS ACQUIRED, &c.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor.* 2338 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 4363 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2306 (i).
SENATE REPRESENTATION: *See* 'N. W. T. Senate Representation B. 254.'
SETTLERS CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
SNOW STORMS, REPORTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 11822 (v).
SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOMINION LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
STEWART, MR., FOREST INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6774 (iii).
STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
SUPREME COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii).
TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).
TIMBER AND TREE PLANTING, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
TREE CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii), 13775 (vi).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
See 'Frank.'
VICTORIA TO ANDREWS, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WADSWORTH, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi)
YOHO PARK, ROADS CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
YORKTON COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
See 'B.C.', 'Man.', &c.

NOTES, DOM.: *See* 'Dom. Notes, &c.'
NOTRE DAME DU PORTAGE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA :

ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, BEACH PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ABRAM'S RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
AMAGANDUS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
AMHERST POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1591 (i).
AMQUI STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY'S LAKE : in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
ANTIGONISH, POST OFFICE, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
ARICHAT PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
BAILEY'S BROOK, BREAKWATER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1072 (i).
BASS RIVER, PERMANENT LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
BAXTER'S HARBOUR, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BAYFIELD EXTENSION PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).
——— HARBOUR WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
BEERSVILLE COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
BELMONT DISASTER, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14155 (vi).
BENOIT'S COVE, BOAT LANDING : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG POND WHARF, SUPERSTRUCTURE : in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).
BRETON COVE, BOAT LANDING : in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
BRIDGEWATER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).
BROAD COVE, HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).
CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS. : in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
CANADA STEEL CO., RY. SUBSIDY : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14479 (vi).
CARIBOO ISLAND, HARBOUR OF REFUGE : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CARLIN, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY, SALARY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).
CHEGOGGIN, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHETICAMP, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHEZZETCOOK, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
COVE HEAD HARBOUR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
COW BAY BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vi).
COW BAY (POINT MORIEN) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
DALHOUSIE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DIGBY, PIER RENEWAL, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

DIGBY, POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION, IMPROVEMENT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).
DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).
DOG FISH NUISANCE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DREDGING, MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).
DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
DUNCAN'S COVE, APPROACH TO WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
EAST BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup.. 13180 (vi).
EAST BERLIN, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, HARBOUR ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
ECONOMY, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
EMIGRATION TO U. S. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
'EUXINE', SCUTTLING OF SCHR. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*) 699 (i).
FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N. S. AND CAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
FINLAY POINT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).
FISHERMEN OF N. S., 'OUTSKIRTS OF CIVILIZATION' : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13316 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 13373 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13374 (vi).
FISHING INDUSTRY, MAR. PROVS., WHARF, BUILDING, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— *See* 'Lobsters,' &c.
FISHING WITHIN THREE MILE LIMIT : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 4179 (ii).
FIVE ISLANDS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
FORT LAWRENCE, LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
FREEPORT, LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
FRIARS HEAD, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup. 1087 (i).
FRUDE'S POINT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
GABAROUSE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
GEORGEVILLE, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
GLACE BAY, DOM. COAL, IRON AND STEEL COS., ACCOMMODATION AT GLACE BAY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
——— SHIELDS, MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF : Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
GRAND ETANG BRIDGE ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
GRAND NARROWS, BRIDGE PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, WHARF REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).
GRAND RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

GRANITE VILLAGE, MOORING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
'GRECIAN', STR., REIMBURSEMENT TO CAPT. HARRISON, *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
GREEN COVE BOAT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX COTTON CO., LOAN OF RAILS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
HALIFAX, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
——— ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825, 12874 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
——— LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).
——— *See* 'Peggy's Cove,' &c
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
HALIFAX, LOBSTER FACTORIES, INSPECTION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).
——— MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
——— POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— AND SOUTH-WESTERN, CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
——— TIME BALL: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
——— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
HARRISON, CAPT., STR. 'GRECIAN,' COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).
HAWK POINT INLET, BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).
HERRING COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
INDIAN SCHOOLS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 6409, 6414 (iii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

INVERNESS MINES, BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
——— POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).
IONA, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
JEDDORE, EAST, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
JUDGES, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).
See 'Henry.'
JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
KETCH HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
LAWLOR'S ISLAND, QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— *See* 'Halifax,' &c.
LIME ROCK, POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— PACKING INDUSTRY, N.S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— *See* 'Fishing,' 'Halifax,' &c.
LORD'S COVE (DEER ISLAND) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
LUNENBURG, FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 13315 (vi).
LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
MAGGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
MCKAY'S POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MCNUTT'S ISLAND, BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MAHONE BAY POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
MAIN A DIEU, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MALAGAWATCH, BOAT CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MALIGNANT COVE, HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MARGAREE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MARGARETVILLE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., HALIFAX, REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*) 14279 (vi).
'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5992 (iii).
MELBOURNE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

METEGHAN COVE BREAKWATER, RESTORATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MIDDLE RIVER, SHEAR DAM : in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MIDDLETON ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).
MILLS, MR., ANNAPOLIS, CLAIMS AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wade*) 6167 (iii).
MOISIE POINT ROAD, IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).
MORRISON'S POINT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MUSQUODOBOIT, WHARF APPROACHES : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
NAPPAN, EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
NECUM TEUCH WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
NEGRO POINT, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
NEIL'S HARBOUR BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
NEW CAMPBELLTON, BALLAST WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, PROTECTION SLOPES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
NOEL WHARF, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' 'Sydney,' &c.
N.S. AND DOM. OF CAN., FINANCIAL TERMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
NOVA SCOTIA EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
N.S. EMIGRATION TO U.S. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
NOVA SCOTIA STEEL AND COAL CO. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
OGDEN'S POND CHANNEL, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
OYSTER POND, BEACH PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
PARRSBOROUGH, LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
PEMBROKE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &c. : in Com. of Sup.. 1146 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTOU GLASS FACTORY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii)
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
——— LIGHT BEACH : in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
PLEASANT BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
POINT TUPPER, IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
——— DREDGING, CLAIMS OF M. CONNOLLY : in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
POIRIERVILLE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
PORTER'S CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

PORT GREVILLE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, HARBOUR ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOWE, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PROSPECT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PUGWASH, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
RY. SUBSIDIES FOR PARRSBORO DISTRICT, N.S. : Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14491 (vi).
ST. ANN'S NORTH GUT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——— NORTH RIVER, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
SANDY COVE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SCOTCH HILL STATION, I.C.R., PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 872 (i).
SCOTT'S BAY, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHORT BEACH, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SKINNER'S COVE, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SOUTH INGONISH, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SPRINGHILL, ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— BOILER EXPLOSION IN DOM. BUILDING : Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SPRY BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 8296 (iv).
STUART, CAPT. D. C., HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).
SUMMERVILLE, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SWIM'S POINT, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
SYDNEY, ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
——— *See* 'North.'
——— POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SYDNEY MINES, POST OFFICE. &c. : in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).
——— *See* 'North.'
TENECAPE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
THREE FATHOM HARBOUR, BEACH WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
TIVERTON, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).
VICTORIA BEACH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
WALLACE HARBOUR, FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEDGE POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WENTWORTH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEST BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE'S COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITNEY PIER POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 130, 668 (i).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, SHEER DAM, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WINDSOR, NEW STATION, I. C. R., RENTAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
WINDSOR JUNCTION RY. ACCIDENT, I.C.R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Clarke*), 3496, 3713 (ii).
WOLFVILLE, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com of Sup.. 13217 (vi).
YARMOUTH BAR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
See 'N.B.,' 'P.E.I.,' &c.

OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).

Oaths of Office: *See* 'Administration."

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4041, 5033 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies Act (France and Canada) Amt. B. No. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*); Res. prop., 10410; in Com. on Res., 10802; 1°* of B., 11422; 2°*, and in Com., 12295; 3°*, 12500 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 44.)

OFFICERS' MESS, STR. "QUADRA", REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 9819 (iv).

OFFICIAL GUIDE, I.C.R., COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 3535 (ii).

OGDEN'S POND CHANNEL, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).

O'HALLORAN, GEO. F., DEP. MIN. OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).

OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).

O'LEARY, J. & M.. CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY. BRANCH LINE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6168 (iii).

O'LEARY'S STATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

Oleomargarine Bill: *See* 'Butter B. 207.'

ONSLOW, LORD, SPEECH *re* CATTLE EMBARGO: *See* 'Cattle Embargo.'

ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS NUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).

ONTARIO, NORTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*), 367 (i).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*), 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., 2716; 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 169.)

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*), 1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 4868; 3°m., 4869; 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 170.)

ONTARIO:

"ALERT", STR., *re* CANAL SURVEYS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALEXANDRIA WOOD EXPORT CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).
See 'Privilege', &c.
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*), 6895 (iii).
AMHERSTBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup, 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
AURORA FOUNDRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*), 1195 (i).
BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thompson, Grey*), 13263 (vi).
BALSAM LAKE AND LAKE SIMCOE: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).
BARRIE P.O., BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).
——— WHARF, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1186 (i).
——— DOM. AID, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13452 (vi).
BARRY'S BAY, MADAWASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BELLE RIVIÈRE, SHEET PILING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 13082 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5588 (iii).
BLIND RIVER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*), 1298 (i).
BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
BOYD, SIR JOHN, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 5990 (iii).
——— RELATIVES IN GOVT. EMPLOY: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*), 4185 (ii).
BRACEBRIDGE CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).
BRANTFORD, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
——— INDIAN RESERVE, LEASES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1322 (i).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) in Com. of Sup., 5757 (iii).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).
BURKS FALLS, MAGNETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
CAMPBELLFORD, PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).
CAN. CENTRAL RY. AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
CANADA FOUNDRY, TORONTO, STRIKE, &C., REPRESENTATIONS TO MINISTER OF LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 7205 (iii).
See 'Scotch Iron,' &c.
CANALS IN ONT. AND QUE., AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).
CHATHAM DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).
CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT *re* RAILS FOR GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Ont.*) 13668 (vi).
See 'Sault.'
CLINTON, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
See 'Macpherson.'
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).
COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE 1901 TO MARCH 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 669 (i).
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i).
——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii), 13084 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD, DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
CORNWALL CANAL, LIGHTING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vi).
——— SUPT'S. DUTIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).
COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATION OF WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P. O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).
CUMBERLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 13239 (vi).
CUTLER, GORE BAY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 2308 (i).
——— AND GORE BAY MAIL CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

CUTLER, SPANISH MILLS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
DEPOT HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
See 'Parry Sound,' 'Grain,' &c.
DESERONTO, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
DETROIT RIVER, &C., INTERNATIONAL WATERS, U. S. GOVT. WORK: M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Cor.* 2778 (ii).
DREDGING PLANT FOR ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii).
DRESDEN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).
DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
EDVILLE POSTMASTER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).
ELGIN COUNTY, CENTENARY CELEBRATION: Remarks (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 3129 (ii).
——— REDISTRIBUTION, PAR. IN 'TORONTO GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 6540 (iii),
ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum (Sir *William Mulock*) read, 14008 (vi).
ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).
FARRAN'S POINT, ACETYLENE GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii), 14150 (vi).
FLESHERTON ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
FT. WILLIAM, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
See 'Grain,' 'Kaministiqua.'
GALOPS CANAL ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).
——— SURVEYS, LIFTING BOULDERS: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— DAM: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12608 (vi).
——— RAPIDS, DEEPENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) Agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
See 'North Channel.'
GANANOQUE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970 (i).
——— CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4823 (ii).
———CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3791, 3897 (ii).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).
GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
——— *See* 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'
GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
GODERICH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).
——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
GOODERICH, MR., REMOVAL, MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).
GORE'S LANDING WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13244.
GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi),

ONTARIO—*Con.*

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).
——— SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i). *See* 'Wheat,' &c.
GRAND BEND, BREAKWATER PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
GRANT, J. G., BARRIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFAULT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).
GREY COUNTIES, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
GREY COUNTY, LIST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS WANTED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
GUELPH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
HALDIMAND, CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).
HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii), 11425. (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
HAMILTON, DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— ELEVATOR WORKS: Remarks (Mr. *Bruce*) in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— INLAND REVENUE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424 (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT. AID *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAYCOCK, J., MR., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE: in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772(iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).
HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Nr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).
HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
HUDSON'S BAY: *See* 'James.'
HURLEY, J. M., APPNMT., DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (ii), 5280 (iii).
——— REP., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
HURON COUNTY JUDGESHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
INDIANS ONT., AND QUEBEC, ROAD REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
INDIAN SCHOOLS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii). *See* general heading.
IROQUOIS CANALS, ELECTRIC LIGHTING: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).
JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
JAMES AND HUDSON BAY FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii), 6893 (iii).
——— Ques: (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).
JOHNSON, MR., PURCHASE OF HOUSE BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
——— *See* 'Port Arthur.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
KELLY, ASST. CUSTOMS INSPECTOR, REFUND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
KINGSTON, BARRACKS, R. C. FIELD ARTILLERY: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
——— GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & CO.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).
——— MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii), 5842 (iii).
——— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
——— MILITARY STABLES: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 13117 (vi).
——— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
KINGSVILLE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
LAMBTON, POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278, 14661 (vi).
LEAMINGTON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup, 5929 (iii).
LT.-GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO, &C.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
——— APPNMT. OF ADMINISTRATOR: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Decease, 1575 (i).
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LONDON, DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
MACNEE FISHING LICENSES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii).
——— *See* 'James.'
MACPHERSON, D. F., CENSUS ENUMERATOR, CLINTON: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PETS. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi). *See* 'Lambton.'
MARA, RAMA, &C., FLOODING OF LANDS: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for copies of Rep., &c., 2762 (ii).
MEAFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13069, 13124 (vi).
MECHANICS FROM ENG. AND TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL FROM TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).
MIDLAND HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
——— DREDGES, &C., CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
MIDLAND MERCANTILE CO.'S RENTAL OF BUILDINGS ON DOCK, MIDLAND: in Com. of Sup., 13427 (vi).
MIDLAND, POSTOFFICE BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
——— WATER FRONT, LEASE TO PRATT & CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

MILITARY COLLEGE : *See* 'Kingston.'
MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
MOIRA RIVER FLOODING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
MORRISBURG PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 492 (i).
MOWAT, SIR OLIVER : *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
MURRAY CANAL, PURCHASE OF MR. JOHNSON'S HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
——— STEWART, MR., INSPECTOR : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).
——— WIRE FENCING: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
NAPANEE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).
NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CHARTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
NEPEAN POINT, IMPROVEMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).
NEWMARKET, OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NIAGARA MILITIA CAMP, ANNUAL DRILL : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
NINETY-FOURTH REGIMENT, SENIOR AND JUNIOR MAJORS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9080 (iv).
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14258 (vi).
NORTH CHANNEL, CONSTRUCTION OF DAM : in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14142 (vi).
See 'Galops.'
OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).
ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 367 (i).
ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS ENUMERATORS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
ORILLIA, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 968 (i), 13086 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REMOVAL OF CARETAKER : in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA, BRIDGE OVER CONCESSION STREET : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— BRIDGES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii), 13321 (vi).
——— BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
——— VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
See general heading.
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
See 'Georgian,' 'Point au Baril,' &c.
OTTAWA RIVER, PETEWAWA NARROWS : in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
——— SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13110, 13122 (vi).

PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

PARRY SOUND, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PERTH PUBLIC BUILDING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETERROUGH ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— CANAL, LIFT LOCK : in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
PETEWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE : in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICTON, MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13134 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, LEVELLING GROUNDS : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
POINT AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
See 'Georgian,' &c.
POINT EDWARD DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13249 (vi).
PORT ARTHUR HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
See 'Kaministiquia.'
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT : in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— *See* 'Welland.'
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT PERRY, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5749 (iii).
See 'Midland.'
PRESCOTT, HARBOUR DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
——— INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968 (vi).
PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRITCHETT, AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN ONT. : Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 898, 908 (i).
QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &c. FOR SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5587 (iii).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RATHBUN CO.'S RY. CHARTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE, TORONTO, ADDITIONAL VAULT : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES, &c. : *See* 'Can. Central.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 13302 (vi).
——— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
RIVIÈRE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).
RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).
ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— *See* 'Trent.'
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: *See* 'Kingston.'
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
ST. MARY'S PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
SARNIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
——— COALING ACCOMMODATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii).
——— CLERGUE SYNDICATE, LABOUR DISTURBANCES: Remarks, 12610, 12717 (vi).
——— PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR' *re* MILITIA: Remarks (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 12939 (vi).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
SCOTCH IRON MOULDERS AND TORONTO CAN. FOUNDRY CO.'S. STRIKE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
——— *See* 'Can. Foundry.'
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
SIMCOE COUNTY CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &C.: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2762 (ii).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5587 (iii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— N. W. T. RESERVES, &C., 6350 (iii).
SMITH, WM., LATE, M.P., AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION: Remarks (Mr. *Cowan*) 894 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).
STANDARD CHEMICAL CO., LONGFORD: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).
——— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 13648 (vi).
STRATFORD ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
STURGEON FALLS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).
SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO, JUDGES' SALARIES: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 10102 (v).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

SYDNENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).
TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).
——— REPAIRS TO WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
THESSALON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).
THOMPSON, MR. P., 'LABOUR GAZETTE' COR., TORONTO, REMUNERATION: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).
THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).
TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
TORONTO, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— (LETTER READ): in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
——— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
——— CANADA IRON FOUNDRY, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
——— *See* 'Scotch,' &c.
——— CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 647, 957 (i).
——— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, &C., TOTAL AMT. PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Grant*) 1203 (i).
——— INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 13501 (vi).
——— ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).
——— LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS, STORE HOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
——— BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
——— COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i), 13096 (vi).
——— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).
TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).
——— BALSAM LAKE LOCKS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— CORRY & LAVERDURE, COMPENSATION *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii), 14651 (vi).
——— EMPLYMT. OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8117 (iv).
——— HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 129 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

TRENT CANAL, PAYMENTS TO THOS. DODDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).
——— PETERBOROUGH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— REP. OF W. MCLEOD: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 12716 (vi).
——— ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, REPS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Copies, 2313 (i).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
TRENTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Conc., 14764 (vi).
WALLACEBURG, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).
WALPOLE, CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
——— DRAINAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
——— RAMY'S POINT, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— 'TOWNSEND' VALVE *re* LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE OF ST. CATHARINES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
——— O. CS., *re*, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
——— *See* 'Pt. Colborne,' &c.
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, COMMISSIONERS' REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6168 (iii).
——— JURY'S VERDICT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3231 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
WHEAT EXPORT FREIGHT RATE TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
WHEAT SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 284 (i).
See 'Grain,' &c.
WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).
WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— LOCKMASTER CASSELMAN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— MORRISON, MRS., CLAIMS *re* LANDS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, OVERSEER'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— STEWART, MR., APPNMT. AS SUPT. OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*) 14599 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
WINDSOR, CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
See 'Kilroy,' &c.
——— POST OFFICE LETTER BOXES: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOODSTOCK ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041, 13108 (vi).
OPERATING EXPENSES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7811 (iv).
ORDER, QUES. OF, IN COM. ON CRIMINAL CODE B.: Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 318 (i).
ORDER IN THE HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12723 (vi).
ORDER, QUESTIONS OF: Mr. Speaker's Rulings (Mr. *Ingram*) 10537 (v).
ORDER, QUES OF, *re* BRUNET AND DOM. ELECTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 108 (i).
——— *See* 'H. of C.'
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3698 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
ORILLIA, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 968 (i).
——— remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REMOVAL OF CARETAKER: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
ORLEANS ISLAND, MAIL SERVICE &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
See 'Island of Orleans.'
OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
OSAKA EXHIBITION: *See* 'Japan.'
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i), 5842 (iii), 14243 (vi).
——— ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ROOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).

OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS, CARETAKERS, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).

—— COAL CONTRACT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).

—— COAL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

—— ELEVATORS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).

—— FIRE SECURITY AND MARTINEAU REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

—— FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 973, 1006 (i).

—— GOVT. OFFICES, RENTALS, LEASES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 588 (i).

—— GROUNDS, MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

—— CRICKET PLAYING: Objection (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).

—— PAVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).

—— LIGHTING &c.: in Com. of Sup., 974, 988 (i).

—— NEW ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

—— RENTALS, LEASES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).

—— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).

—— STEEL SHELVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).

—— TELEPHONES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

—— WESTERN BLOCK, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).

OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES, APPROACHES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).

OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

OTTAWA, CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

Ottawa City Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. No. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6448; 1°* of B., 6456; 2°*, and in Com., 6806; 3°*, 6814 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 45).

Ottawa Electric Railway Co.'s B. No. 108 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 171).

OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
See 'Georgian.'

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 37 (Mr. *Champagne*) 1°*, 540; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 173).

OTTAWA, NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14319 (vi).

—— *See* 'Waltham.'

OTTAWA POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).

—— ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).

—— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).

OTTAWA RIVER, PETAWAWA NARROWS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).

—— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).

OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

OTTAWA VALLEY FIRE SUFFERERS AND GOVTL. ASSISTANCE: Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3133 (ii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) 1°*, 707; on Order for 2°, 977; 2° m., 1327, 1511 (i); M. *re* Ry. Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87), 6537 (iii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 264 (Mr. *Ethier*) 1°*; 2°*, and ref. to Ry. Com., 12993; in Com., and 3°*, 13330 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 172).

OUELLE RIVER BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).

—— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).

OUELLE RIVER, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

OWEN SOUND, BUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13122 (vi).

—— HARBOUR DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).

—— HARBOUR SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).

—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13110 (vi).

OXIDE OF ALUMINUM, IMPORTS INTO CANADA, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1035 (i).

OYSTER FISHING, P.E.I., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).

OYSTERS, HERRING, &c., FISH INSPECTION, INVESTIGATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

OYSTER POND, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).

Pacific Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 164 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 3796 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 174.)

PACIFIC CABLE, CONCESSIONS TO EASTERN EXTENSION CO., LIABILITY OF CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2675 (ii).

PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &c.: M. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) for copies*, 2338 (i).

PARDON PREROGATIVE OF, BY HIS EX.. NUMBER RELEASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 567 (i).

PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE: *See* 'Chamber of Commerce.'

PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).

PARLIAMENT, DATE OF CONVENING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 14853 (vi).
See 'Sessions.'

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, LOWERING TONE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 14583 (vi).
See 'Debates.'

PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS, OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, POSTAGE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).

—— TRANSLATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 545 (i).

PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DUST NUISANCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 2104 (i).
——— LAWN MUTILATION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
PARLIAMENT: Opening, 1 (i), Prorogation, 14858 (vi).
PARRSBORO AND SPRINGHILL RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
PARRSBORO AND TRURO: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies for N.S.', &c.
PARRSBORO, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PARRY SOUND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PASPEBIAC AND GASPE BASIN SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
PASPEBIAC TO GASPE, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).
PASPEBIAC, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
PASSES, I. C. RAILWAY: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.. 2337 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9582 (iv.)
Patent Act Amt. B. No. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 3622; 2°*, 4213; in Com.. 4213, 4674 (ii); 3°* 5293 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 46.)
PATENT ACT AMT., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 97 (i).
PATENT BRANCH, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
——— CLASSIFICATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4433 (ii).
Patent Relief: *See* 'Depew, Geo. M.'
——— *See* 'International Ry. Appliances.'
——— *See* 'Keller.'
——— *See* 'McDougall, James S.'
——— *See* 'Standard Car.'
——— *See* 'Woolf Valve,' &c.
PAVING SIDEWALKS, OTTAWA, CONCRETE: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS, PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
PEEL, CARDWELL AND HALTON CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436 (iii).
See 'Halton.'
PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' PAYMENTS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
See 'Latour,' &c.
PELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
PEMBROKE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. No. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 5763 (iii): 2° m., and in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v); Order dischg., 13444 (vi).
PENITENTIARIES, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
PENITENTIARIES, GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
See 'Justice.'
Penny Banks B. No. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 4175 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793; 3°*, 10798 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 47.)
Pensions, Militia: *See* 'Militia.'
PENSION SYSTEM, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 9216 (iv).
PENSIONS TO S.A. SOLDIERS, PETS. *re*; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
PER CAPITA TAX, EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).
PER CAPITA TAX, REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 13935 (vi).
PERCE, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
Père Marquette International Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 132 (Mr. *Cowan*), 1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 175.)
PERKINS, W.. PAYMENT TO *re* LISGAR ELECTION; in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726, 2753 (ii).
PERMANENT CORPS, QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*), 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).
——— INCREASE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
——— INCREASE OF PAY: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 13371 (vi).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Bourassa*), *re* STOCK GAMBLING, 7204 (iii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* REPORT OF SPEECH: (Mr, *Hughes. Victoria*) 14850 (vi).
See 'Privilege.'
PERTH PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETAWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE: in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENT TO CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PETERBOROUGH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— CANAL, LIFT LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE PIER, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S, DEPOSIT CHEQUE: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
See 'Atlantic.'
PETHIC, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).

PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).
PETITIONS, PRESENTATION OF, RULES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*), 6 (i).
PETITIONS *re* G.T.Ry., SIGNATURES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*), 12715; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 12715 (vi).
PETITION REJECTED AS CONTRARY TO RULE 86 (Mr. *Speaker*), 654 (i).
See 'H. of C.'
PETIT ROCHER, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
"PETREL", REPLACEMENT BY NEW STEAMER: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).
See 'Marine.'
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS, &C: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTON MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Alcorn*), 13134 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, LEVELLING GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
——— LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PIERREVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi)
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec) Amt. B. No. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), Res. wthdn., 12493 (v); in Com. on Res., 12781; 1°* of B., 12800; 2°m., 12984; 2°, and in Com., 13628; 3°m., 13937 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 48.)
Pilotage Act. Amt. B. No. 138 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), 1°*, 2100 (i); wthdn., 11302 (v).
PILOTAGE ACT AMT. B: Prop. Res. wthdn., 12493 (v).
PILOTS, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2915 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4132-4168 (ii).
See 'Shipping Casualties Bill.'
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT FOR I.C.R. CARS: in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
PLAINS OF ABRAHAM AND MILITARY PARADES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3234 (ii).
PLEASANT BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PNEUMATIC TUBE, MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
POINTE AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
POINTE AUX TREMBLES, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINTE DU CHENE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
POINT EDWARD, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i). 13249 (vi).
POINTE FORTUNE, WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT PRIM, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
POINT TUPPER, DREDGING, CLAIMS OF MR. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
POIRIERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
POLAR EXPEDITION, GOVT. AID TO CAPT. BERNIER: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), 12805 (vi.)
POLICE MAGISTRATES, YUKON. LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).
See 'Yukon.'
POLITICAL CORRUPTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Dom. Elections B., 891 (i).
PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
PORTAGE, P.E.I., POST OFFICE OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
PORT ARTHUR, ADDITIONAL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii)., 13012 (vi).
See 'Ontario,' &c.
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
PORT DANIEL, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORTER'S CHANNEL, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
PORT GREVILLE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, N. S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT HOWE, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT MOODY, MILITARY RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
PORT PERRY, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).

PORTRAIT PAINTING OF HIS MAJESTY THE KING AND CANADIAN ARTISTS; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13026 (vi).
See 'Art,' &c.

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i), 13249 (vi).

Postal Scales: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1°m., 5240; 2°m., 5657; in Com., 5659, 5853: 3°*, 5871 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 49).

Post Office and Govt. Savings Bank B. No. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°m., 6353; 2°*., and in Com., 6814; 3°*, 6815 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 62).

POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, MONTREAL, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

POST OFFICE, GOVT'S. POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487-533 (i).

POST OFFICE:

AFFIDAVITS *re* P. O. SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iii).

AGRICULTURE DEPT., POSTAGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4355 (ii).

AMHERST, N. S., POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1591 (i).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

AURORA FOUNDRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).

AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &C.: in Com of Sup., 6139 (iii).

AUTOMOBILES FOR P. O. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).

AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 13263 (vi).

BARRIE P. O., BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).

BLOOMFIELD POSTMASTER, N. B., CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BOXES ON STREET CORNERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
See 'Postal Boxes,' &c.

BOX RENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).

BRACEBRIDGE POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., P. E. I., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

CAMPBELL, D. J., POSTMASTER AT MACLEOD, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 8082 (iv).

CAMPBELLFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).

CANADA AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (iii).

CANADIAN MAIL VIA NEW YORK, NUMBER OF TONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).

CARLIN, PETER, J., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY PIER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).

CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).

CITY POST OFFICES, APPNMT. OF CLERKS ON PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 14001, 14009 (vi).

CLERKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5853 (iii).

CONVENTION, POSTAL, LONDON, ENG., RES. ADOPTED: Read (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14018 (vi).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

CORNWALL ROAD P. O., MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14038 (vi).

COUNTRY POSTMASTERS, SALARY INCREASES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5662, 5676, 5863 (iii).
See 'Postmasters, Rural.'

COUNTRY POST OFFICES, HOURS OF CLOSING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com. of Sup., 5931 (iii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii), 14011 (vi).

CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P. O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).

CUTLER AND GORE BAY MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

——— SPANISH MILLS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

DEFAULTING POSTMASTERS *re* SAVING BANKS DEPOSITS: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *William Mulock*) 89 (i).

DISTRIBUTION, &C.: REMARKS (Mr. *Bell*) 879 (i).

DEPTL. SALARIES, ADDITIONAL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DIXON, MR. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, WINNIPEG, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DOYLE, MR., RY. MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

EDVILLE POSTMASTER, OPENING OF OFFICE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

EMERSON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).

EMPLOYEES, HOLIDAYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4005 (ii).

ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER; Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum (Sir *William Mulock*) read, 14008 (vi).

ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).

FACILITIES TO PARISHES NEAR MONTREAL, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 12498 (v).

FITTINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13090 (vi).

GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).

GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., (Sir *William Mulock*) 14012 (vi).

GUELPH POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).

HALIFAX POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).

——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).

H. OF C., LOCKED P. O. BOXES: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 6026 (iii).

INSPECTORS, SUPT. OF RY. MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).

INSURANCE FUND, REP., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

INVERNESS POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).

JUBILEE STAMPS, SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6060 (iii).

KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938 (iii).

LAMBTON POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278 14661 (vi).

LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

LETTER BOX COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER BOXES IN POST OFFICES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— BOOTS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on Post Office B., 5660, 5672 (iii).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iii).
——— TORONTO, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— WINNIPEG, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
LIME ROCK, N.S., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PET. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
See 'Lambton.'
MACLEOD, N.W.T., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
MAHONE BAY, POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
MAIL BAGS, REFUNDING EXPRESS CHARGES: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14684 (vi).
See general heading.
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
MAIL, CANADIAN, SENT VIA NEW YORK: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
MAILS CARRIED BY RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
MAIL CARS, N.W.T., INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
MAIL CLERKS, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13997 (vi).
See 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
MAIL MARKING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6053, 6065 (iii).
——— P.E.I., IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MALLON, MR., DISMISSAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).
MAN. POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Postmasters.'
MEAFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFAULTING POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
MONTREAL POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
NAPANEE POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).
NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON AND EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1195 (i).
NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NEWSPAPER BOXES, NAMES OF MANUFACTURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 14283 (vi).
See 'Boxes.'

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

N. W. TER., POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).
ORLEANS ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).
OTTAWA, POST OFFICE, ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
——— SUPPLY CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).
OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5924, 6004 (iii).
PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).
PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, POSTAGE, *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).
PICTON MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13134 (vi).
PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
PORTAGE, P.E.I., POST OFFICE, OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
POSTAL, BOXES ON STREET CORNERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
——— CONVENTION: *See* 'CONVENTION.'
——— MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iii).
POSTMASTERS, ASSOCIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T., MEMORIAL *re* SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 13259 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) in Com. of Sup., 13934 (vi).
——— STMNT. (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).
——— DEFAULTING *re* SAVINGS BANKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
——— DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1020 (i).
——— IN MAN. AND N.W.T., PETS. *re* SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 125 (i).
POSTMASTERS, RURAL, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5920, 6037 (iii).
——— *See* 'Country.'
POSTMASTERS' SALARIES, ARREARS: in Com. of Sup., 5921 (iii).
POST OFFICES IN CITIES, STMNT. OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF (Sir *William Mulock*) *re* NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., 13256 (vi).
QUEBEC POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'
RY. CARRIAGE OF MAILS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
RY. MAIL CLERKS: in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5926, 6136 (iii).
——— INCREASED SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
——— MAN. AND N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
See 'Mail Clerks.'
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
RY. MAIL TRANSFER AGENTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iii).
RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6889 (iii).
ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).
RONAN, MR., AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, FREE ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 285 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 13259 (vi).
——— P.E.I., Par. in Charlottetown *Patriot*: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13806 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 6137 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 511 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
——— POSTAL FACILITIES: Ques (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iii).
SAVINGS BANKS, DEFALCATIONS OF POSTMASTER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
SMITH, F. H., P.O. DEPT., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
STAMPING LETTERS BY MINISTERS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).
SUPPLIES AND CURRENT WAGES, DECLARATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iii).
THETFORD MINES POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).
TORONTO, ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
TORONTO POST OFFICE, BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
——— AUTOMOBILES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).
TRANSFER OF TEMPORARY CLERKS TO PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
U. S. INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS OF VESSELS *re* CUSTOMS MANIFEST, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).
VALLEYFIELD POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 98 (i).
——— TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
VANCOUVER P. O., INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Conc., 14764 (vi).
WHITNEY PIER, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).
WINNIPEG P. O., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
——— REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).

POTTINGER, MR., I.C.R., REP. OF *re* TIES, &C.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Haggart*) 3806 (ii).

'POULTRY FARMING,' PAMPHLET OF DEPT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 7640 (iv).

POUPORE, G. C., AWARD: *See* 'Ottawa River.'

PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
——— *See* 'Midland.'

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, AND RT. HON. JOS. CHAMBERLAIN'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13375 (vi).
——— AND S. A. COLONIES, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).
——— CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3583 (ii).
——— WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B. C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
——— PAR. IN 'MONTREAL STAR' *re* MR. FIELDING'S PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME, 13936 (vi).
——— PREVENTION OF FRAUD, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii).
——— *re* GERMAN GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5322 (iii).
——— MEMORANDUM OF MR. BALFOUR, PRES'DT. OF BRITISH BOARD OF TRADE, IN FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1402 (i).
——— OFFER OF CAN. GOVT. TO G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3219 (ii).

PRÉFONTAINE, HON. R., AND PUBLIC WORKS PORTFOLIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2266-2273, 2657, 2925, 2956 (ii).

PRENDERGAST, JUDGE, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).

PRESCOTT, HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
——— INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968 (vi).

PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).

Press Associated Despatches: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.

PRESS REPRESENTATIVES IN GALLERY OF H. OF C., SESSIONAL SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14242 (vi).

PRESTON, MR., INTERVIEW *re* CAN. BUTTER: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).
——— STATEMENT *re* CAN. APPLES: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
——— SUIT BY CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
See 'Barr Colony,' &c.

PREVENTIVE SERVICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).
———*See* 'Customs.'

PRIME MINISTER, CONGRATULATIONS *re* TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AS A MEMBER (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

'PRINCE ALBERT ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
——— *See* 'Advocate.'

PRINCE ALBERT, CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
——— COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

Prince Edward Island Ferry Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1°*, 3391; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914; 3°, 7914 (iv).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
AGENTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6884 (iii).
AITKEN'S WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
ALBANY STATION AND LAND PURCHASE, P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
ALBERTON RY. STATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
——— STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
ANNANDALE, PIER, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
——— RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
BEACH POINT, BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
BELFAST PIER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
BLUESHANK, STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
BONDED WAREHOUSES, RENTAL, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
BROOKFIELD STATION, ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
CANOE COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).
CAPE TRAVERSE, SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CARLETON HEAD, SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
CHARLOTTETOWN, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— DOM. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14131 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).
COAL FIELDS, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
COVE HEAD, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13222 (vi).
CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).
DESROCHES, FISHERY GUARD, ALLEGED FRAUDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).
DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
ELMIRA BRANCH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
FARQUHARSON, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).
FISHING BOUNTIES, GUARDIAN DESROCHES, ALLEGED FRAUD: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).
FISH SHIPPERS, LOSS, &C., BY GOVT. STRS.: Memorandum read (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4051-54 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).
——— PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
GRAND RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
HIGGIN'S SHORE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).
——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938, 6064 (iii).
KENSINGTON STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
LARKIN, CAPT. W. S., COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
LEWIS POINT, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

LOBSTER INDUSTRY, INSPECTION, *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MAIL SUBSIDY, P.E.I. AND G.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii).
MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
See 'Hillsborough.'
NEW LONDON HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— REPAIRS TO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH CARDIGAN, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).
O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY., BRANCH LINE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY, DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
OYSTER FISHING, P.E.I., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).
OYSTERS, HERRING, &C., FISH INSPECTION, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
PERCÉ, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
PETHICK, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
POINT PRIM, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
PORTAGE, POST OFFICE OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
P.E.I. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv).
——— AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
——— AND NEWFOUNDLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13676 (vi).
——— PROTEST *re* REPRESENTATION IN H. OF C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).
——— *See* 'Redistribution.'
P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12608 (v), 12828 (vi).
——— GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——— MISREPRESENTATION *re* TOTAL COST: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P. E. I.*) 1679 (i).
——— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH AND HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14115 (vi).
——— RY. SALE OF TICKETS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— SUBSIDIES BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
——— WATER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
QUEENS, WEST, REPRESENTATION *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).
REDISTRIBUTION *re* P. E. I. AND N. B., COR. RESPECTING : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 876 (i).
REPRESENTATION IN P.E.I. AND N B. FOR H. OF C., LAW OFFICERS' OPINION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).
RICHMOND AND NORTHAM, P.E.I. RY. STATION : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
RICHMOND BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, Par. in Charlottetown *Patriot* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13806 (vi).
SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, P.E.I. RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4443 (ii).
SHIPPERS OF FROZEN FISH, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).
SKINNER'S POND : in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com, of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SOURIS, KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR, RY. TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
ST. LOUIS, ELMSDALE, COLEMAN AND CONWAY STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
"STANLEY," STR., AND P.E.I. WINTER COMMUNICATION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 4006 (ii),
——— MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).
STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 4361 (ii)
STEEL RAILS, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).
SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— COMPLETION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 3234 (ii).
——— COAL SHEDS : in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
——— HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
TELEGRAPH LINES AND MAINLAND : in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).
——— RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
TELEGRAPH SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 2765 (ii).
——— COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*), 1036 (i).
——— STR. "STANLEY": Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 4006 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6895 (iii).

Printing and Stationery Bill: *See* 'Public,' &c.

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1102 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU AND UNION EMPLOYEES : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 4182, 4414 (ii).

——— AND UNION LABELS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*), 4179 (ii).

PRINTING BUREAU, COMPOSITORS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 4444 (ii).
PRINTING BUREAU, INDEBTEDNESS OF MEMBERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*), 4180 (ii).
——— PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 12587 (v).
——— SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
PRINTING COM. : M. (Mr. *Parmelee*) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 5314 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Parmelee*) to concur in 4th Rep. of Com., 5581 (iii).
PRINTING OF PARLT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
PRINTING, STATIONERY, CUSTOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).

Prisons Act : *See* 'Reformatory.'

PRITCHARD AND ANDREWS, P.O. SUPPLIES : in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iii).
PRITCHETT, AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN ONT.: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*), 898, 908 (i).
PRIVATE BANKERS : *See* 'Bankers.'
PRIVATE BILLS : M. (Mr. *Morrison*), to extend Time, 10489 (v).
——— M. (Mr. *Russell*) to suspend Rule, 4958 (ii).
——— NOTICES, REVISING RULES *re* : M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) in Com. on Rep. of Joint Com., 13547 (vi).
——— ORDER FOR PROCEDURE : Remarks (Mr. *La-Rivière*), 5138 (iii).
PRIVATE CARS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR HAULAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 9682 (iv).
——— PURCHASED BY GOVT,, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2309 (i).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM., 1ST REP. OF SEL. COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*), 5511 (iii).
——— M. *re* Stenographer (Mr. *Fraser*), 7202 (iii).
——— 2ND REP. *re* MR. LOY, M.P.: Presented (Mr. *Wade*), 7916 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7917 (iv).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 7918 (iv).
——— M. to conc. in Rep., 7922, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*), 8008, Neg. (Y. 40 ; N. 105), 8069, 8080 (iv).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF : (Mr. *Fisher*) Par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Montreal *Herald* Co., 5314 (iii).
——— (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Par. in *La Patrie*, 6803 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11557 (v).
——— (Sir *William Mulock*) *re* Newmarket Office Specialty Co., 13256 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys. and 'Grafters,' 10497, 10529 (v).
——— (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) *re* Attendance at House, 2015 (i).
——— (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) *re* Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization,' 13373 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Schell*) *re* Purchase of Cheese Hoops, 5416 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Schell*) *re* Appnmt. of Mr. Stewart on Canals, 14599 (vi).

PRIVILEGE (Mr. *Scott*) *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates', in Campaign Literature, 14583 (vi).
—— (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 3127 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets. of G.T.P.Ry. Co., 13265 (vi).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.,' &c.
—— (Mr. *Tarte*) *re* 'Eureka', 14687 (vi).
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
PROCEDURE *re* ADJOURNMENT: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Sproule*), 6630 (iii).
PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Secretary (Mr. *Speaker*), 14844 (vi).
—— Mess. from His Ex., 14858 (vi).
PROSPECT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup.' 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63), 13932 (vi).
See 'Autonomy.'
—— FURTHER COR., &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*), 7295 (iii).
—— IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 6891 (iii).
—— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print Papers, 5582 (iii).
—— Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 5512 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*), 1296 (i).
—— RET., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii).
See 'N.W.T. Subsidies B. 256.'

Provincial Court Judges, &c.: *See* 'Judges Retiring,' &c.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, INCREASES, &C.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 5764 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: M. (Mr. *Fraser*) 367 (i).
—— M. to add Name (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3431 (ii).
—— MEETINGS CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 8334 (iv).
—— PRODUCING CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

Publication of Statutes: *See* 'Statutes.'

PUBLIC DEBT, CONVERSION, PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVANTS *re*, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14253 (vi).
PUBLIC DEBT, INTEREST DECREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14665 (vi).
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION TO BOARDS OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1378 (i).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON PRIVATE WHARFS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).
PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
PUBLIC HEALTH, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
—— *See* 'Agriculture.'

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. No. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3392; 2°*, 4203; in Com., 4203; 3°*, 4213 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 50).

Public Works Act (contracts) Amt. B. No. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1° m., 3970; 2°*, 4221; in Com., 4221; 3°*, 4224 (ii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 52).

Public Works Management and Control B. No. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 14281; 2°, and in Com., 14741; 3°*, 14755 (vi). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 53).

PUBLIC WORKS:
ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ABRAM'S RIVERS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ACTON VALE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
AITKEN'S WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
'ALASKA,' STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629 (iii).
ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
AMAGANDUS WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
AMHERSTBURG, ONT., HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1285 (i), 13235 (vi).
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW, WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY'S LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
ANNANDALE PIER, P.E.I., AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
ANSE AUX GASCONS, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANTICOSTI TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
—— FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
ANTIGONISH POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
ARBITRATION AND AWARDS *re* PUBLIC WORKS, PAYMENTS &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vi).
ARCHITECT'S (CHIEF) OFFICE, OTTAWA, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
ARCHITECTS *re* PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).
ARCHITECT OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY ARREARS: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).
—— STAFF, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
ARICHAT, N.S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).
ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1859 (i).
See "St. Andrews Rapids" (vi).
ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

BAILEY'S BROOK, N.S., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1072 (i).
BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
BARRIE, ONT., WHARF CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1186 (i), 13452 (vi).
BARRY'S BAY, ONT., MADAWASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BATISCAN RIVER, CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
See 'St. Maurice.'
BAXTER'S HARBOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BAYFIELD EXTENSION PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i), 13141 (vi).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
BEACH POINT, P.E.I., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
BELFAST PIER, P.E.I., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
BELLE ISLE, TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2989 (ii).
BELLE RIVIÈRE, SHEET PILING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969, (i), 13082 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5588 (iii).
BENOIT'S COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG POND WHARF, N.S., SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).
BLACK BROOK, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).
BLIND RIVER, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 1298 (i).
BOIS BRULÉ, TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
BONAVENTURE, EAST, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).
BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
BOW RIVER BRIDGE, CANMORE, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
BRACEBRIDGE, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).
BRANTFORD DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
BRETON COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
BRIDGES OVER CANALS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
BRIDGEWATER, N.S., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).
B.C. TELEGRAPH LINES, WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).
BROAD COVE, N.S., HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5755 (iii).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
BUILDINGS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 956, 1065 (i).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 442 (i), 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
——— MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 412, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i), 13129 (vi).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 487, 956 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).
——— OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13053 14245 (vi).
——— QUEBEC, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
See 'Dominion Buildings.'
BURK'S FALLS, MAGNETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
CACOUNA WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
CAMPBELLFORD, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).
CAMPBELLTON, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).
——— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).
CAMPOBELLO, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: in of Com. Sup., 13218 (vi).
CAPE TORMENTINE, N.B., PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
CAPE TRAVERSE, P.E.I., SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).
CARETAKERS OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, GOVT. POLICY *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i), 13061 (vi).
CARIBOO ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR OF REFUGE: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CARLETON HEAD, P.E.I., SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I., BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).
CEMENT USED FOR BUILDINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).
CHARLOTTETOWN, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).
CHATEAUGUAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
CHATHAM, N.B., LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
——— TO TRACADIE, N.B., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
CHATHAM, ONT., DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
CHEGOGGIN, N.S., PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

CHETICAMP, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHEVERIE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
CHEZZETCOOK, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
CLERKS OF PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).
COAL CONTRACTS FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1065 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i), 13084 (vi).
——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
COCAGNE WHARF, N.B., COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD DRY DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
COLUMBIA RIVER, B.C., ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENTS FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
CORRY & LAVERDURE, AWARD *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATION OF WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
COVE HEAD HARBOUR, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).
COW BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i), 13178 (vi).
CRANE ISLAND WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
CROSS POINT PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
CUMBERLAND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
DALHOUSIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DAUPHIN, LAKE LOWERING: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
DAWSON TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).
DEER ISLAND TO EASTPORT, ME., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
DEPOT HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
See 'Parry Sound.'
DESCHAMBAULT WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESERONTO, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

DESJARDINS, ALLUMETTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, CAMILLE, APPNMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques., (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).
DIGBY PIER, RENEWALS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
DIPPER HARBOUR, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DOCKS, HARBOURS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
DOM. BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1065 (i).
——— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 421 (i).
——— RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
——— RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN, ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DREDGES, AT MIDLAND, CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— NEW, COST, CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1856 (i).
——— PLANT FOR B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).
——— MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2674 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).
——— MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).
See "Hydraulic" &c.
——— ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).
——— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
——— VESSELS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
DRILL HALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13043 (vi).
See 'Militia.'
——— ST. JOHNS, QUE., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
DUFFERIN AND SAPPERS BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
DUNCAN'S COVE, N.S., APPROACH TO WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DUNNVILLE: *See* 'Grand River.'
DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
EAST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST BERLIN, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
ECONOMY, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
EDMONTON, BRIDGE, SASKATCHEWAN RIVER, FLOORING: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
ELECTRIC POWER FOR DOM. BUILDINGS GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
ENGINEERS OFFICE, PUB. WORKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

ESQUIMAUX POINTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
'EUREKA,' STR., LOAN BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14285 (vi).
——— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Tarte*): 14687 (vi).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS, REPAIRS TO BUILDINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
FAIR WAGE SCHEDULE ON GOVT. CONTRACTS AND LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
'FIELDING, W. S.,' DREDGE PREPARATION OF PLANS, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14283 (vi).
FINLAY POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).
FISHER, CHAS. A. L., INSPECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1592 (i).
FIVE ISLANDS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
FLESHERTON ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
FT. DUFFERIN EXTENSION WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
FT. LAWRENCE, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
FT. WILLIAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
See 'Port Arthur,' 'Kaministiquia,' &c.
FRASER RIVER, B.C., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
FRAWLEY, MR., REMOVAL FROM ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
FREEPORT, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
FRIARS HEAD HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
FRUDE'S POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
FUEL CONTRACTS, INTEREST *re* UNPAID ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5318 (iii).
GABAROUSE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
GANANOQUE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970 (i).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).
GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C.P.R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GEORGEVILLE, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
See 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
GODERICH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).
——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
GORE'S LANDING, WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
GOVT. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, REP. *re* MARTINEAU INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
See 'Ottawa.'
GOVT. CONTRACTS, TENDERS *re*: Par in Ottawa *Free Press* (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

GOVT. POLICY *re* DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works, Transfer.'
GRAND BEND, ONT., BREAKWATER PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
GRAND ETANG BRIDGE, ENTRANCE. in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
GRAND MANAN, N. B., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i), 13198 (vi).
GRAND PILES DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
GRAND RIVER, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).
GRAND RIVER WHARF, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
GRANDE RIVIERE WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GRANDE VALLEE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514-1574 (i); on conc., 6070 (iii).
GRANITE VILLAGE, N.S., MOORING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
GREAT SALMON RIVER, GROYNE AND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
GREEN COVE BOAT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
GREY COUNTY, LIST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS WANTED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
GUELPH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
GULL HARBOUR, ST. GEORGE'S BAY, MAN., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH, N. S., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
HALIFAX, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
———MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HAMILTON DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— INLAND REVENUE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 145 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii), 13308 (vi).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
——— MAR. PROVS. GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13065, 13227 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424, (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1512, 2241 (i), 3304 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
——— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS AND BRIDGES, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

HARDY BAY, B.C., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT. AID *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAWK POINT INLET, N. S., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HERRING COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HIGGIN'S SHORE, P.E.I., PIER: in Com. of Sup.. 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).
HNAUSA WHARF, EXTENSION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HOPEWELL CAPE, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
HULL, WHARF, COMPLETION: in Com. of Sup., 5900 (iii).
HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (i), 13312 (vi).
INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE, LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12218 (v).
INVERNESS MINES, N.S., BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
IONA, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND TEL. LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).
——— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).
See "Orleans," &c.
ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).
ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5962 (iii).
JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
JEDDORE, EAST, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks: (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
See 'Port Arthur.'
KAMOURASKA EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
KETCH, N. S., HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & CO.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).
——— MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., (i), 13094 (vi).
——— MILITARY STABLES: in Com. of Sup., 638 13117 (vi).
KINGSVILLE, ONT., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
LAKE ST. JOHN, WHARF, PIERS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (*i*), 13459 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).
See 'Temiscamingue.'
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, N. S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3230 (ii).
——— RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &C.: M. for copies*, 3236 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
LATOUR, L. J., LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980, 14002 (vi).
See 'Le Canada.'
LEAMINGTON WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
'LE CANADA' CIRCULAR ISSUED BY J. L. LATOUR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 1032 (i).
See 'Pelletier and Latour.'
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249 (i).
LEVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii).
——— LAND PURCHASED FOR I. C. R.: M. for O. Cs., &C.*: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
LEWIS POINT, P. E. I., PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
LIGHTING DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of SUP., 2257 (i).
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com of Sup., 1105 (i).
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LONDON, DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
LONGUEUIL, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N. B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
LORD'S COVE (DEER'S ISLAND) WHARF: in Com., of Sup., 1177 (i).
LOTBINIERE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 13315 (vi).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

McKay's Point, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
McNutt's Island, N. S., Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Magann & Phin, Claims *re* Toronto Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwaters, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— Land Tel. Lines, Repairs, Rewiring, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
Magog Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
Maguasha Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Main a Dieu, N. S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Malagawatch, N. S., Boat Channel Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Malignant Cove, N. S., Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Marconi Telegraph Stations, Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii), 13639 (vi).
——— Tel. Apparatus at Chateau Bay: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— Success of System: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
Margaree, N. S., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
Margaretsville, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
Maria Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).
Marysville, N. B.: Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).
Meaford Post Office: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).
Melbourne, N.S., Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater, Restoration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
Middle River, N.S., Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
Middleton Armoury, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).
Midland Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
——— Dredges, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
Midland, Mercantile Co.'s Rental of Buildings on Dock, Midland: in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
——— Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
——— Water Front, Lease to Pratt & Co.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
Miscou Harbour, N.B., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
Mistook (Delisle) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Moira River, Flooding: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
Moisie Point, Road Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).
Moncton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
Mont Louis, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Montmagny Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
Montreal, Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13058 (vi).
——— Harbour Dry Dock, Site, &c.: M. for O. Cs., Cor., &c.*: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

Montreal, Harbour, Permanent Sheds, Plans prepared, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
——— Harbour Dock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
——— New Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— Post Office, Enlargement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
Moose Jaw Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
Morrisburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 492 (i).
Morrison's Point, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Murray Bay to St. Catharines, Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
Murray Bay, Wharf Extension, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).
Musquodoboit, N.S., Wharf Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Nappan, Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
Necum Teuch Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
Negro Point, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
Neil's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
Nelson Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— Racine Bros'. Claims against Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).
Nepean Point, Improvement by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).
Newcastle Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
New Harbour Breakwater, Protection Slopes, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
New London, P.E.I., Harbour Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— Repairs to Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
Newport, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
New Richmond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
Nicola, Kamloops, Telephone Service: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
Nicolet River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
Noel Wharf, N.S., Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
Nomininghe Lake Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
North Cardigan, P.E.I., Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
North Sydney Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— *See* 'Sydney.'
N. W. T., Court Houses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
Oakville Pier, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
Orillia, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 968 (i), 13086 (vi).
——— Public Buildings, Removal of Caretaker: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
ORLEANS, ISLE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 5906 (iii).
——— *See* 'Submarine,' 'Island,' &c.
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i), 5812 (iii), 14243 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
——— APPROACHES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
——— CONCESSION STREET: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY, BUILDINGS, &C., ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 253 (i).
——— CARETAKERS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).
——— CENSUS BUILDING, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
——— COAL CONTRACT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).
——— COAL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— ELEVATORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).
——— ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— FIRE SECURITY AND MARTINEAU REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
——— FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
——— GROUNDS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— GROUNDS, PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— HEATING, &C., WESTERN BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— "IMPERIAL" BUILDING, OTTAWA, GOVT. OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3803 (ii).
——— LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974, 988 (i).
——— LIGHTING OF CHAMBER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 816 (i).
——— LIGHTING, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, CONTRACT PRICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 3235 (ii).
——— TRANSFORMERS: in Com. of Sup., 5843 (iii).
——— MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— OFFICE FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i), 13117 (vi).
——— FITTINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13090 (vi).
——— RENTALS, LEASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 588 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
——— RIDEAU HALL, LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i).
——— RIDEAU HALL AND GROUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 344 (i).
——— STEEL SHELVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— TELEPHONES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
——— VENTILATION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).
——— VICTORIA MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 365 (i).
OTTAWA RIVER, PETAWAWA NARROWS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

OUELLE, RIVIÈRE, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13110 (vi).
——— SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13122 (vi).
OYSTER POND, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
PARRSBOROUGH, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PARRY SOUND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PASPEBIAC LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
PAVING SIDEWALKS, CONCRETE: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' PAYMENTS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
PELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
PEMBROKE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PERCÉ, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
PERTH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETAWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE: in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENT TO CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PETERBOROUGH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PETIT ROCHER, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTON PUBLIC BUILDING, LEVELLING GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PICTOU, N.S., LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup. 13205 (vi).
PIERREVILLE, WHARF: in Com. in Sup., 13468 (vi).
PLEASANT BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
POINTE AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE, CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
POINTE DU CHENE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
POINT EDWARD, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13249 (vi).
POINTE FORTUNE, WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT PRIM, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
POINTE AUX TREMBLES, WHARF: in Com of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT TUPPER DREDGING, CLAIMS OF M. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
POIRIERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
PORT ARTHUR HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
See 'Fort William,' 'Kaministiquia.'

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

PORT BURWELL HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
See 'Welland.'
PORT DANIEL, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORTER'S CHANNEL, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
PORT GREVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT HOWE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT PERRY, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, DEEDGING, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i), 13249 (vi).
POST OFFICES, GOVT.'s POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487–533 (i).
POUPORE, G. C., AWARD: *See* 'Ottawa River,' &c.
PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
——— *See* 'Midland.'
PRESCOTT, HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT, COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
P.E.I., PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS, &C.- in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
——— TEL. SERVICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
PROSPECT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON PRIVATE WHARFS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— MAN.; in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13037 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 13133, 13306 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 411, 636 (i), 2612 (ii), 3304, 5006 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i), 13498 (vi).
——— CIVIL GOVT., CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iii).
——— CONTRACTS AWARDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*), 9080 (iv).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*), 6 (i).
——— EMPLOYEES, DISMISSALS, PROMOTIONS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*), 1058 (i).
——— AND MARINE DEPT., DIVISION OF WORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2266-2273 (i), 2657 (ii).
——— TRANSFER OF EXPENDITURES; Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), in Com. of Sup., 2925, 2956 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 2925 (ii).
——— PORTFOLIO AND QUEBEC PROVINCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2925. 2956 (ii).
——— PRESERVATION OF HEALTH, REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1857 (i).
——— TOTAL AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE IN CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*), 1197 (i).
PUGWASH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
QUATSINO CITY, WHARF, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
QUEBEC, CITADEL DRILL SHED; in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).
——— DRILL SHED, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*), 706 (i).
——— HARBOUR PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3972 (ii).
——— HARBOUR WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soleil* (Mr. *Casgrain*), 2237 (i).
——— MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
QUESNEL DAM, B.C., OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*), 11557 (v).
QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &C. FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5587 (iii).
RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3231 (ii).
RACINE BROS., CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O., B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
——— AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7162 (iii).
——— Letters read from Deputy Minister of Labour, &c., 7164 (iii).
RED DEER, COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
REPENTIGNY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &C., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).
RICHIBUCTO, NORTH PIER EXTENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).
RICHMOND BAY, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
RICHMOND, QUE., RIVER ST. FRANCIS ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, DRAINAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 647 (i).
——— MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

RIDEAU HALL, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5006 (ii). *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
RIMOUSKI EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RIVIERE DU LOUP, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).
RIVIERE DU NORD, CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
RIVIERE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
RIVIERE AUX RENARDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).
RIVIERE VERTE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).
——— RECONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
ROBIN, COLLAS, CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC: Remarks in Com. of Supply, 13464 (vi).
RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).
ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
ROSSLAND, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
ST. AGNES, TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
ST. ALEXIS, BAIE DES HA HA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE, HA HA BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. ANDRÉ DE KAMOURASKA, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup.. 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &c.: Que. (Mr. *Puttee*) 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 10490 (v).
——— RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— MAN., REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 14284 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
ST. ANN'S, N.S., NORTH GUT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——— NORTH RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE, PIER RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE: in C m. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
ST. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. CATHARINES, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY FERRY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
STE. FAMILLE, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
ST. FIDÈLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
ST. FRANCOIS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ST. FULGENCE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

ST. GÉDEON ISLANDS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GODFROI DE NOUVELLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. JEROME, LAKE ST. JOHN, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
ST. JOHN, N.B., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).
ST. JOHN RIVER TRIBUTARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 5895 (iii).
ST. JOHN RIVER WHARFS, TIDAL WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
ST. JOHNS, QUE., CUSTOMS BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).
ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLE OF ORLEANS: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).
See 'Island of Orleans,' &c.
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER (LOWER) REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE, CABLE AND TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2989, 5007 (ii), 13332 (vi).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3218 (ii).
——— SHIP CHANNEL, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).
——— WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
ST. LOUIS DE MILE END PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
ST. LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. MARY'S CURRENT WHARF, CONTRACT WITH POUPORE & MALONE: M. for copy of Contract* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
ST. MARY'S PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
ST. MAURICE RIVER, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).
——— DREDGING EASTERN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
——— *See* 'Batiscan.'
——— SLIDES, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
ST. MICHEL DE BELLECHASSE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. NICHOLAS PIER, REBUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
ST. PIERRE POINTE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
ST. SIMEON, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
SABREVOIS WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

SACRÉ-COEUR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
SANDY COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SARNIA, PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
SAUGENAY RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
SCOTT'S BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SELKIRK WHARF, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
SEVEN ISLANDS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHEGAWAKE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHERBROOKE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
SHIELDS MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF : Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SHORT BEACH BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5587 (iii).
SKINNER'S COVE, N.S., PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
——— POND, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SLIDES AND BOOMS, GENERAL REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— COR. *re* : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
See 'St. Anne de Sorel.'
SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT, P.E.I., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).
SOUTH INGONISH WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SPRINGHILL, N.S., ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— BOILER EXPLOSION : Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SPRY BAY, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
STAFFORD & CO.'S RENTAL OF DOCK BUILDINGS, MIDLAND : in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
See 'Midland.'
STRATFORD, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS : in Com of Sup., 13130 (vi).
STURGEON FALLS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

SUBMARINE CABLE, ISLE OF ORLEANS : M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 11186 (v).
See 'Island of Orleans,' &c.
SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
——— BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3234 (ii).
SUMMERVILLE, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720 (ii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
SWIM'S POINT, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SYDENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).
SYDNEY, N.S., POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13028, 13035 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
See 'North Sydney,' &c.
TELEGRAPH LINES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
——— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii), 5918 (iii).
——— P.E.I. AND MAINLAND : in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).
——— P.E.I., RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
——— QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— ST. LAWRENCE : in Com. of Sup., 5067 (ii).
TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).
TELEPHONE COS. IN MAR. PROVS., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2585 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
TELEPHONE, LONG DISTANCE IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 5088 (ii).
TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, REPAIRS TO WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
See 'Lake Temiscamingue.'
TENDERS *re* GOVT. CONTRACTS, INJUSTICE TO ENGLISH FIRMS : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).
TENECAPE, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
TERREBONNE, POST OFFICE BUILDING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
TEULON, NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
THESSALON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).
THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).
THREE FATHOM HARBOUR, BEACH WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
——— RETAINING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
TIVERTON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
TORONTO, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— LETTERS READ : in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
——— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

TORONTO, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 647, 957, (i).
——— HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
——— TOTAL AMT. PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Grant*) 1203 (i).
——— ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).
——— LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS, STORE HOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i), 13096 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
——— PUB. WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).
TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
TRANSPORTATION, COMMISSION *re* SOREL WHARF: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
——— FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
See general heading.
TRENTON HARDOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT CO.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.S., BEACH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.W.T., TO ANDREWS TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WALLACEBURG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 595 (i).
WALLACE HARBOUR, N.S., FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WATER SUPPLY FOR DOM. BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
WEDGE POINT, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WENTWORTH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO, BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup,, 13217 (vi).
WHARFS, &C., POLICY OF GOVT. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
——— PRIVATE, GOVT. EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352-1377 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE MUD RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WILLIAMS HEAD, B.C., QUARANTINE STATION WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, N.S., SHEER DAM., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE, LETTER BOXES: in Com. of of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDING AND POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com of Sup., 438 (i), 13127 (vi).
WOLFE ISLAND, DREDGING SHOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WOODS, J. W., RENTAL OF BUILDING, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
WOODSTOCK, N.B, ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
——— PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5735 (iii).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
WOODSTOCK, ONT., ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
——— PUB. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
WOODVILLE, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
YARMOUTH, N.S., BAR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
YORKTON COURT-HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
YUKON TER., PUB. WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

PUGWASH, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PULP WOOD, DUTY BY U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 4362 (ii).
'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).
Qu'Appelle Land Co. Bill: *See* 'Ontario and Qu'Appelle,' &c.
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. BONDS: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*) *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates,' 14583 (vi).
——— MEMORANDUM FROM MR. KINGSMILL: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 14588 (vi).
——— CO.'S LAND GRANT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2338 (i).
——— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
——— MORTGAGE DEEDS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).

QUARANTINE, ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of of Sup., 5007 (ii).

——— PUBLIC HEALTH, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).

——— LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).

QUATSINO CITY WHARF, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

Quebec Bridge and Ry, Co.'s B. No. 145 (Mr. *Power*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com. 4586; and 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 177.)

Quebec Bridge Subsidy Agreement B. No. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 14523; on Order for Com. on Res., 14690; 1°* of B., 14734; 2° m., 14734, in Com., and 3°*, 14735 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 54.)

——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14280 (vi).

QUEBEC BRIDGE, AMOUNTS PAID IN SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 10496 (v).

——— Papers laid on Table, 14521 (vi).

——— FURTHER AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).

QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14449 (vi).

QUEBEC, CITADEL DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).

——— DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).

——— REPS. TO COUNCIL, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).

——— PIER, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3972 (ii).

——— WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soliel* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2237 (i).

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi),

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 84: (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 176).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No, 135 (Mr. *Logan*) 1°*, 2100 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978, 6399; 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 178.)

QUEBEC, MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).

QUEBEC PILOTS: *See* 'Pilotage,' 'Shipping Causalties Bills.'

QUEBEC POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'

Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 56 (Mr. *Girard*) 1°*, 707: 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 179).

Quebec Sup. Court: *See* 'Judges, &c.'

QUEBEC:

ACTON VALE POSTOFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

ADMIRALTY COURT, QUEBEC, REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

AGRICULTURAL LECTURERS IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).

AIDS TO NAVIGATION, CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

ANSE AUX GASCONS WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

——— LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).

——— TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &c.: Remarks (Mr *Marcil*, *Bonaventure*) 3299 (ii).

BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

BATISCAN RIVER CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
See 'St. Maurice.'

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, FLOODING LANDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).
——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BELLE ISLE TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2989 (ii).

BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).

BOIS BRULÉ TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

BONAVENTURE EAST BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
See 'G.T.Ry.'

BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, AMOUNTS PAID IN SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 10496 (v).
——— FURTHER AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).

BRUNET, ARTHUR AND DOM. ELECTION ACT.: M. for Pets., O.C.'s &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 101 (i).
See 'St. James,' &c.

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

BUILDINGS, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 13053, 14245 (vi).
——— RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).

CACOUNA WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).

CANALS IN ONT. AND QUEBEC, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).

CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, SALARY Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
——— MOREAU, MR., APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331, 8488 (iv).
——— DISMISSAL OF JULES QUESNEL: (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
——— ELECTRIC STATION BY-WASH: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

CHAMBLY CANAL, LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

CHAMBLY CANAL, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
——— MACADAMIZING TOW PATH: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).
CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).
CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2015 (i).
CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).
CHATEAUGUAY RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
CIRCULARS TO CURES, P.Q., *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
CITADEL DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
CRANE ISLAND, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1513.
CROSS POINT, PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
CUMMINGS, JAMES, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 9458 (iv).
CUSTOMS SALARIES AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
DEFAULTING POSTMASTERS *re* SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
DESCHAMBAULT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, ALLUMETTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, CAMILLE, APPNMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).
DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).
DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, TERREBONNE: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DRILL HALL, QUEBEC, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).
——— SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).
——— ST. JOHNS, QUE., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (vi).
DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR, AMOUNT PAID TO: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7055 (iii).
DUCHESNEAU, RESIGNATION AS WARDEN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
——— *See* 'St. Vincent.'
DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNTS PAID TO *re* TRIP TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).
ELLIS, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
——— INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iii).
ESQUIMAUX POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674 (iii).
——— *See* 'Immigration,' &c.
GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C.P.R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GOODWIN, GEO., COMPENSATION *re* SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

GRAND PILES DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
G. T. PACIFIC, MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——— PARISHES CROSSED, LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
G. T. RY., STE. ROSALIE TO MONTREAL, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
See 'Bonaventure,' &c.
——— TERMINALS AT ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
GRANDE RIVIÈRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GRANDE VALLÉE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514, 1574 (i); on Conc., 6070 (iii).
GRENVILLE CANAL, GUIDE PIER AT ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
——— PAYMENT TO HENRY TUCKER *re* INVESTIGATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
GROSSE ISLE, QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
——— SUPPLIES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
GUILBAULT, MR. EDWARD, GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, QUEBEC: in Com. in Sup., 1512 (i), 3304, 3336 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2241 (i).
HARBOUR OF QUEBEC, IMPROVEMENTS, REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3972 (ii).
——— WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soleil* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2237 (i).
HÉTU, RUDOLPHE, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 7915 (iv).
HIDES INSPECTOR AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
HOSPITAL FOR TREATMENT OF TRACHOMA, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).
HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
IMMIGRANTS LANDING AT QUEBEC, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5318 (iii).
IMMIGRATION, MEDICAL EXAMINER, QUEBEC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
INDIANS, QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).
ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5902 (iii).
ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).
——— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.* 11301 (v).
JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
JUDGES IN QUEBEC AND OUTSIDE LEGAL BUSINESS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).
KAMOURASKA, EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES FOR GATES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
——— LIGHTING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

LACHINE CANAL, LOCK GATE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— MASONRY WALL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
——— *See* 'Mill St.,' &c.
LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6679, 6888 (iii).
LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13459 (vi).
——— WHARF, PIERS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (i).
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ASSOMPTION, POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3230 (ii).
———RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &c.: M. for copies, * (Mr. *Monk*), 3236 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i)
LATOUR, L. J., CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* "LE CANADA": Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*), 1033 (i).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR "LE CANADA", &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980 14002 (vi).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*), 1 (i)
"LE CANADA," CANVASSING, &c.: *See* Pelletier, and Latour.
——— CIRCULAR ISSUED BY L. J. LATOUR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*), 1032 (i)
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 8615 (iv)
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249, (i)
LEVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
LEVIS, LAND PURCHASED FOR I.C.R.: M. for O. Cs., &c.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
See general heading.
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS SALARIES, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).
———Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
LITTLE METIS:
See "Metis."
LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133-38 (ii)
See "St. Lawrence".
LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, MONTREAL, GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 2504 (ii).
——— PAY OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 4006 (ii)
———SETTLEMENT, &c.: Tel. Read (Mr. *Tarte*), 2676-7 (ii)
LONGUEUIL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi)
LOTBINIÈRE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOY, GEO. M., VIOLATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elect's., 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to employ stenographer, 7203 (iii).
——— *See* "Beauharnois Electoral District".
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATERS, PIERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— LAND TELEGRAPH LINES, REWIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
MAGOG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
MAGUASHA LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. APPARATUS AT CHATEAU BAY: in Com. of Sup. 13325 (vi).
See 'Belle Isle'.
MARIA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).
MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
MARTINEAU, Mr., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).
MATHURIN, JOS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGES REP., &c: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Laverge*) 3236 (ii).
MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, *re* QUEBEC INDIANS: in Com. of Sup. 6408 (iii).
MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).
METAPEDIA STATION, I.C.R., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).
METIS, LITTLE, STATION CHANGES: in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).
MILITARY BUILDINGS, QUEBEC, IRON FOUNDRY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
MILITARY RIDING SCHOOL, ST. JOHN D'IBERVILLE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8616 (iv).
MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFALCATION OF POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup. 14274, 14655 (vi).
MILL STREET PAVING, LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
MISTOOK (DELISLE) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MONT LOUIS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MONTMAGNY PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
MONTREAL, BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
———BONAVENTURE STATION:
See 'Bonaventure,' 'Victoria Bridge.'
———BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
———CUSTOMS DEPT., SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
———CUSTOMS PORTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
———DRY DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
——— DRY DOCK, SITE, &c.: M. for O. Cs., Cor. &c.: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— DRY DOCK, REP. OF COMMISSION *re* SITE: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13058 (vi).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i).
———HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (iv).
———HARBOUR DOCK IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
———HARBOUR, PERMANENT SHEDS, PLANTS PREPARED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
———INLAND REV. OFFICE, MONEY ABSTRACTED: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
———LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Longshoremen's.'
———NEW POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
———PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
———POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
———POST OFFICE, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 666 (i).
———POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

MONTREAL, ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION : *See* 'St. James.'

———SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).
See 'St Lawrence.'

——— SUBWAY CO., O. CS. COR. &c. : M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Tarte*) 705 (i).

——— TURNPIKE : *See* 'Turnpike Trust.'

MOREAU, DR. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331, 8488 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).

MURRAY BAY TO ST. CATHARINES, TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

MURRAY BAY, WHARF EXTENSION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).

NEWPORT, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).

NEW RICHMOND BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi)

NICOLET RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

NOMININGUE LAKE WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).

NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

NOTRE DAME DU PORTAGE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).

OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi)

O'LEARY, J. & M., CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS : in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

ORLEANS ISLAND, MAIL SERVICE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).

——— PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
See Island of Orleans.

OUELLE RIVER, PIER REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

PASPEBIAC LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR "LE CANADA," PAYMENTS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
See 'Latour.'

PIERREVILLE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

PILOTS, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, RETIREMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
See general heading.

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM AND MILITARY PARADES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3234 (ii).

POINTE AUX TREMBLES WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

POINTE FORTUNE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

PORT DANIEL WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

POSTAL FACILITIES TO PARISHES NEAR MONTREAL, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 12498 (v).

POSTMASTERS, DEFAULTING *re* SAVINGS BANKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, MONTREAL, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
See 'Montreal.'

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS, DEFALCATIONS OF POSTMASTER : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS PORTFOLIO AND QUEBEC PROVINCE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2925, 2956 (ii).

QUEBEC BRIDGE : *See* general heading.

QUEBEC CITY : *See* 'Citadel,' 'Drill Hall,' 'Ellis, Dr.,' 'Harbour,' &c.

QUEBEC JUDGES, COMPLAINTS *re* OUTSIDE BUSINESS : Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).

QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).

RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3231 (ii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

REPENTIGNY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &c., PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).

RICHMOND, RIVER ST. FRANCIS, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

RIMOUSKI EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 12593 (v).

——— FREIGHT YARD : in Com. of Sup , 8309 (iv).

——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).

———WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD FISH LADDERS, &c. : M. for Copies of Reps. * (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

ROBERT VS. KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

ROBIN, COLLAS CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY, ESTABLISHMENT AT QUEBEC : M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

———IMPERFECT RETURN : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i)

ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).

ST. AGNES TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).

ST. ALEXIS BAIE DES HA HA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).

ST. ALPHONSE HA HA BAY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

ST. ANDRÉ DE KAMOURASKA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE PIER, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).

———WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
See 'Sorel.'

STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR TEL. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).

ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY FERRY SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).

STE. FAMILLE PIER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

ST. FIDÈLE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).

ST. FLAVIE STATION ACCOMMODATION ; in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).

ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

STE. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

ST. FRANCOIS, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).

ST. FULGENCE, WHARF ; in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

ST. GÉDÉON ISLANDS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

ST. GODEFROI DE NOUVELLE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL; in Com. of Sup.. 13067 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JAMES (MONTREAL) ELECTORAL DIVISION, JUDGMENT OF SUP. COURT: Notification, (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13376 (vi).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 13303 (vi).
——— NOTIFICATION OF VACANCY: (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).
——— VACANCY: Remarks, (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i). *See* 'Brunet.'
ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. JERÔME WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
ST. JOHNS, QUE., CUSTOMS BUILDING; in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com of Sup., 13069 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE, CABLE AND TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii).
———EQUIPMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).
———GULF FISHING, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).
———LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
———OBSTRUCTION TO NAVIGATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).
———PILOTS, RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
———REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE AND FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).
———AND LLOYDS, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
———REP. *re* NAVIGATION OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4133 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).
ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3218, 3304 (ii).
———TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5917 (iii).
———TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
———TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: *See* 'Transportation'.
——— WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATIONS: *See* 'Marconi', &c.
ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLE OF ORLEANS: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).
See "Island of Orleans."
ST. LOUIS DE MILE END, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. in Sup., 13080 (vi).
ST. LOUIS LAKE, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
ST. LOUIS RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. MARY'S CURRENT WHARF, CONTRACT WITH POUPORE & MALONE: M. for Copy of Contract * (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
ST. MAURICE, RIVER DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

ST. MAURICE, DREDGING EASTERN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
——— SLIDES, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
ST. MICHEL DE BELLECHASSE, PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. NICHOLAS PIER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
ST. OURS CANAL, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
——— STOP LOGS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
ST. PIERRE POINTE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
ST. SIMEON WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
——— ACTING WARDEN, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*), 10831 (v).
——— HOSPITAL, MANAGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. (*Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
——— WARDEN'S RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
SABREVOIS WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).
SACRÉ COEUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
SAGUENAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
SAVARD, MR. R. V., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
SEVEN ISLANDS PULP & LUMBER CO., WHARF *re*: Remarks in Com. of. Sup., 13480 (vi).
——— QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHERBROOKE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
SHOEMAKERS FEDERATED UNION, RES. *re* SLATER SHOE CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 14666 (vi).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— COR. *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEO. GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— O'LEARY CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— REPAIRING BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
SOUTHEASTERN VALLEY AND UNITED COUNTIES RY., SAFETY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 451 (i).
SOUTH SHORE RY., COMPLAINT *re* SAFETY: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 205 (i).
——— WORKING, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 448 (i).
SUBMARINE CABLE TO ISLAND OF ORLEANS: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 11186 (v).
——— M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.* 11301 (v)
See 'Island of Orleans'.
TELEGRAPH LINES, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
TERREBONNE, INDIAN RESERVE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
THETFORD MINES POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*
THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
——— RETAINING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14462 (vi).
TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).
TRACHOMA HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC: in Com. of Supt., 14245 (vi).
See 'Agriculture'.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, *re* SOREL WHARF: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, *re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
See 'St. Lawrence, &c'.
TRAP NETS, GULF ST. LAWRENCE, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).
TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Quest. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).
TURNPIKE TRUST, MONTEEAL, INDEBTEDNESS, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 672 (i).
TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7567 (iv).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
———POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
———POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCASE OF SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 98 (i).
———TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
See 'Loy, &c.'
———STRIKE, PAY OF MILITIA: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753, (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
———STRIKE, 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).
VERTE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. *(Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
See 'Bonaventure'.
VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 11188 (v).
WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATIONS: *See* 'Marconi, &c.'
YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

Queen's College, Kingston B. No. 190 (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4404 (ii).

QUEENS, WEST, P.E.I., REPRESENTATION *re*: Remarks: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).

QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

QUESNEL DAM, B.C., OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*), 11557 (v).

QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 7203 (iii).

QUES. OF ORDER, ON APPNMT. OF JUDGES: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker, Dcp.*), 209 (i).
See 'Order,' &c.

QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS, ANSWERS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 544 (i).

QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &C. FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5587 (iii).

RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3231 (ii).

RACINE BROS. CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O., B.C., in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
———AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7162 (iii)
———LETTERS READ FROM DEP. MINISTER OF LABOUR, &C., 7164 (iii).
See 'Nelson P. O.'

"RAGGING" IN THE BRITISH ARMY: Remarks (Mr *Charlton*) on M. for Sup., 3130, 3134 (ii).

RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER: in Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS, DUTIES OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 1032 (i).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS IN CAN., APPNMT. OF OFFICIAL INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 9217 (iv).
———INVESTIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
———INVESTIGATION INTO: Remarks on M. for Sup., (Mr. *Clarke*), 1329 (i).
——— LOSS OF LIFE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 873 (i).
See 'Belmont,' 'West Lorne,' 'Windsor Jn.' &c.

Railway Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*), 1° m., 93; 2° m., 552; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., agreed to (Y. 99; N., 53) 565 (i), wthdn., 7203 (iii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. No. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), 1° m., 244 (i); 2°*, 2585; M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591, 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5513, 5560, 5679, 5765, 6071, 6170, 6172, 6202, 6271, 7299 (iii), 7609, 8125; 3° m., 8334 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13834, 14519, 14663, 14690, 14734, 14740, 14760, 14762, 14844 (vi); Salaries of Ry. Commissioners, &c., Res. prop., 8085; in Com., on Res., 8119 (iv). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 58).
ACCIDENTS, INVESTIGATION, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5550 (iii).
———NOTICE, &C., penalties, 5549, (iii), ret. *re*, 15772 (iii).
ACTS REPEALED, 5772 (iii).
APPEALS FROM AWARDS, PRACTICE, &C., 4574, 4575, 4693; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*), 4578 (ii).
———FROM DECISION OF BOARD, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5773 (iii).
APPEALS TO HIGH COURTS, 3975 (ii).
APPLICATION OF ACT, 2608, 3536 (ii).
ARBITRATION, DISQUALIFICATIONS, &C., 4574 (ii).
ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS, &C., 4566 (ii).
ARBITRATORS' AWARDS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4691 (ii).
ASSETS, &C., RETURNS *re* TO BOARD, 5772 (iii).
AUTHORITY TO SELL OR CONVEY LANDS, 4131 (ii).
AWARDS, APPEALS, &C., 4574; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4574, 4693 (ii).
See 'Appeals.'
BALLAST PITS, &C., 4131 (ii).
BEACH LANDS, &C., 4125 (ii).
BELL AND WHISTLES, 5259, 5342 (iii).
BELL TELEPHONE AND C.P.R. AGREEMENT, 5514 (iii).
BOARD OF RY. COMMISSIONERS FOR CAN., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3854 (ii).
BOARD'S DUTIES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3859 (ii).
BOARD'S SESSIONS, &C., 3859, 3862 (ii).
See 'Staff,' 'Vacancies,' &c.
BONDS, MORTGAGES, ISSUE OF, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3993 (ii).
BRANCH LINE CONSTRUCTION, 4694 (ii); Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6080 (iii).
BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION, PERMISSION, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5251 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*

By-laws, Printed, 5563 (iii).
Canal Crossings, &c., 4125 (ii).
Cattle Guards *re* Crossings, 5774 (iii).
Cattle Guards, Fences, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 6220, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6222, Amt. (Mr. *Wade*) 6253 (iii).
Charges, 2602 (ii).
Charters, Application for, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Davis*) 6322 (iii).
Classification of Freight, &c., 5577, 6284 (iii).
Commercial Rates, Privileges, 5680 (iii).
Commissioners' Disqualification, &c., Amt, (Mr. *Blair*) 3857 (ii).
Commissioners, Number, 3857, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3887 (ii).
Commissioners' Residence, 3859, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3887 (ii).
Compensation for Lands and Damages, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 4568 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4568 (ii).
Compensation *re* Damage by Fire, Amt. (Mr. *L. P. Demers*) 6299 (iii).
Construction, &c., Buildings, &c., 3999 (ii).
Construction, Time limited, 3997 (ii)
County Divisions, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3882 (ii).
Crossings, Application of Provisions *re*, 3843 (ii).
Crossings or running on public highways, &c., 4697 (ii).
Crossings, Provisions *re*, 3843, 4697 (ii).
See 'Bells,' 'Highways,' 'Level Crossing', &c.
Crown Lands, &c., 4125 (ii).
Decisions of Board, Rules of Court, 3975 (ii).
Deviations of Line, Amt., (Mr. *Blair*), 4121 (ii).
Directors' Qualifications, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5774 (iii).
Discriminating Freight Rates, 6284 (iii).
Discrimination *re* Tolls, 5564-8 (iii).
Dividends and Interest, 3984 (ii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6074 (iii).
Dividends *re* Capital, 3985 (ii).
Documents as Evidence, Procedure, &c., 3974 (ii).
Dom. and Provincial Rys., Crossing, 3846 (ii).
Drainage across or under Rys., Compensation &c , 4728 (ii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6177 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 4735 (ii), 6186 ; Amt. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 6197 (iii).
Electric Rys, Tramways, Right of Municipalities, &c., 6080 (iii).
Equipment of Cars *re* Safety of Employees, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Ingram*) 6259 (iii).
Express Companies, Rates, &c., 2596, 2608, 3538 ; Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) 3725 (ii).
Expropriation, &c., Notice, Service, &c., 4566; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4691 (ii).
Expropriation of Land, &c., 2591, 4564 (ii).
See 'Land,' &c.
Extension of Time specified in Order, 3976 (ii).
Farm Crossings, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 5774 ; Amt. (Mr. *Holmes*) 6202 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6204 (iii).
Fire Guard along the Right of Way, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6071, 6318 ; Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) 5783, 6321 (iii).
Fire Guards along Line, Penalties *re* Damage, Amt. (Mr. *Demers*) 6299 (iii).
Fire Screens, 3894 (ii).
Forfeiture of Shares, 3988 (ii).
——— Sale of, 3989 (ii).
Free Transportation, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5776 (iii).
Freight Classification, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5577 (iii).
Freight Rates, &c., 3538 (ii), 5568 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*

Freight Rate Discrimination, Penalties, 6284 (iii).
See 'Discrimination.'
Freight Rate Standard, 5578 (iii).
Gates, &c., *re* unimproved Property, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6255 (iii).
Govt. Rys., Jurisdiction, 3563 (ii).
Headway of Bridges, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5251 (iii).
Highway Crossings, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5243, 6080, 6173 (iii).
See 'Municipalities,' &c. 'Bells,' &c., 'Ry.,' 'Watchmen,' &c.
Highways, Farm Crossings, &c., 3883 (ii).
Inspecting Engineers, 5251 (iii).
I.C.R. : *See* 'Govt. Rys.,' &c.
Interest Calls, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6075 (iii).
Judges Jurisdiction, 2591 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3885 (ii)
Judicial Decisions, Citations, &c., 3886 (ii)
Jurisdiction of Board to make Orders, 3976 (ii)
Land Expropriation, 4000, 4120 (ii).
Lands of other Companies, 4130 (ii).
See 'Expropriation.'
Level Crossings, Protection, &c., 6256 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 6257 (iii)
See 'Highway,' 'Rails,' &c.
Location of Line, 4120 (ii).
Meetings, Notice of, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3981 (ii).
Mines under Ry., &c., 4124 (ii).
Minutes, Certified Copies, 3981 (ii).
Mortgage Bonds, Penalties, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6077 (iii).
Municipal Rights *re* Crossing, &c., 4697 (ii).
Municipal Rights *re* Highway Crossing, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5243, 6080 (iii).
See 'Highway'.
Orders, Notice of, Duties of Co., Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*), 3974 (ii).
Overhead Bridges, Width, &c., 4712 (ii).
Paid-up Stock issued for certain Purposes, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6072 (iii).
Passenger Traffic on Rys, 2 Cent Rate, 6271, Amt., (Mr. *Macleau*) 6274 (iii).
Passes : *See* 'Free Transportation.'
Penalties recovered under this Act, 5767 (iii).
Penalties *re* Violation of Act, 5765 (iii).
Penalties *re* Violation of Act as to Tolls, 5692 (iii).
Plans and Maps, 2593, 4120 (ii).
Promissory Notes and Bills, 3995 (ii).
Protection Generally, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3895 (ii).
Rails *re* Level Crossings, 4709 (ii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5250 (iii).
Rys. constructed, General Advantage of Can., 3840 (ii).
Ry. crossing another Line, 4697 (ii).
Railway Express Companies, &c., 2596 (ii).
Ry. Facilities for Industries, &c., 4695 (ii).
Ry. or Highway Crossing, &c., 4697 ; Amts. (Mr. *Blair*) 4697 (ii).
Ry. Inspection, 5252 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5253 (iii).
Rates *re* Freight, &c., 5568 (iii).
See 'Freight,' 'Tolls, &c.' 'Two cent,' &c. Tariff.
Regulations *re* Board, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3888 (ii).
Returns, Annual, 5770 (iii).
Rolling Stock, 2598 (ii).
See 'Train, &c.'
Safety Appliances, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5254 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*

SAFETY EQUIPMENTS FOR EMPLOYEES, Amt. (Mr. *Ingram)* 6259 ; Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 6325 (iii).
SHAREHOLDERS' LIABILITY, &c., 3992 (ii).
SHAREHOLDERS' MEETINGS, 3980 (ii).
SHAREHOLDERS' RECORD, 3993 (ii).
SHARES FORFEITED, SALE, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6075 (iii).
See 'Forfeited,' 'Paid-up Stock,' &c.
SIGNBOARDS AT LEVEL CROSSINGS, PENALTY, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4715 (ii).
SITTINGS OF BOARD, 3862 (ii).
SPECIAL ACT, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3885 (ii).
SPECIAL ACT, EXCEPTIONS, 3830 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3835 (ii).
SPEED OF TRAINS THROUGH TOWNS, &c., 3888 (ii), 5322 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3888 (ii), 5323 (iii).
STAFF OF BOARD, SALARIES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3887 (ii), 14155 (vi).
STATIONS ON LINES NOT SUBJECT TO AUTHORITY OF PARLT., 5780 (iii).
STOCK PURCHASED IN OTHER COMPANIES, 5767 (iii).
STREET RYS. AND TRAMWAY CROSSINGS, 3850 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3887 (ii).
TARIFFS, JOINT, FILING AND PUBLICATION OF, 5681 (iii).
See 'Rates,' &c.
TELEGRAPH, &c., PROCEDURE, &c., 4721 (ii).
TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONSTRUCTION, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6173 (iii).
TELEGRAPH OR TELEPHONE WIRES, &c., Amt. Mr. *Lancaster*) 4717 (ii).
TELEGRAPHS, &c., 5513, 5561, 5680 (iii).
TELEPHONES AND TELEGRAPH, GOVT. USE, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*), 5346, 5513 (iii).
See 'Bell,' 'Telegraph.'
TIME-TABLES, RULES, &c., 5561 (iii).
TOLLS, APPORTIONMENT BY LAND AND WATER, 5575 (iii).
TOLLS, CLASSIFICATION, &c., 3538, 3713 (ii).
TOLLS, DISCRIMINATION, &c., 5568 (iii).
TOLLS LEVIED, BY-LAW FIXING, 5564 (iii).
TOLL, TRAFFIC, 2602 (ii).
See 'Penalties,' &c.
TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, 5700 (iii).
TRAFFIC PROVISIONS, 5680 (iii).
TRAIN EQUIPMENT, POWER OF BOARD, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5258 (iii).
TRAINS STANDING ON LEVEL CROSSINGS, PENALTY, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5340 (iii).
TRANSPORT PASSENGERS, &c., 4000 (ii).
TREES, REMOVAL, &c., 4000 (ii).
TWO-CENT RATE *re* PASSENGER TRAFFIC, Amt. (Mr *Maclean*) 6271 (iii).
See 'Passenger' &c.
VACANCIES BY DEATH, &c., 3981 (ii).
VIOLATION OF BY-LAWS, PENALTIES, &c., 5765 (iii).
WATCHMEN AT CROSSINGS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5260 (iii).
WEEDS, REMOVAL BY CO., 5552, 6299 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5554, 5560, 6311 (iii).
WITNESS FEES, 3978 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3979 (ii).
WORKING EXPENDITURES, 2604 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21, Res. from Senate *re* Appnmt. of Managers : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14519 (vi).

——— (Mr. *Fielding*) appointing Managers, 14663, 14690, 14734 (vi).

———FORMALITIES, &c.: 'Bourinot' quoted, 14760 (vi).

——— MESS. FROM SENATE, Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14760 (vi).

——— PROGRESS REPORTED, (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 14740, 14844 (vi).

Ry. Commission : *See* 'Ry. Act B. 21'.

Ry. Debts : *See* 'Exchequer Court', &c.

Ry. Drainage : *See* 'Drainage.'

Railway Act (employees safety) Amt. B. No. 74, (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1° m., 814 (i) ; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3247 (ii).

Railway Act (employees safety) Amt. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1° m., 872 2°, and ref. to. Sel. Com., 2387 (i) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

Railway Act (fire damages) Amt. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1° m. 283 ; (i) ; 2° m., 2780 (ii) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

Railway Act (fire guards) Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) 1° *, 114 ; 2°, 871 (i) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

Railway Act (fire guards) Amt. B. No. 181 (Mr. *German*) 1° m., 3391 (ii).

Railway Act (telephones) Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 92 ; 2° m., 701 (i).
See 'Telephone B. 4'.

Railway Labour Disputes Settlement B. No. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1° *, 114 (i) ; 2° m., 2535 ; in Com., 2923 ; 3° *, 3298 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 5653 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 55).

Railway Subsidies B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*), 1° m., 92 ; 2° m., 545 ; in Com., 550 ; ref. back to Sel. Com. on Rys., 700 ; in Com., 1059 ; 3° m., 1199 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 56).

——— **Subsidies B. No. 270** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 13549 ; in Com. on Res., 14313, 14428 ; 1°*, 14519 ; 2° and in Com., 14735, 14740 ; 3°*, 14741 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 57).

——— RES. 4, PAYMENT TO COS., SAFEGUARDS, &c.: in Com. on Ry. Res., 14511 (vi).

———RES. 5, NOTICE TO MUNICIPALITIES *re* LOCATION : in Com., on Res., 14513 (vi).

———RES. 6, RUNNING POWERS, TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, &c. : in Com., on Res , 14515 (vi).

———RES. 8, PRODUCTION OF BOOKS OF COS., &c.: in Com., on Res., 14516 (vi).

Railway Act (supplies to govt. rys.) Amt. B. No. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 8332 (iv) ; Res. wthdn., 10715 ; Res. prop., 11189 ; in Com. on Res., 12574 ; 1°*, of B., 12584 (v) ; 2°*, and in Com., 12944 ; 3°*, 12983 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 59).

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES, STATEMENT *re* GRANTS TO PROVINCES : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 14687 (vi).

———STATEMENT : laid on Table (Mr. *Fielding*) 14852 (vi).
See 'Subsidies to Rys.'

RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).

RY. LAND GRANTS, MAN. AND N.W.T., AREAS EARNED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2102 (i).

———AREA UNPATENTED : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).

———VOTED &c., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).

RAILWAY POLICY OF GOVT., DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7109 (iii). *See* 'G.T.P. Ry.'

Railway Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. received: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).

Ry. Rates, Govt. Control of: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14502 (vi).

RAILWAYS:

Accidents in Can., Appnmt. of Official Inspector: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

Accidents, Duties of Public Officials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1032 (i).

——Investigation into: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1329 (i).

——Investigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup. 14154 (vi).

——Loss of Life, &c.,: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 873 (i).
See 'Belmont,' 'West Lorne,' &c.

Air Brakes for Freight Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).

Albany Station and Land Purchase, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

Alberton, P.E.I. Ry. Station: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).

Amqui Station, I.C.R., Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Subsidy, Claims against, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 3229 (ii).

Bell Telephone and C.P.R. Agreement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

Belmont Accident, Gratuities to Victims: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14155 (vi).
See 'Windsor Junction.'

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation: Announcement (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 6540 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6522 (iii).

—— Explanation (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

Blueshank, P.E.I., Straightening Curve: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).

Bonaventure Station, Terminal Facilities, Amount paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
See 'G.T.R.,' 'Victoria Bridge.'

Borden, Mr., Ry. Policy:
See 'G. T. Pacific.'

Brookfield Station, I.C.R., Enlargement: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry., Regulations *re* Mortgage Deeds: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
See 'Qu'Appelle.'

C. A. Ry., Strike of Sectionmen: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 2303 (i).

Can. Central, and Ottawa and Brockville Rys., Amalgamation, Compensation to certain Municipalities: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

Can. Freight Classification, Approval, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3537 (ii).
See 'Freight.'

Can. Northern Ry., Cor. between Govt. and Mackenzie & Mann: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 916 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.: Ret. *re* cost, laid on Table, 5052 (ii).

C.P.R., Arrangements with James Bay Ry. Co., &c.: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

—— Bell Telephone Agreement: *See* 'Telephone,' &c.

—— Car Shortage, &c., in N.W.T.:
See 'Ry. Traffic,' &c.

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

C.P.R., Expenditure for Rolling Stock: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 2311 (i).

——and Great Northwest Central Ry. Co.'s Agreement: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

—— Lands exempt from Taxes in Man. and N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 916 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 667 (i).

—— Private Car No. 001, Improvements, Payment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, St. John*) 14282 (vi).

—— Transcontinental Trains, Water Supply: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).

Canso Ferry Service, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).

Car Shops, I.C.R., New Machinery: in Com. of Sup.. 14106 (vi).

Cattle Guard Commission, Appointment of Mr. Geo. Robertson, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 668 (i).

—— Appointment of Mr. Holt and Retirement of Mr. Robertson, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1059 (i).

—— Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

—— Rep. of Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1199 (i).

—— Rep. laid on Table, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 14758 (vi).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Lennox*) 669 (i), 3396 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Pringle*) 14686 (vi).

—— Withdrawal of Mr. Robertson, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1034 (i).

'Chapman' Ball-Bearing Apparatus, Rep. *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 7524 (iii), 8283 (iv).

Charlottetown, P.E.I., Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. 14131 (vi)

—— Rebuilding, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).

Chaudière Junction, Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).

Clergue Works, Sault Ste. Marie, Contract for Rails with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 13668 (vi).

——Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

——Remarks *re* Subsidies to, in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14397 (vi).

'Cleveland' Cylinder Patent *re* I.C.R.: Remarks, (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).

Commercial Travellers, Privileges, Fares, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Clarke*) 5680 (iii).

Demurrage Regulations, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).

Discriminating Rates, G. T. Ry. Co., between Canadians and Americans: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).

Dixon, F. A., Promotion, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726-2753 (ii).

——Promotion as Chief Clerk, Cor. &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1058 (i).

——Chief Cor. Clerk: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).

Double Tracking Parts of I.C.R. Line: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).

Draw-Bars Exchange on Freight Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8288 (iv).

Drummond County Ry., Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).

Drummondville, Ry. Siding, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

Eastern Extension Ry., N.B., Balance of Interest *re* Award: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

EASTERN EXTENSION RY. AWARD, FEES OF STENOGRAPHER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).
EEL RIVER, STATION, I.C.R., AGENT'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 12600 (v).
ELMIRA BRANCH LINE, P.E.I. RY., : in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, &C., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FIRE REGULATIONS, N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 21'.
FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R., ON CONNECTING LINES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION (CANADIAN), O.Cs. &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).
See 'Can. Freight.'
FREIGHT RATES ON OCEAN STEAMERS, DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN CAN. AND U. S. FREIGHTS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 13674 (vi).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'
GATES OVER RY. CROSSINGS: Remarks in Com. on Bill (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5775 (iii).
See 'Ry B. 21.'
GOVT. OFFICIAL, &C., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR HAULAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
See 'Private.'
GOVT. RY. POLICY, DELAY, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7298 (iii).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.'
GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).
G.T.P. RY., ALTERNATIVE POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).
——BILL, DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 8918 (iv).
——BILL, FRENCH TRANSLATION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Leonard*) 8118 (iv).
——COMPARISON WITH DIFFERENT RY. SYSTEMS: Remarks (Mr. *Cargill*) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——CONTRACTS *re* EASTERN PORTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 13027 (vi).
——GOVT. POLICY, DELAY, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399 (iii).
——GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7399 (iii).
——Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7487 (iii).
——Remarks (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 8086 (iv).
——M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 447 (i).
——MEMBER READING SPEECH: Ques. of Order (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 10249; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 10250 (v).
——MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——PARISHES CROSSED FROM LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——PETS. FROM BAGOT AND DORCHESTER: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bagot*) 12941 (vi).
——PETITIONS SIGNATURES, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*) 12715; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12715 (vi).
——M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).
——Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 13266; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 13266 (vi).
——MEETINGS OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13559, 13671 (vi).
—— AFFIDAVITS, &C., PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR': Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*) 14845; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14846 (vi).
—— SUBSIDY FROM GOVT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 671, 1031 (i).
—— PAR. IN OTTAWA 'JOURNAL' *re* SUBSIDY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*), 5733 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

G.T.P. RY., PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re* SUBSIDY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 5892 (iii).
—— SURVEYS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— Mr. Hays' Statement *re*, Par. in *Star*, 14648 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 14765 (vi).
——SURVEYS, BUSINESS SYSTEM, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14355 (vi).
—— SURVEYS, &C. : in Com. on Ways and Means, 14765 (vi).
—— SURVEYS, PLANS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 8230 (iv).
—— AND TRANS CANADA, SALE, &C. PAR. IN TORONTO 'NEWS': Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7566 (iv).
—— TWO-CENT RATE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*), 10462 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*), 11556 (v).
G.T.RY. AND C.P.R. FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).
—— DISCRIMINATING RATES BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), 10745 (v).
——LOANS BY DOM. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 2920 (ii).
—— RENTALS FROM I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
—— STE. ROSALIE TO MONTREAL, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).
—— TERMINALS AT ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
——TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS WITH I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*), 2759 (ii).
See 'Bonaventure'.
GREAT NORTH WEST CENTRAL RY. AND C.P.R. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*), 2306 (i).
HALIFAX COTTON, LOAN OF RAILS TO, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
HALIFAX, ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825, 12874 (vi).
——IMMIGRATION BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080, (vi).
——Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY., CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
HAULAGE OF GOVT. &C. CARS., AMOUNTS PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
——AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).
—— CONTRACTORS NAME, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
——PREPARATION OF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).
I. C. R., PASSES: *See* 'Passes.'
See 'I.C.R.'
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).
KELLEY'S CROSS P. O., P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 6064 (iii).
KENSINGTON STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R. : Remarks (Mr *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N. W. TERS. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN., N. W. T., AREAS, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i).
——— MILEAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).
——— AREA RESERVED, PATENTED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2307 (i).
——— UNEARNED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3797 (ii).
——— UNPATENTED : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* RYS. AND CANAL DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
LEVIS ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. STATION : in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &c., I. C. R., PURCHASE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
LORNE SIDING, I. C. R , TRAFFIC, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR CAR SHOPS, I. C. R. : in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
MANAGERS *re* RY. CONFERENCE : *See* 'Railway Act B. 21.'
METAPEDIA STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).
METIS STATION, DIVERTING ROAD, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE : in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION FOR I. C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).
MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RYS., I. C. R., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*), 1197 (i).
MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P. E. I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
MONTREAL LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I.C.R. : Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MONTREAL SUBWAY CO., O. Cs. COR., &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*), 705 (i).
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES : Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*), 12074 (v).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*), in Com. in Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'Chapman.'
MUNICIPALITIES, COMPENSATION FOR AMALGAMATION OF CAN. CENTRAL, AND BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RYS. &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* TRAMWAY COS., &c. : Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6081 (iii).
See 'Ry. Bill 21.'
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 7530, 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
See 'Hillsborough.'
NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY., CHARTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 8084 (iv).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS, P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
O'LEARY'S STATION, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

O'LEARY'S STATION, P. E. I. RY., BRANCH LINE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks, (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
OUELLE RIVER BRANCH, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
——— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10490 (v).
PASSENGER RATES ON G.T.R. :
See 'Discriminating'.
PASSES, I.C.R. : M. (Mr. *Bell*), for Ret., 2337 (i).
PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT for I.C.R. CARS : in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
POINT TUPPER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12608 (v), 12828 (vi).
——— GENERAL VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——— MISREPRESENTATION *re* TOTAL COST : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *P.E.I.*), 1679 (i).
——— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH AND HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14115 (vi).
——— SALE OF TICKETS : (Mr. *Hackett*), 2503 (ii).
——— SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, DISCONTINUANCE OF, &c. : Ques., (Mr. *Hackett*), 4443 (ii).
——— STATION AGENTS, SALARIES, &c. : Ques., (Mr. *Hackett*), 4361 (ii).
——— STEEL RAILS : in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).
——— SUBSIDIES BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
——— WATER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
PRIVATE CARS PURCHASE BY GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2309 (i).
See 'Govt. &c.'
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. BONDS, ATTACK ON MR. E. B. OSLER : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*), *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates', 14583 (vi).
——— MEMORANDUM FROM MR. KINGSMILL : Read (Mr. *Osler*), 14588 (vi).
——— LAND GRANT : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*), 2338 (i).
——— MORTGAGE DEEDS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 13024 (vi).
See 'Regina', &c.
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters, 10497 (v).
——— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
RY. ACT AMT. BILL : Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 7201 (iii).
See general heading.
RY. CARRIAGE OF MAILS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
RAILWAY COMMISSION OF CAN., SALARIES AND EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
RY. CONFERENCE WITH SENATE, &c., FORMALITIES, &c. : 'Bourinot' quoted, 14760 (vi).
——— Mess. from Senate : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14760 (vi).
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RAIL CONTRACT WITH GOVT. : *See* 'Clergue.'

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

RY. DEPT., CHIEF CLERK, NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i), 14055 (vi).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 92 (i).
——— ESTIMATES, INSUFFICIENCY OF DETAIL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) in Com. of Sup., 14055. 14081 (vi).
——— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8269 (iv), 12593 (v), 12823, 14646 (vi).
RY. LANDS VOTED, &C., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
See 'Lands,' &c.
RY. MAIL CLERKS: in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5926, 6136 (iii).
——— INCREASED SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
——— MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup. 5934 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE INSPECTORS, SUPT. OF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
RY. MAIL TRANSFER AGENTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6136, (iii).
RY. POLICY, ANNOUNCEMENT BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iii).
——— DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7109 (iii).
See 'G.T.P. Ry.'
RAILWAY POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, PETS. RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).
RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER: In Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).
RY. RATES, GOVT. CONTROL OF: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14502 (vi).
See 'Ry. B. 21'.
RY. SUPPLIES VOTED FOR ONE ESTIMATE, TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081, (vi).
RY. TRAFFIC IN N.W.T., BLOCKADE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for Sup., 2424 (i).
RATHBUN CO.'S RY., CHARTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. SURVEYS OF RESERVED LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES:
See 'Can. Central'.
RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, I.C.R., FIRE PROTECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE, SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).
RHODES, CURRY & CO., CONTRACT FOR ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100, (vi).
RICHMOND AND NORTHAM, P.E.I. RY. STATION: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
RIVIERE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (vi), 12593, (v)
——— FREIGHT YARD: in Com. of Sup., 8309, (iv).
——— I.C.R. SHOPS, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*), 12497, (v).
ROBERTSON, GEO. *re* CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i)
See "Cattle Guards Commission".
ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8292, (iv).
ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

STE. FLAVIE STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).
ST. JOHN, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
ST. LOUIS, ELMSDALE, COLEMAN AND CONWAY STATION AGENTS, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
SCOTCH HILL STATION, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 872 (i).
SIDINGS ALONG LINE OF I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi).
SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR RY., TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey* 2584 (ii).
SOUTH SHORE RY. WORKING, &C.: M. for Cor (Mr. *Tarte*), 448 (i).
——— COMPLAINT *re* SAFETY: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*), 205 (i).
STEEL RAIL CONTRACT WITH GOVT.:
See 'Clergue'.
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8295 (iv).
SUBSIDIES FOR PUBLIC HIGHWAYS, PETS., &C.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 591 (i).
SUBSIDIES, TO RYS., GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), 14352 (vi).
——— Remarks, (Mr. *Richardson*), in Com. of Sup., 14345 (vi).
——— Inquiry for, (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 12805 13005 (vi).
——— INTEREST PAYABLE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 3970 (ii).
——— FOR MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).
——— FOR N. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*) in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).
——— (MONEY) PAID BY GOVT. SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1198 (i).
See 'Money.'
——— PER MILES OF RYS. IN N.W.T., AND MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1677 (i).
——— RES., AGGREGATE VOTE FOR EACH PROV., &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).
——— STATEMENT *re* GRANTS TO PROVINCES: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*), 14687 (vi).
———STATEMENT LAID ON TABLE: (Mr. *Fielding*), 14852 (vi).
——— TOTAL AMOUNT FOR TEN YEARS: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*), 13934 (vi).
——— VOTED BY PARLT. 1901-1903: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 2306 (i), 12842, 13259, 13934 (vi).
——— VOTED BY PARLT. for 1900, 1901, 1902. AMOUNT PAID FOR 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 13027 (vi).
RY. TRANSPORTATION IN N.W.T.:
See 'Ry. Traffic'.
SUMMERSIDE COAL SHEDS: In Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
SUSSEX, N. B., ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4672 (ii).
———STATION GROUNDS: Remarks, (Mr. *Fowler*), in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
SYDNEY ACCOMMODATION, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
See 'I.C.R. and general heading.
SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).
TELEPHONE AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Maclean*), 5513 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'
TIES IMPORTED FOR GOVT. RYS., COST, QUANTITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*), 1679 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

TRANS-CANADA RY. CO., APPLICATION TO GOVT. FOR SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1026 (i).
——— CONTRACT WITH GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 2759 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 2794 (ii).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 672 (i).
TRANS-CANADA RY. AND G. T. PACIFIC: Par. in Toronto '*News*' (Mr. *Monk*), 7566 (iv).
TRANSCONTINENTAL RY. DECLARATIONS BY MINISTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
——— GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5765 (iii).
TRANSCONTINENTAL RY. AND SIR WM. MULOCK'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 367 (i).
——— PROPOSALS TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 874 (i).
——— REPRESENTATIONS *re* MILITARY PURPOSES: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 541 (i).
See 'G. T. Pacific.'
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1199 (i), 3129 (ii).
——— APPNMT. OF CHAIRMAN: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF SIR WM. VANHORNE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 7297 (iii).
———SIR WM. VANHORNE'S VIEWS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 8330 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).
——— EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13362 (vi).
——— FORMATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 9819 (iv).
——— FURTHER ARRANGEMENTS, &c.: Remarks Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9458 (iv).
——— INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4120 (ii).
——— MEETINGS, BUSINESS TRANSACTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13027 (vi).
——— O.C., *re* APPNMTS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1324 (i).
———AND TARIFF INQUIRY, PAR IN MONTREAL "HERALD": Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 853 (i).
———PERSONNEL, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 7206 (iii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, GOVT. POLICY *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 3432 (ii).
———*re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION POLICY, *re* SPEECH FROM THRONE: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 6404 (iii).
TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).
TWO CENT FARE CLAUSE, G. T. Ry., REPEAL OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*), 11828 (v).
———Amt. in Com. on G. T. P. Ry. Bill, 12221 (v).
———RATE, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. Bill, 6271 (iii).
TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT, RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*), 7567 (iv).
VESTIBULES ON PASSENGER CARS: I.C.R. in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i.)
See 'Bonaventure,' &c.
WATER SUPPLY ON C.P.R. TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*), 9455 (iv).
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, REP. OF COMMISSON: Remarks, (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088, 5242 (iii).
——— COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on Adjnmt., 4726 (ii).
———COMMISSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 6168 (iii).
———JURY'S VERDICT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 3231, (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

WHARF CONNECTIONS AND RY. SUBSIDIES BY GOVT: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Res., 14463 (vi).
WHEAT, EXPORT FREIGHT RATE TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*), 11188, 11425 (v).
———RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*), 12074 (v).
WHITE, ALBERT S., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4673 (ii).
WINDSOR JUNCTION RY. ACCIDENT, I. C. R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Clarke*), 3496, 3712 (ii).
WINDSOR, N.S., NEW STATION, RENTAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
See 'I. C. R.,' &c.

RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6889 (iii).

RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
See 'Indians,' &c.

RAMY'S POINT, WELLAND CANAL, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).

RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).

RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 1857 (i).
See 'Ry. B. 21', 'Freight Rates', &c

Rathbun Co.'s B. No. 122 (Mr. *Harty*), 1° *, 1675; 2° *, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3° *, 5100 (ii), (3 Edward VII, c. 180).

RATHBUN CO.'S RY., CHARTER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).

REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*), on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).

RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
——— ADDITIONAL VAULT: in Com. of Sup. 5842 (iii).

RECIPROCITY WITH U.S. AND JOINT HIGH COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14053 (vi).
See "Joint High", &c.

RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup.. 960 (i).

Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Co.'s B. No. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1° *, 1295; 2° m., 1812; 2° *, 1853 (i); in Com., 5892; 3° *, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 181).

REDISTRIBUTION BILL, COR. WITH N.B. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1110 (i).

REDISTRIBUTION IN ONT., REDUCTION, &c., COR. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Sproule*), 2337 (i).
——— *re* P.E.I. AND N.B., COR., RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 876 (i).

REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 204, 208 (i).

Redistribution Bill: *See* 'Representation'.

Reformatory Prisons Act Amt. B. No. 221 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 6427 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8087; 3° *, 8087 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 51).

REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup. 5135 (ii).

Regina and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Scott*) 1° m, 591; 2°*, 852 (i); in Com., and 3° *, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 182).

REGISTRAR, EXCHEQUER COURT, EDITING REP.: in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

Registrar of Supreme Court B. No. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop. 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14300, 14403; 3°*, 14405 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 69).

RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES, &C.: *See* 'Can. Central.'

REPATRIATION Agents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iii).

REPENTIGNY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

REPORTS, DEPTL. TRANSLATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 479 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:

AUDITOR GENERAL'S: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).

INDIAN AFFAIRS: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).

INLAND REVENUE: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 89 (i).

INTERIOR: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).

JUSTICE: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLT.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).

MARINE: Presented (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 244 (i).

MILITIA: Presented (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 283 (i).

NORTH WEST MOUNTED POLICE: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 92 (i).

PENITENTIARIES: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).

POSTMASTER GENERAL'S: Presented (Sir *Willtam Mulock*) 89 (i).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1102 (i).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*) 6 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 92 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 125 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE: Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*), 92 (1).

Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 708; 2° m., 1207; ref. to Sel. Com., 1294 (i); rep. of Sel. Com. (presented), 7293 (iii); M. for Com., 10832, 10903; in Com., 10911, 10958, 11087, 11427, 11567, 11692, 12293; 3° m., 12372, 12492, (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 60).

Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 2° m., 1207, 1265; Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1284; Neg. (Y. 37, N. 72) 1292 (i). Deb. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1207, 1265, 1290; (Mr. *Northrup*) 1219; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick* 1230; (Mr. *Barker*) 1241: (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1250; (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1257; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1259; (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1269; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1282, (amt). 1284 (i). 3° m., 12372; Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) 12404; Neg. (Y. 28; N. 65, 12431; Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12432; (ruling) Mr. *Speaker*, 12432, 12435; Amt. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 12454; Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 12459; Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12476; Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12481; Amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12486; Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) 12488; Amt. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 12492 (v).

In Com.,

BRANDON, 11032 (v).

BRANT, 11087 (v).

B. C., 11034 (v).

CAPE BRETON AND VICTORIA, 11028 (v).

CHAMPLAIN, 11035 (v).

DAUPHIN, 11748 (v).

ELGIN, 11517 (v).

FRONTENAC, 11114 (v).

GREY, 11525. 12293 (v).

HASTINGS, 11542, 12294 (v).

HURON, 11003 (v).

KENT, 11004 (v).

KING'S, P.E.I., 11030 (v).

LAMBTON, 11009, 11584 (v).

LEEDS, 11479 (v).

LENNOX AND ADDINGTON, 11114 (v).

LISGAR, 11033 (v).

MACDONALD, 11033, 11781 (v).

MANITOBA, 11032 (v).

MIDDLESEX, 11585 (v).

MUSKOKA, 11114 (v).

NEW-BRUNSWICK, 11809 (v).

NIPISSING, 11156 (v).

NORFOLK, 11114, 11117, 11427; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 11427 (v).

NORTHUMBERLAND, 11010, 11584 (v).

NOVA SCOTIA, 11793, (v).

PETERBOROUGH, 11013, 11624 (v).

PERTH, 11013, 11623 (v).

PICTOU, N.S., 11028 (v).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE, 11781 (v).

QUEBEC, 11034, 11792 (v).

ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE, 11034 (v).

SOURIS, 11034 (v).

TORONTO, 11693 (v).

VICTORIA AND HALIBURTON, 11497 (v).

WATERLOO, 11641, 12294 (v).

WELLINGTON, 11027 (v).

WINNIPEG, 11784 (v).

YORK, 11665 (v).

REPRESENTATION BILL, RESOLUTIONS, (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) moved in Sel. Com., 11441 (v).

——EVIDENCE *re* COMMITTEE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11423 (v).

——REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Hyman*) 7293 (iii).

——STMNT. OF HON. MR. PUGSLEY *re* N. B.: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 941 (i).

REPRESENTATION OF P.E.I. AND N.B. IN H. OF C., LAW OFFICERS OPINION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).

See 'Redistribution.'

RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, I.C.R., FIRE PROTECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).

RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE, SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).

Restigouche Boom and Log Co.'s B. No. 116 (Mr. *Logan*) 1° *, 1575; 2° *, 1816 (i).

Retiring Allowances of Judges Bill:

See 'Judges.'

RETS. INQUIRIES FOR: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5413 (iii)

See general headings.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1903, AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12715, 1337 (vi).

Revised Statutes of Canada B. No. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 13667 ; 2° *, and in Com., 14297 ; 3° *, 14299 (vi), (*3 Edward VII c. 61*).

REVISION OF DOM. STATUTES, PAYMENTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 14643 (vi).

RHODES, CURRY & CO., CONTRACT FOR ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100 (vi).

RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &C., PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).

RICHIBUCTO HARBOUR, N.B., PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).

——NORTH PIER EXTENSION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

——POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Tobin*), 1°*, 1575 ; 2°*, 1816 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 183).

RICHMOND AND NORTHAM STATION, P.E.I. : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

RICHMOND BAY, P.E. I., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

RICHMOND, QUE., RIVER ST. FRANCIS ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

RIDEAU CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).

——CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

—— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*), 13302 (vi).

—— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK : in Com. of Sup.,, 12904 (vi).

RIDEAU HALL AND GROUNDS, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5006 (ii), 13087 (vi).

—— DRAINAGE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 647 (i).

—— LIGHTING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i)

—— MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, GRANTS TO : in Com. of Sup., 3767 (ii).

RIMOUSKI, EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RITCHIE, MR., U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENT : in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).

RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).

RIVER VERTE, IMPROVEMENTS, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12593 (v).

—— FREIGHT YARD : in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).

—— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).

—— I.C.R. SHOPS, CONSTRUCTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 12497 (v).

—— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD, CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).

—— FISH LADDERS, &C. : M. for copies of Reps.* (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

RIVIERE OUELLE. BRANCH LINE, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).

See 'Ouelle River.'

RIVIÈRE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).

RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).

ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

—— CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).

—— RECONSTRUCTION, &C., in Com. of Sup. 2690 (ii).

—— YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

See ' Pub. Works,' &c.

ROBIN, COLLAS CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

ROBERTSON, GEO., and CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

See ' Cattle Guards Commission '.

ROBERT VS. KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

ROBERVAL TO JAMES BAY RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

ROBINSON INDIAN TREATY, PAYMENTS TO INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

Rocky Mountains Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 197 (Mr. *Costigan*), 1°*, 4262 ; 2°* 4404 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 184).

ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8292 (iv), 14100 (vi).

RONAN, MR., AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).

ROOMS FOR MEMBERS, FURNITURE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).

See ' H. of C.'

ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5319 (iii).

ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

ROSSLAND, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY, ESTABLISHMENT AT QUEBEC ; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

—— IMPERFECT RETURN : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i).

ROSS RIFLE, EXAMINATION BY EXPERTS : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2758 (ii).

—— MANUFACTURE OF : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

ROUNDHOUSE, I.C.R., GATES, &c. AT SUSSEX, N.B. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672 (ii).
See 'I.C.R,' 'Sussex,' &c.
ROYAL ASSENT : *See* 'Bills.'
ROYAL CANADIAN FIELD ARTILLERY, KINGSTON : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 13128 (vi).
See 'Kingston.'
ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT, NUMERICAL STRENGTH, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3801 (ii).
ROYAL COMMISSION *re* INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
See 'Labour.'
ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
See 'Kingston.'
ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 344 (i).
See 'Mint.'
Royal Trust Company's B. No. 103 (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1°*, 1295 ; 2°*, 1512 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 185).
RULES OF HSE., REVISION, &c. *re* PETS. FOR PRIVATE BILLS : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Demers*) 4441 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) to amend, 12216 (v).
See 'Private Bills.'
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, FREE ESTABLISHMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*), 285 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*). 13259 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, P.E.I., PAR. IN CHARLOTTETOWN "PATRIOT" : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), 13806 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 6137 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*), 511 (i).
RUSSELL ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*), 1023 (i).
RUTHERFORD, DR., DUTIES IN ENGLAND : in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
ST. AGNES TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
ST ALEXIS BAIE DES HA HA, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE HA HA BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. ANDRÈ DE KAMOURASKA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS, MAN., CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &c. ; Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, RED RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 10490 (v).
——— REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 14284 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS, N.B., WHARF, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE, PIER RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
See 'Sorel.'
ST. ANN'S, N.S., NORTH GUT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
———NORTH RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR, TEL. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING : Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 5321 (iii).
———POSTAL FACILITIES : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
St. Chrysostome Railway Co.'s B. No. 158, (Mr. *Brown*) 1°*, 2582 ; 2°*, 2956 (ii) ; ref. back to Sel. Com., 7369 (iii) ; in Com., 7771 ; 3*, 7772 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 186).
ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY, FERRY SERVICE Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
ST. EUSTACHE TO ST. PLACIDE RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
STE. FAMILLE, PIER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. FIDÈLE, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
STE. FLAVIE, STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER (YAMASKA) RY. BRIDGE SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
ST. FRANCOIS PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ST. FULGENCE, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GÉDÉON ISLANDS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GODEFROI DE NOUVELLE, BREAKWATER : in Com. 13489 (vi).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
———POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION, ISSUE OF WRIT, &c. Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13376 (vi).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Judgment of Sup. Court : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).

——Vacancy : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i), 6995 (iii).

St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).

St. Jerome, Lake St. John Wharf : in Com.of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).

St. John, N.B., and Belfast SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7731 (iv).

——and Digby SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).

——and Glasgow SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).

——and Halifax SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).

——and London SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

See ' Allan,' &c., ' Atlantic Fast SS Service,' &c.

——and W. Indies SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).

See ' Trade and Commerce.'

St. John, N.B., Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).

——Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).

See ' I.C.R.' &c.

——Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).

——Increased Accommodation, I.C.R. in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).

——Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

——Water and Drainage Service : in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).

See ' N.B.', &c.

St. John River and St. Mary's River Indians, Pet. *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).

St. John River and Tributaries, Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 5895 (iii).

St. John River Tributaries : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

St. John River Wharfs, Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).

St. John's, Que., Customs Building : in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

——Drill Hall, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*), 12496 (v).

—— Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

St. John Valley and River du Loup Ry. Co.'s Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

St. Joseph Transportation Co.'s B. No. 151 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°* 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Lake Huron : in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Isle of Orleans : in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).

See ' Island of Orleans,' &c.

St. Lawrence, Cable and Tel. Lines : in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii).

—— Equipment for Transportation Facilities : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).

—— and Fast Atlantic Service : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).

——Gulf Fishing, Pet. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2917 (ii).

——Islands Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).

——Lighthouses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

—— and Lloyds, Cor. *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).

—— Lower Removal of Rocks : in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).

——Obstruction to Navigation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——Pilots, Retirement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2915 (ii).

See ' Pilots ', &c. ' Shipping Casulties B.'

——Rep. *re* Navigation, Obstructions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Clarke*), 4133 (ii).

—— Route : in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

—— Shipping Interests, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 5758 (iii).

—— Ship Channel : in Com. of Sup., 3218 (ii).

—— Ship Channel, Dredging, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).

—— Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 13332 (vi).

—— Wireless Telegraphy *re* : *See* ' Marconi '.

St. Louis, Elmsdale, Coleman and Conway Station Agents, P.E.I. Ry., Salaries, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).

St. Louis Exhibition, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3001 (ii).

—— Live Stock Exhibit : in Com. of Sup. 4602 (ii).

—— Live Stock Exhibit, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 4837 (ii).

St. Louis Lake, Hydrographic Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

St. Louis River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

St. Mary's Current Wharf, Contract with Poupore & Malone ; M. for copy of Contract* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

See ' Montreal ', &c.

St. Mary's, Ont., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).

St. Mary's River Railway Co.'s B. No. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., 4588 ; 3°*, 4591 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 187).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).
St. Maurice River, Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).
——— Dredging Eastern Channel: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
———Slides, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
St. Nicholas Pier, Rebuilding, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
St. Ours Canal, Landing Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
———Stop Logs: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1858 (i).
St. Peters to Louisbourg Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).
St. Philippe d'Argenteuil to Brownsburg, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14457 (vi).
St. Pierre Pointe, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
St. Regis Lockup: in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
See 'Indians'.
St. Simeon, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
St. Stephen and Back Bay Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
———Acting Warden, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 10831 (v).
———Hospital Management, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
———Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
———Warden's Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
Sabrevois, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).
Sacré-Cœur, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
Saddles and Bridles for last S.A. Contingent, Contract, &c.: (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).
Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. No. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1° m., 3298 (ii); 2° *, and in Com., 6918; 3° *, 6921 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 63).
Saguenay Pilots: *See* 'Pilotage' and 'Shipping Casualties Bills'.
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
Sale of Tickets, P.E.I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.' &c.
Salmon Canning Industry in B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v)
——— Commissioners, B.C.: (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii)
——— Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).
Salmon Industry, Fraser River, B.C., Tels. from Canners Association, &c.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).
See 'B.C.' &c.
———Salmon shipped to France from B.C., Tariff *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
Sand, Indian Boy adopted by Mr. Johnston: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii)
Sandy Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
San José Scale: Remarks in Com. of Sup, 4434 (ii)
Sarnia, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi)
Saskatchewan Election, Proclamation in Prince Albert 'Advocate': in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
Saskatchewan Land Co., Sections acquired, &c.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor., 2338 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*). 4863 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
——— Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (ii).
——— Sections, &c.: (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2306 (i).
——— Surveys of reserved Lands: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
Saturday Sittings of House: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 113 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 3225; 3°*, 3225 (ii). (*3 Edward VII*, c. 88.)
Sault Ste. Marie, Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 13252 (vi).
——— Labour Disturbances, Par. in Newspaper (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 12610 (vi).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Militia: (Sir *F. W. Borden, Kings*) 12939 (vi).
———Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
Saunders, Dr. C. E., Appnmt. at Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 1676 (i).
Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 6895 (iii).
Schedules *re* Census of 1891: in Com. of Sup., 705. (iii).
See 'Census.'
Schell, J. T., M. P., Goods supplied Govt.: Ques. (Mr *Fowler*), 4959 (ii).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Schell*), 5416 (iii).
——— 1st Rep. of Sel. Com.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*), 5511 (iii).
See 'Privileges', &c.
Schooley, William Francis, Relief B. No. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*), 1°*, 2100; 2°m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 189).

SCHOOLEY, WM. FRANCIS, RELIEF B. No. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*), in Com., 3223; M. to ret. Evidence to Senate, 3224 (ii).

SCHOOLS, B. C., INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii) 13786 (vi).

——— MAN. AND N.W.T., SALES, AMT. PAID, &c.: M for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*), 706 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 6893 (iii).

——— PAYMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 6169 (iii).

——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
See 'Indians'.

SCHOOLS OF NAVIGATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com. of Sup., 13535, 13545 (vi).
See 'Naval Reserve'.

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS AND HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

SCOTCH HILL STATION, I.C.R., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 872 (i).

SCOTCH IRON MOULDERS AND TORONTO CAN. FOUNDRY CO.'S STRIKE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
See 'Can. Foundry'.

SCOTTISH DEMONSTRATION AT GLENGARRY, TEL. TO LORD DUNDONALD: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*), 10536 (v). *See* 'Dundonald'.

'SCOTIA' STR., SALVAGE SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).

——— Remarks on M. for Sup., (Mr. *Osler*), 7150 (iii).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 7206 (iii).

SCOTT'S BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).

SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
See 'Indians.'

SECRETARY OF STATE.

'ADVOCATE' PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING *re* ELECTIONS PROCLAMATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14268, 14652 (vi).

ALIEN LABOUR ACT, PROSECUTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3971 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 479 (i).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).

——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 222 (i), 14254 (vi).

ELECTIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN, PAYMENT TO PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
See 'Advocate,'

ELECTORAL LISTS, N.S., PRINTING, &c., CHANGES MADE: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 8331 (iv).

ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 288 (i).

ELECTION PROCLAMATIONS PRINTING:
See 'Saskatchewan Election.'

NATURALIZATION ACT, EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii)

——— REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Larivière* 2015 (i).

——— RETURNS, N. W. T.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3804 (ii).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Con.*

PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com., of Sup., 14268 (vi).
See 'Advocate.'

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1102 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU, COMPOSITORS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4182, 4444 (ii).

——— INDEBTEDNESS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Ques (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 4180 (ii).

——— PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12587 (v).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU AND UNION LABELS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 4179 (ii).

SEED GRAIN, RELIEF TO INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).

SEED INSPECTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5845 (iii).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. No. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 4442; in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); 2° & in Com., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn, 12493 (v).

SELKIRK WHARF MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i.)

SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, P.E.I. RY., DISCONTINUANCE OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4443 (ii).

Senate Representation of N.W.T.:
See 'N.W.T.'

SENATE REPRESENTATION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*), 1297 (i).

SENATE, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup. 5264 (iii).

SESSIONAL CLERKS, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup. 14242 (vi).

——— INCREASES TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 14113 (vi).

SESSIONAL MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE, DATE OF MEETING: M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).

SETTLERS' CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).

SETTLERS EFFECTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).

SEVEN ISLANDS PULP & LUMBER CO., WHARF *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13480 (vi).

SEVEN ISLANDS, QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

SEVEN ISLANDS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).

SHEDIAC AND COAST RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14325 (vi).

SHEGAWAKE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).

SHEPHERD, B., FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'

SHERBROOKE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).

SHERIFFS, CLERKS, &c., YUKON, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3410 (ii).

———FEES, YUKON, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

———LIVING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3414 (ii).
See 'Yukon.'

SHIELDS, MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF: Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
See 'Glace Bay,' &c.
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHIPPERS OF FROZEN FISH CLAIMS, AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 13373 (vi).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Shipping Casualties Act 1901, Amt. B. No. 263 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com. on Res., 12801; 1°* of B., 12805; 2°, and in Com., 12994; 3° m., 13560 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 64.)
Shipping Federation of Canada Incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Bickerdike*), 1°*, 1193; 2° m., 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 190.)
Ships Safety:
See 'Safety of Ships.'
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SHOEMAKERS FEDERATED UNION, RES. *re* SLATER SHOE CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 14666 (vi).
SHORT BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SHUTT'S REPORT *re* SOFT PORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
SIDINGS ALONG LINE OF I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).
——AND INCREASED FACILITIES FOR I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14081, 14107 (vi).
See I.C.R.
SIGNAL MARINE SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
See 'Marine.'
SILLS, E. H., PAYMENT *re* STORAGE OF FISH NETS: in Com. of Sup., 5128 (ii).
SIMCOE COUNTY CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &C.: M. (Mr. *Grant*), for Reps., 2762 (ii).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson Grey*), 5587 (iii).
SISAL USED IN BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 8085 (iv).
See 'Binder Twine,' &c.
SITTINGS OF HSE.:
See 'Sessions.'
SKINNER'S COVE N. S., PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SKINNER'S POND, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SLATER SHOE CO. AND ALIEN LABOUR, RES. OF SHOEMAKERS UNION: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 14666 (vi).
SLIDES AND BOOMS, GENERAL REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
———N.W.TER. RESERVES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6350 (iii).
——— PATIENTS, EXPENSES INCURRED BY GLOUCESTER COUNTY, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14688 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007, (ii), 5491 (iii).
SMITH, F. H., P. O. DEPT., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
SMITH, WM., LATE M.P., AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION: Remarks (Mr. *Cowan*) 894 (i).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. Sup., 2672 (ii).
SNOWSTORMS IN N. W. TER., REPORTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 11822 (v).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7258 (iii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— COR. *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEO. GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— O'LEARYS' CLAIMS, PAYMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— REPAIRING BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
S. AFRICA AND CAN. SS SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv).
See 'Can. and S. Africa,' &c.
S. A. COLONIES AND PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).
S. A. CONTINGENTS AND GOVT. EMPLOYEES, REINSTATED, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1026 (i).
———M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2337 (i).
——— PENSIONS TO BY DOM. GOVT: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
——— SADDLES AND BRIDGES, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).
S. A. CONSTABULARY, &C., INFORMATION *re* GRIEVANCES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1027 (i).
———PURCHASE OF DISCHARGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 14287 (vi).
———MEDALS PBESENTED BY KING, PET. *re* FROM NON-COM. OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
———REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv).
———Remarks (*Sir Frederick Borden*) 8319 (iv).
———MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iii).
———PENSIONS FROM IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
———SUPPLIES PURCHASED BY IMP. GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) for Copies of O.Cs. &c., 2760 (ii).

SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).

SOUTHEASTERN VALLEY AND UNITED COUNTIES RY., SAFETY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 451 (i).

Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 152 (Mr. *Riley*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (*3 Edward VII.*, c. 191).

SOUTH INGONISH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR RY., TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).

SOUTH SHORE RY., WORKING, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 448 (i).

——COMPLAINT *re* SAFETY: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 205 (i).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: M. (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).

——Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

SPEECH OF GOV. GEN.: *See* Gov. Gen.'s Speech.

SPEECH FROM THRONE: Prorogation, 14861 (vi).

SPRINGHILL, N. S., ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).

——BOILER EXPLOSION IN DOM. BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).

——PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

SPRY BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).

STAFFORD & CO.'S RENTAL OF DOCK BUILDINGS, MIDLAND: in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
See 'Midland', &c.

STAMPING LETTERS BY MINISTERS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Standard Car Truck Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 105 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 192.)

STANDARD CHEMICAL CO., LONGFORD: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).

—— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).

—— PURCHASE OF WOOD ALCOHOL; in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
See 'Inland Revenue', &c.

"STANLEY", STR., AND P.E.I. WINTER COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

——MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).
See 'Govt. Steamers'.

STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.', &c.

STATUTES, B.C., DISALLOWANCE: M. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) to print, 2675 (ii).
See 'B.C.', &c.

Statutes Publication, Act Amt. B. No. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 94; 2°*, 634; in Com., 634; 3°*, 635 (i). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 65).

STATUTES, REVISION COMMISSION, NAMES, PROGRESS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1029 (i).

Statutes Revision: *See* 'Revised Statutes'.

Steamboat Inspection Act (Marine Engineers) Amt. B. No. 136 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 2100 (i); 2° m., 3288 (ii).

—— **(Regulation of Naptha Yachts, &c., Fees, &c.) Amt. B. No. 225** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; 1°* of B., 6543; 2°, and in Com., 6915; 3°*, 6917 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 66.)

—— **(Coal Oil as Fuel) Amt. B. No. 237** (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1° m., 12494 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12777; 3°*, 12779 (vi). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 67.)

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

—— TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. Sup., 13648 (vi).

STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT, B.C.: in Com. o Sup., 13787 (vi).

Steel and Iron Bounties Act Amt. B. No. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 6629 (iii); in Com. on prop. Res., 7923; 1°*, of B., 7988 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10799; 3°*, 10802 (v). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 68).

Steel, James Reid, Relief B. No. 195 (Mr. *McCreary*), 1°*, 4178; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 193).

STEEL RAILS AND FASTENINGS, CONTRACT WITH CLERGUE SYNDICATE: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*), 13668 (vi).
See 'Clergue'.

STEEL RAILS, CONTRACT, PRICES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 285 (i).

—— FASTENINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).

—— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).

—— P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).

STEEL SHELVING, &c., OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).

STEEL SHIPBUILDING, BOUNTY TO AID: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 8296 (iv).

Sterling Bank of Canada Incorp, B. No. 100 (Mr. *Calvert*), 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 194).

STEWART, Mr., APPNMT. as SUPT. OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).

—— INSPECTOR OF MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*), in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).

—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*), 14599 (vi).

STEWART VS. KING, LEGAL EXPENSES, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

STEWART, E., FOREST INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6416, 6774 (iii).

Stewart River Development Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 160 (Mr. *Davis*), 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 195).

STOCK EXCHANGE SPECULATIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).

Debate: (Mr. *Osler*) 7024; (Mr. *Fielding*) 7025; (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 7027; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7029; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 7032, 7045; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7034, 7047; (Mr. *Monet*) 7035, 7043; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 7035; (Mr. *Monk*) 7036; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7038; (Mr. *Holmes*) 7038; (Mr. *Henderson*) 7040; (Mr. *Maclean*) 7042; (Mr. *Sproule*) 7046; (Mr. *Speaker*) members remarks checked, 7044; (Mr. *Tarte*) 7051; (Mr. *Ingram*) 7052 (iii).

Stratford Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).

Strathcona Horse Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 14314 (vi)

Stuart, Capt. D.C., Halifax, Dismissal, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4353 (ii).

Sturgeon Falls, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).

Submarine Cable, Isle of Orleans: M. (Mr. *Talbot*), for Ret., 11301 (v).

———Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 11186 (v).

See 'Island of Orleans.'

Subsidies for Public Highways, Pets., &c.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 591 (i).

Subsidies, Rys., Aggregate Vote for each Prov., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).

———Bonuses voted by Parlt., 1900, 1901, 1902: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 13934 (vi).

———Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), 14352 (vi).

———Remarks (Mr *Richardson*), in Com. of Sup., 14345 (vi).

———Interest Payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 3970 (ii).

———Inquiry for (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 12805, 13005 (vi).

———Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*), 10955 (v).

———Inquiry for (Mr. *Sproule*), 11422 (v).

Subsidies for Man.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*), in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).

Subsidy for N.W.T. Govt., Increase: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

———for N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*), in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Subsidy for P.E.I. Ry.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).

Subsidies (Money) paid by Govt. since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1198 (i).

Subsidies Per Miles of Rys. in N.W.T. and Man.: (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).

Subsidies, Total amount for Ten Years; Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13934 (vi).

Subsidies voted by parliament, 1901-1903: Ques. (*Mr. Wilson*). 2306 (i), 12842, 13027, 13259, 13370 (vi).

Subsidies, &c.: *See* 'Provincial.'

Subsidies to Railways: *See.*

Atlantic, Quebec & Western Ry. Co.
Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.
Beersville Coal & Ry. Co.
Bruce Mines & Algoma Ry. Co.
Canada Steel Co.
C. P. Ry., Elkhorn Branch,
C. P. Ry., Extension to Winnipeg Beach.
Cape Tormentine Ry.
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.
Chateauguay Ry. Co.
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.
Dawson City to Stewart River Ry.
Debert Coal Mines Ry.
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.
Elkhorn and Moosomin Ry.
Halifax and South-western Ry. Co.
Harvey and Salisbury Branch Ry.
Hawkesbury, Ont., to South Indian Ry.
'Hot Air' Line Ry.
Indian River Ry. and Lake Megantic.
Ingersoll to Stratford Ry.
International Ry. Co. of N.B.
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.
James Bay Ry. Co.
Joggins Ry.
Joliette and Lake Manuan Ry.
Jonquieres to Ha Ha Bay Ry.
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.
Lac Bouchette and Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.
Lake St. John Ry. and La Tuque Ry. Co.
Lake Superior, Long Lake and Albany Ry. Co. to Peninsula Harbour.
Lake Temiskaming and James Bay Ry. Co.
Lime Ridge and Megantic Ry.
Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.
Mackenzie and Renouf Falls Ry.
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.
Matane and Gaspe Ry.
Medicine Hat Ry.
Middleton and Victoria Beach Ry. Co.
Midland Ry. Co., Truro Branch.
Montfort and Gatineau Colonisation Ry. Co.
Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.
Nepigon Ry. Co.
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.
Nicolet River Bridge.
Nova Scotia Eastern Ry. Co.
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.
Parrsboro and Springhill Ry.
Paspebiac to Gaspe Ry.
Quebec Central Ry. Co.
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.
Roberval to James Bay Ry.
St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry.
St. Francis River (Yamaska) Ry. Bridge.
St. John Valley and River du Loup Ry. Co.
St. John Valley Ry. Co. and C.P. Ry. Co.
St. Mary's River Ry. Co.
St. Peters to Louisburg Ry.
St. Philippe d'Argenteuil to Brownsburg Ry.
Seven Islands, Quebec and Murray Bay Ry.
Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.
Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Co.
Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co.
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.
Tilsonburg to Woodstock Ry.
Timigami Ry. Co. to Sturgeon Falls.
Tobin Co.'s Pulp Mill.
Toronto and James Bay Ry.
Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry.

Subsidies to Railways—*Con.*
TROIS PISTOLES BRIDGE TO MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY.
WALKERVILLE BRIDGE CO. RY.
WALTHAM STATION TO FERGUSON POINT RY.
WELLINGTON TO UNION BAY RY.
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY.
WOODSTOCK, N.B. AND FREDERICTON RY.
WOODSTOCK RY.
YAMASKA RIVER AND ST. GUILLAUME RY.
YAMASKA TO LOTBINIERE RY.
YORK AND CARLETON RY CO.
YUKON, EDMONTON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.

SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL AMOUNT 1903, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 14285 (vi).

SUGAR IMPORTED INTO CANADA 1902: M. (Mr. *Madore*) for Stmnt. *, 3236 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE, BREAKWATER, P.E.I., COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3234 (ii).
——— BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— COAL SHEDS: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).

SUMMERVILLE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SUNBURY, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).

Superior Court, Quebec: *See* 'Judges of Sup. Court'.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES: Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).
See 'Estimates.'

SUPPLIES FOR RYS. VOTED FOR ONE ESTIMATE, TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081 (vi).

Supply B. No. 206 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5243 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 1).
——— **No. 218** (Mr. *Fielding*) Remarks, 6170; 1°*, 2°*, 6170; in Com., 6171; 3°*, 6172 (iii). (*3 Edward VII., c.* 2).
——— **No. 241** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8404 (iv). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 3).
——— **No. 271** (Mr. *Fielding*) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 14765; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14768 (vi). (*3 Edward VII., c.* 4).

SUPPLY BILL, VOTE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 5995 (iii).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6003 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* one-fifth Vote (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

SUPPLY: Conc., 5238 (iii).

SUPPLY:
COMMITTEE:
Administration of Justice: *See* 'Justice.'
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Aid to Agricultural Societies, 4432 (ii)
Archives, 4429 (ii), 13503 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Con.
Census, 4594, 4635, 4800 (ii), 7053 (iii).
Cold Storage, &c., 4671 (ii), 7610 (iv).
Criminal Statistics, 4429 (ii).
Exhibitions, 4599 (ii).
Experimental Farms, 4548 (ii).
Fumigating Stations, 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).
General Statistics, 4429 (ii).
Historical Data of Acadians, 13505 (vi).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit, 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
Osaka Exhibition, 4626 (ii).
Patents, Classifying Canadian, 4433 (ii).
Toronto Exhibition, Grant, 13501 (vi).
Year Book, 4429 (ii).
Charges of Management, 12584 (v).
Additional Amount for Dom. Notes, 5135 (ii).
Public Debt, Conversion of, Expenses *re*, 14253 (vi).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 4349 (ii), 14255 (vi).
Auditor General's Office, 224 (i).
Contingencies:
Agriculture, 4349 (ii).
Finance, 226 (i).
Indian Affairs, 13760 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries, 341 (i), 5033 (ii).
Public Works, 5824 (iii).
Trade and Commerce, 7573 (iv).
Customs, 319 (i).
Finance, 224 (i).
Geological Survey, 12592 (v), 13769, 13966 (vi).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 207 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 12585 (v), 13772 (vi).
Indian Affairs, 272 (i).
Inland Revenue, 227 (i).
Interior, 267 (i), 13761 (vi).
Mines Branch, 13762 (vi).
Justice, 207 (i), 14255 (vi).
Labour Gazette, 7151 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, 341 (i), 13663 (vi).
Clement, Jules, &c., 13664 (vi).
Militia and Defence, 221 (i).
North-west Mounted Police, 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
Post Office:
Allowance to J. W. T. Dixon, Winnipeg, 13995 (vi).
Higman, O., Report *re* Pneumatic Tube used in U. S. &c, 13998 (vi).
Junior second-class Clerkships, Salaries, 13995 (vi).
Smith, F. H., Salary Increase, 14000 (vi).
Transfer of Temporaries to Permanent Staff, 13994 (vi).
Privy Council Office, 207 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 223 (i).
Public Works, 333, (i).
J. B. Hunter, Salary, 13499 (vi).
Chief Architect's Salary, 13498 (vi).
Railways and Canals, 333 (i), 14055 (vi).
Additional second-class clerkship, 14055, (vi).
Secretary of State, 222 (i).
Additional junior second-class clerkships, 14254 (vi).
Trade and Commerce, 7573 (iv).
Culling Timber:
General Vote, 7798 (iv).
Customs:
Amount required for Yukon, 3968 (ii).
Kilroy, T., Amount *re* Services, 13993 (vi).
Miscellaneous, 3962 (ii).
Preventive Services, 3949 (ii).
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 3782, 3897, 3949 (ii), 13980 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Dominion Lands—Capital :
Surveys, &c., 6758, 6939 (iii), 13776 (vi)
Dominion Lands—Income :
Commissioners' Salary, 6765 (iii).
Protection of Timber Lands, 6773 (iii).
Salaries, &c., 13772, 13966 (vi).
Travelling Expenses, Contingencies, &c., 6766 (iii).
Tree and Timber Planting, 13775, 14272 (vi).
Dominion Police :
General Vote, 3511 (ii).
Excise :
Adulteration of Food, 5389 (iii).
Further Amount for Electric Light Inspectors, 5407 (iii).
Inspectors of Distilleries, Salaries, &c., 13974 (vi.)
Methylated Spirits, 5373 (iii).
Minor Revenues, 5404 (iii).
Salaries, &c., 5363 (iii), 13967 (vi).
Stamps for Tobacco, 5373 (iii).
To reimburse E. Forrest, 5405 (iii).
To pay J. M. Ferguson, 5412 (iii).
To pay Assistant Inspector Kelly, 5405 (iii).
To compensate A. Guay for Horses, 5406 (iii).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 5373 (iii); Additional amounts, 5404 (iii).
Weights and Measures :
Salaries, 5381 (iii).
Fisheries :
Behring Sea Arbitration, 13568 (vi).
B. C., New Steamer, 5278 (iii).
Building Fishways, &c., 4174 (ii).
Canadian Fishery Exhibit, 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 4174 (ii) 13660 (vi).
Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, 5277 (iii).
Investigation *re* Sardine, Oyster Fisheries, Dog-fish, &c., 13649 (vi).
Licenses to U. S. Fishermen, 5309 (iii).
Protection Services, B.C., 4174 (ii).
Salaries, &c., of Fishery Officers, 5050, 5122 (ii).
Steamers to replace *Acadia* and *Petrel*, 13658 (vi).
Geological Survey :
Compiling of field-notes, &c., 6826 (iii).
General Vote, 6815 (iii).
Geologist to International Boundary Survey, Salary, 6825 (iii).
Metallurgical, Petrographical Assistance, 13778 (vi).
Printing, Engraving, &c., of Maps, 13778 (vi).
Government of North-west Territories :
Further Amount for Assistance in Registry Offices, 6888 (iii).
General Vote, 6946 (iii), 13787 (vi).
Lethbridge, Bridge over Belly River, 13367 (vi).
McLeod, Bridge over Old Man's River, 13367 (vi).
Government of Yukon Territory :
Checking flow of Eldorado Gusher, 6949, 7274 (iii).
General Vote, 6802 (iii), 13367 (vi).
Roads and Bridges, 7283 (iii).
St. Mary's Hospital, Dawson, 7291 (iii).
Immigration :
Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B. and Foreign Countries, 6615 (iii).
Further Amount required, 2299 (i), 6847 (iii).
General Expenses in Can. and G. B., &c., 6658 (iii).
Indians :
British Columbia :
Additional Amount for Salaries, 13785 (vi).
General Vote, 6425 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—Con.
British Columbia—*Con.*
Hazelton Hospital, 13787 (vi).
Industrial Schools, 7254 (iii).
Medical Attendance, 13785 (vi).
Schools, &c., 13786 (vi).
Steam Launch for Agent, 13787 (vi).
Generally :
Indians, Generally, 6425 (iii).
Manitoba and N.W.T. :
Amount for Triennial Clothing, 13783 (vi).
General Expenses, Dr. C. H. West, &c., 13784 (vi).
General Vote, 6350, 6422 (iii).
Implements, Purchase of, 13782 (vi).
Schools, Additional Amount, 13784 (vi).
Surveys, Additional Amount, 13784 (vi).
Maritime Provinces :
Schools, 6409 (iii).
New Brunswick :
Additional Amount for Salaries, 13782 (vi).
To pay Fire Damage at Edmundston, 13782 (vi).
Nova Scotia :
Medical Attendance, &c., 6421 (iii).
Purchase of Lands for Reserves, 13781 (vi).
Relief and Seed Grain, 6417 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec :
Blankets and Clothing, 6409 (iii).
Doncaster Reserve, Squatters' Improvements, 13779 (vi).
General Legal Expenses, 6416 (iii).
Land Management Fund, 6415 (iii).
Lock-up at St. Regis, 6415 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Ontario and Quebec, 6408 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Ontario, 6326, 6409 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Quebec, 6326, 6408 (iii).
Rama Indians, Repairs to Roads, 13781 (vi).
Repairs of Roads, &c., 13779 (vi).
Robinson Treaty Annuities, 6410 (iii).
Salaries of Chiefs, Cape Croker & Gibson, St. Regis, 6410 (iii).
Schools, Ont. and Que., 6409 (iii).
Surveys of Reserves, 6410 (iii).
Yukon :
Education of Indians, 7270(iii).
Relief for Destitute Indians, 7270 (iii).
Inspection of Staples :
Chief Inspectors, &c., 7762 (iv), 13698 (vi).
Inspection of Binder Twine, 7763, 7772 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act, Expenditure, 7798 (iv).
Insurance :
General Vote, 12586 (v).
Justice, Administration of :
Allowance to ad hoc Judges, 3402 (ii).
Divorce Court, N.B., 3400 (ii).
Exchequer Court, Additional to Registrar, 3407 (ii).
Admiralty, Quebec, Registrar, 3408 (ii).
Accommodation for Court, 3408 (ii).
Contingencies, &c., 3407 (ii).
Junior 2nd class Clerks, 3406 (ii).
Legal Decisions, Report of, 3407 (ii).
Expenditure under R.S.C., c. 181, 3401 (ii).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 3398 (ii), 14257 (vi).
Additional Judge of Superior Court, N.W.T., 14257 (vi).
Prince Albert Court House, &c., 3401 (ii).
Retiring Allowance, Judge Henry, 14662 (vi).
Salary of County Court Judge, District No. 7, N.S., 14259 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.

Miscellaneous—*Con.*
Salary of Junior Judge, Nipissing, 14258 (vi)
Travelling Allowances, Judges, B.C., 3399 (ii).
Manitoba, 3399 (ii).

Supreme Court:
Contingencies, &c., 3404 (ii).
Law Books, &c., 3402, 3405 (ii).
Printing and Binding, 3405 (ii).
Reporter's Salary, 3402 (ii).
Salary of E. R. A. Taschereau, 14257 (vi).
To assist L. W. Coutlee, 'Digest of Judgments,' 14256 (vi).

Yukon:
Clerk's Salary, 3410 (ii).
Judges' Travelling Allowances, 3409 (ii).
Law Books, &c., 3506 (ii), 14267 (vi).
Living Allowances, 3411 (ii).
Living Allowances, Generally, 3414 (ii).
Miscellaneous Expenses, 3507 (ii).
Salary of Deputy Sheriff, &c., 3411 (ii).
Stenographers, 3411 (ii).

Legislation:
General:
Printing Paper and Binding, 5267 (iii).
Voters' Lists, 5274 (iii).

House of Commons:
Debates, Amanuenses, 14243 (vi).
Increases to Clerks, 14112 (vi).
Sessional Clerks, 14242 (vi).
Sessional Messengers, 14243 (vi).
Tradesmen and others, 14115 (vi).

Library:
Salaries, 5267 (iii).

Senate:
General Vote, 5264 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Aids to Navigation, 4173 (ii), 5735 (iii), 13633 (vi).
Halifax Harbour, Land Purchase for Buoy Service, 13638 (vi).
Lurcher's Shoal Lightship, 4173 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 13632 (vi).
Montreal Agency, &c., 13632 (vi).
Montreal Pilot Commissioners' Court, 4173 (ii).
Repairs to Wharfs, &c., 4174 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4132 (ii).
Telephonic Communication, Atkinson Lighthouse and Vancouver, 13638 (vi).
Wireless Telegraph Stations, Equipment, 13639 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Canada and Australia, 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).
Canada and G. B., 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672 (vi).
Canada and South Africa, 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 7756 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac, 13694 (vi).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 7742 (iv).
Halifax and Canso, 6002 (iii).
Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool, 7730 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
Manchester and Canada, 7745 (iv).
Petit de Grat and I. C. R. Terminus at Mulgrave, 14249 (vi).
P. E. I. and G. B., 7744 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 7741 (iv).
P. E. I. and Nfld., 13676 (vi).
St. John and Digby, 7739 (iv).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 7731 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow, 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).
St. John, Halifax and London, 7734 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Conventions—Con.
St. John, Halifax, W. I. and South America, 7740 (iv).
St. John and Halifax *via* Yarmouth, 7742 (iv).
St. Stephen, Campobello and Back Bay, &c., 7759 (iv), 13695 (vi).
Services of Str. *Lord Strathcona*, 6002 (iii), 13697 (vi).
Sydney to Bay St. Lawrence, &c., 13677 (vi).
Tadousac and St. Catharine's Bay, 13695 (vi).
Victoria and San Francisco, 7741 (iv).
Victoria and West Coast Vancouver Island, 13694 (vi).

Militia:
Annual Drill, 3603, 5005 (ii).
Contingencies, 3778 (ii).
Coronation Contingent, Further Amount, 6950 (iii).
Dominion Arsenal, 7089 (iii).
Esquimalt Defences, 3778 (ii).
General Statement, 13379 (vi).
Grants to Associations, 3767 (ii).
Hamilton, Drill Hall, Additional Land, 6949 (iii).
Military Asylum, Pensions, 6788 (iii).
Military Properties, 3611 (ii).
Pay and Allowances, 3584 (ii), 13379 (vi).
Royal Military College, 3778 (ii).
Salaries and Wages, 3608 (ii).
To pay Lieut. Col. Cole, 6950 (iii).
Transport and Freight, 3752 (ii).
Winnipeg Barracks, Paving Streets, 6949 (iii).

Miscellaneous:
Alaska Boundary Commission, 6931 (iii), 13957 (vi).
Arbitration, Can., Ont. and Que., 12590 (v).
Art Academy, 12589 (v).
Astronomical Observatory, 6791 (iii).
Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 6790 (iii).
Can. Mining Institute, Publication of Documents, 12591 (v), 13965 (vi).
C.P.R., Transportation of Sir Edmund Barton, 6952 (iii).
Classification of Records, Privy Council Office, 12592 (v).
Engraving, &c., of Maps of Can. and N.W.T., 6800 (iii).
Keewatin Govt. Expenses, 6798 (iii).
Maintenance of Lunatics, 6798 (iii).
Labour Dept., &c., 7197 (iii).
Labour Troubles, B.C., Royal Commission, 6984 (iii).
Litigation, Costs, 6794 (iii).
Maintenance of Assay Office, Vancouver, 6799 (iii), 13965 (vi).
Maintenance of Roads, &c., Banff Park, 6788 (iii).
Bath House, &c., 13955 (vi).
Museum Building, 6927 (iii).
Martineau Defalcations, Expenses of Commission *re*, 6991 (iii).
Middleton, late T. W., *re* Shortage, 6931 (iii).
Naturalization Act, Expenses *re*, 6952 (iii).
N.W.T. Govt., Protection of Bow River Bridge, Canmore, 6925 (iii).
Paris Agency, 12589 (v).
Petersen, Tate & Co., Return of Deposit, 6953 (iii).
P. O. Savings Bank, Defalcation, Compensation *re*, 14274 14655 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate*, Payments, 14268, 14652 (vi).
Printing Bureau Plant, 12587 (v).
Rand's Micmac Dictionary, 12592 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—Con.

St. Lawrence River, Improvements *re* Thousand Islands, 14661 (vi).
South African Memorial Association, Can. Grant, 6992 (iii).
Statutes, Revision, 14643 (vi).
Teulon Road, Man., Construction, 6927 (iii).
To compensate Canadian Bank of Commerce, Yukon, 14274 (vi).
To meet Expenses *re* the King *v.* Bank Note Co., 14279 (vi).
To pay Amos Barnes *re* River Lots, Man., 6922 (iii).
To pay Wm. Perkins for Evidence *re* Lisgar Election, 14251 (vi).
To pay Casca Trading and Transportation Co., 6926 (iii).
Trade Combination *re* Lumber, Expenses *re* Commission, 14654 (vi).
Tuberculosis, Prevention, Grant *re*, 13517 (vi).
Turtle Mountain, Land Slides, Expenses *re*, 13965 (vi).
Unforeseen Expenses, Additional, 6951 (iii), 12588 (v).
Victoria Memorial, London, England, 14655 (vi).
Yoho Park Reserve, Construction of Roads, &c., 6790 (iii).

Mounted Police:

Compensation for Injuries, 5264 (iii).
Pay of Force, 5262 (iii).
Services in Yukon, 5003 (ii), 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service:

Cattle Inspection, 4116 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, &c., 4041, 5033 (ii).
Surveys, &c., of Coasts of Northern Canada, 13760 (vi).
Tidal Service, 4114 (ii).
Unforeseen Expenses, 4116 (ii).

Penitentiaries:

General, 3511 (ii).
Kingston, 3511 (ii).
Manitoba, 3534 (ii).
Regina Jail, Additional Land, 5135 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 3534 (ii).

Pensions:

To Lady Lafontaine, 14252 (vi).

Post Office:

Mail Service, 6065 (iii).
Outside Service, Salaries, &c., 5924, 6004 (iii), 14010 (vi).
Salaries, &c., 6136 (iii).
Salaries of fourth-class Clerks, &c., Increase, 14002 (vi).
Salaries of P. O. Inspectors, &c., Increase, 14001 (vi).
Temporaries in various cities, Appointment as fourth-class Clerks, 14001 (vi).
To pay Arrears Postmasters' Salaries, 5921 (iii).
To provide for Appointment of Additional Mail Clerks, 14041 (vi).
To provide for Promotions in City Offices, 14009 (vi).
Transfer of Temporaries to Permanent Staff, 13994 (vi).
Vancouver Division, Asst. P. O. Inspector 14000 (vi).
Winnipeg, Additional senior second-class clerkship, 14001 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Capital:

Buildings:
Ottawa:
Astronomical Observatory, 342 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Addition, &c., 13006 (vi).
Royal Mint, 344 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 353 (i), 14243 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers:
Kingston Graving Dock, 13023 (vi).
Port Arthur, Dredging, 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 3368 (ii), 13024 (vi).
Quebec, Harbour Improvements, 3336 (ii).
River Kaministiquia, 5825 (iii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, 3354 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 3218, 3304 (ii).
St. Mary's Current, Montreal Harbour, &c., 3365 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, Quesnel-Atlin, &c., 5826 (iii).
Trails, Roads and Bridges:
Yukon:
To pay Trading and Exploring Co., Ltd., 5826 (iii).

Public Works—Collection of Revenue:

Esquimalt Graving Dock, Special Constables, 5919 (iii).
Slides and Booms, 2974 (ii).
Gatineau River, 2977 (ii).
Repairs and Working Expenses, 2978 (ii).
Upper Ottawa Improvement Co., 2974 (ii).
Telegraph Lines:
B. C., 2992 (ii).
Working Expenses, 13368 (vi).
Lower St. Lawrence, 2989 (ii).
N.W.T., 2991 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland, 2988 (ii).
SS. *Tyrian*, &c., 5007 (ii).
Yukon Territory:
Ashcroft-Dawson, &c., 2992 (ii).
Working Expenses, 14041 (vi).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:
British Columbia:
Nelson Public Building, 13131 (vi).
Rossland Armoury, 13133 (vi).
Public Building, 13131 (vi).
Vancouver, Public Building, 13132 (vi).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 965 (i).
Experimental Farms, New Buildings, 972 (i).
General Vote, 961 (i).
Immigrant Buildings, 14247 (vi).
Salaries to Resident Clerks of Works, &c., 963 (i).
Manitoba:
Winnipeg, Immigration Buildings, &c., 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
Military Buildings, N.C.O.'s Quarters, 13127 (vi).
Military Building, Magazine, 13127 (vi).
Military Stores Buildings, 13126 (vi).
Public Building, Addition, 13127 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Dominion Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 421 (i).
New Brunswick:
Buildings, Generally, 421 (i).
Campbellton, Public Buildings, 13037 (vi).
Fredericton Military Building, New Officers' Stables, 13041 (vi).
Sergeant Major's Quarters, 13041 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income :—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick—*Con.*
Marysville, Public Building, 5841 (iii).
Moncton, Public Building, 13038 (vi).
Newcastle, Public Building, 13038 (vi).
Richibucto, Public Building, 412 (i).
St. John, Drill Hall, 13042 (vi).
Immigration Building, 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
Quarantine Station, Water Service, 414, 486 (i), 13041 (vi).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Improvements, &c., 13038 (vi).
Woodstock, Armoury and Gun Shed, 13039 (vi).
Public Building, 13041 (vi).
North West Territories :
Court Houses, Police Accommodation, &c., 958 (i).
Edmonton Jail, 13129 (vi).
General Repairs, 958 (i).
Macleod Court House, 959 (i).
Moosejaw, Public Building, 13130 (vi).
Prince Albert Court House, &c., 13129 (vi).
Red Deer, Court House, &c., 960 (i).
Strathcona Horse Barracks, 13130 (vi).
Yorkton, Court House, &c., 961 (i).
Nova Scotia :
Antigonish, P. O. Fittings, 13034 (vi).
Arichat, Public Building, 5827 (iii).
Digby, Public Building, 13034 (vi).
Guysborough, Public Building, 5839 (iii).
Halifax, Immigration Building, Addition, 13033 (vi).
Public Building, 411 (i), 13031 (vi).
Quarantine Station, Lawlor's Island, 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
Middleton, Armoury, 5841 (iii).
North Sydney, Public Building, &c., 13035 (vi).
Springhill, Public Building, 14247 (vi).
Sydney, Public Building, Addition, 13035 (vi).
Sydney Mines, Public Building, 13028 (vi).
Ontario :
Alexandria, Public Building, 487 (i).
Belleville, Armoury, 13082 (vi).
Bowmanville, Public Building, 507 (i).
Brantford, Drill Hall, 13108 (vi).
Bridgeburg, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
Clinton, Public Building, 518 (i).
Cobourg, Armoury, 540 (i).
Improvements, 13118 (vi),
Deseronto, Public Building, 5842 (iii), 13112 (vi).
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 636 (i).
Fort William, Public Building, 636 (i).
Guelph, Armoury, 13083 (vi.)
Public Building, 637 (i).
Hamilton, Public Building, Alterations, 13113 (vi).
Hawkesbury, Public Building, 13119 (vi).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 638 (i), 5842 (iii).
R. C. F. A. Barracks, 13118 (vi).
Royal Military College, Drill Hall, 13094 (vi.)
R. M. C. Stable, 13117 (vi).
London, Drill Hall, &c , 641 (i).
Military Buildings, Magazine, 13115 (vi).
Oshawa, Public Buildings, 13110 (vi).
Ottawa, Bacteriological Laboratory, 5842 (iii).
Electric Lighting, &c., 5842 (iii).
New Coal Sheds, 13115 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income :—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Ottawa—*Con.*
New Elevator for West Block, 13115 (vi),
Paving in front of Parliament Buildings, 13119 (vi).
P. O. and Customs House, 5844 (iii), 13117 (vi).
Rideau Hall, Drains, 647 (i).
Rideau Hall and Grounds, Repairs, &c., 13087 (vi).
Steel Drawers, &c., 13087 (vi).
Western Block, Heating Apparatus, &c., 13087 (vi).
Peterborough, Armoury, 13083 (vi).
Picton, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
St. Catherines, Drill Hall, 13106 (vi).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 13109 (vi).
Sarnia, Public Building, 13117 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Public Building, 13107 (vi.)
Stratford Armoury, 13125 (vi).
Toronto, Asst. Receiver-General's Office, Vault, 5842 (iii).
Custom House, 547 (i).
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 650, 956 (i).
Drill Hall, Addition for new Corps, 13086 (vi).
Drill Hall, Paving Armoury Street, &c., 13115 (vi).
Examining Warehouse, Addition, 13118 (vi).
Military Buildings, Magazine, 13115 (vi).
Engineer Company's Building, 13086 (vi).
Post Office, 956, (i), 5842 (iii).
P. O., Additional, 13112 (vi).
P. O., Additional Story, &c., 13096 (vi).
P. O., Station "C", 5920 (iii).
Toronto Junction, Public Building, 650 (i).
Windsor, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
Wingham, Public Building, 13120 (vi).
Woodstock, Armoury, 13125 (vi).
Public Building, 13108 (vi).
Prince Edward Island :
Charlottetown, Armoury, &c., 13035 (vi).
Dom. Building, Improvements, &c., 13036 (vi).
Quebec :
Actonvale, Public Building, 13059 (vi).
Dom. Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 422 (i).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 425 (i).
L'Assomption, Public Building, 427 (i).
Levis, Public Building, 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
Longueuil, Public Building, 13069 (vi).
Magog, Public Building, 13081 (vi).
Montmagny, Public Building, 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
Montreal, Barracks for Permanent Corps, 13076 (vi).
Examining Warehouse, Repairs, &c., 438 (i), 13058 (vi).
New Postal Station, 13080 (vi).
Post-office Improvements, 13067 (vi).
Public Building, 436 (i).
Quebec, Citadel, Drill Shed, &c., 13053 (vi)
Drill Hall, 13077 (vi).
Hospital for Trachoma, 14245 (vi).
Iron Foundry, 14247 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Public Stores, 13053 (vi).
Military Buildings, Dom. Arsenal, &c., 13054 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works:—*Income*—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall, 13067 (vi).
Public Building, 439 (i).
St. John's, Examining Warehouse, 13069 (vi).
Public Building, 13059 (vi).
St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building, 13080 (vi).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, 13079 (vi).
Terrebonne, Public Building, 13059 (vi).
Thetford Mines, Public Buildings, 441 (i).
Three Rivers, Custom House, New Heating Apparatus, 13069 (vi).
Retaining Wall, 13080 (vi).
Valleyfield, Public Building, 443 (i).
Rents, repairs, &c.:
Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c., Salaries, 1016 (i).
Electric Power, 1067 (i).
Heating, &c., 1065 (i).
Lighting, 1067 (i).
Rents, 989 (i), 13133 (vi).
Water, 1067 (i).
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings, Rents, &c., 973, 989 (i).
Elevators, Attendance, 1011 (i).
Fuel, Light, &c., 1005 (i).
Furniture, 1006 (i), 5007 (ii).
Grounds, 1015 (i).
Heating, Engineers' Salaries, &c., 1008 (i).
Lighting, &c., 1012 (i), 5845 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, 1015 (i).
Rideau Hall, Maintenance, &c., 993 (i), 5006 (ii).
Telephones, &c., 1013 (i).
Yukon:
White Horse, Public Building, &c., 13133 (vi).
Dredging:
British Columbia:
To replace Snag Boats, *Samson* and *Mudlark*, 13311 (vi).
Tug and Hopper Scows, 13318 (vi).
Manitoba:
New Tug, 13311 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Additional Amount for Dredging, 13309 (vi)
Hydraulic Dredge, 13312 (vi).
New Plant:
Generally, 2673 (ii).
Manitoba, 2672 (ii).
Mar. Provinces, 2665 (ii).
Ont. and Quebec, 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).
Ont. and Quebec, 2674 (ii).
P.E.I., New Dredge, 13313 (vi).
Repairs, Generally, 2612 (ii).
Manitoba, 2665 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Anderson and Kennedy's Lake, Clearing Outlets, 1451 (i).
Columbia River above Golden, Pile Driver, 13304 (vi).
Above Golden, Opening Channel, 13304 (vi).
Above Revelstoke, 1451 (i).
Arrow Lakes, Dredging Machinery, 13305 (vi).
Arrow Lakes Improvements, 13304 (vi).
Fraser River Improvements, 13305 (vi).
Hardy Bay Wharf, 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
Quatsino City Wharf, 13305 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
British Columbia—*Con.*
Victoria Harbour, Removal of Rock, 13306 (vi).
William's Head Quarantine Station, Wharf, 13306 (vi).
Generally:
General Vote, 13308 (vi).
Manitoba:
General Repairs, 1448 (i).
Gull Harbour, 1448 (i).
Hnausa, Wharf Extension, 1448 (i).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering, &c., 1448 (i).
Lake Francis, Outlet, 1449 (i).
Lake Manitoba, Outlet *via* Fairford River, 1449 (i).
Selkirk, Wharf Extension, 1450 (i).
White Mud River, Dredging, 1450 (i).
Winnipeg Lake, Gimli Wharf, 1450 (i).
Mar. Provinces:
General Repairs, &c., 1185 (i).
New Brunswick:
Anderson's Hollow, 1163 (i).
Bay du Vin, Wharf, 1164 (i).
Black Brook, Additional Wharf, 13227 (vi).
Campbellton, Wharf, &c., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).
Campobello, Breakwater, 13228 (vi).
Cape Tormentine, Improvements, 13228 (vi).
Caraquet, Wharf, 1173 (i).
Chatham, Slip, &c., 13231 (vi).
Cocagne Wharf, Compensation *re* Schr. *Morning Star*, 13231 (vi).
Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, 13233 (vi).
Dipper Harbour, Breakwater, 13233 (vi).
Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater, 1177 (i).
Hopewell Cape Wharf, Repairs, &c., 13233 (vi).
Lord's Cove Wharf, 1177 (i).
Miscou Harbour, Wharf, 13234 (vi).
North Head, Grand Manan, Breakwater, 13234 (vi).
Petit Rocher, Breakwater, 13234 (vi).
Point du Chene, Breakwater, Repairs, 13235 (vi).
Richibucto, North Piers, &c., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
River St. John, 1177 (i).
Oromocto Wharf, 1181 (i).
Wharfs on Tidal Waters, &c., 1178 (i), 5895 (iii).
St. Andrews, Wharf Repairs, 5894 (iii).
St. John Harbour, Negro Point Breakwater, 1181 (i).
Protection of Fort Dufferin, 1183 (i).
Shippegan Harbour, Protection Works, 1183 (i).
Upper Salmon River, Alma Pier, 1184 (i).
North-west Territories:
General Repairs, 1450 (i).
Nova Scotia:
Abbott's Harbour, Addition to Beach Protection, 13141 (vi).
Abram's River, Wharf, 13141 (vi).
Amagandus, Wharf, 1068 (i).
Bailey's Brook, 1072 (i).
Baxter's Harbour, Reconstruction of Breakwater, 13143 (vi).
Bayfield Harbour Works, Repairs and Improvements, 13141 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Nova Scotia—*Con.*

Benoit Cove, Improvement to Boat Landing, 13143 (vi).
Big Harbour (Port Bevis), Wharf, 13143 (vi).
Big Pond, Wharf, 1071 (i).
Breton Cove, Boat Landing, 13151 (vi).
Bridgewater Dredging, 1074 (i).
Caribou Island, Causeway, 13179 (vi).
Chegoggin Pier, Training Dam, 13179 (vi).
Cheticamp Point, Wharf, 13179 (vi).
Cheverie, Breakwater Extension, 1078 (i).
Church Point, Breakwater, Repairs, 1078 (i).
Cow Bay Breakwater, 1078 (i), 13178 (vi).
Digby, Pier Renewals, 1083 (i).
Donald's Head, Breakwater Repairs, 13179 (vi).
Drumhead, Breakwater, 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
Duncan's Cove, Wharf, 13179 (vi).
East Bay, Wharf, 13180 (vi).
East Berlin, Breakwater, 13180 (vi).
East End, Cape Sable Island, Boat Harbour, 13180 (vi).
East Jeddore, 13179 (vi).
Economy, Wharf Extension, 1087 (i).
Finlay Point, Wharf, 13181 (vi).
Five Islands Wharf, Repairs, 13180 (vi).
Fort Lawrence, Landing Pier, 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
Freeport, Landing Pier, 13182 (vi).
Friar's Head, Boat Harbour, 1087 (i).
Frude's Point, Wharf, 13180 (vi).
Gabarus, Breakwater Extension, &c., 13182 (vi).
Georgeville Wharf, 13198 (vi).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements, 1087 (i).
Wharf, 13184 (vi).
Grand Etang, Bridge Works, 1095 (i).
Grand Narrows, Wharf Repairs, 1094 (i), 13198 (vi).
Grand River, Entrance, 1094 (i).
Granite Village, Mooring Pier, 13182 (vi).
Green Cove, Boat Harbour, 1100 (i).
Hall's Harbour Improvement, 13198 (vi).
Hawke Point Inlet, Boat Channel, 1102 (i).
Herring Cove, Breakwater, 1102 (i).
Indian Harbour Wharf, 13199 (vi).
Inverness, Harbour Works, 13199 (vi).
Ioma, Wharf, 13200 (vi).
Janvrin's Island, Wharf, 1102 (i).
Judique, Breakwater Repairs, 1103 (i).
Ketch Harbour, Entrance, 13202 (vi).
Kingsport, Pier Reconstruction, 1103 (i), 13202 (vi).
L'Ardoise, Breakwater, 13201 (vi).
Larry's River, Breakwater, 1104 (i).
Lingan, Beach Protection, 1105 (i).
Livingston's Cove, Breakwater, 13200 (vi).
Lunenburg, Dredging, 1106 (i).
McKay's Point, Wharf, 13201 (vi).
McNutt's Island, Beach Protection, 13201 (vi).
Main-a-Dieu, Breakwater, 13201 (vi).
Malagawatch, Boat Channel, 13203 (vi).
Malignant Cove, Harbour, 13201 (vi).
Margaree, Improvements, 1133 (i).
Margaretville, Breakwater, 13202 (vi).
Melbourne, Wharf, 13203 (vi).
Meteghan Cove, Breakwater, 1133 (i).
Middle River, Pier Dam, 13202 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Nova Scotia—*Con.*

Musquodoboit Harbour, Wharf, 13203 (vi).
Necum Teuch, Wharf, 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
Neil's Harbour, Breakwater, 1139 (i).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf, 1142 (i).
New Harbour, Breakwater Repairs, 1143 (i).
Noel, Wharf, 13204 (vi).
North Gut, St. Ann's Wharf, 13203 (vi).
North River, St. Ann's, 13203 (vi).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection, 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
Oyster Pond, Beach Protection, 13204 (vi).
Parrsboro, Landing Pier, 13205 (vi).
Pembroke, Breakwater, 13205 (vi).
Petit de Grat, Protection Work, &c., 1146 (i).
Pickett's Pier, 13205 (vi).
Pictou Light Beach, Protection Works, 13205 (vi).
Pleasant Bay, 13205 (vi).
Poirierville, Wharf, 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
Porter's Lake Channel, 13205 (vi).
Port George Breakwater, 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
Port Greville, Breakwater, 13210 (vi).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 1146 (i).
Port Hawkesbury, Wharf, 1146 (i).
Port Hood, Harbour, 13206 (vi).
Pier Repairs, 13206 (vi).
Port Howe, Wharf, 13210 (vi).
Port Latour, Breakwater, 13210 (vi).
Port Maitland, Breakwater, &c., 13211 (vi).
Port au Pique, Wharf, 13210 (vi).
Sandy Cove, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Scott's Bay, Breakwater, 13211 (vi).
Short Beach, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Skinner's Cove, Channel, &c., 13213 (vi).
South Ingonish, Wharf, 1149 (i).
Spry Bay, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Summerville, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Sydney, Quarantine Station, 13213 (vi).
Tenecape, Breakwater, 13213 (vi).
Three Fathom Harbour, Beach Protection Works, 1149 (i).
Tiverton, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Victoria Beach, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Wallace Harbour, 13216 (vi).
Washabuck Centre, Wharf, 1150 (i).
Wedge Point, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
Wentworth, Wharf, 13216 (vi).
West Arichat, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
West Baccaro, Harbour Improvements, 1150 (i).
West Bay, Wharf, 13217 (vi).
West Chezzetcook, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
White's Cove, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
Windsor Harbour, Sheer Dam, &c., 14248 (vi).
Wolfville, Wharf, 13217 (vi).
Yarmouth Bar, Repairs, &c., 13218 (vi).

Ontario:

Amherstburg, Dredging, 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
Barrie, Wharf Construction, 1186 (i).
Barry's Bay, Wharf, 13236 (vi).
Bayfield, Extension of South Pier, 1188 (i).
Belle Rivière, Sheet Piling, 1191 (i).
Bowmanville, Breakwater Repairs, 1352 (i).
Bracebridge, Wharf, 13236 (vi).
Bronte Harbour, Improvements, 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
Bruce Mines, Dredging, 5911 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Ontario—*Con.*

Burke's Falls, Magnetawan River, 1358 (i).
Burlington Channel, Repairs to Piers, &c., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
Cobourg, Completion of Repairs, 5909 (iii).
Collingwood, Harbour Improvements, 13239 (vi).
Cumberland, Wharf, 13238 (vi).
Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
Georgian Bay, Point au Baril Route, 1365 (i).
Goderich, Harbour, 1365 (i), 13240 (vi).
Gore's Landing, Wharf, 13244 (vi).
Grand Bend, Pier, &c., 13239 (vi).
Hawkesbury, Dredging, 5909 (iii).
Improvements, Repairs, &c., 1369 (i).
Kingsville, Breakwater, 13244 (vi).
Lake Temiscamingue, Wharfs, 1376 (i).
Leamington, Wharf, 13246 (vi).
Little Bear Creek, Dredging, 13245 (vi).
Little Current, Channel, 13245 (vi).
Midland Harbour, Dredging, 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
Oakville Pier, Repairs, 1376 (i).
Orillia, New Wharf, 1377 (i).
Owen Sound Harbour, Dredging, &c., 1377 (i).
Parry Sound, Wharf, 13248 (vi).
Pembroke, 13248 (vi).
Petawawa Narrows, Ottawa River, 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
Pickering Harbour, Dredging and Repairs, 1377 (i).
Point Edward, Dredging, 13249 (vi).
Port Arthur, Breakwater, 13249 (vi).
Port Burwell, Harbour, 13249 (vi).
Port Elgin, Dredging, &c., 1424 (i).
Port Hope, Pier Repairs, &c., 1425 (i).
Port Perry, Harbour, 13249 (vi).
Port Stanley, Dredging, 13249 (vi).
Prescott, Dredging, 5915 (iii).
Rivière de Puces, Pile Work, 1425 (i).
River St. Lawrence, Wolfe Island Channel, 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
Rondeau, Harbour, 1427 (i).
Rosedale, Wharf, 13249 (vi).
St. Joseph, Wharf, 3382 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour, &c., 13252 (vi.)
Southampton, Harbour Improvements, 1428 (i).
Sturgeon Falls, Wharf, 1431 (i).
Sydenham River, Improvements, &c., 13250 (vi).
Thessalon, Breakwater, 13254 (vi).
Thornbury Harbour Works, 1432 (i).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
Magann & Phin's Claims, 13255 (vi).
Trenton, Dredging, 1434 (i).
Victoria Harbour, Dredging, 13255 (vi).
Washago Works, Repairs, 13252 (vi).
Wendover, Wharf, 1434 (i).
Wiarton Wharf, 13256 (vi).

Prince Edward Island:

Beach Point, Widening boat Channel, 13218 (vi)
Belfast Pier, Dredging, 1153 (i)
Canoe Cove Breakwater, Repairs, &c., 13218 (vi).
Cape Traverse, Carleton Head, Survey, 13218 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Prince Edward Island—*Con.*

Cascumpec Harbour, Closing Breach, 1153 (i).
Cove Head Harbour, Entrance Channel, 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).
Creosoted Timber for Piers, &c., 1155 (i).
Gaspereaux, Fisherman's Harbour, 155 (i).
Higgin's Shore Pier, Reconstruction, 1159 (i), 13222 (vi)
Lewis Point Pier, Repairs, 13223 (vi).
Lower Montague, 1159 (i).
New London, Breakwater, Repairs, 1160
Improvement to Clifton and French Rivers, 13223 (vi).
North Cardigan Pier, Extension, 13223 (vi).
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 13223 (vi).
Repairs to Piers, &c., 1160 (i).
Richmond Bay, Reconstruction of Wharf near Grand River, 13223 (vi).
Souris, Knight's Point. Breakwater, 1162 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 13223 (vi).
Tignish Harbour, Breakwater, 1162 (i).

Quebec:

Anse aux Gascons, Wharf Extension, 13345 (vi).
Anse aux Gris Fonds River, Improvements 13445 (vi).
Anse St. Jean, Wharf Extension, 13445 (vi).
Barachois de Malbaie, Breakwater, 13445 (vi).
Bois Brulé Training Pier, &c., 13448 (vi).
Bonaventure East, Breakwater, 13446 (vi).
Cacouna, Wharf Extension, 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
Caplan, Breakwater, 13448 (vi).
Chambord, Wharf, 13454 (vi).
Chateau Richer, Harbour Improvements, 13454 (vi).
Crane Island, Repairs to Wharf, 1513 (i).
Cross Point, Isolated Landing Pier, 1512 (i).
Deschambault, Wharf, 13457 (vi).
Desjardins, Allumette Wharf, 13457 (vi).
Doucet's Landing, Dredging, 5907 (iii).
Douglastown, Isolated Block 13457 (vi).
Father Point, Landing Pier, 1513 (i).
Gatineau River, C.P.R. Bridge Protection 13457 (vi).
General Repairs, 5907 (iii), 2241 (i).
Grande Rivière Wharf, New Covering, 13457 (vi).
Grand Valley Pier, 1514 (i).
Hull, Wharf, 5900 (iii).
Isle aux Coudres, Wharf, 2242 (i).
Isle Grosbois, Dredging Channel, 5902 (iii).
Kamouraska, Pier Extension, 13457 (vi).
Lake Nominingue, Wharf, 13460 (vi).
Lake St. John, Wharf, Dredging, 2243 (i), 13459 (vi).
Lake Temiscamingue, Improvements, 2246 (i), 14248 (vi).
Laprairie Ice Piers, &c., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
Le Tableau, Wharf, 2249 (i).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Rocks, 2257 (i).
Lotbinière, Wharf Improvements, 13460 (vi).
Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 2257 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, 2264 (i).
Maguasha, Landing Pier, 13461 (vi).
Maria, Pier, 2265 (i).
Mistook (Delisle), Wharf, 13461 (vi).
Mont Louis, Wharf, 13461 (vi).
Murray Bay, Wharf, 2266 (i).
Newport Breakwater Extension, 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
New Richmond, Breakwater, 13463 (vi).
Nicolet River, Dredging, 2278 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 13463 (vi).
Paspebiac, Landing Pier, 13464 (vi).
Perce, Extension Pier, North Cove, 13467 (vi).
Pierreville, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Pointe aux Esquimaux, Wharf, 2278 (i).
Pointe aux Trembles, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Pointe Fortune, Wharf Improvements, 13468 (vi).
Point St. Pierre, Breakwater, 2278 (i).
Port Daniel, Extension Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Repentigny, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Rimouski, Pier Extension, Tidal Basin, 13468 (vi).
River Batiscan, Channel, 2280 (i).
River Chateauguay, Dredging, 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
River Fox, Breakwater, 2279 (i).
Rivière Jesus, Dredging, 13470 (vi).
Rivière du Loup, Wharf, 2281 (i).
Harbour Improvements, 13476 (vi).
Rivière Ouelle, Pier Repairs, 13470 (vi).
River St. Francis, Ice Piers, 2282 (i).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 13473 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Dredging Eastern Entrance, 2286 (i), 5904 (iii), 13469 (vi).
Grand Piles and La Tuque, 2285 (i), 13491 (vi).
River Saguenay, Dredging, 13472 (vi).
River Touladie, Improvements, 2286 (i).
St. Alexis, Ha Ha Bay, Pier, 2289 (i).
St. Alphonse, Baie de Ha Ha, Wharf, 13489 (vi).
St. André Kamouraska, Pier Extension, 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
St. Andrew's Landing, Dredging, 5907 (iii)
Ste. Anne de la Perade, Bank Protection, 13488 (vi).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Pier Reconstruction, 13489 (vi).
Ste. Anne du Saguenay, Wharf Improvements, 13488 (vi).
Ste. Anne de Sorel, Ice Piers, 13489 (vi).
Sainte Famille, Pier Extension, 13488 (vi).
St. Fidèle, Wharf, 13493 (vi).
St. Francis Pier, Orleans Island, 2290 (i).
St. Fulgence, Wharf, 13491 (vi).
St. Gédéon Islands, Wharf, 13491 (vi).
St. Godefroi de Nouvelle, Breakwater, 13489 (vi).
St. Irene, Wharf, &c., 2291 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf, 13494 (vi).
St. Jerome, Wharf, 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
St. Laurent, Wharf, 5906 (iii).
St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier Repairs, 13494 (vi).
St. Nicholas, Strengthening Pier, 5905 (iii).
St. Simon, Wharf Extension, 13493 (vi).
Sabrevois, Wharf Improvements, 13485 (vi).
Sacré Cœur, Wharf, 13476 (vi).
Seven Islands, Wharf, 13479 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Shegawake, Harbour Improvements, 13479 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845, 12869 (vi).
Three Rivers, Harbour, Wharfs, 2296 (i).
Valleyfield, Dredging Channel in Bay, 2298 (i), 5905 (iii).
Ville Marie, Wharf, 14248 (vi).
Yamaska Lock Dredging, 13498 (vi).
Yukon :
Lewes and Yukon Rivers, Improvements, 13306 (vi).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments *re*, 13339 (vi).
Chief Architect's Office, Salaries, 2747 (ii).
Chief Engineer's Office, Salaries, &c., 2726 (ii), 13340 (vi).
Insufficient Appropriations, 2925 (ii).
National Art Gallery, 2725 (ii).
Surveys and Inspections, 2715, 2720 (ii).
Surveys, Ottawa River Headwaters, 13340 (vi).
Temporary and Clerical Assistance, 2753 (ii).
Transportation Commission, 13362 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Port Colborne, 13024 (vi).
Roads and Bridges :
Bryson Bridge, 13 21 (vi).
Edmonton Bridge, 13323 (vi).
Generally, 2701 (ii).
Hull Slides and Union Bridge, 13321 (vi).
North Shore, Telegraph Line, 13322 (vi).
Ottawa City, Dufferin and Sappers Bridges, 13321 (vi).
Ottawa City and Vicinity, 2700 (ii).
Peace River to Pelly River, Pack Trail, 13323 (vi).
Portage du Fort, Bridge, 2690 (ii).
Slides and Booms :
Generally, 2690 (ii).
St. Maurice River, 2677 (ii).
Telegraph Lines :
B.C., Alberni—Clayoquot, 5918 (iii).
Kamloops—Nicola, Poles, &c., 13337 (vi).
Vancouver Island—Salt Springs Extension, 13837 (vi).
Mar. Provs. :
Cable Lines, 2701 (ii).
Chatham to Tracadie, 13325 (vi).
Deer Island—Eastport, Me., 13325 (vi).
N.W.T. :
Alexander Indian Agency, Telephone Line, 5918 (iii).
Edmonton — Athabasca Landing, 13335 (vi).
Edmonton to Edmonton Indian Agency, 13334 (vi).
Victoria to Andrews, 13335 (vi).
Wood Mountain Post—Willow Bunch, 13335 (vi).
Quebec, Anticosti, Fox Bay—Bescie River, 13325 (vi).
Belle Isle and Mainland, 2712 (ii).
Bersimis to Godbout, 13332 (vi).
Bryon Island and Anticosti, 5917 (iii).
Chateau Bay—Belle Isle, Marconi, 13325 (vi).
Chicoutimi, Ste. Anne to Lac Clair, 13333 (vi).
Godbout, 2711 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Telegraph Lines—*Con.*

N.W.T—*Con.*

Island of Orleans, &c., Ste. Famille, 13330 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Land Lines, 2714 (ii).
Murray Bay to St. Catharines Bay, Second Wire, 13326 (vi).
Petite Rivière, St. Agnes, 13334 (vi).
Ste. Anne du Saguenay—Descente des Femmes, 13331 (vi).

Quarantine :

Cattle Quarantine and Veterinary Division, 5502 (iii).
Public Health, &c., 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii).
Public Works Health Act, 4440 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 4439 (ii).

Railways and Canals :

Canals :

Chambly, Electric Station By-wash, 12906 (vi).
Land Damages, 12908 (vi).
Macadamizing Tow Path, 12906, 14151 (vi).
Cornwall, Electric Plant for Lock Gates, 14134 (vi).
Compensation for Geo. Heath, 14155 (vi).
Enlargement, 12895 (vi).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Plant, 14155 (vi).
Enlargement, 7565 (iii), 12898, 14150 (vi).
Galops, Enlargement, 7803, 8268 (iv), 12899, 14141, 14644 (vi)
Generally, Operating Expenses, &c., 12920, 14157 (vi).
Salaries, Contingencies, Collectors' Offices, 12933 (vi).
Sunday Service, 12929 (vi).
Grenville, 12909 (vi).
To pay Henry Tucker *re* Investigation, 14156 (vi).
Lachine, Electrical Appliances, 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).
Enlargement, &c., 12903 (vi).
Gratuity to Family of late F. Guilbault, 14157 (vi).
Lock Gate Protection, 14142 (vi).
Paving Mill St., 14153 (vi).
Renewing Masonry of Lock No. 2, 12906 (vi).
Lake St. Francis, Protection to South Side, 14152 (vi).
Lake St. Louis, 12904 (vi).
Murray, To purchase W. H. Johnson's House, 14143 (vi).
Wire Fencing, 14150 (vi).
North Channel, Dam, &c., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14142 (vi).
St. Ours Lock, 12908 (vi).
Landing Wharfs, 12908, 14154 (vi).
Rapide Plat, 12898 (vi).
Rideau, Brasses' Point Bridge, 7808 (iv).
Concession St., Ottawa, Bridge, 14150 (vi).
Hog's Back, Swing Bridge, 12904 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction, &c., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
St. Lawrence Canals, Surveys, Lifting Boulders, &c., 12900 (vi).
Soulanges, Construction, &c., 7549 (iii).
To pay Geo. Goodwin *re* Contract, 14142 (vi).
To pay J. and M. O'Leary *re* Claim, 14651 (vi).
To repair Breach in Bank, 14153 (vi).
Trent, Construction, 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Railways and Canals—Con.

Canals—*Con.*

Trent—*Con.*

Peterborough, &c., Entrance Piers, 14645 (vi).
Repairs and Dredging, 14645 (vi).
To pay Corry and Laverdure *re* Claim, 14651 (vi).
Welland, Deepening Long Level, 14148 (vi).
Dunnville Dam, &c., 7809 (iv).
Electric Light Plant, 12900, 14148 (vi).
Foundations for Elevator, Port Colborne, 14149 (vi).
Improvements at Port Colborne Entrance, 12902 (vi).
Improving Drainage along Feeder, 12905 (vi).
Land Damages, Grand River, 7805 (iv).
Lock Valves, &c., 12905 (vi).
Lowering Mitre Sills, &c., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
Removing Obstructions, 7804 (iv), 12902 (vi).
Rock Cut, Port Colborne to Humberstone, 14148 (vi).
Stone Protection to Banks of old Canal, 12904 (vi).
Summit Level Deepening, Port Colborne to Thorold, 12903 (vi).
Surveying Lands, &c., 12905 (vi).
Williamsburg, Gate Lifter, 14149 (vi).
Overseer's House, 14150 (vi).
Working Scow, 14154 (vi).

Miscellaneous :

Investigations into Ry. Accidents, 14154 (vi).
Litigation, 12911 (vi).
Ry. Commission, Salaries, &c., 14155 (vi.)
Salaries of Engineers, Draftsmen, &c., 12910 (vi).
Works not provided for, 12910 (vi).

Railways :

C.P.R., Canada Central and Brockville & Ottawa Rys., Amalgamation, 14133 (vi).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Surveys, &c., 14646 (vi).
Grand Trunk Ry., Rental, 12887 (vi).
Intercolonial Ry. :
Additional Sidings, Facilities, &c., 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi).
Air Brakes on Freight Cars, 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).
Passenger Cars, &c., 8311 (iv).
Amqui, Increased Accommodation, 12601 (v).
Anchor S.S. Line, Salvage *re* "Scotia," 14107 (vi).
Chaudière Jn., Engine House, 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).
Double Tracking, 14062 (vi).
Drawbars of Freight Cars, 7520 (iii), 8288 (iv).
Eastern Extension Ry. of N.B., Award, 7528 (iii).
Arbitrators' Fees, &c., 7529 (iii).
Eel River Station, Agent's Dwelling, 12600 (v).
Ferry Service, Strait of Canso, 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).
General Vote, 12873 (vi).
Grand Narrows Bridge, Protection, 14094 (vi).
Gratuity to Mrs. W. P. Brown, 14155 (vi).
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, 12597 (v), 12824, 14080 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—Con.
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Railway—*Con.*
Halifax, Dredging at Deep Water Terminus, 14646 (vi).
Lévis, Accommodation, 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
Little Metis Station, Improvements, &c., 12604 (v), 12827 (vi).
Metapedia, New Station, Improvements, &c., 14096 (vi).
Miramichi Bridge, South-west, 8307 (iv).
Moncton, Extension of Freight Car Shop, 8312 (iv).
Increased Accommodation, 12599 (v), 14090 (vi).
New Glasgow, Extension of Freight Shed, &c., 14095 (vi).
New Machinery for Shops, 8290 (iv), 14106 (vi).
North Sydney, Improvements, 14089 (vi).
Operating Expenses, 7811 (iv).
Original Construction, 3698 (ii).
Passenger Cars, Vestibules, 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
Pintch Gas Apparatus, 8291 (iv).
Point Tupper, Improvements, 8309 (iv).
Power Saw, for Sawing Rails, 12607 (v).
Restigouche Bridge, New Superstructure, 8303 (iv).
River du Loup, Shops, &c., 8314 (iv), 12593 (v).
Yard, 8309 (iv).
River Ouelle Branch, 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
Rolling Stock, 8292 (iv), 14109 (vi).
Ste. Flavie, Increased Accommodation, 12602 (v).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
Steel Rails, 5005 (ii), 14097 (vi).
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation, 8296 (iv).
Strengthening Bridges, 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).
Sydney, Accommodation, 3696 (ii), 12597 (v).
To pay M. Connolly Interest *re* Dredging, 14103 (vi).
Truro, Increased Accommodation, 12603 (v), 12823 (vi).
Windsor, New Station, &c., 14097 (vi).
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Albany, Station and Land, 14133 (vi).
Alberton, New Station, 14132 (vi).
Blue Shank, To straighten Line, 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, 14131 (vi).
General Vote, 12608 (v), 12891 (vi).
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, 12840 (vi).
Kinkora, Increased Accomodation, 12841 (vi).
Montague Bridge, Survey, &c., 14132 (vi).
Mount Stewart, Freight House, 7530 (iii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
Northam and Richmond, New Stations, 12841 (vi).
Steel Rails, &c., 7802 (iii).
Summerside, Wharf and Coal Sheds, 12828 (vi).
Water Service, 12841 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Scientific Institutions:
General Vote, 4118 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 4119 (ii), 13648 (vi).
Gratuity to Capt. R. M. MacGregor, 6993 (iii).
Time Ball at Halifax, 6993 (iii).
Superannuation:
To ex-lockmaster W. J. Casselman, 14272 (vi).
Trade and Commerce:
Chinese Immigration Act, 7759 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, 7760 (iv).
International Customs Tariffs Bureau, 7760 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, 7762 (iv).
Law Costs, 7795 (iv).
Unprovided Items:
Generally, 6992 (iii).
CONCURRENCE:
Fisheries, Salaries, &c., 6069 (iii).
Galops Rapid, 8374 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Quebec, 6070 (iii).
Grand Vallee, Pier, 6070 (iii).
Post Office, Additional Amount for Outside Service, 14764 (vi).

Supreme and Exchequer Court Act (jurisdiction) Amt. B. No. 22 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*), 1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).

Supreme and Exchequer Court Act: *See* 'Judges Retiring', &c.

SUPREME COURT CONTINGENCIES, DISBURSEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).
—— LIBRARY, PURCHASE OF BOOKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3402, 3405 (ii).
—— N. W. TERS., ADDITIONAL JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
—— REGISTRAR: *See* 'Registrar'.
—— REPORTER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).
—— REPORTS, BINDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3405 (ii).
—— SALARY OF MR. E. R. A. TASCHEREAU: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).

Surtax, German, &c.: *See* 'Curtoms Tariff Act'.
—— *See* 'Customs Act', 'Customs Tariff', &c.

SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720 (ii), 13784 (vi).
SURVEYS FOR G.T.P.RY. in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi). *See* 'G.T.P.Ry',
SURVEYS, INSTRUMENTS, PURCHASE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
—— CONSTRUCTION, &c., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 8331 (iv).
—— BRIGADE CAMP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 3235 (ii).
—— ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4672 (ii).
—— STATION GROUNDS, I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*), in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
SWIM'S POINT, N. S.: WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 2312 (i).

Swing Bridges Control: *See* 'Navigable'.

SYDENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).

SYDNEY ACCOMMODATION, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.'

SYDNEY AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).

Sydney (North) Harbour Act Amt. B. No. 262 (Mr. *Prfeontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304; wthdn., 12492 (v); in Com. on Res., 12800; 1°*, of B., 12801; 2°, and in Com., 12993; 3°*, 12994 (vi). (*3 Edward VII c.* 39).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. Bill (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res. 12304; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12306 (v).

SYDNEY, POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).

———QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SYDNEY MINES, N.S., POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).

SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMRROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).

TADOUSAC AND ST. CATHERINE'S BAY SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).

TARGET PRACTICES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).

TARIFF BILL: *See* 'Customs Bills, 174 and 273' (i).

TARIFF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1406; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1489 (i).

TARIFF, CHANGES, FREE LIST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

———MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 265 (i).

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4957 (ii).

TARIFF POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Brock*) 4880; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 4884; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 4889; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 4901; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4908; (Mr. *Bell*) 4912; (Mr. *Gourley*) 4919; (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 4921; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 4926; (Mr. *Osler*) 4929; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4931; (Mr. *Field ing*) 4920, 4937; (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 4943; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4945; (Mr. *Northrup*) 4951 (ii).

———Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 4263 (ii).

TARIFF PROTECTION, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6707 (iii).

———PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. on Binder Twine B 233: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*), 7304-7392 (iii).

TARIFF REVISION, COR. *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*), 3003 (ii).

TARIFF TAXATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., on Immigration, 6861 (iii).

TAYLOR, GEO. L., POLICE MAGISTRATE, YUKON, SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONES, in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B., 5513 (iii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

——— B.C., in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).

——— WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).

——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii).

——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

——— P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).

——— P.E.I., RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE: in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).

——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

——— ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).

———WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).

TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418, 3509 (ii).

Telephone Companies B. No. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1°*, 92; 2° m., 700 (i).

———*See* 'Railway Act'.

Telephones, &c.: *See* 'Canadian Telephone,' &c.

TELEPHONE AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

TELEPHONE COS. IN MAR. PROVS., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2585 (ii).

TELEPHONES IN OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

TELEPHONE LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 291, 409 (i).

——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

———SERVICE LONG DISTANCE IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 5088 (ii).

TELESCOPE FOR OTTAWA OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, REPAIRS TO WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
See 'Lake Temiscamingue.'

TEMPORARIES IN P.O. DEPT., TRANSFER TO PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

TENDERS *re* GOVT. CONTRACTS, INJUSTICE TO ENGLISH FIRMS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

TENECAPE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup. 13213 (vi).

TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).

TENTS FOR N.W. MOUNTED POLICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

TERREBONNE, INDIAN RESERVE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).

——— POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).

——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

TEULON NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).

Textile Fabrics Regulation and Inspection B. No. 137 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°m., 2101 (i); 2°m., 3294 (ii).

THANKSGIVING DAY ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13790 (vi).

THESSALON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).
THETFORD MINES, POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).
THOMPSON, MR. P., 'LABOUR GAZETTE', COR., TORONTO, REMUNERATION : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).
THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).
THREE FATHOM HARBOUR BEACH WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
—— RETAINING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
—— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARVES : in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
TICKET OF LEAVE ACT, RELEASE, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 566 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
TIDAL SERVICE, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4114 (ii).
See 'Marine' &c.
TIES, ISSUED, PURCHASED, USED on I.C.R., &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*), 3805 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*), 1679 (i).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, RUBUILDING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14314, 14345 (vi).
—— Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*), 14737, 14739 (vi).
TILSONBURG TO WOODSTOCK RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).
TIMBER AND TREE PLANTING, PROTECTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 13775, 14272 (vi).
See 'Tree Planting'.
TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 2757 (ii).
TIMIGAMI RY. TO STURGEON FALLS, SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).
TIVERTON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
TOBACCO AGENT, MR. DUGAS, AMTS. PAID TO : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1034 (i).
TOBACCO COMBINE, CHAIRMAN'S REP. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1297 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 8267 (iv).
TOBACCO DUTIES COLLECTED IN 1902, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*), 2103 (i).
—— COLLECTED IN 1903 : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*), 12217 (v).
—— DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*), 446 (i).
—— EXCISE DUTIES, PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re* INCREASE : Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*), 5701 (iii).
—— STAMPS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL : Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14462 (vi).
TORONTO, ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION : in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
TORONTO, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 972 (i), 13086 (vi).
—— PAVING, &c. ; in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
TORONTO ARMOURY, LETTERS *re* ENLARGEMENT : Read (Mr. *Clarke*), in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), 11177 (v).
TORONTO CUSTOM HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 647, 957 (i).
—— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
TORONTO ELECTRIC ST. RY. CO. : Remarks *re* running rights (Mr. *Clarke*) 6083 (iii).
Toronto and Hamilton Railway Co.'s B. No. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 2396 (i) ; 2°*, 2756 ; in Com., 4672 ; Order for Com., 4868 (ii), 5555, (remarks) 5882, 6198 (iii), ref. back to Sel. Com., 7812 ; in Com., 9419 ; 3°*, 9431 (iv). (*3 Edward VII*, c. 196).
TORONTO AND HAMILTON RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to resume adjnd. Deb., 5882, 6198 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* running rights, 6091 (iii).
Toronto Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Co.'s B. No. 203 (Mr. *Calvert*) M. to receive Pet., 4261 ; 1°*, 4727 (ii) ; 2°*, 5139 ; in Com. and 3°*, 6399 (iii) (*3 Edward VII, c.* 197).
TORONTO HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
—— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
—— TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT. ON HARBOUR, &c. : M. for Stmnt * (Mr. *Grant*). 534, 1203 (i).
TORONTO INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO : in Com. of Sup., 13501 (vi).
TORONTO ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).
TORONTO AND JAMES BAY RY. SUBSIDY : Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) 14358, 14443 (vi).
TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
See 'Can. Foundry Co.' &c.
TORONTO, LINDSAY AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
TORONTO, MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
—— STOREHOUSES : in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
—— ADDITIONAL STORY : in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
—— BRANCH OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
—— ENLARGEMENT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
—— PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).
TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).

"TOWNSEND" VALVE, *re* LOCK GATES, WELLAND CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
TRACADIE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).
——— LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii), 13038 (vi).
TRACHOMA, EPIDEMIC *re* IMMIGRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 5493 (iii).
——— HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 14245
——— IMMIGRANTS, MEDICAL INSPECTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6662, 6695, 6843 (iii).
TRACKMEN'S INCREASE OF WAGES, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 1297 (i).
——— INCREASE OF SALARIES : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).
See 'North Atlantic.'
——— INCREASE OF WAGES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12874, 14083 (vi).
TRADE COMBINATIONS, INVESTIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14654 (vi).
See 'Lumber.'
TRADE COMMISSIONER IN LONDON, ENG. : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3497 (ii).
TRADESMEN'S ACCOUNTS FOR H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE :

ALLAN'S CONTRACT *re* ATLANTIC SERVICE, DISCRIMINATING RATES *re* CAN. FREIGHT : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13674 (vi).
See 'Atlantic Fast SS.'
ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, ALLAN'S CONTRACT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 13672 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Hfx.*) 7091 (iii).
ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, WITHDRAWAL OF ALLAN STEAMERS FROM ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).
See 'C.P.R.'
ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4007 (ii).
——— Inquiry (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) for Stmnt., 4445 (ii).
——— PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT : in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) to Com. of Sup., 14158 (vi).
———Remarks *re* Amt. to Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 13948 (vi).
——— TENDERS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3882, 4120 (ii).
AUSTRALIA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).
BINDER TWINE, BOUNTIES, &C. : Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7305 (iii).
BINDER TWINE, CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* SALES : Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 4180 (ii).
BINDER TWINE INSPECTION, ADMINISTRATION OF, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF INSPECTOR, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).
——— METHODS OF COLLECTING PENALTIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 14684 (vi).
——— QUANTITY IMPORTED FROM U.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7565 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc. in Rep. on Agriculture, &c. 13788 (vi).
See general heading.
CAN. AND AUSTRALIA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*

CAN. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
See 'G. B. and Can.'
CAN. AND S. AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
C.P.R. STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
See 'Allan'
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN PARIS, COR., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF : in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).
——— DUTIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 4360 (ii).
DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 92 (i).
DEPTL. VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 7573, 7759 (iv).
FAST MAIL LINE :
See 'Atlantic.'
FRANCE AND CANADA SS. SERVICE : Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4957 (ii).
See 'Ocean Steamship Subsidies Bill.'
FREIGHTS ON OCEAN VESSELS : *See* 'Freight Rates.'
FREIGHT RATES BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).
———Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).
———PROVISION IN CONTRACT *re* DISCRIMINATION : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).
FURNESS-WITHY CO.'S SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GASPÉ AND DALHOUSIE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).
GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).
GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND AND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
G B. AND CAN. MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 7573, 7728 (iv).
G.B. AND CANADA SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).
See 'Atlantic Fast SS. Service,' &c.
HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL *via* NFLD, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
HAYCOCK, JOS., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : Ques. (Messrs *Wilson* and *Taylor*) 4959 (ii).
———APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : in Com. of Sup. 7763, 7772 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).
HIDES INSPECTIONS, TEL. FROM W. F. MACLEAN, M. P. : Read (Mr. *Sproule*), 3969 (ii).
HIDES INSPECTOR AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3627 (ii).
HIDES, TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 7748 (iv), 13678 (vi).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS SS. SUBVENTION : i n Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 5878, 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672, 14249 (vi).
MANCHESTER AND MONTREAL SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup.. 7745 (iv).
PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE :
See 'Chamber of Commerce.'
PASPEBIAC AND GASPÉ BASIN SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT CHEQUE : in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Con. of Sup., 14249 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
P.E.I. AND G.B. MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv).
P.E.I. AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
P.E.I. AND NEWFOUNDLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13676 (vi).
ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
ST. JOHN AND BELFAST SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7731 (iv).
——AND DIGBY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).
——AND GLASGOW SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).
——AND HALIFAX SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
——AND LONDON SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
ST. JOHN AND W. INDIES SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE AND FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).
See 'Marine,' etc.
ST. STEPHEN AND BACK BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
S. AFRICA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
SYDNEY AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).
TADOUSAC AND ST. CATHERINE'S BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
TRADE COMMISSIONER IN LONDON, ENG.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3497 (ii).
'TUNISIAN' AND 'BAVARIAN,' RATE OF SPEED, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).
VICTORIA, B. C., AND VANCOUVER ISLAND, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
TRADING AND EXPLORING COMPANY'S EXPENSES *re* YUKON TRAIL : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
TRAFFIC IN N. W. T., BLOCKADE, &c.: Remarks (Mr *Scott*) on M. for Sup., 2424 (i).
TRAFFIC RATES, I. C. R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr *Bell*) 3712 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'
TRANS-CANADA RY. CO., APPLICATION TO GOVT. FOR SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1026 (i).
TRANS-CANADA RY. AND G. T. PACIFIC, PAR. IN TORONTO 'NEWS' *re* SALE : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7566 (iv).
—— CONTRACT WITH GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2759 (ii) ; Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 2794 (ii).
—— M. for Cor (Mr. *Tarte*) 672 (i).
See 'G. T. P. Ry.', &c.
Transcontinental Ry. B. No. 235, 1°m, 7658 (iv).
——Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7726 (iv).
——AND SIR WILLIAM MULOCK'S SPEECH : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 367 (i).
—— DECLARATIONS BY MINISTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
——GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5765 (iii).
——PROPOSALS TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 874 (i).
—— REPRESENTATIONS *re* MILITARY PURPOSES : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 541 (i).
See 'G. T. Pacific.'
R
TRANSLATION OF PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*), 545 (i).
TRANSLATORS OF DEBATES, RENTAL OF OFFICES : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 3799 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 2311 (i).
TRANSPORT AND FREIGHT FOR MILITARY PURPOSES : in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND TARIFF INQUIRY, PAR. IN MONTREAL "HERALD" : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 853 (i).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF CHAIRMAN : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 9582 (iv).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, &c., APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS : Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 5137 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 1199 (i), 3129, 4840 (ii), 9819 (iv).
—— APPNMT. OF SIR WM. VANHORNE : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 7297 (iii).
—— DISCUSSION OF *re* SOREL WHARF : Remarks (Mr *Brock*), in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
—— EXPENDITURE *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13362 (vi).
——FORMATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 9819 (iv).
——FURTHER ARRANGEMENTS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 9458 (iv).
——INSTRUCTIONS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 4120 (ii).
——MEETINGS, BUSINESS TRANSACTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 13027 (vi).
——O. C. *re* APPNMTS. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Tarte*), 1324 (i).
——PERSONNEL, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 4727 (ii), 7206 (iii).
——SIR WM. VANHORNE'S VIEWS *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*), 8330 (iv).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, GOVT. POLICY *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 3432 (ii).
Debate : (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 3438 ; (Mr. *Sproule*), 3442 ; (Mr. *Haggart*), 3444 ; (Mr. *Tarte*), 3451 ; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 3456 ; (Mr. *Charlton*), 3459 ; (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*), Irregularity of debate, 3470, 3499 ; (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3471 ; (Mr. *Oliver*), 3479 ; (Mr. *Bickerdike*), 3483 ; (Mr. *Kemp*), 3486 ; (Mr. *Osler*), 3490 ; (Mr. *Pringle*), 3493 ; (Mr. *Bell*), 3497 ; (Mr. *Clare*), 3505 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE : in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
—— *re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION FROM THE N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Traffic', &c.
TRANSPORTATION POLICY *re* SPEECH FROM THRONE : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 6404 (iii).
TRAP NETS IN GULF ST. LAWRENCE, PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2917 (ii).
TREADGOLD AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, INQUIRY, *re* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4840 (ii).
—— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4960 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*), to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95), 2914; (Amt.) 2826 (ii).

Debate: (Sir *William Mulock*), 2826; (Mr. *Pringle*) 2842; (Mr. *Blair*) 2863; (Mr. *Porter*) 2873; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2880; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 2887; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2898; (Mr. *Barker*) 2906; (Mr. *Osler*) 2912 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2424 (i).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4486; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).

Debate: (Sir *William Mulock*) 4499; (Mr. *Monk*) 4505; (Mr *Borden, Hfx.*) 4509; (Mr. *Blair*) 4513; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4522; (Mr. *Northrup*) 4525; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 4533; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4536; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4541; (Mr. *Davis*) 4544 (ii).

TREADGOLD COMMISSION, APPNMT., &C.: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).

———AND DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1224 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 3298, 3303, 3713 (ii).

——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3864 (ii).

——— CORRECTED ANSWER (Mr. *Sifton*), 6803 (iii).

——— ENGINEER'S REP. TO MIN. OF JUS., 2798 (ii).

———FREE REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 5990 (iii).

——— FREE REPRESENTATIONS: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6427 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 3397 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioner (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 13134, 13258 (vi).

——— INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 4120, 4564 (ii), 5242 (iii).

——— LETTER FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, 2818 (ii).

——— LETTER FROM HON. J. H. ROSS *re* LIB. CONVENTION, 2817 (ii).

——— LETTER TO SENATOR WOOD FROM HOLME, MILLER & CO., 2807 (ii).

——— LIBERAL ASSO'CN, PET., 2821 (ii).

——— LIB. PLATFORM, CONVENTION, 2842 (ii).

——— PLEDGES OF HON. J. H. ROSS, 2843 (ii).

——— 'MORNING SUN', QUOTATIONS, &C., 2804 (ii).

——— 'MORNING SUN', REPS. OF DAWSON CITY MEETING, 2808 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4727 (ii).

——— PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS *re* EVIDENCE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11064 (v).

——— PERSONNEL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638, (iii).

——— PET. BY YUKON CITIZENS TO GOV. GEN., 2798 (ii).

——— PRINGLE, MR., Speech at Bonanza, 2822 (ii).

——— REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638 (iii), 7927 (iv).

——— RESOLUTIONS OF DAWSON CITIZENS' MEETING 1902, 2810 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, RESOLUTIONS *re* LIBERAL CONVENTION, 2815 (ii).

——— SEC. 14, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4593 (ii).

——— TAPPAN ABNEY'S REMARKS IN "HARPERS WEEKLY", 2849 (ii).

——— TEL. FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE *re* PETS &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1195 (i).

——— TEL. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, DAWSON: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 8085 (iv).

——— TEL. FROM W. A. BEDDOE *re* COMMISSIONER'S REFUSAL TO PRODUCE FILES: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9818 (iv).

——— Remarks *re* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9979 (iv).

TREADGOLD EXHIBITS, GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).

TREADGOLD, HYDRAULIC LEASES, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*), 288 (i).

TREASURY BOARD: *See* 'Auditor General.'

TREE CULTURE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii).

TREE PLANTING: in Com. of Sup., 13775 (vi).

See 'Timber.'

TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).

———EMPLOYMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 8117 (iv).

———HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*), 129 (i).

———MESSRS. CORRY & LAVERDURE, INTEREST *re* ARBRITATION: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

———PAYMENT TO THOS. DODDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 8118 (iv).

———PETERBOROUGH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).

———REP. OF W. MCLEOD, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 12716 (vi).

———ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

———SPECIFICATIONS, REPS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ward*), for Copies, 2313 (i).

TRENTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).

TROIS PISTOLES BRIDGE TO MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*), 8488 (iv).

TRURO TO PARRSBOROUGH, RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14491 (vi).

TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).

Trust Co.: *See* 'Royal Trust.'

Trust Corporation: *See* 'Consolidated.'

Trust Funds, Moosonee Diocese B. No. 148 (Mr. *Osler*), 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 157).

TUBERCULOSIS, AID TO CAN. ASSOCIATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

TUCKER, HENRY, PAYMENT *re* INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).

'TUNISIAN' AND 'BAVARIAN,' STRS., RATE OF SPEED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).

TURNPIKE TRUST, MONTREAL, INDEBTEDNESS, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 672 (i).

TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
See 'Frank.'

TWO-CENT FARE CLAUSE, G. T. RY., REPEAL OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 11828 (v).
——— Amt. in Com. on B. 235, 12221 (v).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'

TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT, RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7567 (iv).

TYERMAN, P. D., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 286 (i).

UNFORESEEN EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iii), 12588 (v).

United Empire Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3796, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 198).

U. S. COASTING LAWS, BONDING PRIVILEGES, &c., REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

U. S. IMMIGRATION OFFICERS, NEWPORT VT., TREATMENT OF ENGLISH DELEGATES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).

U. S. INDEMNITY TO FISHERMEN, COR. &c.: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor.*, 3236 (ii).

U. S. INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS OF VESSELS *re* CUSTOMS MANIFEST AND POSTAGE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT CO.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).

UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).

VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

VALIQUETTE, Mr. J. A., APPNMT. AS STENOGRAPHER IN YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 4005 (ii).

VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
——— ELECTION: *See* 'Beauharnois.'
——— LABOUR STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 98 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
——— STRIKE, PAY OF MEN, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).

Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) 1°*, 1111; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., 4587; in Com.*, and 3°*, 4612 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 199).

Vancouver Harbour, Lands B. No. 76 (Mr. *Macpherson* 1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026 (i).

VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).

VANCOUVER POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— P.O., INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).

VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) on conc., 14764 (vi).

VEGETABLES IMPORTED FROM U.S., DUTY COLLECTED AT TORONTO AND MONTREAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1058 (i).
See 'Market'.

VENIOT, P.I., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT BATHURST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

VENTILATION IN H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 488, 975 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).
——— FANS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).

VESTIBULE EQUIPMENT FOR I.C.R. CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).

VETERANS, CANADIAN, PET. *re* MILITARY SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 11188 (v).

VETERINARY, CHIEF INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1591 (i).

VETERINARY DIVISION, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).

VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO S.S. SUBVENTION: in Com of Sup., 7741 (iv).

VICTORIA, B.C. AND VANCOUVER ISLAND, SS SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).

VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 365 (i), 14243 (vi).
See 'Public Works, &c.'

VICTORIA MEMORIAL, LONDON, CONTRIBUTION OF CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

VICTORIA, N.W.T. TO ANDREWS, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).

VICTORIA, N.S., BEACH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

VISITORS IN H. OF C. CORRIDORS: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lennox*) 11427, 11557 (v).

VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N.W.T., LAND SCRIP, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).

VOTERS' LISTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (iii).
See 'Electoral Lists.'

VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

WABY, INDIAN PRISONER, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iii).

WADSWORTH, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).

WAGNER, D. J., SALARY INCREASE: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 14256 (vi).

WALKERVILLE BRIDGE CO., SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

WALLACEBURG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).

WALLACE, DAVID WARDROPE, MEMBER FOR ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RUSSELL: Introduced, 1642 (i).

WALLACE HARBOUR, N.S., FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).

WALPOLE CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).

WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

WALTHAM STATION TO FERGUSON POINT, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

WASHABUCK CENTRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).

WASHINGTON, MR. HECTOR, REP. *re* LAND VALUES: Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).

WATER SUPPLY FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).

WATER SUPPLY ON C. P. R. TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).

WATSON, JOHN, PRES. OF LIB. ASSOCIATION, NESBITT, MAN: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 1195 (i).

WAYS AND MEANS: German Surtax in Com. on B. 273, 14755 (vi).

——— Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 89, 1378 (i).

——— Financial Statement, 1378 (i).

——— DEBATE: *See* 'Budget'

WEDGE POINT, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

WEEKLY PUBLICATIONS, 'JESSE JAMES' SERIES, CUSTOMS DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

Weigh Masters Bill: *See* 'General Inspection.'

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. No. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°m, 203; 2°m., 2338 (i), 3245 (ii).

——— **(scales) Amt. B. No. 188** (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4009; in Com., 4009, 4187; 3°*, 4203 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 72).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTORS: Salaries in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).

WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).

——— DRAINAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).

——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).

——— ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).

——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).

——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).

——— ROCK CUT: *See* 'Colborne.'

——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).

——— WATER POWER, O. Cs. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).

——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE OF ST. CATHARINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).

WELLINGTON TO UNION BAY, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).

WENTWORTH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).

WEST BACCARO, BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).

WEST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).

Western Alberta Railway Co.'s B. No. 205 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 5238; 2°*, 5362; in Com., and 3°*, 6657 (iii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 200).

Western Assurance Co.'s B. No. 244 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 8406; 2°*, 8559 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 10903 (v), (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 201).

Western Canada Mortgage, &c. Bill: See 'Canada Permanent.'

WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, COMMISSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6168 (iii).

——— JURY'S VERDICT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3231 (ii).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on Adjmnt., 4726 (ii).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 249 (Mr. *Morrison*) M. to receive Pet., 10489 1°, 10744; 2°*, 10903 (v).

WEST POINT, U.S.: Remarks (Col. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 13095 (vi).

WHARFS, &C., BUILDING BY GOVT.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 13143, 13449 (vi).

WHARF CONNECTIONS AND RY. SUBSIDIES BY GOVT Remarks in Com. on Ry. Res., 14463 (vi).

WHARFS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

——— PRIVATE, GOVT. EXPENDITURE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1352-1377 (i).
See 'Public Works.'

WHEAT, BLOCKADE IN N.W.T.; *See* 'Ry. Traffic,' 11425 (v).

——— EXPORT FREIGHT RATES PER HUNDRED POUNDS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).

——— FREIGHT RATES, RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).

——— SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 284 (i).

———Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).
See 'Grain,' &c.

WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).

WHITE, ALBERT S., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4673 (ii).

WHITE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

WHITE, MR., EXPENSES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6732, 6853 (iii).

WHITE HORSE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).

WHITE MUD RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WHITNEY PIER, N.S., SALARY OF POSTMASTER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 130, 668 (i).
WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 11188 (v).
WILLIAMSBURG CANALS, APPNMT. of SUPT., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— OVERSEER'S HOUSE; in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
See 'Galop'.
WILLIAM'S HEAD, B. C., QUARANTINE STATION WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. No. 228 (Mr. *Wade*), 1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9149; in Com., and 3°*, 9152 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 202).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*), 1°*, 367; 2° m., 630, 664 (i).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, N.S., SHEER DAM, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT, I. C. R., EVIDENCE *re*: Remark (Mr. *Clarke*), 3301, 3398, 3496, 3712 (ii).
WINDSOR, N.S, NEW STATION, RENTAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
WINDSOR, ONT., CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &c.; Remarks in Com. of Sup.. 3907 (ii).
WINDSOR, ONT., POST OFFICE, LETTER BOXES: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
Winnipeg Bank: *See* 'Bank of Winnipeg'. &c.
WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
Winnipeg City Water Power Bill: *See* 'Assiniboine River'.
WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS AND POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13126, (vi).
———LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
———MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
———MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
———POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 438 (1), 13127 (vi).
———P.O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
———P.O., REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).
Winnipeg Western Land Corporation Co.'s Limited B. No. 61 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°* 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 204).
WINNIPEGOSIS, CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION BY STR. 'STANLEY', P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).
———M. for Copies of Pets., &c., (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).
———CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett* 6895 (iii).
———COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1036 (i).
———M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.,' &c.
WIRE FENCING, MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
See 'Canals,' &c.
WIRELESS STATIONS ON MARINE COASTS: in Com. of Sup., 13639 (vi).
See 'Marconi,' &c.
WOLFE ISLAND, DREDGING SHOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOLFVILLE, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WOOD ALCOHOL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
——— MANUFACTURE IN CANADA, OUTPUT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 98 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
See 'Standard,' &c.
WOODS, J. W., RENTAL OF BUILDINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
——— TENDER FOR TENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii).
———Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
Woodmen of the World, Can. Order B. No. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., 1854; 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 206).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WOODSTOCK, N. B. AND FREDERICTON RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).
WOODSTOCK, N. B., ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
———DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 4563 (ii), 5735 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* Ret. (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 4593 (ii).
——— REPAIRS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
WOODSTOCK, N. B. TO U.S. BOUNDARY, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).
WOODSTOCK, ONT., ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
———PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041, 13108 (vi).
Woolf Valve Gear Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 161 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 205).
WORKING EXPENSES, I. C. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
———P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

WRECKING PLANT, STR. 'LORD STRATHCONA,' MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13524, 13514 (vi).

See 'Marine.'

WRIGHT, MR. A. W., AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 8116 (iv).

YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

YAMASKA TO LOTBINIÈRE, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14318 (vi).

YAMASKA RIVER AND ST. GUILLAUME, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

YARMOUTH, N.S., BAR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

'YEAR BOOK' : in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

YOHO PARK, ROAD CONSTRUCTION, &C : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

YORK AND CARLETON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

YORKTON COURT HOUSE, in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).

YUKON, COMPENSATION TO CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE : in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

YUKON, EDMONTON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Yukon Territory Act (Jurors) Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 94 ; 2°*, 313 ; in Com., 313 ; 3°*, 314 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 73).

Yukon Ter. Act (Court of Appeal) Amt. B. No. 254 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 11692 ; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12301 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 74).

YUKON :

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE : In Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

ADMINISTRATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

BRITTON, JUDGE, CHARGES *re* INVESTIGATION OF TREADGOLD COMMISSION, PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 11065 (v).

BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

CLERKS, &C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

COMPENSATION TO CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE : in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

COURTS, PURCHASE OF LAW BOOKS : in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).

CUSTOMS EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 3968 (ii).

DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re* TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS : Remarks (Mr *Borden, Halifax*), 1024 (i).

DAWSON TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

DISTRICT NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. : M. for stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).

DOM. LAND REGULATIONS : in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

DUGAS, JUDGE, REFUND TO DEPT. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

EILBECK, SHERIFF, FEES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

——— SALARY, LIVING ALLOWANCE, FEES, &C. : in Com., of Sup., 3414 (ii).

ELDORADO GUSHER, EXPENDITURE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6949, 7275 (iii).

GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

GOVTL. EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6802, 6949 (iii), 13367 (vi).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

YUKON—*Con.*

HOSPITAL GRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iii).

HYDRAULIC LEASES : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*), 1323 (i).

INDIANS, GENERAL EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iii).

——— RELIEF, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7270 (ii i).

JUDGES' LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

———TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

———LAW LIBRARY : in Com. of Sup., 14267 (vi).

LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

LITHGOW, MR., CONTROLLER : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).

MIDDLETON, T. W., GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DEFALCATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

MOUNTED POLICE, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5262 (iii).

NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).

N. W. MOUNTED POLICE, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5003 (ii).

OFFICIALS, LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).

POLICE MAGISTRATES, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

POST OFFICE DEFICIT : Remarks (Sir *William Mulock*), in Com. of Sup., 14014 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13133, 13306 (vi).

REGULATIONS *re* DOM. LANDS, APPROVAL, &C. : in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 5826, 7283 (iii).

SHERIFFS, CLERKS, &C. SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 3410 (ii).

SHERIFFS FEES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

———LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3414 (ii).

STENOGRAPHERS, APPNMT. OF J. A. VALIQUETTE : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 4005 (ii).

———SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

SUPPLIES, PURCHASE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6930 (iii).

TAYLOR, GEO. L., POLICE MAGISTRATE, YUKON, SALARY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

TEL. LINES : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

——— MANAGEMENT, &C., PAR. IN 'POST INTELLIGENCER' *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 7003 (iii).

——— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).

TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418, 3509 (ii).

TRADING AND EXPLORING COMPANY'S EXPENSES *re* YUKON TRAIL : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

TREADGOLD AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, INQUIRY *re* : (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4840 (ii).

———Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4960 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, AMT. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2796 ; Neg. (Y. 52 ; N. 95) 2912 ; (Amt.) 2826 (ii).

———Letter from Dawson Board of Trade, 2818 (ii).

———Letter from Hon. J. H. Ross *re* Liberal Convention, 2817 (ii).

———Letter to Senator Wood from Holme, Miller & Co., 2807 (ii).

——— Liberal Association, Pet., 2821 (ii).

——— Liberal Platform, Convention, 2842 (ii).

———Pledges of Hon. J. H. Ross, 2843 (ii).

——— '*Morning Sun*' Quotations, &c., 2804 (ii).

——— '*Morning Sun*' Reps., Dawson City Meeting, 2808 (ii).

YUKON—*Con.*

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4486 (ii).
——APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3298, 3303, 3713 (ii).
——APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3864 (ii).
——APPNMT. &C.: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).
——AND DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1024 (i).
——CORRECTED ANSWER (Mr. *Sifton*) 6803 (iii).
——ENGINEER'S REP. TO MIN. of JUS., 2798 (ii).
——EXHIBITS, GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
——FREE REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 5990 (iii).
—— FREE REPRESENTATIONS: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6427 (iii).
——HYDRAULIC LEASES, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).
——O. Cs. &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*).
——Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3397 (ii).
——Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioners (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13134, 13258 (vi).
——INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4120, 4564 (ii), 5242 (iii).
——Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 5243 (iii).
——NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 4727 (ii).
—— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2424 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, &C., O. C. 12th June 1901, 2800 (ii).
——O. C. 7th Dec. 1901, 2801 (ii).
——O. C. 21st April, 1902, 2803 (ii).
——PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS *re* EVIDENCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11064 (v).
——PERSONNEL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638, 7297 (iii).
——REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638 (iii).
——SEC. 14, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.* 4593 (ii).
—— TEL. FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE *re* PETS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1195 (i).
—— TEL. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, DAWSON: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 8085 (iv).
—— TEL. FROM W. A. BEDDOE *re* COMMISSIONER'S REFUSAL TO PRODUCE FILES: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9618, 9979 (iv).
——TAPPAN ABNEY'S REMARKS "IN HARPERS' WEEKLY," 2849 (ii).
VALIQUETTE, MR. J. A., APPNMT. AS STENOGRAPHER IN YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5005 (ii).
WHITE HORSE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
YUKON ITEMS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13500 (vi).

Yukon Ry.: *See* 'Canadian Yukon'.
Yukon Ry.: *See* 'Coast'.

ERRATA.

Bazinet, Mr.
Joliette and Lake Manuan Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 977; in Com. and 3°*, 2050 (i).

Blain, Mr.
Blankets, &c., read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Blair, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5144 for 5139 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5139 for 5138 (iii).

Bourassa, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5149 for 5145 (iii).

Clarke, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5141 for 5139 (iii).

Davis, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5148 for 5145 (iii).

Fielding, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5151 for 5147 (iii).

Fitzpatrick, Mr.
Dorchester Penitentiary, read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Fowler, Mr.
Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ottawa (census building) read 992 for 982 (i).

Haggart, Mr.
Bonding Privileges with U.S., read 12757 for 12751 (vi).

Heyd, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5152 (iii).

Ingram, Mr.
Dorchester Penitentiary, read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Kemp, Mr.
Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Wendover wharf) read 1439 (i), and delete 1439 for Que. Harbour Improvements.

LaRivière, Mr.
Private Bills, read 5138 for 5137 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid.
Blankets, &c., read 10102 for 10101 (v).
Private Bills, read 5139 for 5137 (iii).

McCarthy, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5139 for 5138 (iii).

Murray, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 235, read 10111 for 1011.

SUBJECTS.

Page clxii first line for "Census Buildings" read "Census, Cost," &c.